

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 17, 1981**

**EVENING SESSION**

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. SOLOMON:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to request leave to introduce some guests, if I may. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some Beavers from my constituency and their chaperones sitting in the Speaker's gallery. There are nine Beavers, aged seven, and I would like to welcome them to this Assembly. They have with them three escorts: Mr. and Mrs. Gerry Zado and Frank Buck, who is a very close friend of mine. Some of you may recall Mr. Buck from past debates. I would like to ask all members to keep in mind that this is the second Beaver pack that has come to the Assembly in the past couple of weeks. This particular one, the 76th from Al Pickard School, is certainly welcome. It's an indication of the young families we have in northwest Regina and I hope that they enjoy their visit here this evening.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MOTIONS**

**RESOLUTION NO. 8 — Labelling of Industrial Chemicals (continued)**

**MR. PREBBLE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to be able to enter into this debate and to second the motion put forward by my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. We are dealing here with a subject that, as other members of the House know, is very important to me. I want to say at the outset that I think the motion is a good one. I also think that the motion is one that needs to be broader based. At the end of my remarks I will be making an amendment to the motion with that in mind.

I want to begin by saying that it is not surprising that we see serious shortcomings in the federal regulatory system with respect to the labelling of agricultural and industrial chemicals. In areas that are perhaps even more of direct concern to consumers who consume foods on a daily basis, we see a complete lack of regulation. In the field of additives, with respect to questions such as food colouring, there are no requirements for the testing or labelling of flavouring in food. There are no requirements at all with respect to the testing and labelling of cosmetics in the federal system. And so, when we see a complete lack of regulation in these areas, I suppose, it should not be surprising to us that when we look at the matter of agricultural and industrial chemicals, the labelling system is inadequate. We should keep in mind, when we are talking about agricultural and industrial chemicals, that we are really talking about highly toxic substances in a great many cases.

Many of them are really by-products of chemical warfare weapons. One can look at a number of insecticides which we use on a regular basis, such as malathion or diazinon, that are known to have their roots in military use. In fact, they are simply variations on military nerve gases, and perhaps they should be labelled as such. I wonder what the ordinary consumer of these products would think if that person knew the origins of the product that he was using?

Now, the state of regulation with respect to labelling is such that some regulations do

exist at the federal level for products handled by federal employees. These regulations are obviously entirely inadequate because they only cover about 8 per cent of those working; the other 92 per cent are not covered by these regulations. This lack of proper coverage has to be a matter of increasing concern, given the tremendous escalation we have seen in past years with respect to the growing use of toxic chemicals in our society, particularly in the workplace.

If you look at the chemical consumption in North America, Mr. Speaker, you see that in the period 1950 to 1975 it has grown tenfold, from some 31 billion pounds a year in 1950 to over 320 billion pounds a year in 1975.

It's not surprising, given the lack of proper regulations in this field, that a 1979 study by Environment Canada showed that almost every single bird, fish, and mammal tested in the prairie provinces had traces of manufactured chemicals in its blood stream and/or body tissue.

We also get a sense of the magnitude of this problem when we consider the hazardous wastes that are the by-products of hazardous chemicals. Saskatchewan alone generates 46,000 tons of this every year, Mr. Speaker, and in the western provinces as a whole we see 250,000 tons of hazardous waste a year generated. These figures simply represent industrial waste. When we add the 10 million pounds of pesticide that are used on an annual basis in the province of Saskatchewan, we can see that the question of regulation in this field is indeed a serious one.

Clearly, the people who have the most reason for concern are those who are using and applying these chemicals directly in the workplace or on the farm. Industrial workers, farmers, people working in the forestry industry, and residents who live near chemical plants are those who are most at risk.

I was both interested and discouraged to note an article that appeared in the *Leader-Post* a few months ago, quoting our own director of the occupational health and safety division here in Saskatchewan, Bob Sass, estimating that 25 per cent of cancer is work-related. When one considers the escalating rate of cancer in the province, Mr. Speaker, the fact that cancer cases have risen from just over 12,000 to just over 13,000 in the course of a decade in Saskatchewan, one again gets a sense of the magnitude of the problem.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, workers' compensation covers very few of the people who are injured. We have a better system here in Saskatchewan than most provinces. Perhaps 5 to 10 per cent of the cancer cases here can be directly related to work and insurance coverage provided. But that is extremely low, and I note that in the province of Manitoba, in the course of the decade of the 1970s, only nine or ten cases of cancer were provided with workers' compensation. In other words, they were able to prove that their cancer was work-related.

Consider the estimate that at least 25 per cent of cancer is in fact work-related. We see how many people are not getting adequate compensation and adequate protection, as a result of the system as it now works. Therefore, I think that these points put into context the importance of issues such as the proper labelling, testing and regulation of chemicals in Canada.

Now, I want to turn directly to the question of labelling. Clearly one of the central problems is the fact that a worker may not be aware that he is dealing with a chemical

that is hazardous to his health, because either there is no indication of that on the label or because the label may not even indicate what the chemical is. As my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg noted, a worker's right to know the health hazards of the substances that he's working with is a basic part of his right to be aware of the hazards in his workplace. We've introduced that concept of the right to know into the workplace in Saskatchewan, but that concept is, obviously, not complete until the worker is provided full information about the chemicals that he is working with. Presently, because of inadequate labelling, he is not provided with that information.

I believe that labelling and registration should be undertaken by the Department of Health in the federal government, and not by the Department of Labour, as others have proposed, and certainly not by the Department of Agriculture, as is the case now with respect to agricultural chemicals. I believe that these labelling provisions should encompass a number of specific points.

First, labelling should take place where the chemicals are manufactured. As my colleague mentioned earlier, a label should include both the common and the chemical name of all the ingredients in the product. The label should also refer to the hazards associated with exposure to this product, the symptoms of over-exposure, the emergency treatment required in the event of injury or accident, as well as precautions for the safe use of the product. The label should also point out the possible long-term effects of the chemical — either known or suspected. Presently, many chemicals are suspected of being related to cancer, birth defects, sterility and mutations, and yet none of these suspected hazards are indicated on the label.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we've seen in Canada in recent months a number of instances where the federal government has banned the manufacture of a chemical, the most recent being the decision to ban 2,4-D esters because they are believed to be related to cancer and birth defects. Yet their sale in Canada continues, and there is no indication on the label.

The problem of labelling is further complicated by a number of federal laws associated with trade secrets. I believe that if we're to have proper legislation respecting the labelling of chemicals in Canada, these federal laws must be changed. We see right now, Mr. Speaker, the inability of our provincial government to obtain information on the composition and test results of a number of chemicals on the industrial Biotest Laboratories' list. That is the list of chemicals that have been tested by this laboratory. Since a large part of the testing has been found to be fraudulent, all chemicals that depend largely on their registration for testing by this laboratory are suspect.

What we have seen in recent weeks, Mr. Speaker, is a ruling by the federal Department of Justice that the federal Department of Health cannot release the information about the make-up of the chemicals on the IBT (International Biotest Laboratories) list, about the hazards that may be associated with these chemicals, about the hazards that already have been uncovered by testing and reviews of testing, because this information has been submitted under the Pest Control Products Act which is subject to the common law protecting trade secrets. So what we have, Mr. Speaker, is an inability to even find out about what the make-up of these chemicals is or what the hazards associated with these chemicals are, as a result of trade secrets legislation. Obviously, it's going to be impossible, Mr. Speaker, as long as this law exists, for proper labelling of those chemicals to ever take place — because the information cannot be made public.

Now we see this whole question of secrecy, which I've referred to, being carried a step further in the operations of the Canadian Association of Pest Control Officers, which is made up of officials from the provincial and federal departments of health, environment and agriculture. Their minutes and the information that they gather on agricultural and industrial chemicals are all kept secret, Mr. Speaker. It's all kept confidential. The private chemical companies can participate with this group of government officials, but the public, members of the legislature and members of parliament are not allowed to attend the meetings.

It's interesting to note that recently the minutes of one of these meetings became public, and Mr. Wayne Ormrod, chief of the pesticide section of the federal agriculture department, is quoted as saying in the minutes, — "Too much detail on the label could lead to increased violations of the law or to more charges from environmental groups." Isn't that an interesting statement for a federal official to be making, Mr. Speaker? He goes on to make a number of other arguments against more detailed labelling and it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to also note a discussion in the minutes of that meeting re the application of Tordon 122-K in British Columbia.

Shortly after Mr. Ormrod's recorded remarks, it was noted that poor labelling on Tordon led to the aerial spraying of the chemical in settled areas near Penticton, when, in fact, it's well known that Tordon should never be applied by aerial spraying. That event clearly took place because of inadequate labelling, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what we see, therefore, is private industry and the federal government working together in a shroud of secrecy to prevent the public from learning the full details of the hazards that are associated with the chemicals that we are using in Canada every day. What we see, Mr. Speaker, is basically a conspiracy that is clearly not in the public interest.

Now I want to note at this point an article that recently appeared in the *Leader Post*, quoting the president of the Canadian Agriculture Chemicals Association. He was talking about why health data has to be kept confidential, in other words, why it shouldn't be on the label. This also reflects the real interest of private industry. The Canadian Agricultural Chemicals Association is always attacking people who are critical of the use of chemicals, Mr. Speaker. Listen to this quote. The president, Mr. A. D. Sinclair, says:

It is important that health data remain confidential because it belongs to someone. The data we work on and provide the government is a valuable piece of intellectual property. Under the capitalist system you simply don't give away valuable property.

Mr. Speaker, it's a perfect reflection of what's wrong with the capitalist system.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PREBBLE:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out one of the other important arguments for the federal government to act quickly to upgrade the quantity of labelling on industrial and agricultural chemicals. The United States is rapidly moving toward improving its labelling system. If Canada does not keep pace, Mr. Speaker, we could very well find ourselves as one of the dumping grounds for hazardous chemicals that are not permitted in the United States.

We've seen in the past the practices of the United States federal government with respect to selling hazardous industrial and agricultural chemicals to second and third world countries that had not banned those chemicals when the United States had, who did not require as vigorous regulatory and testing practices as the United States did. We could very easily see the same kind of occupational diseases in Canada that have been exported to those countries if Canada lags far behind the United States with respect to proper regulations.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, some of the obvious areas where a substantial difference in regulations between the U.S. and Canada already exists. I want to use as an example the chemical TOK which the Government of Saskatchewan was the first government in Canada to ban, Mr. Speaker, when its hazards became known.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that on the cans of TOK that are available in Canada, the warning reads, and I quote:

Don't breathe spray mist. Avoid swallowing and contact with skin and eyes.

At the same time the United States label reads:

Restricted use pesticide for retail sale to, and use only by, certified applicators or persons under direct supervision. Warning to female workers: women of childbearing age should not be involved with mixing, loading or application of this product. Exposure to this product during pregnancy must be avoided. Exposure to TOK has caused severe, delayed, adverse affects in experimental animals. Severely irritating to the skin and eyes, readily absorbed through the skin, harmful if swallowed, inhaled or deposited on the skin.

All that should be contrasted with the simple Canadian statement: "Don't breathe spray mist, avoid swallowing and contact with skin and eyes." You can clearly see, Mr. Speaker, the divergence in the quality of labelling of this product between the United States and Canada. It simply reflects a much wider problem in this field.

It is important for us to recognize that there is a great deal that is not known about the chemicals we use in day to day life. We are increasingly learning that even minute amounts of these chemicals . . . low exposure over very long periods of time can cause a great deal of damage. We are also learning that although the testing for agricultural chemicals is only done on a chemical-by-chemical basis — in other words, the laboratories only look at one chemical at a time. The real impact on our bodies is felt as a result of all the chemicals to which we are exposed interacting with one another. We are becoming increasingly aware of the implications which these interactions can have. There is a great deal that is not known about this.

I was interested to note recently in the *Star-Phoenix* that Dr. Stanley Greenhill, chairman of the community health department at the University of Alberta, expressed a great deal of concern about the lack of information on the interaction between prescription drugs and insecticides. Now, clearly a lot of farmers who are using insecticides, and in some cases householders too, are also taking prescription drugs. The possible new carcinogens which are created by these interactions are a matter of great concern.

Without proper labelling, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for a family physician to make

any kind of diagnosis with respect to the problems his patient may be facing, because he has no real way of knowing the precise chemicals that his patient has been exposed to. The only thing he knows is the trade name of the product. He has no details on the specific make-up of that product.

I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot do a proper job throughout the entire system of regulations, particularly with respect to handling the problems of disposal, if we don't know the make-up of the chemicals and if labelling is inadequate.

With those remarks in mind, I want to say that I believe the issue which is involved here is much broader than just the issue of labelling. If we are to send a resolution to the federal government which will deal reasonably comprehensively with this problem, we also need to deal with the problems of improper testing of chemicals in Canada, and fraudulent laboratory results in Canada and in the United States. We need to deal with the whole question of whether certain hazardous chemicals should be allowed onto the market at all.

We have a situation now in Canada in which the federal government is depending to a very substantial degree on United States laboratories and on a handful of Canadian laboratories (private laboratories) to do the testing and provide the information on which the federal government registers chemicals in Canada.

The worst case that has come to light is well-known by members in this House — the case of Industrial Biotest Laboratories (IBT). The fact has now come to light that the safety of well over 100 chemicals which have been registered in Canada, based on information provided by Industrial Biotest Laboratories, is now in question, because it has been discovered that the tests undertaken by Industrial Biotest Laboratories from Northbrook, Illinois, are fraudulent or inaccurate. A few months ago, when this first came to light, it was said by many people that there was no reason to think that a large majority of chemicals on the IBT list were hazardous. Most of the chemicals they argued, were just being placed into question because a few had been found to be inaccurately tested.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that those who rush to the defence of the chemical industry, those who were skeptical, I might say, including many aldermen in Saskatoon, when I appeared before them, expressing concerns about IBT (Industrial Biotest Laboratories) and the implications that it had for Saskatchewan. We have now come to learn that, in fact, the large majority of the tests which have been done on chemicals by IBT for things like cancer, birth defects and mutations were invalid. And this means that a large number of the chemicals that are on the IBT list may well be unsafe, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I think it's been most interesting to note, particularly with the tests which have been done for cancer, that over 80 per cent of those done by IBT on the 100 chemicals were found to be invalid. But IBT is not the only laboratory which was found to be doing fraudulent and inaccurate testing. There are at least eight other laboratories that are now suspected of having undertaken fraudulent tests. The federal government is depending on those laboratories for providing data for the registration of chemicals here in Canada.

Now, we get a sense of the nature of this fraud with recent memos concerning captan that came to light through the United States freedom of information law. Captan is a fungicide available in about 90 chemical products sold here in Canada, and it was tested by IBT. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that Chevron, which is, of course,

owned by Standard Oil wrote to Industrial Biotest Laboratories when it was having the captan fungicide tested for it. Chevron expressed concerns about the number of mutations indicated in the laboratory's testing. In other words, a number of mutations had been discovered by this lab in the course of testing. But it's then interesting to note that the final report which Industrial Biotest Laboratories came out with on captan specifically stated that captan does not lead to any mutations. Now, this information came to light in the memos that were written by the Canadian government in 1978 and 1979, expressing concern about this IBT test result. These memos are from September 1978 to October 1979. And I think that it's also interesting to note some of the information which both the Canadian and the United States governments had before them at the time. They included a statement from the National Cancer Institute in the United States — that captan caused intense intestinal and liver tumours in mice.

In August 1980, the United States Environmental Protection Agency concluded that captan is capable of inducing gene mutations and DNA damage.

It's clear in my view, Mr. Speaker, that the IBT list and fraudulent testing are just the tip of the iceberg with respect to this problem. In 1979 and 1980, I wrote letters to our provincial Minister of the Environment, urging the minister at the time to ban pentachlorophenyl, which was a wood preservative widely sold in Saskatchewan. It was also applied as a spray treatment for home and garden use. The minister investigated that chemical. He attempted to get information from the federal government on this wood preservative. Unfortunately, he was not provided with that information. Here is another example of the secrecy of the federal government in this respect. But the matter became of particular concern in September 1980, because pentachlorophenyls were found to be contaminating wells in the Glaslyn area (180 miles west of Prince Albert) from the wood-preserving plant there. Mr. Speaker, since that time, it has become publicly known that PCPs (as they're known) are found to contain dioxin, and in October they were also added to the Industrial Biotest Laboratories' list, and have since been banned. What we've seen in a period of about four months are bans on a whole series of chemicals that had been in wide use in Canada, namely TOK; 2,4,5-T, PCPs; disulfoton, a well-known insecticide, and urea formaldehyde. In the last few months, we've seen a ban on a large number of chemicals used for industrial and agricultural purposes, and the federal government has assured us, for years, that they were safe, and we had nothing to worry about. That was topped off by the announcement that dioxins were present in 2,4-D esters and that, while those would not be taken off the market this year, their manufacture would be prohibited.

There has been another unfortunate important aspect to this debate. It's on this point that I want to draw my remarks to a close. A large number of chemicals continue to be on the market that are known to be unsafe; there are at least 32 pesticides now on the market that are suspected of causing cancer and have still not been withdrawn. But in addition to all that, Mr. Speaker, I think the ultimate attitude of the federal government was demonstrated in the recent disclosure by members of parliament within the New Democratic Party in the House of Commons that the United States government had been allowed to undertake military testing of Agent Orange over CFB (Canadian Forces Base) Gagetown in 1966. Agent Orange is basically a mixture of two herbicides, 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T.

It is interesting that similar mixtures have been in domestic use in Canada since that time. For instance, a herbicide in a similar mixture, but with lower quantities of dioxin has been used for the last two years in spraying the New Brunswick forests. If one looks

to Alberta, there was an interesting report in the February 16 issue of the *Leader Post* in which an Alberta government official admitted that combinations of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, similar to Agent Orange, were used throughout the mid 1960s for brush control in the province of Alberta. And he also noted that, while that mix is not being used with the same quantities of dioxin as it was then, it certainly is still in use, but with lower quantities of dioxin.

Anyone who is familiar with the effects of Agent Orange in Vietnam, the impact that it had in defoliating the forests, and in causing skin and cancer problems and birth defects among the people of Vietnam, will obviously realize the very serious consequences that come with the federal and provincial governments allowing the application of this kind of chemical in Canada. And not only did we fail to protest at the time the application of that chemical on innocent people in other parts of the world, we fail to even have the vigour to make sure that it's not done at home, Mr. Speaker. I think, then, that this illustrates the complete lack of adequate regulation on the part of the federal government with respect to this problem. It also indicates the need to broaden the resolution, and make it even stronger with respect to dealing with regulation in the field and going beyond just the recent problem.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Centre, that we add in the motion after the words, "adequate labelling of," "farm and." That way we just don't talk about industrial chemicals, but also talk about farm chemicals. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, that we add to the present wording of the motion the following words:

act immediately to establish a government operated toxicological laboratory to conduct proper testing into the safety of chemicals, and undertake a royal commission into the safety and disposal of industrial and agricultural chemicals in Canada.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the federal government should undertake the responsibility of setting up a laboratory in Canada that is capable of testing agricultural and industrial chemicals for safety here in Canada. It should be a government laboratory and not a private one, and, above all, not a private one from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than enough evidence before us right now to justify a royal commission at the federal level into the hazards and the inadequate and fraudulent testing that has taken place in the area of chemicals, and into the incidents associated with the spraying of Agent Orange in Gagetown, and the application of similar chemicals in other parts of Canada in the past.

The position of a royal commission on this matter should be the position that is being taken by the federal NDP in Ottawa. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter which our government and this legislature should support. I urge members of this legislature to support the motion and the amendment, and I move the amendment. Thank you very much.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — It seems rather strange to me. If one seconds a motion, then that would imply to me that you are in favour of that motion — that's why you are the seconder. I fail to understand then how, if you are the seconder, you can bring in an amendment to that motion, when the very fact that you seconded it showed that that's what you are in favor of.

**MR. PREBBLE:** — I would like to inform you and the House that I had sought the advice of the Clerk on this matter and received advice from him that it would be acceptable. It was on that basis that I submitted it.



**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think that is necessarily a point in favor of or against the amendment which you offer, since the Clerks are not able to defend themselves against something of that nature. Do we have any further comments on the point of order raised by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley? Then I will proceed with my ruling. I have examined the conditions which apply to amendments and they must be relevant to the question to which they are proposed; they must be intelligible, and the purpose of the amendment must be to render a proposition more acceptable to the Assembly.

An amendment cannot be used to accomplish the same thing that would be accomplished by the simple defeat of the main motion. An amendment is out of order if it proposes to alter any part of a proposition upon which the Assembly has already expressed an opinion, or if the substance of the amendment itself has already been submitted to the judgment of the Assembly. An amendment, even if in order in all other respects, is out of order if the substance lies beyond the competence on the Assembly.

I have examined Beauchesne and am unable, at this point, to find any restriction against a seconder of a motion offering an amendment to that motion. Since I have no precedent to show that it cannot be done, I believe that the mover of the amendment is quite in order and on that basis the two will be considered concurrently. What's the point of order?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, surely, Mr. Speaker, if the motion comes from the same side of the House, then why was the motion not brought in in an intact manner, rather than the amendment coming?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have no control over where amendments come from or where motions come from; they just come here and I deal with them as they come. I really think that I can't answer that question and it should not be directed to me.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — In *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, page 99, rule 304 seems to cover the situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Could I have the member for Rosthern give his citation again, please. If the other members would keep quite, I could hear him.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Page 99, rule 304 (numbers 1 to 10 inclusive) indicates the procedure that it shouldn't be allowed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have examined the citation the member for Rosthern has given and I do not find any support for the contention he makes that it is out of order.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I think there are some issues here which have been brought forth in this motion by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and also the seconder and amender, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, that certainly one would support. I don't think there is any question that adequate labelling of toxic chemicals is a priority that needs to be addressed. The federal government should do it, but if there are chemicals that are produced within this province, so should the government of this province.

I think we all need to safeguard the people whose work and way of life find it necessary to deal with these types of chemicals. I believe that we are in a chemical age and, although we may not all support the use of chemicals, they are part and parcel of our

way of life. It only makes good sense that every precaution should be taken to safeguard the lives of those who are affected.

I also think that it is reasonable to have adequate testing. Certainly, past experience has shown that there hasn't been adequate testing in some situations. Dangerous chemicals have been applied which we may not, as of yet, know the long-run implication of upon the lives of people in our province. However, we would support a motion to the effect that before chemicals are brought onto the market — and they are coming on at a very rapid rate — there would be adequate testing to safeguard the lives of people from their effects. This is a very worth-while position to take.

However, I think the two members failed to address a very immediate problem existing in Saskatchewan today. That is, as the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland said, within the last six months there have been a number of chemicals that have been discovered to be very harmful. I am sure that there are people in this province who have those chemicals, and bought them not knowing the dangers to their health or to that of their neighbours or anyone else in that environment and who don't know what to do with these chemicals.

Take, for example, the little old lady who may have bought some type of chemical to kill the bugs in her garden and to spray the plants. Now, she's very concerned for her own health and that of her neighbours and anyone else who may be sharing her table. But she has this type of chemical in her possession and she doesn't know what to do with it. She probably has it stored in the garage or in the basement or some place where her grandchildren or someone else may innocently take this chemical and drink it.

When you go around in the rural constituencies — that of my colleague for Souris-Cannington, my own, those of Rosetown-Elrose and Rosthern — you know, as well as I do, that there are chemical cans out there that our farm neighbours do not know what to do with. They don't know whether to rinse them out, to bury them, or to pile them up. They don't know what the correct action is. In fact, I think, some of them even wash them out and may, inadvertently, be feeding the cows out of them — I don't know what that's doing to the whole food chain.

I think it is of ever-pressing important, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this province take action to have centrally located collection depots where people, who have been using these chemicals or who many have inadvertently bought them and know they're dangerous and don't know what to do with them, can dispose of them. You can't pour them down the sink. What can you do with them? But I think there should be set up, immediately, centrally located areas where people can dispose of toxic chemicals they don't want in their possession, and where the agricultural sector can get rid of these cans and containers.

That's the point I wanted to make. I would like to move a subamendment to the motion, and I see the words have been changed a bit so I'll have to do a little ad libbing here. Let's put it in this form, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Rosthern, that the words:

and that this Assembly urges the Government of Saskatchewan to establish centralized collection depots for the disposal of toxic chemicals and the containers of toxic chemicals.

Be added after the word "Canada."

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We're dealing with resolution no. 8 to which an amendment has been offered, to which, subsequently, a subamendment has been offered, moved by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, seconded by the member for Rosthern. I'm going to rule, at this time, that the subamendment which has been offered would be suitable for an amendment, but is not suitable for a subamendment. The reasoning is this — I'll cite Beauchesne's 438 which is a section that governs subamendments. It says:

The purpose of a subamendment is to alter the amendment. It should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment, but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment.

Now, this is unusual wording here.

If it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the members should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment.

Now, I believe that this does, in fact, enlarge upon the scope of the amendment. The amendment deals with the actions that should be taken by the federal government. This enlarges upon it to the extent of saying that certain actions should be taken by the Government of Saskatchewan, and for that reason I say that the proposed or offered subamendment would be more desirable if moved as an amendment, rather than as a subamendment. I'm going to rule it out of order at this time.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the debate has started so late in the day and we probably won't have time to conclude it. I will comment to the minister that I will be adjourning debate before I am done, because I want to study the comments made by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, who has some credibility in the area of concerns of the environment regarding chemicals, and who has spoken many times in this House.

It's unfortunate that when he suggested that the government cannot release the lists of chemicals, he made no reference to the Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of Labour, which allow people in the city of Saskatoon purchasing department to work in a building that is unfit for human beings, because of past chemicals originally handled by McKee's (I believe were the people) or MacCosham's, who were there. It's unfortunate the minister responsible for occupational health doesn't seem to want to listen to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland as he speaks about the concerns of the workers, and doesn't want to worry about the concerns of the workers in the city of Saskatoon, in what I refer to as the purchasing department, who have asked for and have not received a proper decision from his department.

The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland complains because the federal government doesn't want to make any decisions. He should look at his own mess and see that the Minister of Labour does the same thing. I refer especially to that building, because that is to do with chemicals. You can go to McKee's Moving and Storage, the former occupants of that building, I believe, and ask them what they handled. Go to the employers and the employees who worked in that basement moving those chemicals around. They will tell you what they were.

You've let people in the city of Saskatoon, in the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 59, who are presently out on strike, unfortunately, work in a building which is causing problems for them. In fact, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a doctor has issued

orders to one person working in that building to the effect that he should not enter it because it is affecting his health. But the government sits idly by. All the minister can do is spray his aerosol can in this Chamber. He can't go out and do anything to help the employees with that concern.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland spoke about the concerns of all those who must deal with chemicals. I think that, more than one other member in this House, I can relate an accident or two. My brothers, in employment, almost lost their lives because of improper labelling on a chemical. You know, it's interesting that a minister over on that side is not in his present chair. He seems to think that it's too bad that they didn't. That's what he indicates. That's the government which is concerned about the occupational health of the Saskatchewan employee.

You know, Mr. Speaker, rather than drag this debate to the level of that member on the other side, I will try to keep it on the high level that the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland brought it to. You know, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland refers to the federal government and says it indicated it wasn't in the public interest for the public to know what was in these chemicals. They didn't want it listed because all the information was submitted under the Pest Control Act. First of all, the Pest Control Act should include those bugs over there, the ones in his own party, which don't seem to want to do anything about the problems that exist today in the province.

I almost wondered about the statements the mover of the original motion made as he spoke in this House. The associate minister of labour, who is responsible for occupational health, has been talking all across Canada and Saskatchewan about the labelling of chemicals and many other products. Should the people know what is in them, so that doctors, if children get to the chemicals, will know immediately what to use to make sure that there is no damage to the young person?

The first thing that must be done, Mr. Speaker, is education of the public on the products; we have to make sure they read the label. It reminds me of the story of a chemical that was out for farm use several years ago. On the label it said, "Do not touch the skin." Yet somebody put his arm right into the chemical and stirred it. Who's to blame? The chemical company or the fellow who didn't read the label? The members talk about labelling — that is important. But people must read the label. Nobody talked about that. You can put up all the signs you want, and you can label everything you want, but if people don't read it, it doesn't do any good.

So, instead of spending your money on Crown corporation ads, that propaganda you're involved with, why don't you spend it on something worthwhile, telling people, "Read your labels"? That's what you have to let people know. It's coming up to the chemical season for farmers. Spend some of that Crown corporation money advertising, "Read the labels on your chemicals: handle chemicals safely; dispose of waste chemicals cans properly; be careful that you don't use them for water that you may give livestock."

You know, we had an oil spill in Saskatoon. I think it was Inland Steel Products. The Minister of the Environment told them to clean up the mess. But you know, the most interesting part is that after they had it all barrelled and packaged up, they asked what they should do with this stuff. The minister said, "You take it to the United States, because they will destroy it there." That was the Minister of the Environment's statement to an organization in Saskatoon which had an oil spill. He said to take it to the United States because they have furnaces and can spread it on the desert. If I remember

correctly, that was the statement from his department So I can't sincerely believe that the members on that side are sincere in their concerns. I think the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland definitely is concerned, and he has spoken out and is credible in the situation. I'm not sure about the other members on that side.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all the members on that side, except perhaps the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, are saying to do as we say and not as we do. They keep saying those things and not doing anything. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland complains that the federal government suggests it's not in the public interest. Well, that has to be almost blasphemy, because I continually hear from his government that it's not in the public interest. Whenever they don't want us to know something, it's not in the public interest. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has no problem kicking the tar out of the federal government — and I agree he should kick the tar out of it because we are concerned for the safety of individuals working in this province. But let him take a shot at his own government, which is sitting arrogantly by, doing nothing. Oh, the minister is going to get up shortly, but when he enters this debate, he'll tell us all about the letters he has sent and all these people he has talked to. It has been talk and no action. That's what he's missing. Let's have some action! All we are given is talk, and the Minister of Labour knows to whom I'm referring. He and the person formerly in charge of occupational health were a total joke. Fortunately, he has a man who has some acceptance in his area, even if his party does not.

Going back to what the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland had to say . . . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm glad to hear that the minister for aerosol again is speaking — or is it the member who buys pictures that aren't truly legitimate? I'm not sure which one it is, but he can have either title.

He refers to the health of the worker. I think we're all concerned with the health of the worker. We all are even getting concerned about the health of the Minister of Labour, because he seems to talk, talk, talk, and do nothing.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's the mental health.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Oh, that's the mental health. That's right. Sorry. I should have assumed that.

The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland referred to Saskatchewan as becoming a dumping ground for chemical wastes. You know, I sort of enjoyed that comment because of the Minister of Environment's comment about sending the waste to the United States and spreading it out in the desert. But the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland made many good comments. As for the member who moved the motion, I don't believe it was his own motion, so we'll totally ignore him. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland made comments about a dumping ground.

There are methods to destroy some chemicals by burning them, and that's something that must be researched. Our motion, that unfortunately was ruled out of order, referred to that problem. The waste that you see in the local R. M. dump (you'll see chemical cans) is being buried. Do we know what's going to happen 10 years later when those cans rust and whatever liquid was left in them goes into the soil?

Talking about chemicals going into the soil, I must go back to PCBs (which we all heard a lot about in this House) and talk about a government that has two sets of rules. I don't

see the Minister of Labour concerned with occupational health and industrial workers going out and inspecting every Saskatchewan Power Corporation employee who was spilling the oil out of transformers for years. For years, I watched, on Avenue C in Saskatoon, between 18th Street and 19th Street, the dumping of cylinders full of transformer liquid.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — PCBs.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, I understand you don't use PCBs, but this is some 20 years ago, Mr. Minister. They dumped them quite regularly, and every day as I went by at 4:30 (as I was the paper boy in the area), they were cleaning up the mess.

I don't hear anything about your department examining every industrial worker who was spilling those chemicals to make sure that it was safe. I don't hear anything about your department inspecting all the dumps that you used in Saskatoon and other areas around where they dumped these PCBs.

But I hear mouth service and once again I hear the yappy minister, who just go a new highway to his constituency, talking from his chair. But let's ignore him, because he doesn't know anything about PCBs at all, and he isn't really worried about the occupational health of the individual worker in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, I think it is important that improved labelling be done. You talk about leadership — maybe that's something that this province can take some leadership in. Maybe wheat is something in which this province could take some leadership — and in chemicals that are produced in our province. Let's take some leadership in what is produced in our province, even if we have to suggest that we will assist in the additional cost to put the additional information on these labels.

We think it's important that people are handling the chemical. Therefore, by being an example to others, we can maybe put some legitimate pressure on the federal government to go along that line also. If nothing else, maybe we can together put some pressure on the other provinces to consider it as well.

Labelling is important; coding for dangerous . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I cannot resist the comment from the minister who forgot where he left his budget speech last year, and everybody in the province knew about it before he told the House. He worries about where I find documents. He should worry about leaving them where everybody in the province has an unfair advantage and can know the budget before he has even released it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I'm unaware as to what this has to do with the motion that is before us. I implore the member for Rosthern to resist the temptation to indulge in these side debates, because I don't think they relate to the motion before us. It's out of order for him to be doing that.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, just to inform you how it relates — it relates to the comment the member made earlier today when he was referring to the member who moved the original motion. I was answering on that point, so it was part of the debate.

I have all night. Mr. Speaker, in the Regina *Leader-Post* on March 17, 1981 . . . You know, you can read from this because you are quoting a document. There is reference on page B-8 to the contamination of a building by PCBs. This multimillion dollar

building may never be allowed to be used again because of an accident with industrial chemicals. That was in New York — just so you know, Mr. Minister. This indicates that during a fire there was something that happened that has now contaminated the whole building. That raises another concern for the fireman, or anyone in an emergency, who has to go into a building where all these chemicals are stored. A building that is used for storage gives no indication to the fireman that there are dangerous chemicals in there. That's something we can look after provincially. We don't have to bother the feds for that. We can look after that ourselves. The Minister of Labour can do something about that without asking the feds for permission at all. He has a chance to do something. Let's see if he's all mouth, or if he will take some action. I know he's all mouth from his seat, but we'll soon find out.

What I am referring to, Mr. Minister, so you understand the situation, is that unless there is some outward sign that there are dangerous chemicals inside a building, a fireman going in knows nothing about that hazard. It should be your duty to suggest to all these organizations that store those kinds of chemicals to make sure that there is indication of that danger.

The minister laughs, and I wonder why. Is he not concerned with people whose occupation is to look after the safety of others? I refer to the fire cases. He just smiles and laughs. He forgets about that fireman whose life may be in danger because of these chemicals which are in these buildings. There's no labelling on the outside of the building to indicate that this is dangerous. We talk about the labels on chemicals. We don't talk about labels on buildings. I use for an example, Mr. Speaker, a wheelchair. When you see somebody in a wheelchair in a home, there's always a label outside, warning the fireman that there's somebody handicapped inside, so look for them. I'm suggesting that there should be a label on buildings where chemicals are stored, (and that's within the Government of Saskatchewan's area) so that the firemen know it. Mr. Speaker, the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland made many valid comments. I was a little disappointed that he did not make any reference to all the chemical spills in Saskatoon for which the Government of Saskatchewan was at fault, but I suggest maybe he will bring that up in question period or some other time. There are sites, and he has been offered a tour of them in Saskatoon. There would be no sense in offering the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Labour a tour of these hazardous sites. We at least offered them to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, who showed some concern. I will be studying the comments of the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland.

The amendment is excellent and we will see what happens with it. The motion shows a concern for the worker, but I sincerely believe that it's lip service from all those members on that side, except the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. Therefore, I'm going to wait and hear what the other members have to say. I have other things I wish to add the next time we meet, to confirm some of the figures that Mr. Prebble brought into the House. Therefore, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOWS**

#### **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 16**

**Item 1 (Continued)**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Before I get under way, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give one of my colleagues an opportunity to ask a couple of questions. The member for Rosetown-Elrose had some questions that he was unable to ask earlier. I want to give him an opportunity now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I would like to raise a concern that was raised with me today and several times over the past two years about the methods you use for awarding highway contracts and, in particular, the contracts for the asphalt coating that is used on highways.

The gentleman who has called me advises that he has bid consistently each year for the provision of asphalt and this year in particular, he was 10 cents a gallon lower than anyone else in the bid but was not awarded the bid. I would like to know what process you use to award the contract? What was the reason this man was not given a contract?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would inform the hon. member that we tender the highway contracts, but we do not purchase the materials. The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services purchases the materials and you would have to discuss that with the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, the material I am talking about is put on the highways. You're the Minister of Highways and Transportation, and I want an answer to my question.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — You just got an answer to your question, sir.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, I will accept your answer as that is the way I believe it is done. But I will add this: does it not make sense that the Department of Highways and Transportation, which has the engineers and employees, the people who put the asphalt on the roads, should somehow be involved in this bidding? It seems to me that we have another case of the government opposite putting the cart before the horse. I would think that you are dealing in asphalt to put on your roads to provide the best roads for Saskatchewan, surely your staff would look at the products of various companies and recommend to the revenue department those which have the products and are closest to the areas you are paving, so that there isn't a big freight cost to move it all across our province.

Can you tell me why your department is not involved in that aspect of the bidding for the asphalt for surfacing the roads of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The Department of Highways and Transportation sets out the specifications. The Department of Revenue, Supply and Services lets the tenders.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Does the Department of Highways, in setting out its specifications, indicate any priority for proximity of those supplies to where the work is being done?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The cost will include the cost of hauling. We take that into account.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — What you have just told me is that cost includes the cost of haul. In other words, you will bring supplies from a plant on the west side of Saskatchewan as



you did last year to pave highways in the east side. A plant in my constituency closed down this year and last year; yet that plant underbid the competitors. You are telling me that you pay the cost of transportation. You don't pay it, the taxpayers of this province pay it. Isn't that what you are saying?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The low bid means the cost of supply and the cost of haul.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — The cost of haul is in that low bid? Why if this is one of your specifications — that the low bid of the company located in Wolseley (and you're paving down in that area), the member for Moosomin has pointed out some in his constituency — would it then be that their bid, which was 10 cents a gallon cheaper than ones located in another part of the province, were not accepted?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — You'd have to talk to the Minister of Revenue about that.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, I most certainly will be talking to him and I think it's nothing better than what my seatmate says. It's nothing but gross political patronage. No wonder this man's plants are being moved out of Rosetown. The one in Wolseley has been shut down for two years. You refused again to give him a contract and don't tell me or anyone else in this province that you are for rural Saskatchewan, because you're just talking up your sleeves, as you continually do.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I have a question. You just indicated that the Minister for Revenue, Supply and Services will respond to the question which the member for Indian Head-Wolseley put to you. Are you saying, and am I hearing you correctly — correct me if I am wrong — that when tenders are opened for the Department of Highways you have no input into it? You don't make any decisions as to who gets the tender and it's all up to the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — For materials of this nature, we set the standards, revenue and supply lets the tenders.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — And the Department of Highways has absolutely nothing to say about who is going to get that tender? The decision is solely on the shoulders of the purchasing agent? That's what you are saying?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Revenue and supply has the final decision as long as it meets our standards.

**MR. ROUSSEAU** — Please answer my question. Do you have any input into it at all?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — We set the standards. Revenue and supply lets the tenders.

**MR. ROUSSEAU** — I'll take it one step at a time. You set the standards. They accept the standards. Do you have any input into the acceptance of the tender?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — No.

**MR. HARDY:** — Last night, I was questioning your expenditure of approximately \$3.3 million on an access road, I guess you said, from Carrot River across to Hudson Bay. That would be the extension along No. 163 and then across to No. 3. I have had, today, many calls from the wildlife federation concerning this highway's going through the area, which would be right next to the wildcat wilderness area. It would affect a great

many of the moose feeding in the area in the winter time. I was just wondering if you haven't had second thoughts on taking that highways across from No. 163 to No. 3? This would, indeed, open up an area that is probably the last untouched area we have.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I am not familiar with the area but I am informed the route will follow a road that's already in place — the Fir River Road. And there will be an environmental impact study done to see if there are any environmental problems involved.

**MR. HARDY:** — Will this environmental impact study be done prior to the construction of the highway?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Yes.

**MR. HARDY:** — Have you done one as of the present time?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — We are currently working on the project proposal, and the next step will be the environmental study.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I would just like to clear up a remark you made in this House last night. You indicated to the member for Moosomin that the average number of dollars to be spent in the Progressive Conservative constituencies is \$1.7 million and in the NDP constituencies it is \$1.5 million. I ask you this question: do you have at this point in time the estimates of the expenditures to be made on these different constituencies available, and will you table them?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The only information we can make public is the project array. I think the member would appreciate that many of these projects still have to be tendered, and it probably wouldn't be wise from the point of view of the people of Saskatchewan to let those figures out to the contractors of Saskatchewan.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, that is quite true, you wouldn't want to release those figures at this point in time. However, you did release some figures last night: \$1.7 million average, \$1.5 million average, and so on. What figure were you giving us last night? Was it on a capital expenditure or total expenditure of the Department of Highways?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — That would be a total, capital expenditure.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — How many constituencies are involved in those two figures you handed out last night?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Fifty-nine constituencies.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's exactly what I suspected, Mr. Minister, that is about the most blatant way of misinforming and misrepresenting facts to this Assembly that I have ever seen in my life. You are including in that figure 25 or so urban constituencies in which you have no jurisdiction and where you are not going to spend any money at all. How can you be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well you tell me where the Department of Highways is going to spend money in the Premier's constituency. You tell me where it will spend money in my constituency. You tell me where it will spend money in any of your urban constituencies. Don't be so

stupid. You are talking about an average of 59 constituencies, not including the two northern ones, which indicates to me that what you are really talking about is not \$1.5 million, but over \$3 million for NDP constituencies, and less than \$1.7 million for the Progressive Conservative constituencies. Not let's have a little bit of truth in what you are trying to misrepresent the people of this province with.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I would just point out to the hon. member that we're planning on spending \$14 million in the cities.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — \$14 million. How many cities. How many urban seats are you taking into your account

**HON. MR. LONG:** — It would be about 14 seats.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Now will you take away the 14 urban seats from the \$14 million and then calculate the actual dollars spent on the rural NDP constituencies versus the actual dollars spent on the rural Progressive Conservative seats, and see what you come up with?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that you take an average of the NDP seats — that's what I said last night — and an average of the Conservative seats. We excluded the two Unionest seats. It comes out to \$1.7 million spent in the Conservative seats and \$1.5 million in the NDP seats.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to react to the member for Regina South. I'd like to react to some of his derogatory comments last night re the Saskatchewan traffic accident facts and the new system we've set up. And I'd like to clarify a few of his statements.

In 1979, 290 persons were in fact killed . . .

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, as a point of order, I have absolutely no objection to the minister coming back to what I said last night, in due course. At the present time, I am asking a question on a totally different subject, and I'd like to stay on that subject until such time as . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have no objection to his rebuttal of the remarks I made last night, and I'm prepared to debate them with him at any time. Right now, I'm talking about a different subject and I want to stay on it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! Your point of order is not well taken.

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — Why not?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Well, I'm going to tell you why not. Under item 1: item 1 is for general questions, general answers and general comments by any member of the House on any topic dealing with the Department of Highways and Transportation. The Minister of Highways and Transportation has this opportunity under item 1 to speak on any topic which he wishes. If you wish to ask him another question when he's done that topic or any other, you certainly may.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Well, I'm not debating the point of order. I made my rulings.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — I'm not debating, either. I don't have anything to do with it, Mr.

Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Okay. State your point of order.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — It's been the long-standing tradition of the House, as Mr. Chairman, well knows, that when a member of the opposition enters into a line of questioning, that line of questioning is pursued to its conclusion. And that's been the tradition since long before you and I ever came to the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! That's not a new point of order and I've already given my ruling on the point of order. The Minister of Highways has the floor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Thank your, Mr. Chairman. I would like to correct a few of the misconceptions the member for Regina South raised last night.

In 1979, 290 persons were killed in 229 collisions in Saskatchewan. In other words, there were 229 fatal accidents and 290 fatalities in 1979, which means that more than one person can be killed in an accident . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, well, I'm explaining it again. Fatalities are usually greater than fatal accidents because more than one person can die in an accident.

In 1979, there were 47,510 accidents involving 62,836 vehicles. It is not uncommon for two or more vehicles to be involved in a single accident. For example, in 1979, there were 34,303 accidents that involved multiple vehicles. In 1979, there were 9,081 persons injured in 5,829 separate injury-causing accidents, and 229 fatalities, for a total of 47,510 accidents. This means that there were 41,452 accidents that did not cause any injuries or deaths.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to address the subject of vehicle registration. Vehicle registrations now occur on a monthly basis; therefore, the total number of vehicles registered changes from month to month. The estimate of 692,000 registered vehicles used in the 1979 accident report is the total number of vehicles registered as of December 31, 1979.

Some agencies, like Saskatchewan Government Insurance, prorate registrations. For example, a vehicle registered for only four months is regarded as one-third of a registration for one year. In other words, it would take three vehicles each registered for four months to make up one year of vehicle registration. The highway traffic board uses March 31 as their cutoff date. As for licensed vehicle operators — like vehicles, drivers are now licensed on a monthly basis. This can mean different figures, depending on when the data is monitored. The 1979 accident report reflects the licensed operators as of December 31, 1979. Some agencies use transactions completed as a base. In summary, we are not able to find any discrepancies in this area in the 1979 traffic accident report.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Let me reply to this for a second, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I don't have my Department of Highways report with me tonight, so it's going to be a little difficult for me to reply to the minister's comments — and he's had all day to research them. I will ask you this question: since you are using different year ends, different configurations to come up with your figures, why don't you explain that in your report, so that people are not bamboozled by phony figures that you always seem to enjoy handing out in this Assembly? That is not much different, I might add, than what the minister in charge of SGI has tried to do to the people of Saskatchewan. You use, by

your own admission, different tallings of figures at different times to suit your purpose. You want to use what you call financial claims for one report, and you come into another one and you use actual claims, and in another report you'll use something else. But there is never an explanation to what you're doing; as long as you can play your jiggery-pokery with the people of Saskatchewan, you'll continue to do that.

I would like to come back to the figures that the minister gave us last night. According to calculations, and I did it very quickly and perhaps I'm wrong, you're using \$1.7 million for 15 constituencies. That works out to \$25.5 million. You're using 30 constituencies; I presume you're talking about \$1.5 million for those constituencies, which would work out to \$45 million. Then you said 14 constituencies at \$1 million each. You said 14 constituencies where you were spending \$14 million, so that's \$1 million each. That works out to \$84 million. According to the report you're tabling here, you have \$96 million spent on capital expenditures under the consolidated fund, and under heritage you have another \$14 million, for a total of \$110 million. Where's the rest of the money being spent?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — You ask where the other money is being spent. I would suggest to you that some of it will be spent in the urban areas, some of it will be spent on bridges, some of it on air. There are various places it could be going.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — What you're saying then is the \$1.7 million that you threw out here last night and the \$1.5 million are totally false and totally phony and totally inaccurate. You're not giving us at all information that is right. There is absolutely no way you're going to convince anyone in this Assembly that \$91.5 million (the total you gave) and the average you say are spending in the constituencies are honest. I asked you how much you are spending. You answered that you're averaging for 15 constituencies \$1.7 million. You didn't break out bridges or urban areas, other expenditures or anything else. Now what we're asking you is: what is the amount you're going to be spending in your constituencies on the average? Let's have an accurate and an honest breakdown for a change.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I think the urban area is the only one that we broke down. If you exclude the urban constituencies and just go to the rurals for an average, our figures show that the average PC constituency is \$1.8 million and the average NDP constituency is just over \$2 million. I would say to you that that's not too bad. It's not bad at all. In any one construction year it could turn around, and does at any time.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Now, we have a completely different impression given to the people. All of a sudden you're spending an average of \$200,000 more in NDP constituencies than you are in Conservative constituencies. Not that we were worried about it, but you were the one who brought it up. The member for Thunder Creek said he got zero . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it probably does. But we didn't even ask you that question. You volunteered it, but you couldn't give us an honest answer. You had to be political and you had to let on that you were being a benevolent minister in helping all the Conservative constituencies when, in fact, you were lying to us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The member seems to be upset about the road program we put on this year and the amount of work we are doing in Tory constituencies . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You have a four-lane highway through your constituency all the way. As a matter of fact, if you look at the four-lane highways in Saskatchewan you'll find that

most of them are in Tory ridings.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — My colleague here just said he came from the bull sale but he says it is nothing compared to what he is hearing from across the way. That was small peanuts compared to what is going on here tonight. However, we made the charge of political patronage, and it seems that you're rather confused in your figures. Last night it was \$1.7 million and \$1.5 million, and now it is \$1.8 million and \$2 million on the new figures and I suppose if we recalculated and pressed you a little more it would change again. My colleague for Moosomin did his homework single-handedly, I suggest better than your complete department did, with the kilometres . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I haven't heard you stand up and refute anything he said. You still don't seem to grasp the situation. You don't understand your own figures and you didn't understand his, so I have a graphic illustration here that maybe you boys can understand if you see it; I wonder.

I did this last year on the expenditures and you will see the blue areas here are the Conservative-held seats in this province. The yellow lines represent the capital expenditures in excess of \$1 million. Even you fellows, who have trouble understanding figures and working things out, are not blind. If you look at that you cannot deny that the capital expenditure on highways in this province is nothing short of political patronage to keep the NDP satisfied in their seats.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I will deny it, Mr. Chairman, that anything I said last night was dishonest. We took an average of the seats in Saskatchewan and that's the way it worked out. There was nothing dishonest about that. When you exclude the urban constituencies from the rural constituencies it still works out to \$1.8 million for the Conservative ridings, on an average, and just slightly over \$2 million for the NDP ridings, on an average. And that's not a bad track record, I don't think. I say to you again, on any one year it could turn around. If the people of Saskatchewan are ever so unfortunate as to have you in government I doubt that you will ever do that well.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the minister must realize I never said that anything was dishonest. I do say that it is grossly in error. Your figures and your way of dividing and figuring out averages is equal to about a grade 3 math class. The figures have changed tonight and I am sure if we looked at them further they would change again. So when you get up with bogus figures of \$1.8 million and \$1.5 million and now they have change to \$2 million, don't say that we are accusing you of any wrongdoing, we are just accusing you of total incompetence.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the map which the hon. member just displayed did not show the constituency of Kelsey-Tisdale. I wonder if there is something we don't know? Has the member from that seat resigned?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I see he is not in his seat.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I think that question is out of order. Let's have a little order here. The member from Kelvington-Wadena is grossly out of order when he asks a question of a member on this side of the House. Hon. member from Thunder Creek.

**MR. THATCHER:** — That is probably why he is the former minister of the environment. I know you are delighted to have me back from the bull sale. It's a good thing somebody in this Assembly was over there supporting the agricultural industry.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Incidentally, several of your constituents are complaining about their roads and they asked me to convey that everything isn't perfect in your constituency. However, as I pointed out to them, it's better than what it is in Thunder Creek. I took the project array to show to some of my constituents — to show them zero. Now you can rattle all the figures you wish about how much you are putting into Conservative constituencies and into NDP constituencies but there is nothing in Rosthern, Souris-Cannington, Maple Creek, and Thunder Creek. I don't know where the rest of them are. I suppose it's appropriate to say that the constituents, if they elected a Conservative, may be up the creek as far as the Department of Highways is concerned — and this undeniable.

Mr. Minister, I'm not familiar with some of the other constituencies but, as I briefly indicated to you last night, you have left work in my area in very serious disarray, and I pointed out to you Highway No. 42. You started it and then you dropped it. That road is a very dangerous, narrow strip. I'm really surprised you didn't proceed on it because, frankly, it leads up to the strongest NDP territory in Thunder Creek constituency.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Duly noted.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Yes, duly noted, but it is no joke. All of a sudden we have a nice broad highway, then it narrows off to nothing and, Mr. Minister, that's a very, very dangerous situation. Now you can rattle off all the numbers you want, but don't tell me that you were fair or that you didn't look at a map. There are just too many zeros on this side of the House as far as work is concerned. Zero as far as the Department of Highways . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . However, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that there's one exception to the basic math equation on this side of the House which is a contradiction to what's on that side of the House. Zero plus zero plus zero means something over here; over there it still means zero.

Mr. Minister, we still have received nothing for road construction, and would you tell us how you justified that? How did you justify zero in Maple Creek, in Souris-Cannington, in Rosthern and in Thunder Creek? Do you call that equitable or unbiased?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out to the hon. members the criteria that we use for highway construction last night, and I stick to those criteria. Those are the criteria we use when we decide which roads we're going to construct. Certainly, we'll be considering a new road program soon and I'll deal with it accordingly, as the need arises and the dollars become available.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, that's a pretty poor answer. All right, rightly or wrongly, they decided to do Highway No. 42 again, and I apologize for using my constituency. Rightly or wrongly, the department decided, two or three years ago, they were going to do Highway 42. Now you drop it. Now you tell me how you justify that, very quickly.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, highway construction programs don't necessarily carry on from year to year. I point out to the hon. member last night that the traffic volume in

the section that you are talking about has dropped rather dramatically. It's higher on the new part and so some of those things come into consideration in the construction of that road.

**MR. THATCHER:** — That's unadulterated nonsense, and you know it. You know very well that traffic volume on that road is going up. The reason the department started construction is that that road is in a disgraceful, deplorable condition. They started to do that — went all the way up to Riverhurst — and you've altered it.

Mr. Minister, I suggest your criteria for selecting roads are based on nothing more than political considerations.

A prime example, a very clear example, is your decision to finally do Highway 1 west to the Alberta border, and I'm delighted that you're finally going to do it. It is regrettable that it took a tragedy to get you started moving west of Swift Current. It should have been done years ago.

I think of a lady from Tompkins who, ironically, led the committee to get that road four-laned all the way to the Alberta border for I don't know how many years. Regrettably, her oldest son was killed in a traffic accident at Gull Lake last fall which is right in that area. She led that campaign for four to five years, but her oldest son won't see it.

I have heard your predecessor stand up in this Assembly so many times and say, "Why would I put a four-lane highway out into that desert out there? There's not traffic out there." What are your criteria? Your predecessor had not criteria. You have no criteria, other than a catastrophe. It took a catastrophe to bring you to your senses and to realize that the Trans-Canada Highway should be four-laned from one end of this province to the other. But it's going to take a catastrophe to make you deal with the problem I mentioned last night, and you listen to this one. You listen to this one, because you should have been on this a long time ago. It will take a catastrophe to get an overpass at 9th Avenue and the Trans-Canada in Moose Jaw. If your Moose Jaw MLAs were doing the job, they would have had that overpass many years ago . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You are not doing your job as an ordinary MLA in Moose Jaw South, since you haven't been pushing for it. Mind you, you've been a lousy MLA for a lot of years — why should you change now?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, again, let's get back to what your priorities are. What suddenly made you change the thinking of your department — the thinking that we heard so many times from your predecessor — as to why there should not be a four-lane highway west of Swift Current? Now there is one to Webb. Are you going to deny that it was because of that terrible tragedy? And are you going to tell us that your highways are based on either a catastrophe or political consideration? In other words, let's hear the real reason for a change.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have been over this ground so many times and explained it so many times; I'm sure that that sod is rather beaten up. I would point out again to the hon. member that the precedent wasn't set at Webb. The precedent was set where we started last year to twin a section of road west of North Battleford on No. 16, the Yellowhead route. That is a similar kind of situation, in terms of construction. I told you that earlier, during the consideration of the estimates of my department in this House. So the precedent was set and I explained that to you. I talked



about the criteria we used when we consider the construction of new roads.

The one thing that I have to say to you is that I very much resent your comments about my predecessor. The former minister of highways, Mr. Chairman, has a reputation across this province as a servant of the people of Saskatchewan that none of you will ever match — 28 years in this legislature, Mr. Chairman, 28 years of serving the people of Saskatchewan. He did a very fine job, indeed. And I'm proud to try to fill his boots; it will take someone like me a long time to fill Eiling Kramer's boots. He did a great job. I very much resent the fact that the opposition attacks a man like this, when he's not here to defend himself. I think it's very unfair and completely unwarranted, if you look at the record of that man and how he served the people of Saskatchewan.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, I am sort of amused looking at the emotionalism coming from the rookie minister. We hear many of the same things his predecessor stood up on his feet right over there and repeated — and I don't know how many times. How many of you have heard it? As the former minister of highways would ask, "Why would I four-lane that highway out into that desert, out of Alberta?" If that offends you, I can't help it. But he said it many, many times. And he would say, "Why would I four-lane that highway? Nobody goes out there; that's a desert." Well, that delighted him — fine. That's his prerogative. If he regards the southwest part of the province as a desert, that is his privilege.

I find it very strange, listening to the philosophy of the highways department that all of a sudden, after we have a tragedy, a terrible tragedy, the Department of Highways sees the light. All of a sudden, by coincidence, you see the light. I suggest to you that your criteria for building your highways is one of two things; a let-it-go consideration, or conversely, a tragedy. But then a tragedy is not everything because if tragedy was everything, the member for Moose Jaw South or the member for Moose Jaw North would have that overpass north of Moose Jaw. And let me tell you, when we finally turf you people out of here, in about six or eight months, that overpass will be built, and hopefully, it will be before there is a tragedy.

Mr. Minister, you lost me there. You said the precedent was set on Highway No. 16 west of Swift Current. Now, after you, maybe, sip a cup of coffee or take a gulp of water, tell us what you were talking about. The comments you made went away beyond me and made no coherent sense. So, try it again. This time take a deep breath, don't shake so much and tell us a little more slowly.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, I suppose if the member for Thunder Creek can repeat himself, I can too. If you'll check *Hansard*, I'm reasonably sure you'll find that I said No. 16 west of North Battleford set the precedent, okay?

We started twinning it last year. You people are talking about some sort of a precedent being set on the highway west of Swift Current. Why did I start No. 16 Highway? I didn't start it, my predecessor did. We started No. 16 Highway because it was a piece of road on which the passing distances were very minimal. It was over hilly terrain and was a similar kind of situation to the section of highway we are constructing west of Swift Current.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, west of Swift Current. Would the minister pardon me if I get a little cynical and suggest that it was started by his predecessor west of North Battleford? Just who was holding that constituency when that decision was made? Who was the MLA? Who was the minister responsible for highways? That's in Bob's seat.

Okay, I see. Highway No 16 from Battleford to 11 kilometres west. Isn't that nice. This is on the 1981-82 grading. Doesn't Highway No. 16 appear quite a bit now? West of Battleford to Delmas, shoulder widening. Well now, isn't that coincidental.

Well, let's move over to surfacing. Highway No. 16, Battleford to the west. That's a coincidence, obviously a coincidence.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's a carry-over from his predecessor.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Right, that's a carry-over from his predecessor. Well, let's hear another one. No. 16, west of Battleford to Delmas is 16.84 kilometres. Does anyone think that maybe we're done with Highway No. 16 in the minister's constituency? There's another one under Highway No. 16. My, my, my! It certainly is a question of priority. There are absolutely no politics whatsoever. Well, let's see. West of Battleford to Delmas to Paynton is 12.34 kilometres — not bad, not bad! That was certainly arrived at through an impartial decision based on a question of priorities and on an impartial list of priorities. Do you think we're done with Highway No. 16? Do you think there are any more? Would you believe it? There's another one! Maidstone to Lashburn, 6.45 kilometres. Isn't that interesting. I'm sure every one of these projects was arrived at on the basis of merit, and that absolutely no influence was given to the fact that the minister represented that constituency. That's not bad for an impartial synopsis from the Department of Highways.

So now we can drop any guise of impartiality, let's get down to the nitty gritty. How about rearranging this project array, because it's a disgrace. It is a disgrace for a new minister to come in here and profess impartiality to this Assembly, to profess that everything is done on the basis of merit and according to the traffic count. Mr. Minister, would you give the Assembly the traffic count for Highway No. 16 that I just mentioned? Those are the areas under 1981-82 for grading and the four categories under surfacing. I'd like the traffic count for those right now, please.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I really do appreciate the remarks the member is making, but all those projects were in place before I became minister. As a matter of fact they are a carry-over from the year before. They were all carried over from the year before. I think it's great that a backbencher can manage that kind of influence and get that kind of work done. I'd like to take credit for it as a backbencher but I can't even take credit for it as a minister, because all those projects were in place before I became minister. Some of those projects were started two years ago.

The traffic count on the section west of Battleford is 2,280 per day. That's a '79 count. As you go farther up the Yellowhead and get closer to Lloydminster, you'll find the traffic count increases to about 3,000 per day.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, I'm a little surprised that a minister would come into this Assembly and acknowledge that he has had no input into the estimates, no input into the project array. In other words, you are really just talking about inheritance and you've had no input whatsoever. That in itself has to be a little bit surprising, because I would think any minister taking over a new department would want some sort of input. Maybe that's an indication of why your figures aren't all that accurate either.

Mr. Minister, if Highway 16 with this traffic count justifies all this work, kindly tell me why doesn't Highway 1 east at Indian Head where the traffic count approaches 3,100, or at Grenfell where the traffic count approaches 2,700, or at Moosomin where the

traffic count according to your map is in excess of 2,300? It's Highway 16 that justifies all of this work. Tell me about Highway 1 east. Why doesn't that justify a certain amount of work at a comparable level?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I'd just like to point out to the hon. member that except for the section of the Yellowhead which we're twinning directly west of North Battleford, all of the Yellowhead route was road with very narrow shoulders or virtually no shoulders at all. The construction we're doing on that road now is to bring those shoulders out to a width where you can pull a vehicle off in safety.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, let's say that everything is true. Let's give you the benefit of the doubt and say that the shoulders are very narrow. I wonder if the minister has ever heard of Highway 6? If you haven't, ask your department people. I think they will tell you that Highway 6 is very similar to what you've just described. Highway 6, as you proceed immediately south of Regina, has a traffic count of 3,000 according to your figures. It is a very narrow-shouldered road, similar to Highway 42 which you started to rectify and for some reason changed your mind. Move a little farther south on Highway 6 and you're into 2,450. You move farther south into the next section and it is 2,450.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that your criteria are a crock of garbage. The work being done on Highway 16 is based on purely political considerations because it's surrounded by NDP constituencies. Contrast that with Highway 1 east — Conservative constituencies — zero. Contrast that with Highway 6 — Conservative constituencies — higher traffic count, zero. Mr. Minister, I tell you that it's a crock of garbage when you tell us that your project array is based on need and on necessity and on what's available. It's based purely and simply on political consideration. Or, conversely, where you've been tripped up, where it got bad, such as Highway No. 1 west, it's based on tragedy. I challenge you to refute those numbers.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — First, I would like to make the hon. member aware that the point I was making was that I had no input into the projects on Highway 16 as a minister, those projects were all carry-over from last year. I certainly like to take credit as a backbencher for having some influence on those decisions. I work hard. I work hard just as you people do to get things into my constituency and get things done in my constituency. I think that's natural. But I had no input as a minister into any of the construction on Highway 16. It's all carry-over from the year before.

You mentioned Highway 6. I would point out to you that we are working on 12 miles of it this year. We will be strengthening the shoulders 12 miles south of Regina. We're starting to address that problem now.

**MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Minister, I think I asked you twice last night if that was going to be done this year and you said you didn't know for sure. Now, you are saying you're going to do it. Will you tell me again tonight that you are going to do it for sure?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Don't play with words. I'm saying it's on the project array. Don't play with words.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PICKERING:** — I'm playing with what you said? You wouldn't tell me last night that you would guarantee that you would do the shoulders of Highway 6 south. Now, I'm asking you again: are you going to do it or are you not? Yes or no?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I told you last night I couldn't guarantee any of these projects. The weather, or anything may cause problems. I can't guarantee it.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I guess all you've confirmed tonight is something that we already knew. Since you have disavowed decisions that have been made by your predecessor, I guess we have to say that it was your predecessor who was that biased individual who based all his decisions on political considerations. Very few of them were based on merit, fairness and need. Since you have disavowed any responsibility for what's here, we have no alternative but to say to your predecessor, as we said many times before, that he was a poor minister, a minister who got the heck beaten out of him every time he went to treasury, a minister who, year after year after year saw the percentage of the highway budget, as a percentage of gross provincial revenues, deteriorate. He was a poor, poor minister. I said it to his face many, many times. Send him a copy of *Hansard*; he can send me a dirty letter.

If you don't start getting the percentage of the highway budget, as a percentage of gross provincial revenues, going the other way, I will say to you next year that you're a lousy minister and that your fellow ministers beat the blazes out of you when you go to treasury board for your funds. I hope that that's not going to be the case. I regret that it probably will be. And I am surprised, because I'd never heard a minister before say that the lousy, rotten job in front of us was not his fault, that it was all his predecessor's. I've never seen a minister do that before. As much as I didn't really think that your predecessor was all that good a minister (and I'm saying nothing that I didn't say to him every year), he could look after himself quite capably. He doesn't really need very many speeches from you.

I hope to goodness that you're a better minister. But, Mr. Minister, again I suggest to you that the comments that you've just made to my colleague for Bengough-Milestone indicate that this project array is just a piece of paper. It really doesn't mean a great deal, because I suppose it would bring up a question. We should pull out last year's project array and ask how much you completed of that. If you're not going to guarantee this, why don't you tell us how much you did of last year's? Why don't you ask your officials, right now, how much of the project array that was presented to this Assembly about this time a year ago is completed in percentage terms? Is it 80 per cent, 90 per cent, 100 per cent, or have you moved beyond it?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to respond, briefly at least, to the member's comments, again about my predecessor. That statement certainly isn't accurate if you measure the regard in which my predecessor is held across the province. Indeed, the people of Saskatchewan don't agree with the member. I think that when members opposite have the kind of record my predecessor has, they can start criticizing him. When you come back for 28 years to this Assembly, you will have something to say and something to criticize. But at this time I don't think you really have anything to criticize.

In 1980, we announced 453 kilometres of grading; we completed 473. We announced 677 kilometres of paving; we completed 630. We announced 137 kilometres of oil treatment, we completed 122.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, the fact is simply this: as a percentage of the total provincial budget, the expenditures allotted to highways are once again down. Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that that is partly the result of a poor job by your predecessor in battling for the funds, competing with other ministers in treasury board. But it's also an indictment of a government which pretends that it is committed to keeping people on the farms and in rural Saskatchewan. What better way is there to keep them out in rural Saskatchewan than to give them a good paved road into the main town?

A government that is committed to rural Saskatchewan, and yet year after year allows the Department of Highways to decline as a percentage of provincial revenues, is talking unadulterated hypocrisy. The number of farms has continued to decline under the NDP. Your entire rural Saskatchewan program is under indictment, and the Department of Highways merely adds to that indictment. The number of farms continues to decline. We've now got a balanced economy — the same number of farms as people on welfare. The Department of Highways continues to do the same job that it's done throughout the decade of the '70s, and that is a lousy job. I'm surprised that you, as a new minister, would beg off this problem, and pass it all on to your predecessor. Respectfully, I suggest to you that, really, you don't do things that way. You come in here and you take your lumps, as though they were yours. Every other minister does it, and I'm rather surprised that somebody with shoulders as broad as yours would attempt to dump them, even though the former minister probably deserves to have them dumped on him. I'm surprised that you would throw back the mess that he created. At least you could pretend to take the responsibility. It's the parliamentary way, and I'm very disappointed in the minister. Mr. Minister, for 10 years the Minister of Highways has failed to compete with other ministers on the treasury board, and I hope you're going to reverse that. I doubt it.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd just say to the hon. member that I'm not dumping on anyone. I indicated earlier I'm proud of my predecessor's record and I only hope that I can someday come close to matching it. I would indicate to you that the overall budget increase this year is 12 per cent, not a bad increase. And I think there are some figures here we should consider.

How do our expenditures compare with Alberta and Manitoba on a per capita basis? In Saskatchewan we spend \$202.04 per capita on highways. In rich, wealthy Alberta across the way, my neighbours there — \$211.70 — which is only marginally more per capita, Mr. Chairman. What about Conservative Manitoba? Conservative Manitoba spends \$154 per capita — a rather shameful record. Let's have a look at the number of miles of highway per thousand population: in Alberta, 61 miles per thousand population; in Manitoba, 49 miles, and in Saskatchewan, 139 miles.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the member for Thunder Creek, mentioned the sad situation of a lady from Webb who single-handedly put forth a real effort to indicate to the former minister the danger and, subsequently, had the grave misfortune of losing her son on that portion of highway.

I have a letter here that I would like to read to the Assembly that was postmarked today, March 17, to Mr. R. G. Long, Minister of Highways. It says the following:

I am writing to you about a problem that deeply concerns me and a great number of people in and around the communities of Wolseley, Sintaluta, and Indian Head.

The problem is concerning the No. 1 Highway which goes through these particular areas. I would like to see this highway continued from Qu'Appelle right on through the communities mentioned. What I refer to as continued is a double-lane, divided highway.

I have come to various conclusions as to why I think this should be done.

- (1) It is the Trans-Canada Highway, and should be given first priority.
- (2) It being a Trans-Canada Highway, it is frequently travelled by residents of Saskatchewan as well as out-of-province people who may not know this highway which can be a hazard.
- (3) It is a highway travelled frequently by semitrailers and trucks, which can be quite dangerous.
- (4) The amount of traffic this road provides for, single-lane highway with oncoming traffic doesn't provide enough room for passing.
- (5) There is a lot of slow-moving farm equipment being travelled on this highway, which also can be hazardous.
- (6) The road isn't flat and straight like most people think. It is full of a lot of dips and curves which also makes it hazardous to pass.
- (7) When signalling to turn into Sintaluta or Wolseley, there is no adequate turning lane in which you can turn when the oncoming traffic is clear. This is dangerous for the person or anyone following you at that time, and holds up traffic. The No. 1 Highway should be better equipped so you don't have to stop in the middle of it.

I feel I have given you seven good reasons, and this should be thought of getting done soon.

I have lost my brother on the stretch of highway between Indian Head and Sintaluta just recently because of these reasons. My mother was also seriously injured and is still in hospital, and I think something should be done before there are more fatalities. The rate of fatalities should tell you that this highway is in dire need of being better equipped. I don't know what a person must do to get through to you or how you evaluate if a highway needs upgrading. I hope it isn't by the number of fatalities it takes.

It is especially ironic that my brother had signed a petition to get this piece of highway divided and now he is killed on it. This also should tell you something. I fear for the other people's safety and hope no one else loses a member of their family on this highway. As you can see, I am deeply upset and want something done about this highway. Highways should be built to accommodate traffic with the intention of the safety of the people behind it. I know it would be an expensive procedure but there is not a price you can put on a person's life.

I definitely would like to see some immediate action on this. If you feel there is

no need for this highway to be divided for reasons other than money, please let me know. I would be interested to know what you honestly think. To be truthful, with the taxes we pay, I think it should be going towards its people to keep them safe. This is apparently your job. A concerned resident of Saskatchewan, Kristine Begg.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, this kind of letters always cause one concern and I assure you that, as Minister of Highways, any fatality on the highways of Saskatchewan causes me a great deal of concern. I have been in office three months and I assure you that on many occasions already I have felt a lot of concern about highway safety.

I want to make a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan and this Assembly that I will do all that I can in the province to promote safety. But I have to make some harsh decisions in terms of where roads are built and not everyone always agrees with my decisions and those made by the department. I am sure that everyone would agree that we are all working toward the same goal and that is to make highways in the province of Saskatchewan as safe as possible.

I think we have accomplished some of this, if you look at the Trans-Canada Highway. Indeed, out of the 406 miles of the Trans-Canada that are four-laned, 191 of those miles are in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't think that is a bad record for a province with a population of a million people. I think that is a good record and I certainly would like to see that improved and I think we will all agree to work toward that improvement in the future.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Minister, those are very laudable words and I don't think anybody is going to argue with you. You know where the fatalities happen and where there is potential for fatalities. Mr. Minister, it is common sense to say that the main arteries in this province should be four-laned. Probably your Yellowhead route should be four-laned from one end of the province to the other just like No. 1 should be. Probably everything that crosses these major intersections should have an overpass — if we had the funds. Why haven't we the funds? How much if life worth? Would you rather save some lives where these fatalities are occurring or would you rather own a potash mine? That's about the alternative.

I have named a location in Moose Jaw, an overpass that is not in my constituency, one that terrifies me because I am afraid it is going to kill one of my children, somebody else's children, any children. It is a ticking time bomb. Why can't we find the money to do that overpass when we can afford to buy potash mines and uranium mines? Why wasn't Highway No. 1 four-laned years ago?

We have money to buy potash mines and money to put into uranium and put, goodness knows, where else. Why isn't that Yellowhead route up north four-laned? You think about it. One of the reasons is because your predecessor, and hopefully you'll change this, didn't get in there and slug hard enough to get money to do it. It should be done. How much is a life worth? I suggest to you that a life's worth more than a potash mine. Maybe the member for Morse doesn't think so but we on this side think that lives are worth far more than potash mines. We think that safety is worth far more than running another multinational out of this province in order to bring them back through a back door. That's our assessment. When we're the government, that's what we'll do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, the member will agree that the revenues we're getting from PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) will certainly build a lot of highways. They'll twin a lot of highways in the future. I'm looking forward to bigger and better budgets for highways, to create and build safer highways for the people of Saskatchewan.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — I just have a short question and perhaps a short comment with respect to what you said about safety. I think another factor you should look into is the marking of the highways as soon as possible after they've been resurfaced or had potholes filled. Highway 32 in my constituency was resurfaced some time ago and it's still not properly marked with centre lines. The Fort Walsh Road, west of Maple Creek, was completed early last summer and we had another terrible tragedy there. We had five young people from our community, under the age of 21, killed on that unmarked highway. I found it extremely ironic that the week following that accident, the crews were out there marking the centre lines. Surely the accident was the contributing factor; I hope you take this into consideration and those lines will be put in place as soon as possible, perhaps even as a part of the resurfacing or refilling of highways. There's nothing worse than driving at night on a newly black-topped highway. It's almost impossible to see the shoulders or the centre.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Duly noted.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I have a few questions yet that I want to ask. The Manitoba government is twinning the Trans-Canada, portions of the Trans-Canada, and they're doing it without federal aid. I wonder how the minister could explain the policy adopted by the Manitoba government? Mr. Minister, the fact of the matter is that we're supposed to have the buoyant economy here in Saskatchewan, not Manitoba. You talk about miles of highway or kilometres of highway per capita. You want to keep in mind there are 2 million people in Alberta and a great portion of Manitoba is covered with lakes. Maybe you'd be better off to do a bridge count over there.

The member for Turtleford, I see in a motion on the blues, is asking for federal government aid (it's item no. 5, resolution no. 7). Interestingly, he's commending the Government of Canada. You seem to have some agreement there on that particular aspect of federal government assistance. And yet you're unable to get the federal government to give you a hand with some double-laning of the Trans-Canada. I should think that possibly, if your members were sincere in supporting your apparent policy, or at least the one that you claim, they would not be putting motions on the order paper commending the government. Mind you, I can understand that at this time — Liberals and NDPs, I should think they would want to be criticizing the federal government for not giving you some financial assistance so that you can get on with the double-laning. So, I wonder, Mr. Minister, in light of that particular fact and the comments from the member for Turtleford, through his motion that he has in the blues, what response would you have?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, I'd just like to point out to the hon. member that Manitoba, in total, has 260 miles of four-lane highway throughout the province, as compared with our 389 miles of four-lane. So we are well ahead of Manitoba in terms of highway construction. I would point out to you that none of the four-laning that we've done in Saskatchewan as yet has received federal aid. I think, considering the fact that we are considerably ahead of Manitoba in four-laning, that we are quite justified, and that



Manitoba would support us. I'm sure the Manitoba Minister of Highways, Mr. Orchard, would support us in our demands to the federal government for more moneys to go toward the four-laning of highways, such as the Yellowhead and No. 1.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I want, at this time, to ask the minister if he could give me the average cost per kilometre of oil treatment of highways. I will clarify that for your staff. They classify their highway types under oil treatment, asphalt mat on subgrade, pavement B and pavement A, and under pavement A, type 1 and type 2. I would like your officials to provide for me an update of the average cost per kilometre of those various grades of highway.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Okay, I'll give this information to the hon. member. There are two pavement A's, one with the blacktop at \$139,400 per kilometre and the second with the double-seal and sealed shoulders at \$70,400 per kilometre.

The pavement B is \$54,800 per kilometre. The AMOS (asphalt mat on subgrade) is \$29,000 per kilometre and the oil surface is \$10,000 per kilometre.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, do those figures include grading and surfacing?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — No, that's just the surfacing.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I wonder, could you provide, as well, the grading costs?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The pavement A, I mentioned earlier is \$116,200. The second pavement A is \$87,000 per kilometre. The pavement B road is \$79,000 per kilometre. The AMOS road-grading costs are \$67,500 per kilometre and the oil treatment is \$67,500.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — All right, thank you, Mr. Minister. I want to ask a question with regard to the projected costs of twinning the Trans-Canada from Qu'Appelle to the Manitoba border, broken down into two parts. I would like to know (this may take some time) if your officials can't provide that information fairly quickly, then I would appreciate your commitment to this committee that it would be forwarded to me, the projected cost of twinning the Trans-Canada from Qu'Appelle to Broadview (which is approximately 88 kilometres) and the second part from Broadview to the Manitoba border (which is approximately 116 kilometres).

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The total cost is \$219,000 per kilometre for the construction of one lane, which is what we would be doing. We can supply you with the complete figures; we would have to take a little time to put them together, but we can get them for you.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I would ask that you do that, and I would expect that comment is your assurance that you will provide that information for me. I would estimate, approximately, that the cost would run in the neighbourhood of about \$46.5 million. The interesting thing here is that, if you had that particular twinning on your project array, that \$46.5 million, it would bring your budget (the total budget, of course, is capital expenditure) to approximately 9.5 per cent.

Now, the reason I raise that particular subject is because your expenditures have been reduced from approximately 7.8 to 7.4 per cent, so you are in a declining position in

terms of your highway expenditures as a percentage of the total government budgetary expenditures that are projected. If you had had that on your project array, it would have put your per cent of the total budget back on target where it should have been, and in fact where it was back in 1976, '77, '78, and I give you those figures by memory. Do you not agree that that would have been a far more reasonable assessment of your highway project than what we have here in your project array at this time?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I think our government has to set its priorities in terms of the budget. I think a 12 per cent increase this year for highways was a fair enough increase. I think the Department of Highways, in many ways over the years, has proved to be a very efficient operation, and I think we can pick up much of this in terms of efficiency. I have confidence in the road construction industry in Saskatchewan. I'm sure they'll do a good job for us and we'll get the best value we can for our dollar.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Minister, we are making some very valid points from this side of the House, and we have since we undertook to cross-examine the estimates from the minister's department. If we look at the figures from 1975 (and this is the Department of Highway's expenditures as a percentage of the total budgetary expenditures), they've gone: 1975, 9.9 per cent; 1976, 9.28 per cent; 1977, 8.9 per cent; 1978, 8.62 per cent; 1979, 9.27 per cent; 1980, 7.7 per cent; 1981 (1981-82), 7.4 per cent.

My suggestion was that if you continue on with the twinning, as the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and I have been asking, that would have put your figure back up to approximately 9.5 per cent, given my estimate on twinning of the Trans-Canada from Qu'Appelle to the Manitoba border. Mr. Minister, even at that, it would be just in excess of what your government has invested in land bank, which is only about one-third of what the value of land bank today is to the Government of Saskatchewan, given the increase in its value due to inflation, the demand for land, and other factors.

So, what I'm saying here, very simply, is that your priorities are in land acquisition, and making people like our farmers in this province tenants on their own land. You talk about priorities. Your priorities are not right, and you'd better talk to the Minister of Agriculture, and tell him that money is just in the land bank program. The Department of Highways has to have more money so we can stop this unnecessary loss of life — if we can accept your statement that you are safety conscious as a minister. Those are the figures and they are accurate. You do not have your priorities straight. I don't need to even give you an opportunity to reply to that, because you can't. You haven't been able to reply to the question since we began.

Now, I want to know if you agree or disagree with the minister responsible for SGI. He says, Mr. Minister, that there was an increase in automobile accidents. Now, if we accept that the minister responsible for SGI is right, is that because there are too many winding and twisting roads, you're not getting the amount of money into your department that you should be, and that you don't have your priorities and your policies straight in terms of road improvement?

Or, Mr. Minister, (now here's the other side of the coin) do you agree with me when I say that the minister responsible for SGI is not using accurate figures to reflect the automobile accident rate? If we take a look at the police records, we find that in the last year the accident rate was down. So, either you're agreeing with the minister responsible for SGI, which is a damnation of your own department, or you're going to agree with me that he was using false figures.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hocus-pocus figures.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — He's using hocus-pocus figures — that's a good expression — to mislead the people of Saskatchewan into accepting that SGI rates were up. He used figures from the last three years to lead the people of Saskatchewan to believe that the accident rate was up, when in fact, Mr. Minister, it was down last year. Now, who do you agree with?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Mr. Chairman, the accident rate on Saskatchewan highways has been dropping continuously over the years. I think the member has to agree that the worst accident record that we have in the province is in the urban streets. And I don't disagree with the minister in charge of SGI. He is correct in his figures. The greatest number of accidents in Saskatchewan — indeed, 70 per cent of the accidents — are in urban streets, and really have nothing to do with the Department of Highways. Our record is a good one. The accident rate has been dropping yearly on the highways of Saskatchewan.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I thank you, Mr. Minister. I appreciate your comments. I don't want to reply to that any further. I just want to go to *Hansard* and check the record, because that's exactly the answer I was looking for.

Now, Mr. Minister, I have one further question before I wind things up — two, actually.

You have been promoting your seat belt legislation, saying that it's reducing the numbers of fatalities, and in light of those remarks coming from the department, I want to ask you this: if 100 people who were involved in an accident on the one side were not wearing seat belts, and another 100 people who were involved in an accident on this side were not wearing their seat belts, and both sets of 100 were fatal accidents, how many more would have survived who were wearing their seat belts? Do you have an accurate figure? Do you have a figure that's within 10 per cent?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — We'll have to get the member his answer later. The point I would like to make now is that our calculations are that out of the 264 people killed on Saskatchewan highways this past year, we estimate (and I think accurately) 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the fatalities were not wearing seat belts. We suggest that 100 or those 264 people would be alive had they been wearing seat belts.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Minister, I asked the question for a very good reason, and the reason is very simple. You use these statistics and these figures that you bandy around from time to time to support the seat belt legislation. Quite frankly, as a member of the legislature, I don't think you have to use any of those kinds of statistics to support seat belt legislation. The best way to advocate the use of seat belts (and I do this all the time when I get people who argue that they don't like wearing them; they don't want to wear them and they don't think they are any good) is to ask them, "Did you ever see a race car driver who didn't wear one?"

I don't have to buy an ad on TV. That's pretty simple. Now, I have heard comments that 75 per cent to 80 per cent of people involved in a fatal accident would have survived if they had their seat belt on. If you had used that figure then 212 of those 264 or 265 people would have survived, not 100. But that's neither here nor there, and I don't think there is any point in pursuing that particular line of questioning. I just want to ask you department and get a commitment from you to provide the most up-to-date, accurate

percentages available and how you arrived at those percentages as to the per cent decrease in fatalities and injuries if one is wearing a seat belt as opposed to not wearing a seat belt. Can I have Mr. Minister's commitment on that? All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister has agreed to that request.

One issue that I want to get some assurance from you on is Highway 48. I expressed all my concerns about Highway 48 and that it wasn't being brought up to the standards it should be. It's long, long overdue. I want to ask if you will have members of your department, as soon as possible (and I gave you the criteria for that), within the next two months, meet with the people who are so affected by the lack of improvements to Highway 48. That includes people in Kipling, Kennedy, Fairlight, and Maryfield, right through to the border and right up to Glenavon in the Indian Head-Wolseley riding. I'm sure the member for Indian Head-Wolseley concurs with me on that. Can I have some assurances, Mr. Minister, that you will have your department go out there and explain to them why No. 48 was not put on your project array and why it is not slated for some improvements? I would very much appreciate the assurance tonight that you could do that.

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I indicated to the member that we are constructing a portion of No. 48 this year. My department is prepared to meet with the people of Saskatchewan at any time. There shouldn't be any problem in arranging those kinds of meetings.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — All right, I will take that, at least, as a form of assurance. I can assure you that I will be very adamant in my support for the people out there in getting such a meeting so that they can have some justification made by your department officials.

In concluding, I set out some time ago to examine your estimates with the assistance of my colleagues, and I have to commend them for the work they have done in assisting me in these departmental expenditures. I would thank your officials, Mr. Minister, for the work they have done in assisting you in providing at least some of the answers. I realize, as I said at the outset, that it would be difficult for them to provide answers to the kinds of questions we would be asking. Nonetheless, I want to say, in a very general way, that I compliment the department staff at this time, because I know they do a lot of work and they're not involved in the political field. They are employees of your department, and I should think that they are there as professional employees to fulfill the responsibility of the Department of Highways. I know they are and so I wanted to pass those comments on.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I am, needless to say, very disappointed in the fact that your department has only a 12 per cent increase in expenditures. I suggest to you that's only going to cover inflation and in all probability you will be in a shortfall position given the fact that your contracts won't come due for another six, seven or eight months. I'm concerned about that.

I'm also concerned, Mr. Minister, that your department officials were not able to substantiate the comments you made in the Assembly regarding the political patronage which we had charged you with, and which you had tried to rebut. I think that that was an unfortunate situation for you, as a new minister, coming into the estimates. I know you were looking to try to get through them without any discredit and it was difficult because you do not have the figures to substantiate any kind of argument.

We have charged that you have been political to quite an extent. I can appreciate your comments that you have not been. But the figures don't lie. Of course, we've gone

through all mine; they are on record. They are available. I don't doubt there could be a few very minor mathematical errors in those statistics. What it results in is a damnation on your department that there is such political patronage taking place. I would go on to say (with a lot of regret, Mr. Minister) that this brochure which is your project array should in all probability have been paid for by the New Democratic Party and not the Government of Saskatchewan, because I don't see it as being anything other than an election brochure, given your comments tonight in reply to the members on this side of the House.

In light of the comments from you, Mr. Minister, in response to this side of the House, the highways that are itemized here are not necessarily going to be done in 1981-82. So, what we have here, quite frankly, are paper roads and false promises. It is an election brochure that should have been paid for by the New Democratic Party and not the people of Saskatchewan. I find that very unfortunate. It goes without saying that your government has placed you, Mr. Minister, in a very difficult position and for that I don't make any apologies for the government. I do have a lot of sympathy for you; I think this is a very unfortunate thing for a government and a party to have done to a new minister who comes in with such good intentions. Clearly, our cross-examination of the estimates shows that there was absolutely no substantiation whatsoever of your proposed Department of Highways budget and, Mr. Chairman, those are my final comments. I don't know what else we could say because it would be further damnation if we did.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just one question to make sure that I understood the minister earlier. You say that when the tenders come in you don't do the accepting on highways. Is that also the same now for road construction equipment (graders and so forth)? Are you still making the decision on those? Just so I know if the question has to go to your department or to revenue?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Revenue and supply makes the final awards.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Do you write the specs? If I want to argue about the specs, whom do I discuss it with, you or revenue? Mr. Minister, one comment on your specs. If you go through the specs you have been writing the past few years carefully enough, it is interesting to note that you are designating the type of equipment you want within the specs. The way you write your minimum specs, only certain pieces of equipment can fit. If you take a look at your tender procedure and the way the contracts have been awarded, it has proven itself out over the years. I think that is totally wrong. Your specs should be written in such a way that all those who make equipment have a chance to tender.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 14 inclusive agreed.

### **Item 15**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I have one question here. I gave one of your department officials notice earlier this evening that I would ask about a dangerous intersection at Hague. I spoke to Mr. Bird, who is the engineer up in that area, suggesting the problem. I should comment here that he has been very helpful in two other cases along this line and we have cured them. Are you planning this year to cure the problem with Hague? Have you an answer for me?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — Well, the problem has been referred by Mr. Bird to the engineering people in Regina and we'll make a decision in due course.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Will I have it before the House prorogues, say by the end of May?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — I'll make every effort, but I can't promise that.

Item 15 agreed.

Items 16 to 21 inclusive agreed.

Vote 16 agreed.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOWS**

### **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Capital Expenditure — Vote 17**

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

#### **Item 3**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, there is a drop here. I assume that's because you're into no construction at airports. Is that correct? Have you made any agreement with the federal government, or are you prepared yourself to go ahead with the construction at Estevan for a decent airport, so that we can get proper service in that community?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — The federal government has cut all its programs for airport assistance, so we haven't an agreement.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Are you prepared to start a program to make sure that Estevan gets the services it requires for an airport, which is long overdue?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — It is a little premature to make a decision on it.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I have one other question. Are there any other small airport facilities that you were looking to improve? If there are, could you forward us a list of them?

**HON. MR. LONG:** — We have our regular airport assistance program. We will be making that program available to small airports across the province. I can't give you a list. In fact I am not even sure who has applied, or if they have applied; we can send you a copy.

Item 3 agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

## **HERITAGE FUND**

### **BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCES DIVISION)**

#### **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

**Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 17**

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOWS (SUPPLEMENTARY)**

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 16**

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 16 agreed.

**Capital Expenditure — Vote 17**

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

**HERITAGE FUND**

**BUDGETARY EXPENDITURES (RESOURCES DIVISION — SUPPLEMENTARY)**

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

**Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 17**

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 17 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:24 p.m.