

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 23, 1979**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), in that he was not going to be in the House today and is out of the province, that I might welcome the students from Earl Grey. The Grade 7 and 8 students, as I understand it, sitting in the west gallery, are 22 in number. I want to welcome them to the legislature this morning on behalf of their MLA who, as I have already said, is out of the province. We do hope that your day here will be enjoyable. I pass on the regrets of your MLA that he was not here to personally introduce you to the Assembly. I also want to meet with you later this morning as you leave the Assembly and are meeting in the rotunda. Perhaps there are some questions which I can answer for you.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Assembly, we welcome the students from Earl Grey School to the Assembly today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**INTRODUCTION OF CADETS AND WRENETTES**

**MR. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and this Assembly, 10 Regina navy cadets who are sitting up in the Speaker's gallery — cadets and wrenettes. Mr. Speaker, they are accompanied by their officer escorts, Mr. Dave Leslie and Mrs. Vickie Satler. I understand that these 10 members of the navy cadets and wrenettes are outstanding members of their organization and are attending here today as part of a project associated with the study of citizenship. I'm sure they will find the activities of this Assembly interesting and a great help and assistance in their studies.

I'm sure I speak for all members when I say I welcome them to the Assembly and I'll be meeting with them at 11:30 for further discussion.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you 20 Grade 8 students seated in the east gallery from St. Oliver School in Radville. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ed Borsa.

I'm sure all members here will join with me in welcoming them here and I hope they have a pleasant stay and a pleasant trip back home. I will meet with them at 11 o'clock in the lounge.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS Land Bank Leasing**

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Is the minister aware that the land bank leases three quarters of land to a Susan Argue?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Yes, I believe that's correct.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister now aware that the same land was purchased by the land bank from Senator Hazen Argue, father of Susan Argue?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, I'm aware of that. The land was bought from Senator Argue in the normal way that we buy land from anyone who wants to transfer it to their next-of-kin.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Supplementary. I'm advised by the people in the Kayville area that the same Susan Argue is a resident of Regina, and does not in fact farm the land. It is custom hired, farmed by neighbors and relatives. Is the Premier aware of that?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not the Premier but I'm not aware of the circumstances which he indicates. Certainly if the person who is leasing land is not actively farming it, that would be of some concern to us. We have not been advised that that's a fact and until I can verify that, I would not accept it as a fact.

### **Effects of Australian Uranium Development**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the minister in charge of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) in absence of the minister in charge of mineral resources. I'm pleased to see that the minister is on his way to sell potash. I think that's very commendable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARTER:** — In the March 17, 1979 edition of the Economist, it is stated that two Australian mines of 3,000 tons and 4,000 tons of uranium oxide will come on stream in 1982 and 1985 respectively. Is the minister aware of the probable negative effect on Saskatchewan uranium markets because of these two mines?

**HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, we're aware, obviously, of substantial deposits of uranium in Australia; of some difficulties the Australians are having with respect to sorting out their nuclear policy. We have taken into account the impact of likely new production from mines in Australia and other places in the world in looking ahead at what the price and market will be for uranium and we remain (as does the rest of the industry in Canada) quite confident.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The article also states that the Australian government is approving too many mines too quickly in the face of slackening overseas demand. Have you made any direct discussions with the Australian government with regard to their uranium policies which may have a serious impact on Saskatchewan

uranium development in the future?

**MR. COWLEY:** — I'd like to say I'll leave tomorrow to check. No, I haven't personally carried on any discussions with the Australians with respect to their policy. Some members of the SMDC have been keeping in rather close touch with developments in Australia and I believe in the next six or eight weeks we'll have some technical people, a couple of technical people, at a conference in Australia where they will have some opportunity at first hand to see the developments there. I repeat that we've been taking into account as best we can the developments in Australia along with the private sector in Canada and with other uranium producers. The market, I think, continues to be one which is quite solid. Certainly in our discussions with potential consumers in Europe and Asia, they don't feel that there's a tremendous glut of uranium on the market and are very anxious to assure themselves of a long run supply of uranium.

**MR. LARTER:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Mead study done on the future of uranium markets says that uranium markets are speculative and tentative. Do you have any market studies as far as SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) is concerned, and will you table them immediately?

**MR. COWLEY:** — We have access to various studies done by some groups which are public like the OECD (Organization for Economic and Co-operative Development). We have access to some material which has been done for us by consultants, and we've tried to assemble this and come up with our own projections. No, I'm not prepared to table our projections with respect to demand and supply of uranium. Some of the material was acquired at some cost to the corporation. It's not in the public interest to make that material public and freely available to others who may or may not compete with us in the market.

### **Investigations into Argue Matter**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister give his assurance to this Assembly that in fact your department will conduct an investigation into the entire Argue matter that has been raised in the last two days?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to examine the file of the Argues to see that everything is done according to the requirements of the act. We will certainly be interested in knowing that all the requirements are being met and I can give you that assurance. I'm a little frustrated though, with the continuous involvement of members opposite in the personal lives of a lot of people, and I'm just wondering if that's an attempt on their part to have a bit of a police state, going out there and checking on everybody's personal involvement.

**MR. ANDREW:** — The minister indicates that he is concerned about being in the lives of the people. I suggest to the minister that the purpose of the Land Bank Commission is to help the young farmer become involved in farming, and not to let the rich person get richer in farming. That's what I'm concerned about and that's why the question is being raised.

### **Continue Bargaining with SCAPO**

**MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek):** — Question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes), Mr. Speaker. With regard to SCAPO (Saskatchewan Council of Anti-Poverty

Organization) you stated a few days ago that as soon as an agreement is reached with SCAPO or another group that you would make an announcement concerning this. Does this indicate that your department is still in bargaining with SCAPO to continue this program?

**MR. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — I'm not sure which program she's referring to, but if the hon. member is referring to the job training program I have the information here, Mr. Speaker. SCAPO will be notified as of March 30 that we intend to terminate our contract with them as far as job training and job placement is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this training on the job is not with the Department of Social Services but with the Department of Continuing Education. It may come as some surprise, I suppose, that I wasn't aware that we had a contract between continuing education and SCAPO. In a way I'm glad that I didn't know because it was the officials of continuing education who came to me and recommended that we terminate the contract because of the poor performance of SCAPO. I have evidence here, Mr. Speaker, that SCAPO did not live up to the contract and it has been on a continual basis that the officials of the Department of Continuing Education have been prodding SCAPO to live up to the contract.

They have very few clients; very few referrals have been made to SCAPO; and it has been a very costly per client situation. The reporting that SCAPO was to have done on a monthly basis had not been done. For example, we have here, two reports out of 24. The department has continually urged SCAPO to bring in their reports; they have not done so. I have documented evidence here that there were a number of meetings held between officials of the Department of Continuing Education and Mr. Shepherd to try to get the reports in. They have not been submitted and the officials have recommended to me and I concur with them, that 30 days notice be given as of March 30, that the contract be terminated.

That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we will not seek out another agency so that training on the job and job placement for socially disadvantage people can take place in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, does the minister recall questioning in this House on estimates, with reference to the grants to organizations such as SCAPO, and quite specifically, to the SCAPO organization in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977, and the minister's suggestion that this organization should operate this kind of program itself? Does he recall those discussions in this Assembly?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I really don't know what the member is referring to, Mr. Speaker, since I was only appointed the Minister of Continuing Education, I believe in November, December, or whenever it was I was appointed. How can I possibly have said that in estimates when I wasn't the minister responsible for continuing education?

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that you are actually doing nothing more than playing politics with the poor? On one hand you criticize the federal government for cutbacks and on the other hand, you cut back on your own programs.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, if the member is suggesting that we, as a government,

allow inefficiency in non-government organizations, and that we not expect non-government organizations to live up to the contract that is made with them so that taxpayers' money can be spent wisely and efficiently I disagree with the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan). We accept our ministerial responsibilities in seeing to it that people's moneys are spent wisely and for the benefit of the socially disadvantaged people in this province. If you are suggesting to me that I not pick up my ministerial responsibilities and see to it that SCAPO (Saskatchewan Council of Anti-Poverty Organization) or any other group lives up to its contract and to its responsibilities, I totally disagree with you in those procedures.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — New question.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Can you tell us how the government arrives at such a contradictory policy of cutting back on an organization because the president of it happened to be a defeated NDP candidate and deliberately embarks on a system of government inefficiencies and make-work projects by hiring Don Faris and Gordon McNeil?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I'll take the next question.

### **SCAPO — Mr. Shepherd**

**MR. COLLVER:** — It's strange to say the least that in his capacity as Minister of Social Services who was making grants to SCAPO, he stood up very strongly in favor of those grants to SCAPO, prior to the president of the organization announcing as a Conservative candidate. Does the minister not think it is strange to say the least that now he's cutting off this organization as being an inefficient organization?

**MR. ROLFES:** — First of all, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to go through the Votes and Proceedings and table that in the House, that I said that. I challenge him today to table the Votes and Proceedings wherein I said in this House that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . estimates are recorded. Mr. Speaker, I indicated to this House that in June, 1978 (before I knew the politics of Mr. Shepherd, I don't care what his politics are), Mr. Shepherd and I had a discussion in my office and we were concerned at that time and he indicated to me his concern, at not being able to implement the recommendations of Dr. Albert of Carlton University. We had a very open discussion about it. That was in June, I forget the exact dates but I'm sure I could look back in my record and find out. Mr. Shepherd had not announced . . . he announced I believe in late August that he was running for the Conservatives . . . he did not indicate to me that he was a Liberal or Conservative or NDP and I don't care. We were concerned that the moneys allocated to SCAPO were spent for what we had allocated them and he indicted to me that he was having internal problems with his own personnel and he was seeking my help to try to assist him. He was unable to do it and we have now taken another try.

### **Library Week**

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — I would like to direct my question to the

Minister of Education, if he would be quiet. My question has to deal with Library Week, which is coming up next week, March 24 to 31.

Mr. Minister, you no doubt are aware of a brief presented to you by the Saskatchewan Library Association in which this association condemned the present government for its failure to support the provincial libraries. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to make a small quotation, to prove my point, of about two or three lines. The quotation is:

The provincial library is now in the position of not being able to expand, but actually having to cut back staff and services in order to meet the budgetary restrictions being placed on it by the provincial government.

In view of this quotation and recent announcements concerning the importance of reading skills that you have made throughout this province, Mr. Minister, and the importance of libraries in the lives of Saskatchewan residents, is this failure to supply funds for the provincial libraries the true indication of your government's priorities, or are your words merely window-dressing?

**MR. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such brief. I did receive a brief from the library association.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Did you read it?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I did read it. I read it before I met with them and I read it with them. That brief was quite complimentary about our library system, I might say and those compliments were fairly accurate. We have the best library system in Canada.

In fairness to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, that brief did express a concern about the workload of the staff at the provincial library. I indicated that we were aware of the pressures and that if the situation did not improve or got worse, we would be prepared to meet it and see that they are able to meet the demands by the regional libraries. But, by and large, I think the brief was fairly complimentary. It did not lambaste the government as the member said.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The report recommends also, Mr. Minister, the automation of the entire Saskatchewan library network to facilitate the sharing of resources and avoid duplication, that is to put it into a computerized system. What measures is this government prepared to take to implement this system and the resulting benefits that would come to the people of Saskatchewan?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That process, Mr. Speaker, is ongoing and we are going full steam ahead at automating the libraries. That is a huge project because it means that we will, hopefully, tie into a computer all of the libraries in the province and, perhaps, from out of the province, so that you can punch in a computer and find out what books are available on different subjects. It is a huge project involving not just the provincial library and the regional libraries, but university libraries and special science libraries. It might involve private libraries as well if they were prepared to be part of it. But that work is going on. I indicated to the library association, when I met with them, that in all likelihood, in a space of two or three months, we would be setting up a steering committee (which is what they asked for in their brief) and we would be proceeding to go ahead with it. In a fashion, I think it is generally satisfactory to the library association.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary. You are aware that the University of Toronto has its library tied in with UBC and University of Victoria and, I think, University of Regina here and you're giving me assurance, I take by your statements that you are investigating doing this type of tie-in for the libraries in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would just like to ask this final question on this. This is the brief I received from the libraries committee, Mr. Minister, and on page 9, they are not as complimentary; they say you are having cutbacks and budgetary restraint, as I previously said. I just want to know, did you get a different brief than I did?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, Mr. Speaker. The only difference is that I've read the whole brief, not a small part of it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Purchase of Hopper Cars**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Mr. Minister, I have a news release dated November 24, '78 in which the minister responsible for transportation for the province of Saskatchewan expresses his position on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan regarding hopper cars and that, very simply, being opposed to the purchase of hopper cars by the Canadian Wheat Board. Does the Minister of Agriculture agree with this position taken by the minister responsible for transportation?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of the press release which he refers to and I certainly would not comment on a press release which I have not seen.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. I will be seeing to it that the Minister of Agriculture gets a copy of the news release, a government news release. I will table the document, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect a reply and ask the minister to give me a reply in the next sitting of the House.

### **Charges Laid Against Unlicensed Driving Instructors**

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question. Is the Minister of Transportation . . . the Attorney General, perhaps can take the question. I have a departmental memo from the director of driver licencing and motor vehicle administration to Mr. Gordon McGregor in the Highway Traffic Board. It deals with the registration of driver instructors and driver training schools, and is dated October 2.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What year?

**MR. LANE:** — 1978, which is the year prior to this one for the information of the hon. member opposite. It becomes very clear from my records that a number of driver education instructors are not properly licensed and that attempts to locate them by telephone or letter have totally failed. In other words, they are not complying with the regulation which requires them to register on August 15 of each year. Effective October 31, they're instructing the Highway Traffic Board to lay charges against those instructors not properly licensed and I'm wondering if the Attorney General can tell us the number of instructors charges were in fact laid against and whether the penal bond — and I know the Attorney General is aware of it — were in fact prejudiced by their failure to have that registration by the required date?

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — I'll take notice.

**MR. LANE:** — Would you also take notice that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'll take the next question.

**MR. LANE:** — New question to the minister. Will the minister take notice that attached to the memo was a confidential monthly accident report which sets up the fatal . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'll take the next question, the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan).

### **Saskatchewan Housing Project — Whitewood District**

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the minister responsible for Sask Housing and I see that since he's not here, perhaps someone else will pick it up. I have a concern raised by a member from the Whitewood Chamber of Commerce with regard to a Saskatchewan Housing project in the Whitewood district. Was that contract tendered or was it just given out to someone?

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, we'll take note of the question and see to it that the member in charge of the housing authority is advised of it.

### **Clean up of Lakes in Qu'Appelle Valley**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — My question is to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, in view of the alarming increase in the mercury content of fish in the Qu'Appelle Lakes (I refer to the fishing lakes) and in view of the fact that your government has initiated plans to develop the tourist potential of the Qu'Appelle Valley, what responsibility does this government feel it has towards improving the environment of the Qu'Appelle Lakes and what measures are you willing to implement to clean up these fishing lakes?

**HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, the government is certainly concerned about the condition and the quality of water in the Qu'Appelle Valley Lakes. But insofar as what is going to be done about it, I would suggest that the hon. member direct his question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman).

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He can't get answers out of him. He's just appointed to his department. He doesn't know. Give it to the Minister of Continuing Education.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary question. As I've said many times in this House, I'm after answers. I don't care who gives them so we'll go to this gentleman, if he is able to give one. My next question is what assurance do we have that Round and Crooked Lakes, which are further down the Qu'Appelle Valley, do not contain the same degree of mercury pollution as is the case of the fishing lakes when in the last year or so you reported that the fishing lakes had an acceptable mercury level?

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, as a result of investigations or inspections of fish in the fishing lakes, there has been a serious



increase in the level of mercury recorded in the flesh of fishes within this last year or two. That's the reason why the announcement was made by the Minister of Public Health with respect to his concern for public consumption of that fish. The same investigation did not show up that increase in Round and Crooked Lakes; they are further down the lake chain I suppose, and, therefore, perhaps the mercury contamination has not reached those lakes at this point in time. That's the only thing that I can conclude might be responsible for that situation. Mr. Speaker, so therefore the announcement which was made earlier referred to the fishing lakes rather than all of the lakes in that Qu'Appelle chain.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As these lakes are at the end of my constituency and as you kind of indicated that maybe this pollution is moving down, I think we realize that it is very important to stop it. We have witnessed cases in history where the Rhine River has recently been cleaned up and the very polluted Thames River has, also, been cleaned up. Therefore, would the government not realize that it is possible to clean up these rivers in rather short periods of time and will they not implement the same type of operation in the Qu'Appelle River immediately?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, I am not sure where the member's evidence comes from with respect to the Rhine River and I guess that is not my responsibility, at least I hope it is not.

With regard to pollution — mercury contamination or PCB . . . and we are talking about the member who is sitting in his seat uttering his voice from that position. In terms of mercury and PCB it is found that in the Great Lakes much of it comes from the atmosphere, rather than from some seepage into the system itself, or from effluent flowing into the water. We find that there is air pollution contamination which, in fact, is contributing more PCB contamination in the Great Lakes than it is out of the effluent coming in from the cities and from industrial wastes in the area.

So, it well might be that as the member suggests, cleaning up the river system to try and do away with the mercury contamination in the Qu'Appelle chain, would not be totally successful, in the sense that it would immediately lower the rates of mercury contamination or other contaminations as well.

### POINT OF ORDER RE QUESTION PERIOD

**MR. COLLVER:** — I rise on a point of order before the orders of the day with reference to a reply given to this Assembly by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) today, on a very important question. That is with reference to a government news release issued by information services of the Government of the province of Saskatchewan. The member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) issued a question to the minister and the minister took notice of a question based on a government news release.

The point of order is quite simply this. Ministers are required to answer questions in this Assembly if Mr. Speaker rules them to be a matter of urgent public importance and if Mr. Speaker rules them to be in order. The question was obviously ruled to be in order. To take notice of a question from a government news release is an obvious attempt by the minister, to escape responsibility.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't have any jurisdiction to force the minister to give any answer whatsoever. My responsibility is to decide whether the question is in order and whether the answer is in order. Now the minister may give an answer, he may give

no answer, he may refer it to Crown corporations. He can do just about anything he wants. He doesn't have to answer a question whether the question is in order or not. So I think if the member is raising a point of order, meaning that the minister has to answer the question, then the point of order is not well taken. The minister does not have to answer the question.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION — VOTE 16**  
**Continued**

**ITEM 1**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition):** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to question the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), always. His answers are always erudite and complete and we look forward to receiving them today.

The minister will recall, last year, my asking him questions about a priorities list of the Department of Highways. The minister provides to this Assembly, every year, a project array in which he spells out (presumably for the edification of the people of the province of Saskatchewan), what specific highways the Department of Highways is looking at for the next year. This is not a priorities list; this is just the highways that they think they are going to do some work on. But every year, this project array, because of weather conditions, (we have always agreed with that), has a carry forward. There are areas in the province which, whether it is for weather or not for weather, seem always to be on the carry-forward list. Interestingly enough (for the edification of the Minister of Highways) those areas, in the last five years at any rate, always seem to be the areas that fall within the constituencies in which Progressive Conservatives were elected. There is a little bit more carry forward in what you might call the Progressive Conservative areas of the province than there are in the New Democratic areas of the province.

My comment to the minister, last year, was to say that this may be totally accidental and totally incidental. The Department of Highways may not, for example, listen to the minister when he says, get a highway paved in The Battlefords because that is my constituency, or get a highway paved in Quill Lakes because that's an NDP constituency; or yank the crews that are there just before election, yank the crews out of Nipawin, or yank the crews out of Bengough-Milestone as soon as the election is over. Put them in there for two or three weeks just before the election and then a week later yank them out of there and get them into Battleford, or get them into Quill Lakes, or get them into some area that elected NDP so we can prove to the people that we're going to reward them. We're going to see that their highways at least are better maintained than are the highways in the so-called Progressive Conservative areas. This may be totally incidental and totally accidental but last year I asked the minister if he would get the Department of Highways not only to make up a project array, but also to make up a priorities list to indicate to the people of the province which areas are first, weather permitting; what projects are first in terms of your plans this year, weather permitting?

Now last year, the minister informed this Assembly if I recall correctly and I'm sure the minister will correct me if I don't. If I can recall correctly, the minister informed this Assembly that the reason that there was an increasing carry forward at the end of last year was the fact that he ran out of money towards the end of the year. Inflation caused the costs to go up. The minister, with all sincerity had a certain budget for the year. He watched inflation through partially the fault of the government of Saskatchewan, partially a fault of all governments, partially a world-wide situation . . . watched inflation

push the costs up which meant that the number of units that could be completed had to go down, and it left an ever increasing carry forward. Why then, Mr. Minister, are we not entitled to be able to go back to our constituents, even the backbenchers in your own party, and say to them, here's the priorities list. I'll give you an example from the constituency of Nipawin right now. According to the project array for 1979-80 the Nipawin constituency receives four potential projects for the Nipawin area. As the minister well knows every member of this legislature is required to answer to this constituents about roads. I think that if there is one thing in the province of Saskatchewan that all of us are unanimous on in this Assembly it is the necessity to provide good roads for our constituents. Every single member is questioned probably most often in his home area, especially the members representing rural areas; every road; what are you going to do about this road? I'm pounding the heck out of my cars; what are you going to do about this bridge? That's the kind of questions we get. We want to be able to be reasonable in so far as the minister is concerned and reasonable in so far as the Department of Highways is concerned. So we want to be able to go back to our constituents and say, O.K. had real problems in many areas of Saskatchewan last year with weather not permitting work to go forward. That was the year before that we were discussing in the House last year and we had a lot of carryover that was under contract and had to be finished there are four or five projects on the books for this year. These four or five projects that are on the books for this year, weather permitting, are going to be completed in this order — this is our priority — and make some commitments to our people so that they know that we are being realistic and reasonable.

My first question to the minister is quite simply this. In the light of our discussions last year when you didn't have a priorities list, has your department this year prepared a priorities list?

**MR. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of things that the member for Nipawin has said that apparently were misunderstandings last year. He said that I said we ran out of money last year. That is not a fact and I hope I never said anything that would have indicated that. I think our discussion last year, if my memory serves me correctly, was that we had real problems in many areas of Saskatchewan last year with weather not permitting work to go forward. That was the year before that we were discussing in the House last year and we had a lot of carryover that was under contract and had to be finished this year and was, in fact, finished this year. You see, Mr. Chairman, I want to be as careful as I can to explain what happened. There have been no projects started or finished or crews pulled out because a contract is a contract. Contracts let have to be finished. I ask the member for Nipawin and anyone else to show me one instance where work was discontinued after October 18 this year, because we would be sued for breach of contract by the contractors if we cut out a particular job. When a job is contracted that job is finished. I don't know what the member is talking about when he says that somehow or other contractors were pulled out of a certain area. I think we have a number of lists here of work that continued in Conservative constituencies or constituencies that were Liberal before. There are a limited few that may have been under other jurisdictions, where the work continued and the work will continue.

Now he asked me for a priority list and I give him the same answer as I gave the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) last year, suggesting to them that certainly we have a priority list. But I am not going to anybody in Saskatchewan saying look, we want to do this and this and this and get their hopes up and then have them say, you broke your

promise, because weather changes, conditions change in every part of the province and we have to select those areas where we can do the work most economically. We're not going to, Mr. Chairman, get into a bog to construct. If the heavy rains occur after — and it quite often does — after the contract has been let, that's bad enough. It's a terrible loss to the contractor as well as to ourselves. The only time we could pull out a crew would be if it was a government crew of that small group of people. In fact, there is some history where we have done that because of weather conditions; but there is no evidence, whatever, and no truth in the suggestion that we have discontinued work projects in any constituency because of changes in representation or continued representation.

I have — and I'm prepared to give them — as I said . . . where's this information? I have records here and these are in-House estimates. We will use \$12 million this year in constituencies represented by Conservatives. Now, out of the total percentage-wise there will be, I think, a fair allocation. We will have constituencies represented by New Democrats that will have no work done and we have already had it drawn to our attention that there's constituencies represented by Conservatives that will have no capital work done. I add the word capital because there is a tremendous amount of maintenance and upgrading going on by maintenance forces all the time. But these are not contracted jobs, but the contracted plan work in Conservative constituencies will approximate \$12 million worth of work this year. They can hardly say . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Out of how much?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Out of \$160 million.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Oh, no. Here you are wrong again. You are looking at the total global budget.

**MR. COLLVER:** — That's why I'm asking you. Out of how much?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Yeah, let us look at the amount of capital and if you look . . . I will tell you. The member for Swift Current says out of \$160 million. It's not out of \$160 million.

Our capital budget is \$85 million and part of that . . . \$85 million. I assure the member that whether that's up or down or a greater or larger share, that too is purely coincidental. There is no design of where we are going to build because so and so represents here and there. We try, very hard, to build as they are needed and if, because — and quite often we have this — we have had conditions in two parts of Saskatchewan during the last three or four years, where there was a sudden haul of grain out of our control demanded by the wheat board, for example Rabbit Lake, Saskatchewan. All of a sudden they decided to haul all the grain from that area down to the terminal in Saskatoon. They simply ruined miles and miles of highway in putting those heavy trucks on in what was moist weather.

Yellow Creek No. 20, was another and they . . . yes, put a ban on then you would have the farmers feeling unhappy. The farmers want their grain moved out.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say we are not going to publish a priority list. I have no intention of publishing one. We have our long-term plans, but we are not going to publish them, because if we printed something it would be considered a commitment. These things change.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister's comments, today, are facetious, to say the least, and misleading, to say the least.

1. He says contracts have to be finished when he knows that the Department of Highways, itself, conducts many of the contracts throughout Saskatchewan. This is not private contractors, it is the Department of Highways itself and the Department of Highways' officials have the right to transfer highway crews from one constituency or one area to another. He couldn't possibly be sued by the Department of Highways for moving the Department of Highways' crews from one area to another.

He asked me to name him one. Well, I will name him one today and I will name him 20 tomorrow and I will name him however many later. Highway No. 334, Kayville to Avonlea, the crews were removed from that road on the weekend following the provincial general election. That is just one!

Now, the minister today, in this Assembly, happens to have automatically, Mr. Chairman, from his officials the amount of money that is spent by highway crews in Progressive Conservative constituencies. The question that one has to ask is, why would you keep the numbers in that way at any rate if you weren't going to be political with your Department of Highways? Why would your officials have automatically figured out and calculated, how much of the budget is going to apply to Progressive Conservative constituencies and how much is going to be provided to NDP constituencies, if it wasn't political to begin with?

2. By the minister's own words, today, he is hoist on his own petard, because he says the \$12 million, in his words, out of \$85 million is going to be spent in Progressive Conservative areas, while at the same time that must mean, since there are only two parties in this Assembly, that some \$73 million is going to be spent in NDP areas.

Now, if a total of \$85 million is being spent, and since there are 17 (and I am taking the full 61 constituencies) this has nothing to do with the fact that the majority of the NDP candidates or the majority of the NDP members represent cities, and the majority of the — well, a far larger percentage of NDP caucus represents cities — we, if you want the truth, bombed out in the cities as the NDP will well know. Our members come from rural areas. Our members represent areas in a far greater degree in the rural constituencies with more miles of highway than do the majority of the NDP members. But even with those numbers calculated on a total of million, with 17 members that means \$24 million should have been allocated to Progressive Conservative areas if you are going to be even. Nobody suggests that you can be even on that thing, but I think by your own admission, today, you have admitted that you are spending in this current budget year far less on the areas that are represented by Progressive Conservatives than you are on areas that are represented by the NDP.

Surely the people of the province of Saskatchewan are entitled to better government than that. Surely once the election process is over, you and your officials should sit down and act in the best interests of all of the province, not just the best interests of those areas that happen to elect your party members. Surely the whole principle of parliament, the whole principle of this legislature, the whole principle of a free and democratic society, the tradition that has been handed down to us for three or four hundred years — surely the principle of that is once you are elected, you cease to represent just your party faithful. You represent all of the people. Surely that is true, and if that is true, then why, Mr. Minister, do you refuse to provide a list of priorities? You

haven't explained it to this Assembly to anyone's satisfaction. Why do you refuse to issue your priorities list? The reason I ask that question is, then at least we could say to our various constituents, these are the priorities of this government. Surely they are entitled to know what your priorities are.

There has been a great deal of discussion in this Assembly as to what the responsibilities of this Assembly are, and what the responsibilities of members are, and why does opposition ask certain questions. Surely it is a matter of establishing what the priorities of government are. Anybody can spend money. It is a matter of whether or not you are spending the money relatively wisely. Surely it is a determination then of what your priorities are. Surely you are prepared to stand up to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and say, these are our priorities. As a result of that, stand or fall on what your priorities really are instead of attempting to couch it in phraseology that attempts to fool the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because that's what you're doing. You are attempting to fool people by suggesting that you're not prepared to submit your priorities to them, and tell them what your priorities are. You are attempting to tell them well, we're not prepared to tell you what our priorities are. What you have to do is look at the highways. Well, I want the minister to be aware of something. I want the minister to take a drive up to the Nipawin area. I'll just speak for mine; I can assure you the rest of our members are going to speak for theirs. But I want you to take a drive up — don't fly up, Mr. Minister, as you always do. Don't take your plane — your executive aircraft — and fly up into this area, because you don't get to see what the roads are like. You come and take a drive, for example, up to Nipawin and don't come by way of Prince Albert. Come the other way which is the shorter way, the way most of the people want to go. Go up from the Melfort turn-off and go north to Carrot River, as an example. Just take that road, which has been under construction since I've been in this legislature.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Poor representation.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Under . . . poor representation! Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) decided to add his intelligence to this discussion. Poor representation. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, trying to stand in this legislature talking to the government about where their priorities are? They won't give us the priorities. They won't tell us where their priorities are? We have to go back and represent our constituents and try to say to them: look, we're doing our beset to influence the government to spend some money in this area on highways because the highways are bad, because they're falling apart. We want the government to have certain kinds of priorities. We're trying our best and the member says, poor representation. We can't influence this minister. We can't influence this government in any way, for anything.

For four straight years we have brought before this Assembly the suggestion that the Department of Highways put forward a priorities list so that people can explain to their constituents why things aren't being done. We accept the minister's suggestion that weather is going to influence the construction of highways. Of course it is. And in the northern part of Saskatchewan, in areas like Meadow Lake and Nipawin and in other areas, we accept the fact that weather is going to get bad periodically and interrupt highway crews. But last year in the Nipawin area was the best highway-building weather in the history of Saskatchewan. There was less rain in that area than at any other time in memory and yet these projects were not completed; they were left incomplete. The question I'm asking the minister is, why? What are you attempting to do here? Are you attempting to fool the people? Are you attempting to say: look, by your own words, we're only going to spend half as much as a reasonable allocation on the

Progressive Conservative areas as we are on the NDP areas? Is that what you're saying to the people? That's what you said today: \$12 million out of \$85 million. You work out the numbers yourself and you will know that seventeen-sixty-firsts of \$85 million is \$24 million and you're only spending \$12 million. So by your own admission you're spending half as much on the Conservative areas as you would otherwise do. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And less than that on some — that's correct. I say to the Minister of Highways, he has a responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan not just to NDP supporters. He has a responsibility to see that the highway system is improved. He has a responsibility to use his influence as the oldest member in this Chamber to make certain that the Treasury Board opposite take highways seriously. I know for example, that the member for Swift Current last evening went through in some detail to indicate to the minister the deteriorating percentage of total provincial government expenditures on highways. He has attempted to tell the minister what's happening in our areas. What we can't understand is why the minister, who is the dean of this Chamber, can't have any influence on cabinet.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Well, I don't think that I'm going to take a great deal of time in trying to reply to all of the innuendo that has been expounded by the member for Nipawin. He asks why, Mr. Chairman, I had the figures. I had the figures this morning because the accusation was made last night, before he made it. That's why I had the figures, because the research was done. You'll see that it's handwritten because it was done during the night, last night. I wanted to know what and I frankly don't care whether it is proportionate or not. I'm saying \$12 million is a substantial sum especially when people are saying — members have said last night — that we were spending nothing. Well, \$12 million is hardly nothing. I am not suggesting for one minute, Mr. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I listened to you, now you listen to me. Give me the same courtesy I gave you.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I'll do that.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Please do. All right. Now, Mr. Chairman, this paper is simply a working paper. It does not indicate that proportionately we're going to build, because highways don't operate that way. They are simply prioritizing on the basis of need; what happens with weather and so on, throughout the province and it varies a great deal. It's far easier to build highways in the southwest. Highways, in fact, are far less necessary in the southwest because of scattered population and low traffic counts and it varies from one spot to another. I am not going to — I repeat again — I'm not going to give a priority list. The program is there. We will attempt to carry it out. Last year, we had a fair amount of carry over. We have carry over again, this year, but we are not underspent on our budget this year as we were last year, as the accounts will show. Hopefully, we'll have good weather this year.

Now, the member for Nipawin made another accusation. He said, you can pull out government crews. Again, he points out one and he says he will point out 20 more. I have not; I wasn't even aware; I'm sure the work program that the government crew, mentioned in the cable area, the work program that was suggested for that period of the year was completed, because they worked under contract. Our government crews bid on the work the same as any other contractor and they put their estimate in. When a job is let to a government crew they finish it. I ask again, if there is any evidence. I can give the work orders that were given to them and prove my point. There has been no political interference with crews simply because of an election. It's a ridiculous statement and I reject it out of hand. That's about the only answer I intend to give on that.

**MR. COLLVER:** — I would be happy to have this minister not bother to give answers to legitimate questions. Here is project array from 1976 to 1977 — Carrot River to Arborfield, Highway No. 23 — not done. Here is project array 1977 to 1978 — Carrot River to Arborfield — not done. Here is project area 1978 to 1979-1980 — Carrot River to Arborfield — not done. The question in my mind, Mr. Minister, is what are you telling this Assembly? You are going on with a lot of blither about how much money you are putting in there where, in fact, you are losing your percentage, you are losing your impact. You are losing your influence on this government because a lower and lower percentage every year of our resources is being devoted to good roads when, in fact, we need good roads.

You want to talk about development in the northern part of Saskatchewan. We are not going to get northern development unless we have good roads. The fact remains that's only in my own constituency. That road from Carrot River to Arborfield, as a matter of fact was promised by the NDP in 1971. It was promised that they would get that road and what's happened, Mr. Chairman, is that they haven't got that road. Sure there has been work done on it. Every time it comes close to an election, boy, those crews are in there to beat old Harry. They are just working like a Jim-Dandy bunch and as soon as the election . . . bang, they go into Melfort, bang, they go into Tisdale, bang, they go somewhere else but they don't stay in the Nipawin area.

The people of Nipawin are wise enough to realize that socialism and the kind of government that you fellows are trying to propose where you reward people because of their political vote is absolute and utter nonsense. They have got some principles and they are going to stand on those principles. So don't try and fool the people of Saskatchewan with the fact that you have spent \$12 million. You are spending \$73 million on NDP areas and \$73 million is a lot more dough than \$12 million. Be fair, Mr. Minister, and be reasonable and be realistic. The fact is you are not able to influence your cabinet members on anything. Dean of the Assembly, big deal! Minister of Highways, big deal! They go and spend fortunes on these other areas, fortunes on the administrative areas, fortunes on building the empires, building fortunes and their building of the bureaucratic administrative empires and you in the Department of Highways continue to get a lower and lower share.

**MR. KRAMER:** — It's very difficult to give answers to people that refuse to accept answers. Millions of dollars have been spent in that constituency. Certainly there were projects that were planned. They were re-tendered because the cost came in too high. The member knows it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Nonsense. The fact is that when one of those tenders alone . . . if we had of accepted the tender . . . we re-tendered, we came back in and the cost we saved was \$600,000 by re-tendering and not taking bids during a very wet period. These things happen and that's one reason; in fact, in his own way, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) has answered my question. Because of the unpredictability of weather, work does not get completed. You can promise all you want but when the weather is against you . . . There were periods in the Kelsey constituency during that same period of time when we had to pull contractors out of there; stopped work and brought them out to the South to keep them working to keep them from going broke. The one from Hanley to the Blackstrap Hill — it was not planned! It was not any project array. We put them to work, Mr. Chairman. Magnus Construction and Zealandia Construction, we took them out of the mud and that was in Kelsey constituencies. I suppose the member would scream that we had walked away from a job and not done it because it was new Democratic constituency. We do our work when it's possible, as economically as possible and that is what we intend to keep on doing regardless of the tirade that comes from that side of the House.



**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased that the minister has mentioned the constituency or the area of Kelsey-Tisdale and I'm very interested in what he says about the weather. It might interest the minister to know that during this same period of time when he was suggesting that he had to pull crews out of that area for weather, the Melfort airstrip was being completed at the same time under the same weather conditions, 30 miles away, less than that — 20 miles away, same weather conditions. During that same period of time, the Melfort airstrip was completed. Now, the minister shakes his head and says that's meaningless. You pave an airstrip and you pave a road. You grade an airstrip and you grade a road. If you can complete an airstrip in Melfort, you can complete a road in Nipawin. So, Mr. Minister, all I say to you is, your failure to provide a priorities list to this Assembly will in fact be noted by the people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask of the minister. I have about three or four complaints. If you don't mind, I'm just going to list them at once, more or less, for you to take notice of. I have to leave to an Agribition board meeting.

Mr. Minister, my complaint pertains to Highway No. 354; that's where the highway cuts off from No. 11 to Dilke and Holdfast. I've had some complaints from the people in that area, saying there's a dangerous bridge where only one vehicle can go through at a time. The people that know the area have no problem. They're used to it, but strangers have had a few minor accidents there and they would like you to look into this bridge situation. Another point about Highway No. 354 has caused a few more minor accidents. There are no signs from the oncoming roads to Highway No. 354, saying it's a highway. There are several roads people use crossing, and I would just like you to take notice on this particular one.

Then on Highway No. 2 . . . I'm happy to say this highway is getting close to completion. The only complaint I have on Highway No. 2 is — maybe it has to be this way — there's been so much stopping and starting on it, and I say it must be costly to the Department of Highways to stop in midstream, take their machinery away and then come back at later dates and do some over again. Maybe I don't understand the procedures, but I do say, Mr. Minister, that in my point of view, it must be more economical when you start a highway to keep on.

No one could possibly have many complaints about Highway No. 11. I'm sitting on the best highway, I suppose, in Canada, the only four-lane highway we have. But, Mr. Chairman, the complaint I have, and perhaps this could be a federal issue although I'd like to bring it to your attention, is on the approaches, where the farmers own land on both sides. I've had several people at Aylesbury that own land on both sides who have come to me because they have to go eight miles down the access road and around, and it's a real inconvenience. It could be pointed out to someone. If it's a federal matter, go there. But these people have to cross that highway and with what's happening, there are going to be accidents. These people are breaking the law with their machines. They're going down ditches and up over the highways without going down the access roads. I see the trails all the way from Regina to Saskatoon. As a farmer, I've watched this situation, and as a councillor too, and it's a serious situation. Let's not just drop this now, because the farmers have to go with their machinery, and early in the morning they'll just go down the ditch and up over the highway when they don't see anybody coming. Why not approach someone for more approaches. I don't need an answer on this, Mr. Minister, I'd just like you to do something about it.

The other one is Highway No. 44. Now, this is the only one that came into my area that did have something to do with the election. It was told to me by the highway crew themselves, people that I knew personally, that this highway crew was working in the Outlook area, building a highway. They were pulled out of Outlook, on a road that they needed badly there. But they said, we have the votes in the Outlook area. We have to get this done quickly in October between Davidson and Loreburn to obtain votes. They threw this highway in and it is being complained to me now, Mr. Minister, that they only threw half an inch to three quarters of an inch of pavement on. On our grid road at Craik, super grid road, we have an inch and a half of pavement and this Highway No. 44 has more traffic and is already breaking up.

I would just like you to look into Highway No. 44. That is past business now about why it was done, but this road has to have some attention. They are going to have to tear it up and rebuild it to specifications. It is not a highway where people are just going back and forth in cars. As soon as that pavement was put there people were leading in from all roads from the side to haul their heavy trucks, their heavy grain, to Davidson and to Loreburn and it was breaking up before the frost hit last fall. They know that they would have rather . . . they have indicated to me, Mr. Minister, I would rather have a good maintained gravel road than a messy piece of broken pavement that is going to be harder on our tires.

I have about five minutes before I have to leave, so if you have a few comments I would appreciate it, Mr. Minister.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We will take under advisement those areas that you complain about; the staff has recorded them. You talk about continuing on a 36 mile section of No. 2. We let contracts, which are the most economical, because they are the most competitive. Because it allows both the small and larger contractors to bid and be able to be effective, rather than if we let a 36 mile contract, the large and in some cases, internationally owned contractors, would have it all their own way and our local contractors would have very little.

Now, coming and going, I don't really understand what you mean by coming back with machinery. Once the contractor has been granted that contract it is up to him to finish it as efficiently as he can. He makes those decisions, unless he does a poor job and he has to go back in to finish them.

Regarding the last comment about instructions to go in to do something because there is an election. First of all, as a minister, I have never even heard of that particular piece of road and I don't even know whether it was regular maintenance or what. But I can tell you this. The member for Arm River is really accusing my management staff of playing politics with the road, certainly when I knew nothing about it. I think that's dead wrong, because I'm sure they did not do that whatever happened there, good or bad. The responsibility for maintenance and management of work is allocated to six districts — Saskatoon, North Battleford, Swift Current, Regina, Yorkton, Prince Albert. These people fall under the management of the staff I've had here and I gave you some wrong information last night. I said there was 125 years of experience but for these five people that are with me, it's 135. They've been around for awhile. I'm going to tell you there's too much pride in these people. If I was to ask them to play petty politics with chunks of road, they would tell me where to go because they could earn as much or more money in a lot of other jurisdictions where they wouldn't have to.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear that we didn't make this statement and you people on that side didn't make this statement, it came from the workers, and I didn't say whether it was right or wrong. I just brought it up. It came from the workers and if it's not right well then, that's fine.

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I'd like to first say that I appreciate the project array is including two pieces of highway that I raised in my answer to the Speech from the Throne and that's the piece on No. 15 going over as far as Sovereign. I had asked you to look at completing 15 to the junction of No. 4. At least this is a beginning and I appreciate that part.

I would like you however, if you have a copy of your map, to take a look at another piece of road that I asked you to consider. It's not in the highway system at this point in time but it should be, and that's the connecting link that goes from Beechy to Demaine and up to Lucky Lake. There's a chunk of pavement now or oiled surface that goes as far as Demaine and it stops there. You have provided subsidized bus service to run through that district and yet it's not going to continue very long unless we get an all weather road. I think that if you would consider that as an extension to the highway system it would be a real benefit to the community there, and also to the availability of bus service for the whole area. Perhaps it can't be done in this year but I would hope that you can consider it. It's minor; the road is there. It doesn't have to be rebuilt it just needs to be oiled. So it's not a major project, but I would ask you to give it a lot of consideration.

In conjunction with the oiling of roads that are not now in the highway system, I think that you should be looking at the possibilities of some rail line abandonment that was projected by the Hall Commission. Now your government has stated that they are in agreement, basically with the Hall Commission Report and if they are, then the railway is to come out of the Matador subdivision and those people are going to be asked to haul into the town of Kyle. I think if that's the case, you're going to have to look at providing highway service or much better roads than they now have. I would hope that you could look at something in that area. It's not a long piece of highway. It would connect with Highway No. 4. It's only a matter of seven or eight miles but it would have to be done, I believe, in order to handle the amount of grain that comes out of the Matador area.

Also, if you go over into the area that is now called White Bear, the rail line is to be abandoned there, according to Hall. I think that one also needs to be looked at to connect White Bear area with Highway No. 4. It's the only way that we can conceivably handle the volume of grain that is produced in those areas. If we're going to lose the rail line, we have to do something different and I think highways is the only way to handle it. I'd like your comments on those please.

**MR. KRAMER:** — The member has raised 2 or 3 items. Certainly, as I've said before, the highways that are under our jurisdiction will continue to get either upgraded maintenance or construction. A lot of that is going to go on for quite a while because I think most of the members were here last night when I said we have 5,000 or 6,000 miles of secondary highway that is in more or less, the same condition. It will take a long while. But one thing about it, we can maintain a road over a long period of time for a lot less than we can build one. The capitalization — I think I gave that figure — looks prohibitive if you look at economics alone.

Now, getting to Demaine. Demaine did not qualify for Operation Open Roads and Main

Street because of the formula. When we brought dust-free roads to a number of towns, 320 some, the formula we used, because we had to have a policy, was that the community had to be within three miles of a highway or over 100 population in order to qualify. If they were 100 or over we would go any distance, and we did, to those communities. We took all of those roads into the highway system which brought an extra 500 and some. With highway extensions we brought another 500 in. During the last six or seven years, we have added approximately 1,000 miles to Saskatchewan highways, priority areas, highway extensions in areas that were deemed to be more of a provincial responsibility than a federal responsibility.

Now coming back to your Demaine — and I have to inform you — this is an item that should be taken up with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy). They have a policy that might accommodate oiling if the municipality co-operates in that area. I can tell you, right now, my policy, the policy that I have to work under, will not allow me to do anything about the road into Demaine but it's going to be done. I have to inform the member it has to be done through the grid road authority through possibly on super grid or whatever. In that area, there is money available for that. The millions of dollars have been allocated to super grid and this is the area where it should be discussed.

**MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Minister, first of all I would like to ask you just a little bit of information on the classification, and just very briefly, on the way that you classify your paved roads. Basically what I'm thinking of is No. 4 Highway, let's say, between North Battleford and Meadow Lake, and in which classifications different sections of that highway will fall into. Maybe by using that example, you could give me the classifications as they go.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We have sub-systems 1 to 5. These are subject to change. I could actually give the member a map of these sub-systems so that he could study them. They are graded. Mainly the priorities are to a large extent on the basis of traffic counts (what we call the ADT, the Average Daily Traffic counts) and I don't know . . . You want to know, your question I guess was which system does No. 4 fall into between North Battleford and Meadow Lake. Was that the question?

**MR. McLEOD:** — The question, Mr. Minister, is the different sections of No. 4 Highway as you are well aware, the different parts of No. 4 Highway are obviously different classifications. At least, it appears obvious to me.

**MR. KRAMER:** — I think I know what the member is driving at. They may be of different construction on this road between North Battleford and Meadow Lake and that's a fact. The fact of the matter is the design of No. 4 north, for instance to the Lakes and junction of Highway 26. The best chunk of that road is to the junction of Highway 26, where the heaviest traffic comes. Then the traffic tapers off once it gets north of the lakes. It tapers off again and the ADT (added daily traffic) becomes less when it gets to Glaslyn. When it gets to Turtle Lake turn and past the Helene Lake turns, the traffic count tapers off to as low as 450 per day. When you get closer to Meadow Lake and past the Loon Lake-Makwa turnoff, there is an increase because all the local traffic is coming in at those junctions.

The quality of the road is just as good. The width of the road is less, once you start to go from Turtle Lake north.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., just to follow this further — that section of the road, and we will go from where you mentioned, from Turtle Lake and to the north. What are the plans of

your department for that section of the road? I notice in the project array that there are no plans for this year, and I know there was some work done there last year. What I want to know is, is that your final plan for that in the near future, let's say for a two or three year period?

**MR. KRAMER:** — There were two paving contracts on that which were not completed. They will be completed because those are carry-overs. There is a section by Poole Construction, close to the height of land there, where there is, I think, about five miles of grading and paving to be done. Down below, at Botkin Construction, close to Glaslyn is not completed. They tried to finish in frosty weather, and a section of that is in real rough shape, because the weather was just too cold and the job was not satisfactory before he closed in for the winter. Those two jobs will be completed as soon as weather permits in the spring. At that point, this road, according to the best advice we have (unless there is a tremendous increase), is good for seven to ten years.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., and so when these paving contracts are finished . . . they will be finished this summer . . . and when they are finished, you are saying that they will be there and completed for a period of seven to ten years.

**MR. KRAMER:** — It should be.

**MR. McLEOD:** — O.K., another question. The grid road from junction of Highway 3, the one that goes into Onion Lake, through Frenchman Butte and so on, (there is a community access road there and also, that is now in the rural municipality of Frenchman Butte), has there ever been any communication with your department regarding the moving of that road into the highway system?

**MR. KRAMER:** — There is scarcely any municipal road that people haven't wanted taken into the highway system, but I can say that there are no plans, nor were there any plans, to take it into the highway system because 13,000 miles, the planning people say, is plenty. That is almost the combined total of our two neighbors. What is it, about 1,000 more when you throw Manitoba and Alberta together, that's a fair bit for less than one million taxpayers to take care of. That is the criteria I have to work under. Now there will be extensions here and there. There are actually, frankly, some highways in the highway system that should not be in the highway system that got in there some years ago for strange reasons that I don't want to go into.

**MR. McLEOD:** — So really what you are saying is that you aren't considering and you won't consider taking that into the highway system?

**MR. KRAMER:** — The answer is I can't consider that.

**MR. McLEOD:** — On another section of highway which is in my constituency, I know (and I'm sure you are aware as well) you've had correspondence with the people from the Indian Affairs Department, mentioning the area just east of Meadow Lake on No. 55 Highway for some lighting because of accidents which have occurred there. I know this has been going on for some years now. What plans do you have in that area for lights on No. 55 Highway as it relates to the pedestrian traffic area through the Meadow Lake Indian Reserve?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I think at the request of the Indian reservation there and the chiefs there, we put a speed limit on which met with a lot of disapproval of some Meadow Lake

people and Green Lake people and so on but it has worked. There have not been, to my knowledge, serious accidents there for the last two years. That is a pretty dangerous area because the people from the reservation will walk under various weather conditions and that makes the problem even worse, not only in Meadow Lake but in other parts of the country. That is one of the concerns.

We will take a look at the lighting situation. The lighting is tremendously expensive and I think it's three miles. Now to light up three miles of area there is a pretty expensive job. People say, look at Cochin. We'd like to have that, but Cochin is just teeny. The highway goes right through the middle of it and that is a vastly different situation than this rather more scattered population. It is a lot longer length of road than the quarter of a mile through Cochin, which I deemed to be necessary at the time. I think everyone will agree, the more people, the more children and holidayers. Kids on holiday! My gosh, it's becoming a real death trap. That's why the lights are there. I don't think we can contemplate a lighting system of that kind for the three miles east of Meadow Lake.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I don't disagree with you about the lights at Cochin. I agree that they are there for a very good reason. I drive through there very often, as you know and I know that there is a lot of pedestrian traffic there. I do disagree that the speed limit situation which has been instituted on the 55 east of Meadow Lake. As you know, traffic and workers to the Meadow Lake sawmill and so on, go through there. Everybody east and everybody who comes in from the north, all the way to La Loche and Cluff Lake and so on and now the truck traffic, everything that is through there, I don't think it is fair to go for that distance of some four and a half miles at that greatly reduced speed. I don't think . . . I obviously agree with you that it costs money to put these lights in, but in the interest of safety I would submit to you that that would be the way to go and I would hope that you would consider it very, very seriously.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Well, we are always considering safety measures. My staff has just checked and there have been no accidents since the speed limit was put in there several years ago. I thought it was about two or three, but times goes by quickly. So, there have been no accidents since then. That seems to be working. Heaven forbid that we have to have a multiple accident; but I don't agree that it is that much inconvenience for people to slow down to 35 miles an hour. That might be a couple of minutes. By golly if they have to get up two minutes earlier, too bad, if it means safety.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I don't totally disagree on that, but I think if you use that same argument, Mr. Minister, you could say that on any bit of highway in the province — and I don't think it holds any water. There are all kinds of areas in the province where you could say, well, certainly we had an accident. Let's reduce the speed limit to 35 on a big wide A-grade highway, or whatever it is (one of your top classifications) and I know that highway is a good one. I don't think that is really a good argument for four or five miles of good road.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Maybe it is not a good argument, but the fact is that every stretch of road in this province does not have a high pedestrian count because of a settlement outside. That is the difference.

**MR. McLEOD:** — And lights would make that difference I'm submitting to you. The lights are very important and I hope you consider it.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Minister, I would like to get back to what we were talking about last night on the No. 21 highway.

You stated last night that the vehicle count was 20. Obviously, you must have been referring to the Willow Creek section. The daily count on No. 21 averages to 350; the daily count into the park from No. 21 on the No. 221, is 220 daily. This is the part that I am mainly concerned about.

Generally speaking, people don't use the Willow Creek entrance. The hours are very short. Generally speaking, people from our area drive to Elkwater and south. It is a much better road all the way, right from the American border into Haver, whatever. The thing that we are concerned about, in our area, is that the narrowness of the road, the increase in traffic — trailer, campers, that type of thing — is very, very dangerous. We realize that you have spent a lot of money on it, the whole north/south route. We feel that consideration and priority consideration should be given to widening the No. 21 from Maple Creek to the park entrance. There is widening and gravelling and upgrading south of the park towards Consul. Could you comment on this?

**MR. KRAMER:** — We are constantly looking at number 21 and moving as quickly as we can with the budgets that are available. We are aware of the . . . 220 is not a high traffic count. I think I heard you say that the grid road had 320. Is that correct? . . . that 21 had 320 to the park. Did you give me the traffic count on the Fort Walsh road? . . . Oh, I see. I thought you were referring to it. All right fine, but it's 220 south of the park and 300 and some north of the park. O.K. I have it. Yes, the member raises a question that is of concern and certainly we are going to be looking at it and moving with improvements whenever budgets will permit.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — You couldn't say approximately when?

**MR. KRAMER:** — No, that's one thing I've made a policy not to do, and that hinges on some of the discussion before. I think it's bad policy to be saying well maybe, then all hell breaks loose (pardon me, Mr. Chairman) somewhere else with heavy traffic and bad weather and you'll find you have to put a concentrated effort somewhere else. The priority is just too fragile.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — I appreciate your position, Mr. Minister, I'd like to just point out another thing. The access from the number 1 highway to the Trans-Canada site at Maple Creek is maintained by the Department of Highways during the summer months. There is a garage and store just west of the entrance and it's run as a year round enterprise. Now the last few years we had much higher than normal snowfall in our area, and this person has been wrongly done I think. The Department of Highways tells him that it's not their responsibility to maintain it in the winter months and the rural municipality tells him that it's not their responsibility, that that's a highways' road. Now who should be responsible?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I don't think I've quite got the . . . you are saying a service station along the highway and that's the one off the highway immediately west of the campsite; that's the one. Alright, I have that one in mind . . . south of the highway, right. Alright. After snowstorms they do not have access in and out . . . well, it's something we'll take a look at. It is their right. It's not our responsibility but some accommodation should be made. I will get back to you on that and we'll see what we can do, but our crew is right. Their job is to stay . . . in fact if an accident should occur with equipment off around the service station they would be liable because they would be, you know, breaking the law to go there. There would have to be some legitimate arrangement made to handle that and I just can't, I won't, give you an answer right off the top of my head but we'll take a look at

it.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — I would like to just point out that this fellow is right when he says, you know, that he pays municipal taxes and he pays provincial taxes and neither party will take responsibility.

**MR. KRAMER:** — You've made your point. I'll look at it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I have three questions, Mr. Minister, I would like to deal with this morning.

Just simply, I asked you yesterday — you and your officials — about Highway No. 1 which you know is a concern of mine. You said you were going to get me a reply. I was just wondering if it's ready. I'll accept either a verbal or a written one. But if it is ready I would like to have that.

**MR. KRAMER:** — I will give you this. I'll pass this across.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That's fine. I'll read it and if there are any questions arising, I'll ask them later on.

Mr. Minister, you have mentioned numerous times this morning and I accept this, last year was a bad year because there was bad weather. I've heard you say on several replies you ran into cold conditions and so on, which I accept. I imagine that you and the Department of Highways have a very limited time in which you can work, probably May, June, July and August. I would guess you may go into September. I think you are a farmer and you know many farmers; let me give an example of harvest in this last year. When there is a bumper crop waiting out there, I know many farmers, myself included and many of my neighbors, will work around the clock because of the constraints of weather. Now, it has always been a question to me why the Department of Highways doesn't do the same thing when you are operating within the constraints of the weather, which you have no control over. You are also hampered, I believe, by the tourist season — at least when I'm driving up and down the highways, I feel sorry for your crews that are sometimes trying to work when there is a very heavy traffic flow in the tourist season during the daytime. I have often wondered — and we're all wanting to create employment in this province — why you have not considered some type of around-the-clock shift system? Now, I'm not talking about overtime. I'm talking about a three-shift system which is very common in industry and in business and in our farming communities in this day and age when we are subject to the constraints of weather. We're seeing this coming into practice. I just wonder, when you have that huge capital investment in equipment, would it not make sense to hire a few more people, put on another shift? I think you could make fantastic progress from the hours of say, 10:30 or 11:00 at night through to the morning in the months of May, June and July which are conducive to night work in this country. I'd just like to hear your response to that, Mr. Minister.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Chairman, that's an obvious question and I have asked the same one over the years. But going back to the facts of life, 85 per cent of our work, as I said last night, is done by private contractors. They undertake to run their show as they see fit. It annoys me in fair weather, when it's been awfully wet and I see that machinery standing still over a weekend. But they say if these men could not go home to their families and one thing and another, and have their weekend, that they just wouldn't be able to hold them. That's the contractor's decision; that's the decision of the private



sector. Our groups of people pretty well have to subscribe to the same thing because in the contracting industry they move back and forth.

Now, working at night is another matter. It's not efficient. They can't see well enough in order to take the dirt from the right place because it's a matter of levels and everything else that has to be watched very closely. Those stakes are there; they seem an awful nuisance but they're there for a purpose. They have to be watched and it's impossible to do a good job during the night. That's the other reason. Supervision problems would be involved. We would get less efficient work done. We have to keep a man or men steady on those jobs to supervise to see that the right kind of dirt goes in, so that trash dirt doesn't go in. We have had examples. In fact, we're rebuilding one road right now that was only rebuilt in the '60s; we're rebuilding it now simply because it was not supervised closely enough. The contract on that particular road — the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) is aware of it — threw everything into that road but the kitchen sink. It never would stand up and the cost is rebuilding it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Some of your points I will accept there. As far as seeing what you're doing — I know you're well aware of this — in this country, especially in June, you can see what you're doing from 11 o'clock at night and then again at 3:30 in the morning and that's good working time. I wasn't suggesting overtime and working weekends. I was suggesting another shift. I wonder if your contracts to private groups are open ended or is there any type of a completion date that you try to hold them to? That's another question I had.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Oh, yes.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — All right.

My third question goes back to Highway No. 48 and it comes from discussions you had this morning where you admitted to the Leader of the Opposition that you had a priority list. Now, it would seem to me that when the portion of this work was done from Highway No. 1 to Montmartre, that Highway No. 48 had to be on the priority list. As my colleague for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) has informed you, the fellows that we ran against for your party in the election went around indicating that the completion of 48 would be a priority. I would like you to tell me when was Highway No. 48 taken off the priority list? I have reason to believe that it was just in the last while. Would you give me the date when you dropped Highway No. 48 as one of the priorities for your department?

**MR. KRAMER:** — It was never taken off a priority list or put on a priority list, Mr. Chairman. I think, Mr. Chairman, we are no kinder or more unkind to Liberal members, than we are to Conservative members or New Democratic members. Now I received a lot of criticism because of the work that was done from some of our New Democrats. They said look, we're not getting anything and Cy MacDonald is getting it all — your predecessor! I got criticism for that. I just can't win.

I think the members will realize that the further you get away from the larger centres the traffic count becomes less. Therefore, the priorities are not off and on. Look at your traffic count; the maps are available. In fact, I'll send all of you an up-to-date traffic count, (see that we get those, will you please for all the members in the House) as up-to-date as possible. It will provide you with some of the criteria that lead to decisions. That's not all of it. Sometimes it would be fairly simple if it was, but you have weather conditions and road conditions. There may only be 100 people or 200 people who are

in isolated areas who get more priority by far. If we had to build northern roads on the basis of traffic count we wouldn't build any of them but it's a case of getting into resource areas and treating an area with a different priority because of the special needs.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, first of all, I should say thank you for the co-operation in my constituency that I have received from Mr. Berg who is your representative up there. I have two points I would like to pass along to you and your department. First of all last year, I think through your maintenance budget you corrected a really bad situation at the Martensville corners by widening them to eliminate the accidents that they were having with vehicles coming on and off. I am suggesting that you look at the Hague corner now to do the same repair type of change to the intersection, putting in a right turn lane so that you don't have the rear-end accidents as vehicles are turning.

Secondly, I am concerned with Circle Drive around the city of Saskatoon in certain areas, Preston Avenue and Clarence Avenue which are very dangerous, especially with the Alliance Church being built. That's really going to make a very dangerous intersection. Those are some concerns I would express for your people to look at.

The other thing which concerns me is Highway No. 12 which you indicated you are going to repair to the bridge. I suggest that you look at Highway No. 312 to Waldheim. The Hall Commission report indicates that the track will be coming out of that area, and recommends that the grain elevator remain. In it, I believe, he did suggest that the federal government assist you in upgrading that road for the large grain trucks that will be required to service that whole area. Have you anything on the drawing board? Are you working on that? If the people of the area cannot stop the removal of that line (that is one of Hall's recommendations and your party backs the Hall report) are you working on anything so that we can get that six or seven miles upgraded well enough so the big trucks can run, and we can keep our grain elevator, the UGG (United Grain Growers) open in that area?

**MR. KRAMER:** — A number of questions. They've been noted and we'll let you know. There's a constant study going on of the implications of the Hall report, and so on. I am sure our staff have that under control and we will be looking at Hague and so on.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — One other question, then, about Highway No.60 to Pike Lake which is not in my constituency. It is Mr. Cowley's constituency. I understand you are in the process of negotiating to buy land from people to widen it. Do you have any date that you intend to have this done by, to make the park more accessible to people?

**MR. KRAMER:** — It's under consideration and there is an indicated need for widening, but there are no immediate plans for it.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I was informed, I believe it was Wednesday of this week, that you are already talking to people to purchase land. I assume it must be on your priorities list that you're going to widen it. Is it a one-year-away project, two year away, three years away; you know, where is it? If you're talking to people to purchase 25 feet of land on their property, I assume you have a target date for the project.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Not necessarily. We know very well that it's going to have to be widened sooner or later, and the sooner we get in and buy and dedicate that land and prevent development from impinging on it, the better it is. One of the mistakes that we

have made in the past is not dedicating land and then having to go through the costly process, especially in semi-urban areas, of moving people back. Simply because we're buying right-of-way does not indicate that there's going to be a road there immediately in the next year or two.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I've just been looking over the information you gave me on Highway No. 1 and I find it shocking that the survey from Qu'Appelle to Indian Head has been completed for 13 years. The distance, Mr. Minister, between Qu'Appelle and Indian Head is about 13 miles. The distance from Qu'Appelle to the border is about 120 and at your rate of progress, we will all be gone from here before you ever complete the Trans-Canada Highway in this province.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Chairman, the member raises a point that interests me. Certainly I'm not for one moment denying the need, but 13 years, yes you bet 13 years, there was a decision made by a former government that we should be four-laning west where the traffic count was considerably less at that time. We were developing a four lane between here and Swift Current; this was not based on traffic count. There were other criteria. Maybe you might ask the finance critic. He might have had some historic information at least on that. As a matter of fact, those decisions were made prior to 1971. The only thing that we did until last year is that we completed the four-lane because the most dangerous thing you can have is off-again-on-again four-lane where all-of-a-sudden you now have to go to two-lane. So that had to be completed. Now we're faced with a very costly situation of moving east. We have completed the four-lane nearly between here and Saskatoon which is, I think, higher priority because it has a high traffic count, mainly Saskatchewan people. But one thing I want to say again to the House, we and all the western provinces and the rest of Canada are saying to the federal government (and they'll say this to any federal government), we need a national transportation policy that will accept the national responsibility for national traffic.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I have a second question here. You have been going into highway traffic flows and this is very interesting and I'm glad you raised this question. I would ask you to supply me with the information of the highway traffic daily flow on the No. 1 east of Regina in comparison to the Yellowhead route, in comparison to the Regina-Saskatoon and I would especially like to have this comparison during the peak holiday periods. If you haven't got the information now, I'll accept it as you give it to me but I would like those bits of information, Mr. Minister.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, last night I asked for certain information to be provided to me. Do you have it with you today? Can I have it, please?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I guess so.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, Mr. Chairman, of every item under highways, the top position on the three categories.

**MR. KRAMER:** — My deputy was going to take a look at that . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Mr. Minister, I'm afraid you're not being taped when your replies are made. Just rise and the light will go on.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Well, the member gave me some sheets of paper. My staff has taken care of them and tried to answer them last night. I have the figures here and I would be quite happy to pass them across to him.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a quick glance at them to see if the information he's providing is what I want.

**MR. KRAMER:** — That's fine. We'll try to have the answers for questions, if any.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, can I also have my information if you have it ready for me, please? It's on Highway No. 21 and Highway No. 31, I believe.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, this is not what I want at all.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We have the figures here for those two stretches and I hope the member will, when he looks at these, also take a look at the figure I gave him on the cost per mile of building new highway and what the possible implications of interest per annum are compared to our maintenance costs. Would you please take this across?

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, while we're at it, I wonder if I could have the information that I requested yesterday also. That was to do with — and I can't recall all of them — the reflector study, if there was such a thing, the cost of . . .

**MR. KRAMER:** — Oh, that will take a little more time; I'm sorry.

**MR. HAM:** — The cost of roads in the North, resource roads, do you have that.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Those will take more time, but I assure you, you'll get them.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I'm going to have to ask the minister to start over again. This isn't at all what I wanted. I asked yesterday, and you gave me the information under Item 1, for the salaries of the deputy minister and the two top executives next to him. I want the same information but only the top position of every item from here on down. From Item 2 to Item 20, the top position salary this year, actual salary paid last year and the estimate of '78-'79 salary for the one position, not all of them as you've provided.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We understood that you wanted all of them. Now, we'll do the research for you if you wish, but all of those figures are in public accounts, the name of everyone. What you want is the top position of each branch head in those items. Is that right? All right.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister says they are in public accounts. They are not in public accounts because all that's in public accounts is the actual salary paid. I'm asking for (a) The 1978-79 estimate of the salary for the top positions, (b) I am asking for the actual salary that was paid to that individual; and (c) The actual salary estimate for 1979-80? Now do we understand each other?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Yes. Mr. Schwartz has taken your specifications down. We'll see that you get it. We'll see that that answer is given.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, just looking very briefly over this and I presume the deputy has a copy of this, do you? Would you just please follow through with me. On your '78-79 expenditures there for the Kerrobert to Unity road, Highway No. 21, the \$158,049 — that isn't the complete figure there of money which will be spent for the '78-'79 year. Is that correct?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Yes, to March 21, 1979, that's the last figure and it would be during that fiscal year. The books close off about April 7 so there might be a little dribble come in and it might vary when the final fiscal accounts come in, but it would be very close.

**MR. GARNER:** — O.K. Mr. Minister, I noticed on the '76-'77 figure which \$103,000 approximately, and in '77-'78 it is \$207,000. There we had over \$100,000 increase in that stretch of road — I'm talking the Kerrobert to Unity road. Now the '78-'79 figure we are going down. (Is the minister listening?) Would you listen to me just for a minute? Does this indicate then that with less money being spent on this road, and naturally the road is getting in worse shape all the time, that your department will be contemplating in the next year of doing something about these roads?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Obviously the spending of this kind of money indicates that we are doing something fairly substantial. Now simply taking one year with another again is an apple and an orange comparison because we may be doing stockpiling for maintenance purposes in one particular year and that cost would go up. That stockpile could last for two or three years — gravel and whatever materials are needed for upgrading and sealing and that type of thing. I can't give you chapter and verse, although I could if you wanted to do a research as to just exactly what was done. We could do that. We could do that very easily. I would like to point out to the member that each year's maintenance (if you took the average of those three years) costs would only build one mile of new highway.

**MR. GARNER:** — O.K., Mr. Minister, I will accept that. Would you, further to this then, tell me how these costs were on these two roads incurred, please.

Just one other point while I am up. Mr. Minister, I can appreciate that it will only build one mile, but I am very, very concerned. With the road from Kerrobert to Macklin I would especially like to know what has been put into that road? I have been over it many times and there have been little sections torn up and then rebuilt, then torn up and rebuilt again. I am accepting these figures of yours, but there have been a lot of repair crews.

One other question — whereabouts are the crews that do the repair work on these two roads stationed?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I know we have a subdistrict at Unity; there is one at Kerrobert; there is also one at Macklin. It would be one of those three or maybe, in some cases, a combination depending on the amount of work that is being done, because they could pool their resources in some instances if the work is light in some other area.

**MR. GARNER:** — One further question, Mr. Minister. Many times, during the past few winters, I have observed the snow plows. I don't know what your government's definition is of them; I call them a sidewinder plow. There are three men, sometimes, riding these plows, Mr. Minister. Now, can you tell me why there has to be three men riding in truck sidewinder plows, please?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Normally, my staff tell me, that there should be only one person in a truck. There would be times when there would be a trainee. It could possibly be a mechanic or it might be one person travelling from one subdistrict to another. I don't know if this is breaking the law, but somebody may be going along for the ride for the

day, a youngster or someone. The paid person will be one, unless he is there as a trainee under training or a mechanic that wants to see how things are performing.

**MR. GARNER:** — O.K., Mr. Minister, I think it is a very good point that there be a trainee along. I can even go along with the theory that there should be, maybe, two men in these trucks, because sitting there driving a truck mile after mile, hanging onto that truck hitting snow banks, isn't the nicest job. I can see where they could trade off drivers. But what does concern me isn't hitch-hikers.

It isn't a child I've seen or a young person riding in these trucks, it's another adult. Now surely to goodness these vehicles aren't in this bad shape that we have to have a mechanic riding along to see how they perform all the time. After all this thing just lifts the plow up and down and pushes the snow off the road. If the truck isn't working I don't think you would take a mechanic along to see how the driver drives the truck down the road. I would just like to further state that I can agree with either having the trainee in there or two drivers, but the third person I don't believe should be in there. What can be done about this if this is found out? How would the minister like me to bring this to his attention please?

**MR. KRAMER:** — If you see this going on constantly certainly you can let me know when, where, and the vehicle. Simply report it directly to the Swift Current district, or send it in to my office, it doesn't matter. Merv Clark is the engineer in charge of that district. He has the direct responsibility or the delegated responsibility. In North Battleford it's Mr. Gerbrandt and he goes as far as Unity (doesn't he?) Unity is in the North Battleford orbit. You can't win 'em all. There's bound to be things going on that we don't know about, and they may be picnicking along the road or something like that.

That's one of the difficult things we raised last night, and I want to repeat again. These people are judged by the mileage of work they perform and they still have to stop for coffee. They have to stop. They're not going to go out behind a bush somewhere; you know. So I would like a little bit of tolerance in this because I go into a garage in my city and I see four or five mechanics sometimes sitting on the bench smoking cigarettes, and that's a private organization. They're probably smoking cigarettes because the jobs have not piled up for their particular line of work or they may be stopping for a break, but if that was a government crew they'd say, look at those characters sitting on the bench there and they ought to be working.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, I will agree. I think we have some very good civil servants, some very good people working for the Department of Highways. There may be the odd bad apple in there that could be ruining it and I can fully appreciate the man should stop for lunch and he should stop for coffee, and he should not have to hide behind a bush. If he was hiding behind a bush I'd want to know what was going on behind that bush so I will report any of these incidents directly to you, Mr. Minister. Thank you very much.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Question to the minister and I believe you could supply me with the information later. You have your own purchasing department I understand. Am I correct? You purchase your own major equipment — road graders, this type of stuff, not cars am I correct?

**MR. KRAMER:** — You're partly correct. We have our purchasing people, qualified people in our department that look over the tenders, recommend which machines they

want and write up the specs, but the final purchase is made by the purchasing agency, for the government, under the Minister of Revenue.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I'm just checking so I know where to ask my questions more than anything. When I want to know about any of the heavy machinery that was bought last year and the year before under tenders where you did not accept the lowest tender, I will have to ask the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Robbins) and not your department, is that correct?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Well, as far as the machines that we purchase when there are tenders for cats or trucks or so on, my signature goes on that but then it is sent over to the purchasing agent to pay the bill. We accept the responsibility for signing and my staff, they sign it, I sign it. And if there is any question you want to ask on any particular equipment you are quite welcome to ask us. As I said before, we write the specs and so on for the tenders.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — So it's your department that I ask. Fine. Could you supply me, so we don't take up the time of the House, with the tenders since the spring of 1978 where the low tender did not receive — I believe there are three of them that I am aware of — where the low tender did not receive the awarding of the equipment and your reasons why? Am I asking for something out of line?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I think that's a legitimate question. One thing about it, it will be easy to find because it is very unusual that we don't accept the low tender if he's within the specs and so on. But there can be reasons and I make that clear because of the quality or something else of the equipment or some reason why we would not. All right?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I accept that and that's why I'm asking for the reasons rather than start anything else on it.

**MR. R. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, regarding secondary Highway No. 334 from Corinne to Avonlea which is the main artery leading down into that area and I realize it is in the gumbo so-called part of the country as far as a base is concerned, there are thousands of dollars every year spent on this road regarding potholes and whatever. I know that being the only main road into the Avonlea-Kayville country there are a lot of heavy loads hauled over it and it is very narrow. I wonder, have you looked into this and decided whether you were going to rebuild this section of the road? They have been talking about it for years now and wishing something would be done about it.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We'll consider that request and I can probably drop you a line and let you know just about where it's at.

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Chairman, I have a comment or two about some local problems again and then I would like to turn to some provincial problems. I neglected in my remarks last night to commend you in your department for the installation of lights on No. 4 Highway as it intersects with No. 1 through Swift Current. However, may I suggest, that perhaps those lights would have been better used if they had been divided between the two highways rather than concentrated on No. 4. I mean No. 4 at 12 o'clock at night now is like 12 o'clock noon, is well lit, but I think probably if those lights had been used on the over-and underpasses along the Trans-Canada and there, it probably would have contributed to an (as I mentioned last night) easier access and exit to the highway.

Just one passing comment, Mr. Minister. I have some experience in the automotive business, although not any longer; those mechanics sitting on the bench smoking cigarettes are on a flat rate. They are not being paid unless they are working usually, so there is a difference between maybe a highways' employee and a mechanic.

Can you indicate to the Assembly when you expect to complete the shoulders that are now not evident on the sections of highway 11 between Regina and Saskatoon?

**MR. KRAMER:** — You are talking about the old sections that have been incorporated into the four-lane? No, I can't give you an exact date. I'll say this, that the accident rate has dropped tremendously on those roads, and the present road (and I travel it as much as — well, not as much as anyone, but I travel it a lot) . . . I am far happier when I have got two lanes to myself, even though there are no shoulders, and when I have no oncoming traffic to contend with. In view of the total needs of the province, I don't think it is all that high on our priority list at the moment.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Just on a personal note, Mr. Minister, and I am not trying to suggest anything. I am just curious. I don't know what criteria any minister of highways should use, but (you indicate you travel extensively by car) could you tell us about how many miles you would travel on various highways throughout the province? Personally.

**MR. KRAMER:** — I think most of my travelling is done inside of Saskatchewan and I think it would be well over 30,000 miles per year. Well over.

**MR. McLEOD:** — And in kilometres, say? Are there any plans at the present time, or can you indicate when you plan to bypass Chamberlain, or, are you going to bypass the town of Chamberlain?

**MR. KRAMER:** — It's a quandary there. I don't think we will be able to bypass Chamberlain in the near future. There is a railroad problem and an intersection problem with highway 2 and a number of other things. It is under study and we will try to accommodate the traffic to make it as safe as possible through that area. There are people around who say a little bit of an obstruction like that, occasionally, is a good waker-upper in order to stop this road hypnotism.

**MR. McLEOD:** — I would disagree with that attitude, except that we are both aware that it becomes somewhat dangerous, as you mentioned, when highways change from 4 to 2 and back to a 4. There is a bit of a congestion problem there and I think you are aware of this that truckers tend to congregate there and it is very congested.

Could you indicate to the House approximately the costs of installing railway signals, and projected plans for either an increase, or to maintain the same level of installations you have handled in the last few years?

**MR. KRAMER:** — . . . check that and give it to him in writing? Thank you.

**MR. HAM:** — Last night I requested details about roads to resources in northern Saskatchewan and that brought something else to mind that I think is very important. As I indicated last night, we're facing potential investment in the North and I hope it does come to pass. We're also facing a possibility that if, heaven forbid, the federal Liberals are re-elected, the PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) Report may be carried out. It may be interesting, if the federal Liberals are re-elected and they're in a minority



position supported by an NDP opposition, to find out what PRAC, in fact, will do. However, in the event that we are faced with rail line removal through PRAC, can you indicate to the House what plans your department has to compensate or to strengthen the roads that large trucks will be using in lieu of rail lines and in lieu of the loss of elevators? Is it your commitment to make certain your department has access to funds to make certain we have these roads when the time comes?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I think that question should be asked when transportation agency estimates are up because they are the group of people that are, under Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs), continually discussing and arguing with the rail line abandonment people. We have input with them but they are the official spokesmen against rail line abandonment. I would advise you to ask that question when Mr. MacMurchy's estimates are up under transportation agency.

**MR. HAM:** — Excuse me for not having that knowledge, Mr. Minister, but your department is responsible for maintaining the highways and building our highways. If we lose an elevator or a rail line or whatever and we are faced with an increase in traffic on a particular road, then I ask, is that not your department's responsibility to make certain those roads are maintained and strengthened?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Yes, it is and when those situations arise, we will definitely take care of them. But heaven forbid that we should have to, because our estimation — and that's fairly close — is that at least \$200 million would be passed on to Saskatchewan taxpayers because of the obvious need for highways resulting from the recommendations of the PRAC report.

**MR. HAM:** — What you're saying is that you're hoping or planning or suggesting that the PRAC recommendations may never be carried out. If in fact they are, do you have some contingency plans? Have you had discussions, if you like, about the potential increase in expenditure and are you planning to acquire more funds to meet that need in the event it happens?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I can assure the member that the Department of Highways and Transportation will get the necessary funding whenever there is a need anywhere in Saskatchewan for agricultural products to be moved.

**MR. HAM:** — So, Mr. Minister, then, what you're saying is you haven't had discussions about the possibility of increased usage of the roads.

**MR. KRAMER:** — We're not going to be, we're certainly not going to start budgeting and crying wolf before we're hurt. I'm sure that it doesn't take an awful lot of pre-planning to say, O.K. we have to improve certain roads or build certain roads because there is no other means of access.

**MR. HAM:** — Earlier one of my colleagues was asking for information about tendering. I have had it brought to my attention through a trucker and construction concern in my constituency and I would like you to supply me with the information to answer his concern and mine. That is, he has over a period of years bought a number of heavy duty trucks. He was very concerned about what he considered to be the excessive expenditure of the Department of Highways on their large trucks (heavy duty trucks). In his words, they were fully accessorized or fully equipped when he felt it wasn't necessary. Can you supply me with the criteria your department uses in the purchase of these vehicles and indicate whether or not the accessories on the vehicles are

necessary or are they in fact frills?

**MR. KRAMER:** — We'll check into that. I'm sure that we do not have frills on the trucks but we'll check into that and give the member the information.

**MR. HAM:** — I note in your annual report that there are several United States projects involved recycling of old pavements. Are you and your department in constant contact with those governments and others? If so, can you tell us which ones and how often you are in contact with them and table any reports that may be relevant?

**MR. KRAMER:** — We have already done some recycling and I think we have all the up-to-date information from the best authorities down there that are engaged in that process.

**MR. HAM:** — I assume you're going to continue to keep in contact with them. Can you tell me what results you've attained from the rubber crumb test in asphalt sealing and how miles presently are being sealed with that same material?

**MR. KRAMER:** — We did about 22 miles of test area last year. It looks good. It continues to look good after winter; it's one of the concerns we had about the severe winter. It continues to look good. We plan to do about 150 kilometres of rubber crumb mixed with asphalt this year. We're very hopeful that this will be a new way to go. It's not only that; we hope to get rid of that terrible pollution problem that old tires create.

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not sure what the test pattern or test area was described as but there is a series of rubber balls or lines between Moose Jaw and Regina that has been under test for some years now. I'm wondering first of all, if you can tell me what it was for and the results of the test?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Testing the quality of the different paints on the centre lines and edges.

**MR. HAM:** — I'm not sure if this is under this subvote. I don't believe it is, but could you indicate or research for me the cost of the bridge over the North Saskatchewan on Highway No. 2 north of Maidstone. To answer further that question, has your department ever studied or made comparisons between the costs by private contractors versus your government operations?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Well, number one, the bridge at Maidstone was tendered to a contracting firm. The price, if I'm not mistaken, was around — we'll I'll give you that — approximately a little better than \$4 million. This was totally tendered to private firms. I don't know whether you thought it was done by ourselves or not. It was not. I don't think that our bridge crews have ever contracted for a large bridge. They do all the smaller bridges because I think since the 30s, the Department of Highways has had a bridge building capability for small bridges.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2, 3 and 4 agreed.

## **ITEM 5**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, under this item surveys for future highway projects are done, I have to assume, in advance. My question very simply is how far in advance?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I can answer the question but the work that the member refers to is not done under this particular branch. The Surveys Branch is a group of people in the department who process all the titles and there are literally thousands of them, little fractions of land that all have to be entered into legal parcels and with the Land Titles Office. This branch does all of that work.

To answer your question, in another area that will take care of it as much as four years ahead in some areas unless there is an emergency situation show up where the survey crew goes in practically ahead of the contractor.

Item 5 agreed.

Item 6 agreed.

#### **ITEM 7**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, does this include the road information service that your department provides? If not, what item would that come under?

**MR. KRAMER:** — This particular branch takes care of mapping, the information, preparing of the highway reports and news releases concerning advertising of contracts and tenders and this type of work is done by communications.

Item 7 agreed.

#### **ITEM 8**

**MR. HAM:** — Just a quick question, Mr. Minister. I noted in the annual report there was a comment, or the report alluded to experimental programs on the use of secondary roads in winter months. I wonder if you have any things to report, either in written form or verbally about the results of those tests?

**MR. KRAMER:** — The tests have been . . . last year we did for a short period. We were satisfied that the damage during the frozen period was not too much and that we could safely continue to do it all winter, the way we did last year. Last year there were 800 permits issued; this year the permits will probably far exceed 2,000. I am very happy with this because it does cut down the expenses for communities that are not on the primary system. We think we can use, what I call, the ice bridge in the winter time for stockpiling and moving stuff around.

Item 8 agreed.

Item 9 agreed.

Items 10, 11, and 12 agreed.

#### **ITEM 13**

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Minister, I have understood for some years we have been facing a

gravel problem in the Swift Current district, at least in the southern portion of it. There were some questions on that problem last year. I am wondering if you have anything further to report and whether there has been a change?

**MR. KRAMER:** — The situation unfortunately hasn't changed a great deal. We have devised some new exploration or prospecting methods where we have equipment that we can use from an aircraft which works a bit like the seismic operation, where we can identify hopefully some gravel deposits here and there. But on the whole, it's still a gravel-scarce area.

Item 13 agreed.

Items 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 agreed.

## **ITEM 19**

**MR. HAM:** — I'm not certain if this question is under this subvote or not, but maybe I can ask if you can answer me one way or the other. I note on the annual report, under Support Services Division that there are six senior managers retiring over the next few years, no a considerable number of senior managers retiring over the next six years. I'm wondering if you have replacements within the department and, if you don't have replacements within the department, is there potential replacements within the province and, if not in the province, within the country?

**MR. KRAMER:** — We have had, for a number of years now, a management development plan. There is a considerable pool in service in the province that is prepared to move along. I am confident that, certainly if they stay with us in Saskatchewan, we will continue to have adequate people coming from in-service. Occasionally, we may have to draw on national advertising to bring a person in, but certainly there's no indication of it now. With the continuous service management improvement plan that we have in the department, I think we're quite happy with the total staff we have. I might add that, in case anyone wants to ask that question, our total administration costs within our department run at 7.5 per cent.

**MR. HAM:** — Just further to that. You said if they stay in the province, which leads me to ask, have we had a problem with management types leaving Saskatchewan for better positions outside of Saskatchewan?

**MR. KRAMER:** — Not too many but there is some movement, not an abnormal movement. We've had some that have wanted to come in and out, so I think it's normal.

**MR. HAM:** — Would it be fair to say that the salaries for our senior civil service in the Department of Highways is equal to or relative to neighbouring provinces? Would that be fair?

**MR. KRAMER:** — More or less comparable. Last time I checked Alberta's, it was a fair bit higher, but I think the kind of increments we're mentioning here are gradually coming into line. All in all, the prairie provinces are fairly compatible.

Item 19 agreed.

Item 20 agreed.

Item 21 agreed.

Highways and Transportation Vote 16 agreed.

**CAPITAL EXPENDITURE — VOTE 17**

Items 1, 2, 3 agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

Supplementaries Agreed.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION — PROVINCIAL DEVELOPMENT — VOTE 17**

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

Supplementaries agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:55 p.m.