

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Eighteenth Legislature

April 21, 1978.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Edgar Kaeding (Saltcoats) in take pleasure in introducing a group of students from the Tantallon public school . . .

HON. E. KAEDING (Saltcoats): — I've got it here. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the Assembly a group of students from the Tantallon Public School in the beautiful Qu'Appelle Valley, they are sitting up in the Speaker's Gallery. They will be meeting with me after they have been sitting in the House and they have been visiting around the Legislature. I will be meeting with them at 1:30.

I am sure that all of you will join with me in welcoming them to the Legislature and wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GASOLINE PRICES AT BORDER

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Revenue. I have asked this question in the House several times, Mr. Minister, and I realize that in representing all areas of Saskatchewan that possibly you are having some problems in reaching a government policy. That is a policy, Mr. Minister, that you have promised to me on three occasions at least in which you would be announcing the government policy in what way the government would be taking measures to protect the interests of Saskatchewan businessmen along the Alberta-Saskatchewan border due to the difference in the gasoline price. When can we expect the announcement and shall we say not within the next few days but I'll put the question to you, can we expect an announcement before this month is up?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue): — I think it is fair to say that we should expect an announcement before the month is out. I could point out that we expect anything that is done will be done retroactively to the 1st of April, when the Alberta tax came off. I might inform the House that we have some officials out in that area right now doing some checking with people with respect to getting some input from them as well.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister realizes this comment has been made in this House several times. I wonder with the retroactivity clause which you have promised to the people along there as to what provisions you are going to make for those who have since April 1st had to close their businesses entirely, is any consideration going to be given to these people at all?

MR. ROBBINS: — We haven't been given any information with respect to any that have closed in that interim.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A supplementary to the Minister of Revenue. You have made the commitment that we would be expecting government policy shortly and the promise has been made on several occasions. In light of the very intense Cabinet and caucus divisions on your side of the House in coming up with a policy, why would you be so certain that you would have it by the end of the month and is there not a little wishful thinking there?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, we want our decision to be a reasonable one. The member who just spoke was the member of a caucus at one time, head of a government that tried to rush in where fools have feared to tread, I suppose, in the Lloydminster area and they had to back off very quickly in terms of the decisions that were made at that time.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I would like to direct a question to the minister. The minister has indicated that you are now trying to determine a policy retroactive to April 1st in relation to actual sales. Can the minister indicate whether or not his government is considering retroactively, consideration for lost sales because the real issue in western Saskatchewan today is not only the amount of the gasoline gallons that are sold but by far what is more important is the thousands and thousands of dollars or lost sales that now these businessmen have lost because of the change in price.

MR. ROBBINS: — That, Mr. Speaker, is totally impossible to pinpoint.

CABLE TV FILTERS

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General or the Minister in charge of Sask Tel and I return to the matter of filters and converters once again. I asked the Attorney General yesterday about the matter of filters to confirm that filters would be required on all television sets that are hooked up to Cable TV.

My first question to the Attorney General, have you had any communication with Sask Tel in connection with this matter and can you now confirm to the House that filters will be required for every television set whether they take the licensees, the private licensees, or CPN or both?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, indeed I have had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the officials at Sask Tel and as I am sure all hon. members will realize this is a fairly highly technological matter. As I understand the situation, the answer to the question put forward by the member is that filters are not required in order to separate the two functions, the two services, as a matter of provision of service for the Conventional Cable operators. They may be required upon depending whether or not a Conventional Cable customer can uncover technology which will allow him to subscribe indirectly to the CPN subscription service which, of course, would be contrary to law, or could be contrary to law, and would also involve some expenditure.

But in terms of strict provision of service, a filter is not needed for the Conventional Cable operator since CPN will be, and is now, in the area between channel 5 and channel 6, referred to as the mid band and you can't get that on Conventional Cable unless you have a convert which, in effect, plucks this signal out. You don't need the

filter in order to prevent the Conventional Cable operator for getting the CPN in between 5 and 6. That is the advice that I get from the Sask Tel officials.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The advice that I received differs and the advice I received comes from Saskatoon Telecable and Cable Regina.

Accepting your proposition for the moment, be that as it may, is it not correct that a converter is readily obtainable in most stores in Saskatchewan and can be fairly simply hooked up to a television set that already is receiving Cable Regina and the signal that is being sent down the line by CPN just be put on the TV set because you have the converter? Is it not a fact that Sask Tel recognizes that this is a problem and the only way that you can prevent that from happening, short of prosecutions of course, is to have the filter installed? If that is the case, would you please tell me, Mr. Attorney General, how much these filters cost. When you are going to get a supply of them for Sask Tel and when they are going to be installed?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I think, it is fair to categorize his remarks as partly right. There is a gizmo on the market which is a converter, which may be able to do the thing that the Leader of the Liberal Party indicates, namely, take out that signal between channel 5 and channel 6. I emphasize the word “may” because these are commercial models and as I gather it is far from being absolutely scientifically clear that that is the case.

I would remind the member that there are two deterrents against people, going out and doing this on their own. Firstly, there is a financial deterrent, or could be a financial deterrent. The converter — I don't know what it costs at a commercial shop, this particular commercial shop, but using your figures it is certainly in the \$60 to \$100 range. One would argue that it is still cheaper than paying for CPN but 8 that is a deterrent.

Secondly of course, there is the question of whether or not this is a violation of the law — a violation of either a broadcasting law and/or a Sask Tel Act law or even perhaps even a Criminal Code with respect to theft because this would definitely be the stealing of a signal on the operation. So . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Doesn't that apply to CPN today?

MR. ROMANOW: — Absolutely not! We will come to that at a point but that is another question and I don't want to get too wordy. Those are the two deterrents that are there. The simple question is whether or not there will be any widespread use and successful widespread use of the converter for the use of this particular gizmo to take out the CPN signal from the mid-band 5 to 6. Sask Tel recognizes that this could happen but equally there are strong arguments that it will not happen in sufficient numbers for any kind of widespread production and/or purchase of filters in order to trap it out, and we are basing our assumptions that the latter will take place.

MR. MALONE: — The only way you can enforce this of course a policeman at every house to make sure that the people haven't attached a converter, if what you say is correct. But to put it mildly there is a great deal of uncertainty on both sides of the House as to the situations with filters, converters, converter-filters. I am not satisfied with your answers and I'm not saying that to demean you in any way and I am not satisfied with all the information that I have received. So bearing this in mind, would the Attorney General do one of a number of things? Will he call Sask Tel on estimates

immediately so that we can get Sask Tel officials in here and question them through the minister as to the actual situation. If you are not prepared to do that would you recall Sask Tel before Crown Corporations giving them instructions to answer questions at this period of time — would you do one of those things?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, there may be some confusion and I don't take away from that point because, as I say, this is technological, but if I may, I am advised by Sask Tel people that there are — if I can be permitted the very brief indulgence of this House, three ways that we can get the service. If a person gets conventional cable only and he does not want the CPN he does not need anything else to get that cable because the CPN will be on the mid-band and you can't get it unless you get the converter from Radio Shack or somewhere else. We were confident about that in question period. It is not a primary to separating the service. Whether it happens, the widespread abuse of converters, time will tell.

If however, he gets both CPN and conventional cable then he needs the filter converter — approximate cost, \$68 in all. This is Sask Tel information and I pass this along to the House. If he gets CPN only, he needs the filter converter — same gizmo, same cost, recaptured by the rates that Sask Tel charges the CPN.

To answer the question specifically, as House Leader, I have no objection to calling Sask Telecommunications' vote in estimates here early or to Crown Corporations, but there is a problem and I tell you candidly there is a problem. Many of the Sask Tel people are tied up right now in Ottawa with a very important issue before the Canadian Radio and Television Commission involving an application by CN . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Just given us reason No. 6.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, that is fine. You can politic all you want and I know that is your game now until the federal election is called, or whatever. I am telling you, the facts are, that the people who are involved primarily with cable and Sask Tel, including our legal counsel and including the top rates man, are in Ottawa and have been there for weeks and are going to be there for some time, on a very important application by CN/CP which directly affects Sask Tel. That is the simple fact of the matter — you can accept it or reject it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order, order! I will take the member for Qu'Appelle first.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, by supplementary. You have admitted that an individual who, supposedly wishes to break the law (if that is a question) and is prepared to make the economic commitment of buying a converter, can in fact get CPN for no charge. Will Sask Tel be prepared to supply converters to any person who has cable TV? Will he be able to get the converters from Sask Tel without hooking up to CPN? Are you prepared to give them that right to have converters from Sask Tel?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, Sask Tel is not in the commercial retail business in the sense of Radio Shack in the sale of these converters. We are in the provision of . . .

MR. COLLVER: — He never said it was.

MR. ROMANOW: — You are never here to know what he says so just don't tell me what he says. Just go out there and do your politicking out in rural Saskatchewan and believe me you need to do a lot in order to get some operation I am telling the hon. member for

Qu'Appelle that is not our game. We are in the business of providing services to customers, to clients who enter into contract, of which CPN is one — and if a gizmo, a box is required in order to facilitate a particular function and if we can do it, keeping in mind the economics of the operation, that's the obligation we are involved in. That is the answer to the question from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

I KOY CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the PC Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in the light of the Attorney General's aside, I would like to be addressing my question to him, but instead I will address the question to the Premier. The Premier is no doubt aware of the questioning that has gone on in this assembly in the last number of days, of the Minister of Finance pertaining to I KOY design out of Manitoba, and MBS, the contracting company out of Manitoba, that have been building senior citizens housing around in various locations in Saskatchewan. I would ask the Premier. In the light of the substantial contributions that were brought to the attention of this Assembly sometime ago to the NDP by I KOY and that organization, and since I KOY the designers, and MBS seem to be the same principals, one designing and one building, and since the Minister of Finance suggested the other day, the minister responsible for Sask Housing suggested the other day that the local authorities who are appointed by the Cabinet are making the decisions, and the architects making decisions — will the Premier now promise this Assembly that he will conduct an investigation of this entire matter of the questionable construction practices of MBS, I KOY and others in Sask Housing out of his office?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have not had made available to me evidence which would suggest that there were questionable practices requiring a major investigation. If the hon. member wishes to pass along something more than allegations, rather carefully worded, to supply innuendo and not facts, I would be happy to have the matter looked into, but I would ask him to supply the facts which he alleges, in writing, so we will all know what is supplied. Then we will have an opportunity to know whether or not a further investigation is warranted.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Premier. I think that the Premier would agree that the facts outlined in the first question are certainly correct. They have been presented to this Assembly in writing.

MR. SMISHEK: — What facts?

MR. COLLVER: — The fact that I KOY . . . The Minister of Finance suggests that I KOY have made contributions to the NDP. That fact has been presented to this Assembly. The fact that I KOY and MBS are the — well, we have the lists from the — and tabled the document in this House.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Premier is this. Since a Saskatchewan organization, the organization in Moose Jaw producing kitchen cabinets, was ruled out as a supplier of cabinets for the MBS senior citizens' projects because of design specification that specified American manufactured cabinets by the designed specifications by the architects in Saskatoon and the contract given to a Manitoba firm,

would the Premier not agree that that was sufficient fact in itself to investigate the rather questionable practices of Sask Housing?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member gives what he alleges to be facts. I would very much like to ask him to put those alleged facts down on a piece of paper so we could all examine them one by one. May I just instance one of those alleged facts, that we appoint the local housing authorities. Now, in a very, very technical sense, that is accurate, in the sense that they are appointed by order in council. But to the knowledge, and the full knowledge, of the Leader of the Opposition, that is done pursuant to an agreement whereby our government nominates one, the federal government nominates one, and the local authority nominates one, and we confirm those by order in council.

His suggestion that they are our appointees and not the appointees of the federal government, the local authority and ourselves one, one, and one, that suggestion is false and yet he, by innuendo, suggests that they are our appointments when he well knows they are joint appointments by federal, provincial and municipal governments.

GASOLINE PRICES AT BORDER

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Revenue. While I appreciated the fact that you announced this morning at least some retroactivity with regard to anything that is governing the gas price, I would just like to read a paragraph which I think refers to some problems that go above and beyond anything that a retroactive payment might help, and this is from a person in the Maple Creek area. It says:

We have just settled in Saskatchewan and purchased a small tourist supply store and gas pumps. Up until April 1, we had a fair gas trade. Now it has dropped to almost nothing. The tourists are only getting the minimum of gas to get them to Alberta and we are only 15 miles from the Alberta border, that isn't very little. In the last few days we are only selling \$2 to \$5 worth.

The person who runs the service station on the 121 tells me the average fill is now six gallons instead of 10 and that doesn't measure the number of people who drive by the service station.

Now, the Alberta budget was brought down on March 17, this is April 21. I would like to suggest that any further delay on this simply will not recover this lost business. It may do something about the gasoline that is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Does the member have a question?

MR. STODALKA: — Would the minister indicate whether or not it is possible to hurry up this decision? I understand a few days ago you said it would be in three days.

MR. ROBBINS: — I am sure I did not state any specific time. The decision will be made as soon as we can come to a decision.

STAR WEST

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of your answer to the member for Nipawin's question, I would like to ask

the Premier, that upon checking yesterday's Hansard where the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) suggested and, in fact, I believe stated although I have not seen the record, that a local firm in Moose Jaw had misled me into presenting incorrect facts regarding tendering practices of MBS and an architectural firm in Saskatoon. In light of the Minister of Finance's and the Minister in charge of Sask Housing Corporation's charges there, regarding what I think are very reputable people in Moose Jaw, would the Premier, therefore, undertake in his office to either substantiate the Minister of Finance's charges of the allegations that have been made the Star West people in Moose Jaw via myself. In other words, confirm it one way or the other and let's get the facts in the open, through your office.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, no doubt if the business firm in Moose Jaw, Star West is the name I believe you mentioned, has anything they would like the government to investigate, they will get in touch with our office or with the Minister in charge of the Housing Corporation — they may well have done so — with respect to . . . But for my part, if we cannot have a more reliable source of information than the verbal comments of the members of the Conservative Opposition, then I think that is a rather unstable base on which to launch an investigation. I would prefer them, I would prefer Star West or anyone else, if they allege that improper charges have been made, to state what they wish investigated and we will be more than happy to consider whether or not that merits investigation.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, I would like to ask you if your office maintains any records of phone calls? I would like to ask you if there is any record of the numerous times that Star West attempted to contact you personally in your office? I would like to ask you if there is any record of the numerous times that Star West worked through Sask Housing Corporation?

Again, Mr. Premier, may I ask you, when a minister of the Crown makes a serious charge on a private individual within this Assembly such as occurred yesterday, would the Premier not agree with me that certainly those charges should either be substantiated or they should be repudiated, one way or the other, certainly by your office.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I was here yesterday and I heard no charges. This is my difficulty with the member for Thunder Creek. I heard the minister say and I speak now from memory that the people who were running that contract on some sort of an invitational basis suggested that other people might get in touch and this particular firm you refer to did not get in touch. That's my recollection. I don't have the transcript here and I suspect nobody else does because yesterday's transcript is not out. So the difficulty really stems from operating from those very, very vague general comments. I will check my office records to see whether calls were made by Star West but I would have thought that if, as alleged by the hon. member Star West was attempting to get in touch with me and failed, they would have resorted to one of the other means of communication, a letter or telex or something to get their message through. I am not here to suggest that what the hon. member says is not accurate but I am just saying that if in fact they have not been able to reach I suspect they might have done that. I am not aware of them having done so. I accordingly ascribe to the comments of the hon. member that level of importance which would follow from that level of concern shown by the company that he represents. I am not saying it isn't a matter that should be investigated, I want to be very clear on that, I'm just saying that I would like from someone at first hand a statement of what they believe ought to be investigated and if Star West wishes to send it no doubt they will know where to send it.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SASK TEL AND GOVERNMENT

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — To the Minister in charge of Sask Tel. I want to ask the minister if what we are hearing about the deteriorating relationship between Sask Tel and the government is, in fact, so? Is it a fact that at the moment the government feels that it's being misled in respect to some of the issues that have been raised in the House in the last few days by Sask Tel and is Sask Tel on the other hand not currently of a strong feeling that the government is interfering in its operations?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment): — The answer to question one is No, and the answer to question two is, No.

MR. CAMERON: — Is it not a fact by way of supplementary, that the government ordered Sask Tel not to abide its earlier commitments by way of letter which is filed in the House? Is it not a fact that was a decision of the government and not Sask Tel?

MR. ROMANOW: — No.

MR. CAMERON: — Are you saying that is, No? Can I ask you then, why is it, why may I ask by way of supplementary to the Minister in charge of Telephones, is the government's lawyer, George Taylor, appearing in respect of the court case rather than the lawyers within Sask Tel? Can we draw any or make any assumption from that of any kind? I ask the Minister in charge of Telephones.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Minister, I just finished telling the member earlier in question period that Mr. Tom Howe has been engaged for weeks in Ottawa at a CRTC hearing involving an application by CN-CP which would 'clean skin' much of Sask Tel's very profitable businesses, and also impair the service that Sask Tel provides to rural Saskatchewan. We are one of four or five telephone companies appearing before the CRTC. I said that once, I said that again. The reason, therefore, is there has to be a counsel engaged by Sask Tel. Mr. George Taylor is that counsel engaged by Sask Tel. And that is the simple fact of the matter and that is the answer to the situation.

IKOY CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. COLLVER: — I would address my question to the Premier, in the light of his apparent acquiescence to the fact that an investigation may be necessary, and I believe he said he is not going to rule out an investigation, with reference to the IKOY and MBS situation where Manitoba companies are taking over Saskatchewan organizations' work in the province of Saskatchewan, I wonder if I might table in the Legislature today again, Mr. Speaker, and then ask; oh, you can't, well that's fine. I'll table it later then. I would ask the Premier is he aware of the donation of some \$4,240 by IKOY to the NDP in the last year and of the donation of \$480 to the NDP of MBS Construction Ltd. in the last year.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the facts nor would there be any reason why I would be aware of the facts since I have had no dealings with either company and so far as I am aware, I have never met any of the principals or had any dealing with them. Let me put at rest one of the comments earlier made by the hon. member and it illustrates the difficulties which we have. I have said that we do not rule out an investigation if someone sends some facts. We have had no facts, only innuendoes and a wild innuendo, and on the basis of that innuendo, I most assuredly do rule out investigation. When somebody puts some hard facts that suggests that

there ought to be an investigation, when someone suggests this, other than by innuendo, then I think we will know whether or not some action ought to be taken; but up to now member officers have been careful, and understandably careful not to make any statements of fact in writing which could be the basis of an investigation since they prefer to go down the trail of innuendoes rather than the trail of hard facts. They are understandably pursuing that route. They are understandably pursuing that route since they have no other route to pursue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would like to raise a question with you.

Yesterday, you brought to the attention of the Assembly the fact that an individual member had reprinted a picture that had been taken of the Assembly. Mr. Speaker, raised this on his own motion. I would like to ask, on behalf of all members, that we get to the bottom of it and we clear it up.

I would like to put three questions to the Speaker, that he might consider them and reply.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is, can a private citizen bring a question of privilege in this House, through the Speaker, and what are the limits? In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who made the phone call, when it was made and can a private citizen bring, through you, something about privilege in the House?

Secondly, why, Mr. Speaker, on the date that the Budget was made, when the galleries were filled with photographers taking pictures and we all saw the flash bulbs, did the Speaker do nothing about it. Where, Mr. Speaker, are the other pictures. . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think it is quite commonly understood and known to members, at least it should be, that questions cannot be directed to the Speaker with regard to any subjects, because this puts the Speaker in the position of being in the middle of debate.

Now, this issue will be dealt with and I am sure the members will take every opportunity to clear it up when it arises next Tuesday, if it arises on adjourned debates since that is where it is on the agenda and the members will get an opportunity at that time to deal with it.

MR. MacDONALD: — On a point of order on your ruling. First of all, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion by Mr. Allen, before the House, or the member for Rosemont. We can speak, but no way, Mr. Speaker, can we derive any information. You are the man who brought the charge before the House. We want the facts. Where are the other pictures? What use is being made of all the pictures there? Who took the pictures?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will take the next point of order.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to table in this Assembly, two documents. One of them is a document that came from the NDP federal

party headquarters (came from the Chief Electoral Office of Canada, I'm sorry) based on the filing by the NDP as to the contributions which outlines a \$4,240 contributed by IKOY Limited and another document from the same set of documents from the Chief Electoral Officer in which MBS Construction Limited made a contribution of \$480.

MR. CAMERON: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the matter raised by my colleague, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, we will have a motion coming for debate on Tuesday with respect to the subject matter raised by my colleague.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how will we get to the facts of that matter to argue it? The point I put to Mr. Speaker, is this. Isn't this the problem, with Mr. Speaker raising an issue on his own motion when members who are affected by it cannot question the Speaker about it, or reply. Now Mr. Speaker can't get into the debate; we can't put Mr. Speaker under questioning, yet it was an issue raised by Mr. Speaker on his motion and we can't get out the facts. Don't you see that as a problem?

MR. SPEAKER: — It is quite often that a Speaker raises issues which he feels should be raised. I think I stated quite clearly in the statement I made as to why I raised the reason — because it was an embarrassment to the Speaker's office because this happened and I don't want to be put in the position of having it happen again — a member coming to me and saying, I want to take picture in the Chamber, and I would say, no, you can't, and the member would say to me, well what about the member for Wascana, apparently he can. I don't want to have the Chair put in that position, therefore it was incumbent upon the Speaker to take action to protect the position of the Chair, quite clearly. So therefore I think that deals with the matter of why the Speaker raised the issue. Now as far as discussing the issue, investigating the issue the members are quite at liberty to do that as they see fit within the rules of the House when the issue arises next Tuesday, if it arises then.

MR. CAMERON: — Could Mr. Speaker, give us a precedent? What single precedent, when Mr. Speaker raised an issue of that kind on his own motion?

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You are privy to information that nobody else in this Assembly has, Mr. Speaker. Somebody gave you some information that you felt necessary to bring to the attention of this Assembly which was political insinuation against an individual member and you refuse to make that information available to us.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table, the document being alluded to by all members of the House. It shows clearly the member for Regina Wascana in the House, picture being taken, clearly against the rules of the Legislature and I am sure I don't know why the Liberals are arguing about this because I know he is dead wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! It is a long standing tradition that the purpose of the Speaker being here, in part, is to enforce the rules and practices of this Assembly and to bring attention to . . . Order, order! . . . to bring to the attention of the members, for the protection . . . has the member for Regina South finished speaking from his seat?

MR. CAMERON: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Good, good. I'm glad you have finished because then I can take over

according to the rules which say, when I am on my feet I have the floor and when you are on your feet I'll let you have the floor.

MR. CAMERON: — That's fair.

MR. SPEAKER: — Right. As I was saying, it is the responsibility of the Speaker to bring to the attention of the member breaches of the rules or practices of this House as he sees fit. That is what the Speaker has done in this case and it is for the protection of the members and it is quite clear, in the statement I made to the House, the reasons why it is for the protection of the members. There are all kinds of precedents which can be cited if need arise to support that case.

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, one more question. Would Mr. Speaker inform me, when the Assembly gave permission for any cameras to be brought into this House, and as I understand it is must be by motion of this Assembly. You do not have the authority as the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that's quite right that the Speaker acts within the rules, the wishes of the Assembly (and it has been traditional for some time) to allow cameras in the Chamber at a certain time...

MR. MacDONALD: — Then why . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Has the member for Indian Head-Wolseley finished?

It is traditional on certain ceremonial occasions that the Speaker, on behalf of the members of the Assembly, allow television cameras into the Chamber. But they are not allowed in unless they have the permission of the Speaker. And I submit that my record and previous Speaker's records have been quite clear and above reproach, that cameras are only to be allowed in this Chamber on certain occasions and members have been well aware of that, that there are ceremonial occasions and they are under the control of the Speaker. Now if the members are upset and concerned about that, then I am sure they can refer it to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee will look at it on behalf of the members and make a decision for a new recommendation about how this should be dealt with. I think that would be the practical way to handle it if the members are upset about that.

MR. ANDERSON: — Did you, to control, because you do have control of the cameras, give passes to the people who are allowed cameras that they were allowed to bring cameras in so that no other cameras would be brought? How did you police it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — Well the usual tradition is for members or someone who wishes to take pictures to come to the Speaker and ask permission. The Speaker considers the case and I have considered the case with regard to television cameras and I have said, yes, you may televise and I have considered the question (as I mentioned the other day) about a person from another caucus who came to me and asked me if he might take a picture of a member sitting in his seat working. I said no. But I cannot consider the case that arises where a member does not come to me, but surreptitiously takes pictures in this Chamber. And then, furthermore, produces them in a political bulletin. Now I can't do anything about that. It is up to the members and it is in their hands now by the very fact that this motion is before them and can be dealt with at a later time, at an appropriate time.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. CAMERON: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of order?

MR. CAMERON: — The point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rose before he did.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's your point of order?

MR. CAMERON: — My point of order is, is it not a fact that on Budget day there were several cameras in the galleries. Mr. Speaker did not prohibit the flashbulbs that were going on up there and elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! If the member, on Budget day, noticed a lot of cameras in the galleries he should have risen in his place and said . . . order . . . said, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I see someone in the gallery taking pictures and I would have dealt with it immediately. Now maybe the member, on opening day, didn't have much to do. I had certain things on my mind which I had to take care of. My staff are watching for people in the galleries and in fact they noticed someone in the galleries taking pictures and I am informed that my staff took some action with regard to that. However, that's beside the point. If a member notices that someone is breaching the practice of the House then he should have stood up and noticed it and said to the Speaker, somebody is taking pictures.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order.

First, with respect to some documents which the member for Nipawin tabled this morning, I have gotten a copy of this, a photocopy of the documents which were tabled and as a member, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing on the document to indicate precisely what the document is, other than what the member says and I would ask that the member table the entire document which he had before him so that I may assess, as a member, exactly what the document says. I invite the members to look at it.

The second point of order, Mr. Speaker, deals with points of order. My observations here, Mr. Speaker, is that we are getting into the habit, after Mr. Speaker has made a ruling, rightly or wrongly, acceptable or unacceptable that this is the end of the issue, that we are getting into the mechanisms where members are continually debating with Mr. Speaker the facts and the issues on the points of order. I would ask Mr. Speaker, and I know it is a difficult task that you have, but that once you have made a ruling, take for example, on the picture situation today that that is it. Let us move on to the government business.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I think the Attorney General's point of order is well taken on both points. The fact that I should not be abusing the time of the House by debating points of order. I think that is a point that we've generally observed in the past. I'm sorry I was debating points of order today and should not be. I think we should move on to the next order of business.

MR. COLLVER: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When a member tables a document in the Assembly and states that the document came from a certain source, the House must believe that member that it came from that source or prove otherwise. Mr.

Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! I think the members of the House should use some discretion when they are tabling things in the House and it is not unusual for members to want to know what the source of the document is. The members shouldn't be tabling everything that comes into their hands in the House. They should table things that are recognized as coming from some source so that it is of some value to the members. Because it is just a waste of time of the House to table documents that aren't identified.

Now I agree that the member for Nipawin stated in his view where the document came from. The Attorney General, I think, is probably justified in saying that he wants to see it on the document where it came from. We don't want to get into a long wrangle about tabling this. The member has said that they will table the document and I think the matter is closed.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, if I may . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The member for Lakeview.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, a moment ago in referring to a matter raised by my colleague the member for Regina South, you indicated that at opening day when pictures were being taken nobody drew it to your attention. My point to you, Mr. Speaker, is, and I can sit here without making this point at this time. Is it not a fact that I spoke to you after that day; drew to your attention that photographs were being taken? You advised me at the time that there was nothing you could do about it at that particular time and you weren't very embarrassed about it. I'm wondering how you are now embarrassed by the situation that I drew to your attention at the very time it happened.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Is the member on the same point of order as the member for Lakeview?

MR. CAMERON: — No, I have a different point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — O.K.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave of the Assembly to set aside 15 minutes to put Mr. Speaker under some questioning with respect of this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have leave?

MR. ROMANOW: — No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! There are no questions put by members — Government Motions.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Is it on the same issue?

MR. MALONE: — No.

MR. SPEAKER: — O.K.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave of the House to move first and second reading immediately of an act to prohibit Saskatchewan Telecommunications from interfering with the delivery of programming by Cablecaster.

MR. ROMANOW: — No, no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — You have heard the request of the member for Regina Lakeview. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Faris that Bill No. 22 **An Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at much length with respect to Bill 22, The Education Act, but I do want to make a couple of points. In fact, I have three points I want to make in the course of my remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a very important issue. I believe that this is an issue which affects, not only the perspective on the quality and direction of education from the point of view of the trustees and the teachers and perhaps the parents, as represented by the trustees, but also reflects the importance of the quality of education as it affects the student. After all, when all the rhetoric is over, from all sides of the House, it is going to be the quality of education that the student receives as the end result, which will be the test whether or not this bill and this government's actions are good or bad. Because it is an important issue, Mr. Speaker, it requires a full and proper debate. It requires a debate with as minimum amount of emotionalism as is possible. I am not one however who says emotionalism in debate is bad. I am not one who says that you can't advocate and argue unemotionally, if that is the only way you should do it! Indeed, I think in some areas, such as areas of this nature where there is a great degree of importance there should be high degree of emotion. But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be a full and proper airing of all of the issues which are before the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been watching this debate over the last few weeks in my capacity as House Leader, and outside as a citizen of the province of Saskatchewan. I am asking myself whether or not this province has seen the kind of free and open discussion about the bill, as I think the subject matter deserves. And quite candidly, Mr. Speaker, in some areas I am very disappointed. I am very disappointed for example, about the quality and calibre of public reporting with respect to the issues surrounding Bill 22.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I have been watching the press reports in the daily newspapers primarily the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix over the last couple of weeks, trying to determine whether or not this Legislature has received the kind of coverage on this important issue of all sides of the points of view, that the issue deserves. And I am the first to say, Mr. Minister's that this is a very highly subjective judgment that individuals have to make. But in my judgment regretfully, I have to conclude that there has not been that kind of an airing of the issues. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in my view the press has either deliberately or unconsciously, tried to represent one point of view generally espoused by the members of the PC Party. It is a view which, in my judgment as I move to the second point in a few moments, a view on the general issue of education which is contradictory, a view of the PC Party. It is a view which, in my judgment as I move to the second point in a few moments, a view on the general issue of education which is contradictory, a view of the PC Party which is confusing, one which I think will leave any responsible thinking organization, be it the SSTA or the STF, very uncertain as to the position taken by that party if it should ever form a government, on this important issue of education and the education bill. And yet, Mr. Speaker, one sees through a reading of the popular press, no indication of this kind of serious division. One sees by the reading of the popular press a total representation of the particular speeches of the day given by a particular MLA of the day on the issues involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I am the last person in this House to complain about coverage in the press, because I have a gotten my share of it (I think most of it probably unfavourable) but I certainly have gotten my portion of coverage in the press. But I am going to do that, Mr. Speaker, today, I am going to do it because I see here in the Leader Post of the other night, from page 8, a headline surrounding a speech of the hon. member for Rosetown-Elrose: 'Binding arbitration proposal opposed by Superintendent.' The story goes on to quote at length the hon. Mr. Roy Bailey, the member for Rosetown-Elrose and goes on to quote, not quite at length but in some detail, the leader of the PC Party. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may not have dawned on the press but I think there was also another speaker that day — it certainly dawned on me, I happened to be the speaker — and I realize that, in the judgment of the press and, perhaps, in the judgement of the House, what I have to say, after all I am only the Attorney General and Deputy Premier, didn't really indicate much value or much importance. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of coverage which has, in effect, blanked out not only my speech, but minimized the speeches given by the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood, the former Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy), the kind of variations of the coverage from the Minister of Continuing Education on this important bill, is a deliberate attempt by certain segments of the press of the province of Saskatchewan to play a very partisan point of view with respect to Bill 22.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that this does not serve democracy or serve the debate on this particular bill, very well. I think that all of us as members of this Legislative Assembly can say that the quality and the calibre of the reporting which has ultimately ended in the press, (I don't now single out the individual members but somewhere down the line it has happened this way on this bill) has left a very partisan one-sided point of view, a one-sided view to reflect the view of the editorialist in the press, the Leader Post press, the view that somehow we should keep politics out of education, that very general point of view which everybody agrees to, but no one can particularize with any detail as to how that can be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a speech at length on the press because, I suppose, we as politicians ought not to be concerned. We are here to debate in the forum, but the sad fact of the matter is that whatever we do or say, for its merit or demerit, can only be translated to the SSTA membership and the STF membership and the public, the students and the parents concerned, though the media. I personally, decry what I believe has been a purposeful attempt to represent the bill in an unfavourable light. End of point number one, Mr. Speaker.

The second point that I would like to make is the question of the position of the two opposition parties on Bill 22. Mr. Speaker, I say that both of the opposition parties, the Liberals and the PCs, have characterized their comments on this. The member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron), the Liberal member for Regina South, takes a virtually contradictory position from the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) on the important issues of the day. There is no doubt about that!

The member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) in a letter, which he distributed to the members of the teaching profession within his proposed federal riding, yet takes a different tack. I don't think there is anything that can be a different tack, yes, similar to the member for Regina south, but different from the member for Maple Creek, the education critic, and certainly variations of difference from both positions. I think there is no doubt about that and I am not going to get into the details of those operations. That is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the PC caucus Party position. I say, Mr. Minister, that here the divisions are even more deep. The position taken by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) on a couple of issues, at least, if not more, are fundamentally at variance, fundamentally at variance, with the position taken by the Leader of the PC Party, who is officially spokesman.

I think it is about time that the organizations that are interested in this area start asking the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the PC Party precisely where their caucuses stand on this particular bill. I would like to know of the Leader of the PCs, for example, who is not in his seat today, or not now, I would like to know which view he supports with respect to Bill 22.

The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) of the PC caucus, when he spoke on this bill, said that he wanted more areas of collective bargaining at the local level. There should be more there. The member for Rosetown-Elrose says that he adamantly opposes that. I want to know where the Leader of the PC Party stands on that area and I, for the life of me, don't know why the SSTA and STF don't ask the Leader of the PC Party exactly what the PC party position is in this area. I would like to know what the Leader of the Liberal Party says when he sees a speech made by the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) as compared to the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) on the areas that are at issue here on the binding boards of reference, the arbitration. I think that the organizations involved should be asking the Leader of the Liberal Party what would he be doing if he were Premier in 1979 on those key issues. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know no one in the press is asking that question and so far as I know neither the SSTA or the STF is asking that question or at least if they are, I stand to be corrected, if they are asking that question then certainly the divisions are not being resolved.

The simple fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is just take the PC caucus point of view, and I have here in front of me the Hansard of April 6, 1978 when the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) was addressing the main critique of Bill 22 on behalf of the PC

caucus. I could go into the quotations on the various pages, 1121, I have them marked in yellow on the various issues. I'm not going to take the time of the House to do that. But the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland said that government should not be involved but that trustees and teachers should get together to discuss terms of employment, etc., to get more areas of bargaining at the local level.

The member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey,) I also happen to have his answer to what he spoke the other day and he says he is opposed to that. I want to know here the Leader of the PC caucus, the member for Nipawin stands on that issue. I think the people of Saskatchewan want to know as well. The member for Rosetown-Elrose in his remarks the other day said that principals should be given more protection; teachers are given too much. The member for Rosetown says that I am in error there. I say to the member that that is not the case if you will look at the quotation of the words that are said, that's a paraphrase, a slight paraphrase but not much of paraphrase because you indicated that there was no security there, that there should have been more. The member of Saskatoon-Sutherland said teachers need more protection, in fact they need a professional organization and he compared it to the Law Society of the province of Saskatchewan, and those are the exact words here again on page 1123 of the speech that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland indicated.

The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland talked about binding arbitration. He said this idea was perhaps not quite the one that he would tailor but there is some form of protection needed for the teachers along those lines. The member for Rosetown-Elrose says on binding arbitration and here's a direct quote, 'We're not dealing with welders of front end motors but teachers of our children', and boards of reference are not needed; that's the position taken there. That is a direct quotation, Mr. Speaker, a direct quotation from the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, forgive me if I say I'm slightly confused as to where the PC and the Liberal caucuses stand on those issues. Binding arbitration is surely one of the most important issues, whether you are for it or against it or modifying it one way or the other, of this Bill 22. Everybody agrees with that. Now here's a party which proposes to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that it is fit to govern in educational matters where the two leading spokesmen take two different positions. I want to know where the Leader of the PC Party and the PC caucus stands on that particular issue.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we all heard how eloquent the member for Rosetown-Elrose was the other day about boards of reference, how they were a disaster or whatever word that was, it wasn't disaster but it was of that nature. They have been, it was repeated here from his seated position today. I think that that is a fair representation, he'll agree with me on that quote.

Mr. Speaker, I just happen to have had a and perhaps I'm in error here because I'm not the Minister of Education, I just had somebody on my staff do a quick check, I could be wrong in the numbers. I stand to be corrected here. But I have a record of what is purported to me to be a record of the actual boards of reference. In 1973 there were no appeals; in 1974, Mr. Speaker, there was one appeal, the Gull Lake School Unit and there the dismissal which was the subject of the appeal was upheld but there was some compensation awarded for the teacher. That's in 1974 — one. In 1975, Mr. Speaker, two, a Govan dismissal, the Govan dismissal confirmed. In 1975 a second one, Radville, the teacher reinstated. Fifty per cent for the teachers, fifty per cent of the trustees; that was in 1975. In 1976, the northern school board brought an appeal, the school board did, against two teachers. The board won the appeal. In 1977, no

appeals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the situation with respect to the record of the boards of reference. That's the terrible record of unmitigated disaster that the member for Rosetown-Elrose says the boards of reference have, the same boards of reference the member of Saskatoon-Sutherland says he thinks is a good idea, with a few changes here or there. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not picking on the member for Rosetown-Elrose because I say this again, if there is any member in that PC caucus who knows something about education law and who strongly believes in what he says about education law and does it with, what I think, conviction, he is the member for Rosetown-Elrose. He's not the issue. The issue is, given that record, given those statements, I want to know where the Leader of the PC Party stands on that particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And that's the same situation with respect to the Liberals and their critics, identically the same situation. I say to the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) and I'm not trying to curry equal favor on Liberals and PCs, but I say again, sincerely, I think it is generally thought of on this side of the House by all of us that the member for Maple Creek is a man who is also very knowledgeable and sincere particularly in this area. I want to know where the Leader of the Liberal Party stands as between him and the member for Regina South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Do you think we get that in the press? Well we did, a little bit on the Regina South speech. I think there was a headline in the Regina South speech that was guarded but we don't get it right here Mr. Speaker, not here. We don't get in on the coverage and we don't get it resolved in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do the PCs try to resolve this fundamental difference? They say they are going to vote against this bill. That's what the press will, of course, cover. But you know why they are going to vote against this bill? Not on the fundamental issue upon which they agree, because as I have indicated already, they don't agree on fundamental issues. No, they are going to vote against this bill because the member for Rosetown-Elrose will be able to say, I did what I could do on my fundamental opposition, therefore, I am opposed to the bill. How does the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland justify his differences from the member for Rosetown? Well he says, I am voting against the bill because it is sloppily drafted. That's the bottom line on the speech made by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland.

You recall in detail and I invite you again to take a look at it, because I have it marked in detail. I was in the House at the time and there are all sorts of interjections here from Mr. Romanow (that must have been an unusually sensitive microphone that day because I normally don't give such interjections) but this day it was a sensitive microphone, an unusual day, and all of these things are saying, yes, Mr. Attorney General, you should look at section that and section this; it is sloppily drafted and my goodness . . . and then he started again at how terrible an Attorney General I was . . . and I'm glad to see the House unanimously rejected that proposition and we got him back onto Bill 22. But he says that he is against it because of the drafting. Well that's how the PCs are going to do it. That's how the various groups will say to themselves, you see here is the position taken on this bill by way of policy.

Mr. Speaker, that is simply not the fact of the situation. I say again, what comments I

make are not directed to the member for Rosetown-Elrose, whom I think has at least got the guts and principle to deviate from his own caucus. I don't criticize him. I criticize the party leader and the caucus for not having the clear, precision of thought as to where they stand on this education law. I criticize the Liberal Party for doing exactly the same thing, indicating their opposition to the bill and then trying to shilly-shally around, embroider the edges of it. I condemn the Leader of the Liberal Party for not telling the people of Saskatchewan precisely where they stand on this important area of education law, and they don't.

Mr. Speaker, that is the simple fact of the matter. They have points of view on various issues. They may be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I am having trouble hearing the comments of the member who has the floor at this time. I wonder if the members could preserve some amount of decorum for the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much, because I do believe that what the members of the Liberal caucus are doing in response to my reaction, to my statement, is proving the very validity of my remarks about their indecision and indecisiveness and their division in this area. End of point number two, Mr. Speaker.

The fact is that there is serious division within both of these parties on this bill and the people of Saskatchewan, on this bill deserve something more. They deserve a clear-cut statement of policy as to where they stand on these particular issues of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the third point that I would like to make before I take my chair, is, if you will, the point that I touched on briefly yesterday, the last day that I spoke. I have never been a Minister of Education or Continuing Education and maybe I am never likely to be, although sometimes I have had fantasies about how challenging a job that would be and how exciting a prospect that would be. I think all of you would be interested in that and whether I would or not, that's not here nor there, but that is the kind of feeling that I have had toward education and the Department of Education and the education bill.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who is fair-minded at all in this Legislative Assembly will know that historically with Woodrow Lloyd, 1944, the CCF has set a tradition of about the quality of education which was bar none, head and shoulders over any province in the Dominion of Canada at that particular time. Not overnight, not overnight in 1944 but as it developed and as it evolved.

I think everybody will agree that from 1944 to 1963 there were upsets in Education, but the relative tranquillity of that period compared to 1964-1971 is as different as night is to day. In 1964 to 1971 we saw the introduction, I say, for the first time of a form of politics in the educational law with the former Thatcher administration.

The Thatcher caucus, the Liberal Party then, had politics injected into education. I won't say that the Thatcher caucus of today, on the opposition side is injecting politics on our bill today, but that was the politics of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I say this and in a self-serving way I admit, that I think that the NDP and the CCF, in the area of education, can take that as one of the stars in its constellation together with some social reforms such as health and medicare and the like that we are noted for. But I think any fair-minded person would indicate that. But there is no doubt about it, no doubt about it, education law is a touchy area. We have all kinds of motivations running from the STF side and the SSTA side. How to resolve those two competing views is a difficult task, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult especially given the period of disruption from 1964 to 1971 that the Liberals wrought in the province of Saskatchewan and which some, darkly, suspect the PCs wherever they are, are continuing to promote and to sow the seeds of discontent with respect to Bill 22.

My point number three, Mr. Minister, is this. The Minister of Education in Bill 22 may not have brought down the perfect education law; may not have brought down the law which will make everybody happy. I think he is going to be proposing some changes when he gets to close up the debate. But he has done a very good job given the climate that exists today in the province of Saskatchewan and the issues that are before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — It is simply not good enough for opposition parties, without a clear voice, to single out particular areas upon which they can find a common ground for themselves collectively to attack this bill on that basis, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education deserves the commendation of those who are interested in education in the province of Saskatchewan and not the condemnation that the various despairing voices of the members opposite would cast on him in this particular area.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education has continued the tradition of Woodrow Lloyd in the quality of education in this province. I say this bill is a continuation of that tradition, which places key emphasis on the student himself or herself; that places key emphasis on the quality of education; that tries to resolve the competing interests — and difficult it is, not easily glibly dismissed by editorials in the Leader Post or Star Phoenix or blind-eye coverages in those areas; not easily dismissed by contradictory policy positions by the members opposite, but by actually writing the law, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has done a tremendous job and he deserves the support of this House in respect with Bill 22.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I know that has been ongoing consultation with the SSTA and the STF and there will be changes. I know that the Minister of Education will want to elaborate in the House some time today or in the next few days when the debate winds up, an ongoing continuing process of consultation, which indicates the good faith that we, as a government, have toward both of the major organizations involved in this area and toward the parents and the students that are involved in this matter.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support in principle Bill 22.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to rise to speak in this debate because of the great concern that I feel for the whole education system. Also, I,

both as a teacher and a member of this Legislature, would like to congratulate the government for the work that they have done over the past years starting with the first Minister of Education, Mr. MacMurchy, that we have had in the Blakeney government and continuing on through to the Hon. Dr. Faris, who is the present the Minister of Education. I would like to congratulate the government for the concern it has shown by the fact that it has taken so much care and caution in developing this Education Act. First, through the discussions that were held throughout the province by the then Minister of Education, Mr. MacMurchy. That continued through in the form of the White Paper and the constant discussions that were held throughout the province on that, the constant hearings, in a concerted attempt, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to develop an Education Act that would be second to none in this country. And while I would not say that it has gone a long way to developing an act that can truly serve the people that it is intended to serve and that is the young people of this country, the students. I hear constant attacks, Mr. Speaker, from the Liberal Opposition about the style, the form of the Education Act and yet they themselves did not in any way follow this style of development for any acts or any of the things that they did. I think terms of the Moore Commission that was paid for and held under the former Thatcher administration, the Moore Commission that was supposed to come out with a style of teacher negotiation, and it was completely ignored by that Liberal Opposition. I say that this government has shown concerns that were certainly not shown by other, by the previous government. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a great deal more on this act but I would like at this time to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, this morning it gives me great pleasure to welcome to this Legislature, 24 high school students from the Kinistino High School. They are going to visit the Legislature this afternoon and have dinner down in the cafeteria.

I hope the Legislature will be able to demonstrate what parliament really is and that they can bring home some very good impressions of the Legislature. I am sure that members will join me in welcoming them here and I hope that their stay here will be an educational one and one that they can bring home very fond memories. I also want to wish them a very safe journey home. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Richard Friesen. Thank you.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION — VOTE 16

ITEM 13 con't

MR. D M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, under subvote 12, Mr. Minister, can you indicate which three communities in the Swift Current district were involved with 'Operation Mainstreet' and Urban Assistance?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — I would be glad to make a note of that and move on. The details seems to be a little . . . It's there; we will give it to you if it is of any interest. Would you be satisfied with a note sent across? All right fine. Go ahead then.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, these are not under subvote 13 but you indicated last night that we could deviate if we found a question within our notes here that was important.

This is regarding a gravel shortage. Do you feel that your department is concerned or is there an apparent shortage of gravel in the province?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, well, depending where you are at in Saskatchewan. There are some areas in the southern area where we are short but in the North, the Prince Albert area and the mid-band area — strangely enough when you get further north into some of the far north construction, we find it difficult at times to find good gravel supplies. I would say that if you took the park belt in the southern forest region, there is no shortage but when you get into the prairie area it becomes very costly at times because of the long hauls.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Minister, does that mean then you could foresee the day — the day may be coming when you have to haul gravel from the North to the South or do you have adequate supplies to last some years?

MR. KRAMER: — Not in the immediate, foreseeable future in any case.

MR. HAM: — The second question, Mr. Minister, is not on subvote 13 but I note that in other provinces in Canada that there is a substantial use of cement in highways. Is there any reason why we are not using cement in Saskatchewan?

MR. KRAMER: — Well, the economics of cement versus asphalt is in our favor, that is the asphalt is less expensive. We do use soil cement in some cases where it is advantageous, but that again goes back to your earlier question of the availability of gravel and so on, as well. But, we have found in the main that cement really, concrete is too expensive.

MR. HAM: — I note that, in reviewing your annual report there is a reference to B type pavement. Could you tell me what is different about B type pavement over normal pavement?

MR. KRAMER: — Well, I thought I had answered that question last night. It is the first stage of a heavier pavement which suffices for years and as I say, saves money. A B pavement is about a two inch lift of asphalt on top of something.

MR. HAM: — Is your department carrying on a present liaison or testing with neighbouring provinces, Alberta and Manitoba, with respect to pavement testing, roadbed testing and the like?

MR. KRAMER: — I didn't . . . that mike is still a bit of trouble but I think you were asking do we liase. . . was the question do we liase with other provinces in comparing testing and so on? We have a number of conferences. In fact, there is a conference of western highway officials in Victoria next week. Various papers are given as to procedures being used by the various jurisdictions, and anything that is useful that we think we may be able to use, the information is available to us, likewise ours to other jurisdictions. This information, new ideas are always presented at the annual convention for Roads and Transportation Canada (RTAC) and they have an annual meeting and several district meetings as well. Actually, commercial development is included in this but any innovations that come up in the road building industry, by the contactors or by government, are brought forward and shared.

MR. HAM: — On that same note, Mr. Minister, could you give the House any indication of the results of the test pattern? Just this side of Moose Jaw on the Trans-Canada Highway there was series I think it was rubber applications applied to the highway for testing. I am wondering if there are any results on that yet.

MR. KRAMER: — We have nothing conclusive yet because a proper length of time has not elapsed on that.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I note on your annual report you refer to a project 18-4 involving lagoon waste ash. I am wondering if there has been any positive reports on that testing?

MR. KRAMER: — We are using it in the Estevan area because that's where it is at, the lagoon ash, and thus far we are satisfied with the use on No. 18, west of Estevan. We will be using it on No. 47 north of Estevan and as long as it is within an economic haul distance and so on. It does take the place of gravel and so far it is pretty hopeful that it is going to make a good substitute.

MR. HAM: — I perhaps maybe missed this under one of the subvotes, but I note that your department administers southern airport assistance program and provided \$86,180 in financial assistance. If you could just explain quickly how your department does administrate the airport assistance program and secondly, is the money to construct the airports a combination through the Department of Highways and local money and is there any federal money and who maintains the airports?

MR. KRAMER: — We have a policy on that and I think the simplest way, I would be very happy to send this across and other copies are available of the policy. It depends on the grading quality of the airport and when they get to a certain category they are also eligible for some federal assistance. I think the book will explain the policy to you. I think it would be useful to you.

MR. HAM: — One final question, Mr. Minister. In a news release in 1977 you indicated that there was a federal cutback of a substantial amount of money to do with the Trans-Canada Highway construction and repairs. I am wondering how much cutback from the federal government in 1977-78, versus the previous year. Is it as great?

MR. KRAMER: — I don't recollect a cutback. They can't very well cut anything back because we are not getting any assistance at all on the building of Trans-Canada. That ceased when the first Trans-Canada was completed in Saskatchewan about 20 some years ago. The only assistance, as I mentioned last night, is the strengthening program which is an extra lift on existing surface, but that does nothing whatever for grading or constructing new roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I first would like to commend the member for Swift Current for the manner in which he has presented his questions and in which he has adhered to the rules as closely as possible. I will admit that we have been fairly lenient and let them go from one subvote to another, which was agreed last night. But I would like to state now that as close as possible I would like to continue on with the subvotes as they are here and I think with the co-operation of both sides of the House we can certainly gain much from it.

MR. HAM: — Since we are being so nice, Mr. Chairman, thank you and thank you, Mr.

Minister, and your officials.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Well, Mr. Chairman, there were some questions asked under this item with regard to gravel pits, is it all right if I ask question in that regard? Is that O.K., Mr. Speaker? You could revert back?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I will recommend that it be asked under 'Capital' because I think that's where it would come in, under Capital Expenditures. That's what I would like to adhere to as close as possible.

MR. KRAMER: — I would suggest if it is concerning gravel in his district, why, ask under Regina district, the Regina management district, that would be item . . .

MR. BIRKBECK: — My area is Yorkton.

MR. KRAMER: — All right. Yorkton district, item 15, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Chairman, in that Swift Current . . . the four-lane highway of Trans-Canada comes to an abrupt end just slightly west of Swift Current. Would the minister agree that it's rather, at certain times of the year in heavy traffic times on the Trans Canada Highway, that it's a very dangerous situation where people who may be travelling through the province and they get on a four-lane well east of Regina and travel it straight on through until Swift Current and all of a sudden it narrows.

I think the Minister would probably conceded that on a four-lane highway the traffic may look very thin, when all of a sudden it narrows down to two-lanes. All of a sudden, you wonder where all the cars came from.

I would like to ask the minister what plans he may have, and I am speaking specifically west of Swift Current to the Alberta border, what plans the Minister in the Department of Highways may have in the very near future towards making the Trans-Canada Highway four-lane right to the Alberta border; conversely, if you care to answer, what plans you may have going to the Manitoba border.

MR. KRAMER: — Well, at the present time the traffic counts, even though the problem that the member suggests is a valid one, when you come off four lanes into a narrow-gauge road fortunately the traffic count tapers off pretty rapidly as you go west of Swift Current. It is much less than it is east through the Indian Head area. The first priority actually, that many years ago, should have been four-laning east rather than west but that is water under the bridge. That is where the heavier traffic count is.

Now, we have no plans immediately unless there is a national policy which is being requested by all provinces in Canada for a national Trans-Canada Highway system shared by the federal government. This would only approach what our neighbors to the south are doing, where all interstate highways, as most members know I hope, are built entirely, 90 to 95 per cent of the cost is borne entirely by federal jurisdiction; so to go back to Swift Current west, we are going to continue to improve and possibly improve sidelines but the traffic counts, according to Canadian standards, is still way less than 5 to 6,000. I think Canadian standards start to demand four-laning when the traffic count, the ADT, goes up to 5-6,000 vehicles a day. You will note that our neighbors across the border have done very little between our border and Calgary. They have not given a great deal of priority there so we feel that we are going to improve

the safety, improve the sideline on the two lanes.

MR. THATCHER: — In that district west of Swift Current — I do not like going into scare statistics and I will not, but I am sure the minister is aware that one of the most dangerous spots in the entire province where probably the greatest number of people have been killed over a period of years, or very close to it, is at Gull Lake, shortly after you come off that four-lane highway, about 25 to 30 miles. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to recite statistics because I am sure you are aware of it. It is a dangerous situation at Gull Lake. But, Mr. Minister, I respectfully suggest to you that part of the reason that it is dangerous is because of people coming off the four-lane highway. Granted it is maybe 25 miles down the road from where that happens but, Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that has to be some factor because it is not the sort of location where you have had one big one; for instance we have had one north of Moose Jaw where we had that terrible one four or five years ago and we all refer to that as a killer intersection, but really we have just had a couple of real big ones there, to get that terminology.

On this one at Gull Lake there have been numerous ones. There has been a constant number over the years, a steady number. Mr. Minister, I respectfully suggest to you that part of it because of the four-lane highway being reduced down to two lane. Again, Mr. Minister, I would ask you to reconsider, and seriously consider in the foreseeable future, the four-laning of the Trans-Canada highway from one end of the province to the other because it is a main arterial road and it should be done. As well, Mr. Minister, there should be four-lane up in your country, right through to Edmonton as well as between Regina and Saskatoon. It should have been done years ago, Mr. Minister, but particularly on this one because of that Gull Lake situation, and I am not going to belabor it but I would ask the minister to familiarize himself with that particular location and perhaps reconsider your attitude toward four-lane highways.

MR. KRAMER: — It is not my attitude. It is simply based on economic fact. The fact that we cannot afford to build two-lanes of road in one portion of Saskatchewan where the traffic is relatively light and leave thousands of miles of road that are used entirely by Saskatchewan people to leave to go to potholes and one thing or another. Our first responsibility is inside Saskatchewan to Saskatchewan taxpayers. Our responsibility is to provide a good or better road than other province, which we have right now. I think that when we see our neighbors, both west and east going very slowly on four-lane, except that which they have in Alberta where they have assistance federally in the park areas. I think that we have to make those priorities. As minister, I say that to spend \$300,000 a mile — that's what the four-lane costs now, \$300,000 a mile, grading from the ground up — when there are a lot of \$100,000 and \$125,000 mile highways that are needed. I see that No. 13 Highway was asked for last night and extensions to it. I would give priority to service to the rural areas, the small urban areas before I would contemplate taking budget away from those areas and putting them into the four-lane at this time, until I see some action on the part of our neighbors to the west and east.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, do I understand you correctly? In essence what you just said, are you in effect agreeing with a comment that was made about a year, a year and a half ago by your deputy minister, Mr. Gentles who I understand is on leave, where he made the comment, 'Potholes are good for the economy because they employ people to repair them.' In effect are you saying, Mr. Minister, that people's lives are not worth as much as repairing potholes, because that's about what it adds up to mean, what you just said.

MR. KRAMER: — I won't even bother replying to that question, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Gentles never made that he was quoted as having said that. He certainly was misquoted and I think he corrected that later. We have never said that at any time. I would suggest to the member that Saskatchewan's safety programs are second to none. We are leading in safety programs and concern for people. I think that that comment is not worth a reply.

Item 13 agreed.

ITEM 14

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you and I have had the debate for some years and I think you know my stand on the Ring Road as being, in my opinion, poor planning and poor policy. I think from the point of view of the city of Regina, which is a decision of their own, that improved the traffic flow to the downtown area instead of around town would have been a much more sound approach. The decision has been made and the engineering and construction is well advanced on the Ring Road. The Ring Road though has caused some social problems to say the least, problems in subdivisions such as the Glen Cairn subdivision which has very, very limited access to other parts of Regina by reason of the Ring Road. Of course your officials had taken time to attend a University Park Community Association meeting where the concerns in that area were raised with you. My first series of questions deal with the Ring Road. The Ring Road as a result of being built in Glen Cairn has caused the truck diversion to go down Fleet Street over to Dewdney Avenue and right through a residential community. Of course that practice should be stopped and there has been some difficulty on that. I will ask you what the department officials are doing first of all to reduce departmental traffic along that route and secondly what activities the department can take to stop such truck-traffic diversion. What provisions will you make to allow the University Park subdivision a much more reasonable access to downtown or into the city of Regina? It has basically only got Highway 33 now with the second outlet on Highway 33. I think they haven't been dealt with fairly in my opinion in either subdivision. I would appreciate your comments.

MR. KRAMER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, two items, number one the University fund. Those questions are actually questions that should be directed at the city. Yes, the city. I told the member about the 42nd Street bridge, the same thing is true. We helped the city of Regina pay for a transportation study as well. Now, for instance, if they want a flyover, if the city planners decided that's what they want they will come to us and ask for it and we will consider it. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's off Assiniboia, that's right.

MR. MERCHANT: — . . . Wascana Centre Authority . . .

MR. KRAMER: — That it is not my problem. I'm saying what the policy is. The policy is that the city is the initiator. Similarly on Fleet Street, this is even more of a city responsibility. We are there with advice and assistance if it falls within policy.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Chamber a group of 15 Grade Nine and Ten students from Matthew School at LaFleche, accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Nobert and Mr. and Mrs. Emile Martineau in the Speaker's Gallery. I will look forward to meeting them in a few minutes in the rotunda for pictures. We hope you enjoy the proceedings and

have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the other members of this Assembly approximately 27 Grade Eight students from the public school at Wymark. They are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. John Wall and I understand by another teacher, Miss Thompson.

I might say that I had the privilege shortly after the new year to spend about one hour and a half's time with the Grade Eight class in Wymark, talking about the responsibilities of an MLA and the procedures which take place in these Chambers. I found that hour and one-half to be very interesting and very exciting. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Grade Eight students on their excellent knowledge of the Legislature and what takes place in government; it was certainly evident in many of the questions which they asked. I look forward to meeting with them briefly at 12:30 and I hope that they enjoy the mornings proceedings.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — TRANSPORTATION CON'T.

ITEM 14

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — On the problems with access to the University Park subdivisions, we'll discuss the flyover. Has the department considered the impact of such a flyover and if such a flyover was requested by the city or allowed by the Wascana Centre Authority, would the department agree with such a flyover? Secondly, at the University Park Drive where it connects at the intersection with Highway 33, that is going to become an increasing bottle neck in the future. You know, it's a main road into the subdivision and it connects with No. 33 Highway. What proposals do you have for modifying that intersection so that the traffic slow down into the subdivision can get off the highway safely and onto the road back into town in a more safe manner than just stopping and waiting for highway traffic to go through?

MR. KRAMER: — I already said that we would consider sharing the cost of an overpass if the city made application. That is an internal problem, that decision, and if they approach us our policy is such that we would accommodate it. It is the city's jurisdiction and the answer is the same once again, this is city traffic and it is a city jurisdiction on the 33 junction and once again the answer is the same. There is an ongoing study, our engineers assist the city engineers wherever possible, liase with them, provide traffic advice. Our traffic Safety Engineering Branch is continually working with other urbans as well as Regina, but the initiation of any of these actions must come from the governing jurisdiction.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — With regard to the matters I raised with truck traffic on Fleet Street and then going down Dewdney east, could you give your departmental undertaking that departmental vehicles or trucks will not take that route and will use the ring road to wherever they are going or at least not drive through that subdivision. It is causing problems, I think we can all accept that heavy truck traffic through a residential area is something certainly not a desirable situation and would you give us the assurance that at least the Department of Highways vehicles heavy truck traffic will not be following that route of Fleet Street and then Dewdney.

MR. KRAMER: — I think it would be wise for the member and the people in that area to wait until the project has been completed because we have been, the planners certainly anticipated that once completed this traffic would move. Certainly anything we can do in the department to avoid congestion will be done, but right now I think there are a few too many instant experts around as to what will happen, what may happen and I think we will find that once the ring road and all the various adjuncts to it are completed, that things will certainly improve and many of the imagined hazards will not actually take place and become a problem; and if they do, certainly ongoing studies will correct them. I'm certainly not going to anticipate problems before the work is done.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — The problem exists today; it is not an anticipated problem. The fact is there are departmental heavy trucks and other heavy trucks avoiding the service road access and are, in fact, using Fleet Street and going down Dewdney east by the school and highly populated residential area and I am asking you that that practice be stopped.

MR. KRAMER: — We will certainly take a look at it, but I would say that any traffic that is going there is necessary traffic and I don't think there is a great deal can be done about it at the moment but if there is a way of routing it to other ways, we will certainly have our officials look at it, people in charge of that division and see if it is a problem that it can be alleviated and that is about the only answer that I could give today.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — But you will have your department take a look at it and see if it can be alleviated. Thank you, Mr. Minister. Would your department supply me and I am prepared to continue questioning or to wait if you are prepared to give me the assurance the amounts paid to anyone that receives compensation for work along the ring road, No. 1 east, and anywhere through there. There were various stores, business establishments and whatnot that were affected by the ring road or the by-pass and would you supply me with the amounts of compensation paid to the various individuals or companies.

MR. KRAMER: — I think we could do that but the normal procedure and the best procedure again, I would like to suggest would simply be to list in either a question or an order for return, it would then be a researched, answered, completely researched answer. Now, if the member wants, and I'm not trying to be difficult but I think that that is the proper procedure, Mr. Chairman, and we would be happy to provide the answer, I think either way. I hope the house is winding up, I think we can get you the information. I will ask for it but please list either through the blue or directly, but give me a shopping list.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I am aware of the procedure also, and I think the Minister will agree I have the right to ask the questions at this estimate and if you simply will, all I asked for was your undertaking to supply the information. The letter is fine. If that is given that is acceptable to me.

I have a particular matter as an MLA that I would like to raise with the Regina district. I have tended to follow the practice if a constituency matter, which would be irrelatively minor one, that I have written directly to the head of the Chief Engineer of the district. I have had some difficulty in getting replies. Some have been several months before I have been getting replies. I will assume, unless you advise me differently, that it is the workload of district engineer. For example, in one matter that I raised early last year and am still waiting for a reply, is the possibility of a stop sign on 364, on the grid road. I believe it is about four miles north of 364, there is a valley on the way up to Edenwold

and Edgeley and the visibility is not good at that particular junction of the highway and the grid road. I have received no reply. Would you have your officials check that out for me and see if they can reply?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, and regarding other inquiries I don't know what the answer is. Mr. Kocur is the district engineer. I would like you to possibly send me a copy of the letters and we can probably check it out and see that you get the answers.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I follow the practice and I think your officials will agree in that past that if Mr. Kocur and his officials deserve credit, I have given it in the Assembly and I haven't been getting replies and so I raise that as well.

Now, there is another aspect and I think it has special concern in my constituency and I am sure in any constituencies that surrounds one of the major urban centres.

The communities are limited, I believe, to two small arrow signs showing how to get to a particular community and the mileage or the kilometres. I believe it just two that they are allowed. For example, if you come down No. 1 and you want to know where Avonhurst is there is one sign. There is not a sign going east, I believe, for Avonhurst and there is none on No. 10 as a result. So that with the number of highways there is inadequate signing of these small arrow-directional signs that you have, convenient signs. Would the minister, first of all, give me the policy on that and, secondly, be prepared to consider reviewing that policy in light of the limitations, given the number of highways surrounding a major urban centre?

MR. KRAMER: — The Avonhurst problem is something that seems to be . . . no it is not according to policy as near as I understand your question. We will get back to you on that.

Now, in the matter of broadening our signing policies and so on, which I hope have been reasonably adequate, it is part of a study that we are undertaking in signing, safety and the whole bit. This is under study now to see if there are any areas we can improve.

Now, a few years ago, you will remember on all the main highways we put a pre-warning sign — access one mile — and this is one of the reasons that our accident rate in tailending on highways has dropped considerably. People, before that advance warning sign was up, they would be right on top of it, put on the brakes and bang and could be two or three. This has been tremendously valuable and that was as a result of signing study that we did back more than five or six years ago. There is another study being undertaken now on these particular things that you mentioned. Regarding Avonhurst itself, we will get in touch with you.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I would like to make the following suggestion, that when you finalize your policy in that regard that . . . I am sympathetic with the departmental position that you can't have these signs all over and there can't be an unlimited number, but one of the criteria that should be taken into account, I suggest to you is the number of main highways in a particular area. If there happens to be one region where there are a lot of main highways then each one should be designated rather than the blanket limit which we have had in the past. I would suggest that for the minister's consideration.

The other matter I would like to raise is a particular matter in the Balgonie area and that is, going west on No. 1 to Balgonie the signing is more than adequate but coming east, it is not the same type of signing and the signing for Edenwold and in that direction up

to there it is not the same going west, and will your officials take a look at that particular area so that east bound traffic on No. 1 towards Balgonie and Regina would have the same signing considerations as those going west?

MR. KRAMER: — We will take a look at it.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — My final area is, has the department made its final arrangements and will it give consideration to the Balgonie 'bed derby' again this year, and its use of No. 1 Highway. The departmental co-operation last year was excellent and the townspeople were very, very pleased with the departmental consideration. I think the event however, is going to get considerably bigger this year by the looks of the entries that are coming in. Would your officials again — I'm sure they will show the same consideration but have they made any plans as to blocking off one lane and how that is going to be handled this year given the increased volumes of beds?

MR. KRAMER: — Well, there will be no change from last year's policy to accommodate the race. I think if you get too many it may have to be run in relays. Anything is open for discussion. I'm sure that the people will be in touch with us. Thus far we have not been contacted unless they have recently contacted Mr. Kocur, but certainly I think it is a great idea. I don't think there was any hazard.

MR. LANE(Qu'Ap): — There were no accidents but there was, (obviously being the first time that it was run) some confusion and some concern about . . . but again this year I suggest that the department be put on notice that with the indications that the townspeople have already on the number of entries, it could be dramatically higher than last year and that lane may somehow have to be blocked off with a flashing sign in position. I gather it is going to be quite a bit bigger.

Item 14 agreed.

ITEM 15

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, how many gravel pits do you have in this district and how many do you have under provincial jurisdiction in the province?

MR. KRAMER: — We will research that and provide with a written answer.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What security or protection measures do you have — do you have any policy with regard to protecting the general public at large from the gravel pits in particular, the water they contain therein, especially during heavy rainfall, or if they happen to be in a high water table area?

MR. KRAMER: — Our policy is at the present time, and has been from some time, that we back slope any dangerous ledges. We fence wherever possible. There are some pits that may be municipal and are old abandoned ones and if the old abandoned pits that are under our jurisdiction we are gradually trying to landscape those to bring them into a more attractive position.

The study that we are undertaking, we are going to undertake a study now of pits that are adjacent to small and larger urbans that probably might be useful for garbage disposal and we can kill two birds with one stone that way by using it for landfill and cleaning it up at the same time.

This is about the only assurance I could give. If you know of a pit that is a hazard, please get on the phone, call us collect any time, or if you see anything that is a hazard, I would appreciate a collect call either to the department, to the district office, because they are interested as well. I never get out on the road but that I spot a hazard somewhere and we try to correct those. If everyone would kindly keep his eyes open we would clean up a few more hazardous places that may be overlooked by the engineering department.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, thank you for your comments. I brought the matter to your attention and I think that it does deserve some recognition, in particular because a young lady, and possibly there could have been two more (but in particular one lost her life about a year and one-half ago roughly) and I would like to see that where these pits are under your jurisdiction, where it is your responsibility, we can't protect people from every danger in the province I am sure, but in this regard, the provincial gravel pits, that may be fenced, that there be 'no admittance' signs well displayed so that people are entering at their own risk and this would clear the department and you will have done all that you can. Where they may be filled, I believe that that is a good approach to take as well, or as you say, they could be used for garbage disposal and at the same time I think we have to recognize that some of them are a very valuable source of water to the rural area so in those cases we would want to maintain those bodies of water and yet I am sure that the public is protected as best as can be.

So I just want to bring that matter to your attention and I appreciate your comments and I think that we can work successfully on that regard.

I would like to know with regard to Highway 16, if your plans are to complete that highway to the Manitoba border this summer, or do you have a target date as to when Highway 16 will be finished?

MR. KRAMER: — That road will become No. 48 because of the western Canada signing using a common number on the Yellowhead. It was 16 in Alberta and 16 most of the way through British Columbia and we have agreed with the suggestion with the Yellowhead people that a common number be chosen. So that number will . . . but that's only by the way . . . the construction of that road is part of our long-term planning and it's fairly high priority. There is no program on it this year, but budgets permitting, we may be able to let a contract on that again another year.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I just wonder, we are talking about the same road, are we? I am talking about Highway 16 which runs through Kipling.

MR. KRAMER: — Yes.

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K. you mentioned Yellowhead, so I kind of thought maybe you weren't I am not sure that I understand completely why the change is required in the numbering of the highway. I think you mentioned that you wanted some uniformity throughout the system, interprovincially. O.K. One more question with regards to the present Highway No. 16. Was there any difficulty settling on the contractor that was hired for the job? Were there any delays in that regard, to your knowledge?

MR. KRAMER: — Which section are you talking about? I don't recollect any problems in any case, but . . .

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K. Wawota, Mr. Minister.

MR. KRAMER: — No, there were no problems there. I think probably . . . Well, you can enlarge on your question if you wish but, there were no problems to our knowledge and as I mentioned, we are paving on that section of road this year. So when I said there was no program at all, that is not quite correct — there is.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Yes, that was the question I wanted to get in — that there was work being done there and it was a question I asked you about in the Estimates last year. I am glad to see that those improvements are taking place and I am just anxious to see it proceed and get its way through to the Manitoba border. There is one more question I would like to ask. I would like to ask why some \$13,000 were appropriated from your department for the Land Bank Commission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Please, if I could indulge on the House once more. There has been another group of students who entered and with your permission, I will give the member for Yorkton the privilege of introducing them.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House, a group of 47 charming young ladies in the west gallery. These are 47 Brownies who are from Yorkton and they are accompanied by Mrs. Janet Bell and Mrs. Lynn Thompson. I would like to wish them an interesting stay in the House and look forward to seeing you a little bit later to have hot chocolate discussion about the proceedings there. I wish them an interesting stay and a good journey home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION — VOTE 16 (Con't)

ITEM 15 (Con't)

MR. KRAMER: — The only way we could have paid any money to the Land Bank Commission would be for the purchase of right-of-way for land that was owned by the Land Bank. That would be the answer. I don't know of any other way that money would change hands between the Department of Highways and the Land Bank Commission.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I am not clear in just what your answer is to my question. Are you suggesting just right-of-ways to the Land Bank Plan? That would only be approaches would it not?

MR. KRAMER: — I wish you would. I think the thing I would like the member to do would be to specify and just give me a note so that we can research it. I don't know what you are referring to. I am saying that the Department of Highways does not pay out money. I presume it must be for land. It does not pay out money except for right-of-way or other damages, shelter belts and other damages due to land. That seems to me to be the most logical reasons from the Department of Highways and Transportation to be paying any money out to the Land Bank Commission.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am only referring to the figures that are clearly outlined in F-235 of the Public Accounts, in 1977, and it is quite a substantial sum of money, \$13,0101.10 (for what that is worth). I can't really believe that it would just be

for approaches. It surely must be for something and I would like it know what it is.

MR. KRAMER: — I was saying, first of all, the place to ask the question will be in Public Accounts when the question comes up. That is that. Now, I will research it in any case. Now, if you are saying that \$13,000 is an unusually large sum — if we are cutting through a piece of land with a full grade and there are large numbers of acres, there could be seven or eight acres, it doesn't take long to get into (depending on the length) it and then if there is damage to or movement of buildings and damage to trees and so on, enter into it, you are going to run into bills—and we do — considerably larger with some farmers, considerably larger — \$13,000. I do not accept the premise that this is an unusual amount to pay to a landowner.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the minister possibly misunderstood me. I was not saying that it was a terrible sum of money. After all, when your government is budgeting \$1.7 billion. I do not think that \$13,000 is that great a sum of money in those terms, but I say it is substantial enough to ask a question about why it is being submitted, and I accept your suggestion that we shall proceed and pursue that particular matter in Public Accounts when we get into that.

If I might then just proceed to ask another question, and to give you a specific example. In the town of Rocanville where the Highway No 8 goes right through the town, there is also another highway which goes around the two, which is on the square. Highway No. 8 goes through on a double curve type approach.

Now, when you are coming out of the town of Rocanville and you are on No. 8, you have to stop and yield right of way to another highway which is not a main highway. It just seems logical to me that you would, as a department, designate No. 8 around the town of Rocanville and have the one that is going in, and you can call it anything you like, but surely it does not make much sense to me to be driving along No. 8 and have to stop and yield to another road. Are you familiar with that particular section?

MR. KRAMER: — No, I am not, but we will ask our traffic safety engineer to check into the situation and provide you with whatever assessment they make of the situation. You could be right. I cannot debate it one way or another. If you are satisfied to have an assessment from the engineers, we will be glad to get it for you.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Minister, the comments attributed to the Deputy Minister, Tom Gentles, were allegedly made at a meeting in Kenosee last June when he was being questioned on the condition of No. 8 Highway. No. 8 Highway, since I have moved to this province, has been an utter disgrace. Admittedly, some work was done on it last year but it is still an utter disgrace and it has been an utter disgrace, according to the people who have lived there a lot longer than I, since almost forever.

Looking at Public Accounts, I see a couple of expenditures which would be made in the year ending 1977, one for \$3.85, another one for \$9.35. For 12 miles of highway there is an expenditure for \$102.18. How can you possibly expect to maintain a highway with these meagre expenditures, or is that a \$3.85 pothole and a \$9.35 pothole, etc.

MR. KRAMER: — Once again you are looking at Public Accounts. Certainly I can tell you, without consulting, it has nothing to do with the maintenance costs of the road. There is no way I can comment on items you are taking out of public accounts, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, I notice on the little layout distributed a week or two ago of your proposed program for highway construction or repair for this coming year, that No. 8 Highways was omitted again. I wonder if we can ever expect to see some upgrading to the No. 8 Highway.

MR. KRAMER: — I am sure you can. It is in the planning. It is under study but we have to make selections. Now we are trying to work on several north-south arteries. No. 47 is certainly one of them, No. 235 is another, No. 2 is another; they are carrying a great deal more traffic than No. 8. No. 9 carries most of the north-south traffic down through that area and it is a matter of priority. The average maintenance cost on that area — I would say our average maintenance cost on all those roads will run \$1,200 to \$1,300 per mile per year. That's a fair bit of maintenance but let's remember this as well that you can do a fair bit of that and we still have got 150,000. Those are the least expensive highways we can build today. That's not the 300,000 miles Trans-Canada and they'll run from 150,000 to 200,000 miles. Now you look even at a \$90 million to \$85 million capital budget scattered over 13,000 miles of highway in this province. I sympathize with the fact that that highway certainly needs upgrading but it isn't, I would say, any better or any worse than approximately 5,000 miles that we have and some of those with higher traffic on them.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, I don't question your logic. I question your priorities and as it relates to the traffic on No. 9 Highway being high, there is no question about that. But one of the reasons for the traffic volume on No. 9 Highway is quite simply because people are quite prepared to drive that 60 miles out of their way to avoid No. 8, it's such a terrible disgrace.

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, last spring I had occasion for a month to visit the Pelly area and during that time there was a . . .

MR. ROBBINS: — You took your vacation there?

MR. WIPF: — I took my vacation there and watched the surveying of the highway between Kamsack and Pelly going on, a lot of surveying and a new highway was going to be built, it would just about make you believe there was an election coming up or an election down there. I was over there just recently and the stakes are down and there is no new highway in there. Can you tell me what happened? What is the disposition of that 210 miles . . .

MR. KRAMER: — I can. We had to get the right-of-way through the Indian Reserve and the Cote people were not prepared to sell us that right-of-way almost at any price. The price was too high. We had to redesign and stay within the narrower perimeters, either that or pay fantastic sums of money and other things for damaging. So we are proceeding, we have redesigned it. We are probably going to move in dirt from distances, narrow the gauge and narrow the ditches but we will be proceeding with it. There was no way we could proceed because we did not have the right of way.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, what would be the action of the government if you were going to build a highway in another area of this province and you had a couple of farmers alongside the highway who wouldn't sell you their land? Would you expropriate their land or what would you do? Would you have to leave the highway narrow for them?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, but in this case we can't do it because it's a federal jurisdiction and we have no expropriate rights with the Indians.

MR. WIPF: — In the federal jurisdiction then you just deal directly with the band and not the federal Department of Indian Affairs, is that right?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would like to just ask a question regarding the building of roads through reservations. Then, in fact, if that is the case this land is the property of the Indians, then do the Indians have to have a driver's licence to drive on that stretch of highway which is within the reservations?

MR. KRAMER: — That's not within my area of authority, I really don't know. I'm sure the Highway Traffic Board could provide you with that answer.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman — just in reply to some of your comments to the member for Souris-Cannington regarding the flow of traffic on Highway No. 9. I think it is understandable for three reasons that the traffic would be higher on Highway No. 9. The first reason being it's a lot better road than any of the others running north and south in there. Secondly because there is a great amount of tourist travel on that particular stretch — and I might add it is mostly Saskatchewan and maybe more so this year than ever. The other reason is that it is a main link from the south to the north to get on the Yellowhead Route, if that's the route you want to travel to get going east and west again. In light of that I think we still have to take a look at Highway No. 8. The member for Souris-Cannington raises a good point. Highway No. 8 is just not what it should be, there is no question about that. I understand that it is being worked on from the north end and working down south. How far south are you going to get? Do you have any idea at this point in time just how far south you are going to get in the next year?

MR. KRAMER: — We have improved a long stretch in the Kamsack south area. The next priority is from No. 1 north on No. 8. I don't know how soon we'll be moving south. As I say, it's a matter of priorities. There is a continuing effort to upgrade there. This is a fairly important arterial road, I won't argue that. I am simply saying that some are more heavily travelled and more important than others.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, are you saying then that in the next year you are going to be working on Highway No. 8 between the Trans-Canada north to Kamsack?

MR. KRAMER: — Not on this year's program. I am saying that will be the first priority and it could well be that we might be moving in that area. That certainly is open for question and study.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Will it be open in the next year, then?

MR. KRAMER: — I am not prepared to answer that until my Budget is in place. We ask for a certain amount of Budget every year. Sometimes we don't get everything we ask for and we have to cut back in those areas and repriorize. I just will not make a commitment to anyone as to what next year's program will be unless it is absolutely in place and irrevocable as, for instance, No. 1 was between Swift Current and Moose Jaw. That four-laning had to be completed so much every year because it had become a hazard with the braking, as the member for Thunder Creek said. We had to clear up that situation and that was an expensive one. That priority now had been dealt with and we can move into other areas. That was an expensive one. That was a \$300,000 mile

priority.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, really in essence what you have just said is that you don't have any long term policy with regards to some of our, I suppose you could consider secondary highways, in the province of Saskatchewan. You said that No. 8 is of concern to yourself and I am sure it should be. But surely, you must have some long-range policies. You must have some idea what your priorities should be. You give an example of a highway that is doing considerable cracking up and breaking up and that is the one that you are going to direct your attention to. Well, Mr. Minister, I might bring it to your attention that No. 8 is doing that right through clean to the United States border and has been for quite sometime. We have had a lot of complaints about it along that border line, right along the Manitoba border, right from the States right through. We know that it is being worked on in the North and our people, in the Souris-Cannington constituency and the Moosomin constituency, are wanting to know just when it is going to get upgraded. They see surveyors out there every summer, staking it out and they have little flags and stakes and the whole bit and everybody is getting excited, oh, boy, they are going to build this road up. Now you are telling me they are not going to, not this year, not next year. I would like to know, so that I can go back and tell my people well, the Minister of Highways says, no, we are not going to be touching this road for two years and never mind getting excited about the little stakes with red flags on them. It isn't going to happen; the government doesn't have a long-term policy with regard to secondary highways. We are going to leave it up the main roads where there is some tourism or some other people, but the people that live here and are stationary people, well we are not going to be concerned about them.

Now, Mr. Minister, surely if you haven't got a long-term policy well then fine, I just want you to stand up and tell me you don't have one and then I can go back and tell my people that the minister and this government doesn't have a long-term policy with regard to roads in this province.

MR. KRAMER: — Well you will probably tell them what you please anyway. But I am saying, Mr. Chairman, we do have a long-range policy and within that policy we prioritize.

I would just like to point out that this year \$53 million will be spent on secondary highways. That's the secondary highways, the kinds of roads that the member is talking about. That's a 20 per cent increase over the 1978-79 budget.

Now I will not make a commitment. I'm saying that there are a large number of roads that are similar to that one that have a similar priority and our engineers will look at these roads and prioritize them according to what seems to be the greatest need at that particular time when we are finalizing our budget next fall. That's all I can tell you. That is all within a long-term budget on priority.

As far as staking is concerned, I think people in Saskatchewan ought to know that simply seeing stakes go up is no indication that a road is going to be built immediately. Stakes have been put up for various reasons by various governments over the years, but when you see staking going on it is doing advance work to provide right of way in set-backs to avoid future confrontations when people are going to be building too close to the right of way and so on. So the staking that's being done is to simply enter rights of way on to title and certainly I don't want anyone to run off with the idea that when they see staking and right of way being purchased that that is an indication there is immediately going to be a highway. We are setting right of way aside now that certainly probably in some places the road won't be built for six or seven years, but it is being

dedicated so that in future we won't have to do the rush job and pay through the nose or have to move farm buildings. That's the policy and that's all I have to say about it.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, thank you for your statement. This is what I wanted to hear you say and I think that is very well understood that the section of No. 8 Highway through the constituencies of Moosomin and Souris-Cannington do not rate high enough in priorities (in the government's priorities) to deserve any recognition in terms of upgrading or general maintenance in that regard.

If I might just move to one other area of concern and that is not a secondary highway and that is with regard to the Trans-Canada and the proposed by-pass around the town of Moosomin. Now then, do you have any policy or long-term planning in that regard? Can you give this Assembly and the people of that area, the people that have to travel the Trans-Canada, any information whatsoever as when that by-pass will be built?

MR. KRAMER: — Here again, as far as construction goes, immediate construction, there are no immediate plans for that. The work that is going on, however, in Moosomin is, again, one of dedicating the road so that business people and development people will know where that road is going to be even if it is five years from now; that that land can be dedicated and people can plan their residences or businesses in accordance with what is going to happen. Now it might happen in one or two years, it may be longer, I don't know. But the work that is being undertaken to secure agreements and dedications, I think, is necessary and proper, that we do that now rather than later and probably it would be far more upsetting and certainly may be upsetting to business.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I think just one more question depending on the minister's answer in this regard. I can concur with what you say that you have to do some long-range planning once you decide that you are going to put a by-pass in that area. What I would like to know, is have you made any settlements for any of the property which will have to be utilized, the private property at this point in time, for the highway itself? Have you made any settlement at all?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, we have.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could tell me which property that is, that you have made settlement?

MR. KRAMER: — I wouldn't have a list here, immediately, but I don't know whether that is private or not. You simply want to know from whom the land has been purchased? We can give you the names of the people who have settled, who have had their land sold and dedicated, but I think it is privy to give you the prices. I don't think you were asking for that.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I've heard you mention that two or three times now, sold or dedicated. So, the previous owner gets compensated, dedicated he does not. All right that's one question that you will reply to. Secondly, in that particular area, I'm just using this as an example, I am sure you must have cases like this all over the province. I would like to see you take a definite position as to what your plans are in that particular area, either to purchase the land in the whole new stretch that goes around the town of Moosomin and lease it back, buy it outright or whatever you are going to do but do it consistently and uniformly right through and not just to hit and miss as you go through that highway section. You are going through farmlands there as well.

I know that the Moosomin Chamber of Commerce would like to see you make some decision in regard to their sports ground area relocation. They want to have settlement in order that they may purchase another parcel of land to create a new sports ground, so it's creating some difficulties in that area. Now then, if in fact you settle with the town in regard to their sports ground, then what about the farmer? Are you going to settle with him and lease the land back to him so that he knows if a guy comes and wants to buy that farm of his he is going to say O.K. but there is so much of this that belongs to the government whenever they decide to utilize it to build the highway? The same applies to an auto body shop out there, there's an auction mart that you are going to be slicing in pretty close to. There's a number of places, you are right through the CCIL depot. I just want to know if there is going to be the same policy applied to all or is it going to be a different one as you go through?

MR. KRAMER: — The same policy will apply to everyone. We'll still have to depend on individual negotiation and individual people. There is no other way that you can secure land. When every avenue is being explored, if we feel that unreasonable demands are made, then in the public interest it is not only the right but the duty of the department to expropriate because we simply can't pay out any large amount of money if it is in the opinion of our negotiators. We have experienced negotiators working continually. As far as that sports ground and so on, my officials say they think that one has already been settled. I don't think that I can here in this House give you individual items. We can give you the names of those people who have settled and the process will just simply go on. I can't comment on individual cases.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, just one question just for my own clarification. When you were talking you said on these long term plans for highway construction and secondary road construction in the province here, that you actually set your priorities on a year to year basis according to your budget, or do you have a long-term plan? You mentioned one thing there that it could happen, the ring road or by-pass could happen two years, three years, five years, you know. Have you got a long-term plan beyond one year or does everything work within the one year.

MR. KRAMER: — We have a broad overall plan and when you are talking about five or six thousand miles of secondary highway, there are a lot of unpredictables as to what the condition of those are going to be. For instance, things happen, like I can give the Yellow Creek example where the bridge went out. All the grain was hauled over oil road. The whole ruddy thing went to pieces because of a truck haul that was necessary to get the grain off because the railroad bridge was washed out. Those are only small items. There are other situations that develop and I have the situation of rain fall. Sometimes certain parts of the province get a tremendous amount of rain fall compared to others and roads that were expected to stand up, don't. Those priorities then have to be changed. We may have had intentions to go with a No. 8 or some other number and if you have, we have to have the mobility to move in on those roads that require immediate action.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I don't want to interfere with the minister's grand plan, but there is one little highway I'd like to enquire on an information that has been under construction for a long period of time but only we see about 40 miles or less than that. I understand that now you are going to continue construction or reconstruction of No. 16, the other side of Wawota. Why would you leave that major gap between Montmartre and Wawota. I am sure that the members of your staff would inform you about the condition of the road. It's narrow, it's very

dangerous and why would you skip 40, 50 miles and why would you not continue from Montmartre east and finish that 16 Highway through to the border? I can't understand it. It has been under construction since about 1970.

MR. KRAMER: — Certainly the long-term planning again, well, possibly you can't please, you've proved my point, you can't please everybody. The member over there is very happy that we moved into the Wawota area, which was, in our opinion, needed it greater at that particular time. Our intention is to continue to develop 16 and I think the member will realise that it is only a few short years ago, very few, that the first construction was initiated on that road when I was the minister, and I haven't been around that long. We are consistently moving, as you move further east the traffic count is less, you know that, and that road the traffic count is less. You know, and that road is not all that bad because I was on it recently. It is not that bad because I went over to Kenosee twice and I took that road deliberately. My cruise control was sitting at 62.5 miles per hour all the way over there and it never kicked it off except when I got behind a slow moving vehicle. Now do not tell me that road is so bad.

Item 15 agreed.

Items 16 and 17 agreed.

ITEM 18

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, there is a highway running east of Prince Albert going east of Prince Albert out to the Steep Creek area. The number just slips my mind right now, but you are going to be widening that and doing some work on it this year. Just leaving the city, for the first two or three miles there are a fair amount of small lots there and I have had some concern expressed to me about the highway going through and the widening of that and cutting into some of these people's properties. Is there a plan to widen that? How much property are they going to be using off of each side of the road? One of the other questions they asked me is, is it possible that this highway can stay within the outside boundaries now for that couple of miles that run out before you have to widen it to finish that road?

MR. KRAMER: — Now, the member is asking about the first portion of No. 302 leaving east from Prince Albert. That is a fairly heavy traffic count on the first distance. I remember something like 600 or 700 vehicles per day. The survey is going on now. We are studying that but I think I have to say that our people are going to be very surprised if we do not need a wider right of way to provide the kind of width that is necessary for safety on that first stretch where the road carries a lot of traffic. I'm sure there would be concern on the part of people who are living along that road and that I suppose, is the price of progress. We just have to satisfy the majority of the people and sometimes the minority have to suffer a bit by giving it but they will be well compensated whatever happens.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, one final compliment to your department in that area. I want to thank you for the co-operation that your people in that area have given with the Chamber of Commerce and for some of the projects that are planned for the future.

Item 18, 19 and 20 agreed.

Vote 16 agreed.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:03 o'clock p.m.