

Friday, March 19, 1976

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. B. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the House this afternoon a group of 26 Grade Five and Six students from Walker School in my constituency. They are accompanied by C.B. Wilson, their teacher, this afternoon who also happens to be my next door neighbor. I think it is really great, Mr. Speaker, that young people take such an interest in public affairs because I think that all of us realize that in our type of democracy that it depends on the interest of and the knowledge of the citizens and it is really good to see young people taking an active interest in the political process at such an early age.

I welcome them and I am sure all Members do also.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO LUMSDEN CUBS

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to the Members of the Assembly and to yourself a group of Cubs from the Lumsden Cub Pack. They are accompanied by Reg Rempel, Gord Sutcliffe and Doug Smith. I think that, if I can comment to the Members, this is a very, very active Cub Pack in the community of Lumsden and certainly reflects the community in its participation and its activities.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome them to the Assembly and wish them all a very entertaining and interesting afternoon, and I hope, a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST — MR. CLIFF McISAAC

MR. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a guest to the House and my Member of Parliament, the Hon. Cliff McIsaac. He is no stranger to this House, we are pleased to see you back, Cliff.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

C.F. Industries Paying Expenses of Trip to Florida

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I wonder if I might address

a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) who I understand is the House Leader today. Does the Government consider it appropriate that the Premier and Mr. Dombowsky and the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation (Mr. Cowley) should now be travelling at the expense of C.F. Industries, a company with whom they are negotiating, to have C.F. Industries paying for what can't be described by any way other than a holiday junket to Florida? And would the Minister also indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the Member is debating the issue now rather than asking the question. If you could get to the point of the question.

MR. MERCHANT: — I am trying to say, could the Minister also indicate who else went on this trip, did Don Ching, for instance go on the trip, did the whole eight or nine who are in Chicago supposedly negotiating, go on the trip to Florida?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Premier is meeting with C.F. Industries in Chicago. All that I know is what I have heard in the news that he has been invited to visit the company's facilities in Florida. I don't see anything inappropriate about it, Mr. Speaker, and whether there are eight or nine or twenty-one people on that aircraft I have no idea. Perhaps it would be nice to be in Florida, but the weather conditions are pretty nice in Saskatchewan as well.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would tell the House who is paying for the trip, whether C.F. Industries are paying for the trip and whether the Government is aware of whether these eight or nine or three or four, whatever it is, are travelling on C.F. Industries' plane and whether they are travelling at the expense of the people with whom they are supposed to be negotiating?

MR. SMISHEK: — All that I am aware of is that they were invited to visit their plant in Florida. I can only presume that it was at the expense of the company but I do not know, I can't answer that question specifically. Perhaps when the Premier returns the Hon. Member may wish to direct that question to the Premier.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy). In view of the denial reported in today's Leader-Post of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities having requested the Government to provide for the weight limit policy the Minister announced on Tuesday, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs would direct the attention of the House to the portion of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities' brief that he relied on in indicating that that was at their request, that contains their request for that policy?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I indicated to the Assembly the other day that I would be providing the brief presented to the Government on behalf of SARM and I will also provide for the Hon. Member the policy booklet for the specific figures relating to load limits which we announced our intent to bring into force.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Does the Minister continue to tell Members of the House that the specific policy was initiated at the request of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Does the Minister then have any comment upon the denial by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities that it did in fact request the policy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — I will have an opportunity from time to time to discuss this with SARM. I will certainly not take the word of the press with respect to the position of SARM. I will await to meet with Mr. Mitchell and his directors to discuss any position that they will have. I do know that their policy booklet is very clear and I do know that they made a request to us by brief to implement a load limit on the municipal system.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Did the request made to the Minister by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities not specifically request that discretion be left in the municipalities to have load limits above the limits he mentioned?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I can't recall the brief in my mind that clearly but certainly as we develop the policy into specific form we can certainly take that into consideration. But as we view the presentation to us, and I might say as we developed the policy following our November meeting and discussed it with them the kind of specific limits that should be within the policy, they then presented to me the policy booklet, which I will table for the Members of the Legislature.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, when will the Minister table the documents. I requested they be tabled last Wednesday.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am sorry I intended to table them today, they are in my office. In returning from the convention facilities at the Hotel I neglected to go up and get them. I will go up and get them and have them tabled.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that many of Saskatchewan rural communities are served by large semi-trailers that have to drive on municipal roads?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will not permit further supplementaries. Next question.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a further supplementary if I may to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — Not on that issue. No.

Safety Values of Headlight System

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). Is the Minister acquainted with the safety values of the halogen headlight system?

MR. KRAMER: — Pardon?

MR. HAM: — Are you aware of the safety advantage of the halogen headlight system?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I don't regard that to be a matter of urgent public concern. At least from the phrasing of the question I am not impressed with its urgency.

Municipal Road Load Limits

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Perhaps the question may sound like a supplementary but in fact it is a question. If the SARM were to withdraw or to suggest to the Government that the load limits that have been suggested as Government policy were . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The question is hypothetical. Next question.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, in enacting proposed load limits that you have mentioned, will this be a separate piece of legislation or will this be an Order in Council?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The information that we have been provided from our advisors from the Attorney General's Department, it will be handled by regulation, by Order in Council.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the Minister's remarks to SARM he indicated that a system of permits would be in the

offing for gravel trucks, livestock trailers, etc. Would the permits referred to be available to hopper bottom grain trailers?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I can't answer specifically because I can only respond in a very general way, that obviously as I indicated to SARM and to the House last Wednesday that there are administrative problems. We know that, SARM knows that, and we will want to sit down together to work through the administrative problems on how permits are handled, whether they be handled through the Highway Traffic Board, through Department of Highways or jointly with the municipalities themselves. We don't have that sorted out as yet.

Annual Statement

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

The Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation has recently said, publicly, that the Saskatchewan people have the right to ask for and to receive an annual statement from people with whom they do business. Now this is a major statement of government policy. I should like to know from the Minister when that policy position was made and whether we will get further public statements as to the ramifications to that particular policy.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member has misinterpreted what the Minister responsible for Saskatchewan Potash Corporation has said. I believe that he has said that the Government representing the people, who in fact then is responsible for the administration of that resource, or if you want to use some other resources, have the right to see the books of the company which may be involved in extracting that resource. I think there is a distinct difference between the companies passing that information on to the governments in the best interests of the people and providing that information to all of the people in the province.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary, are you then saying that the statement made by the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation is either inaccurate or untrue?

MR. MESSER: — I am saying that my interpretation of the statement made by the Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation are to be interpreted to mean that the Government has the right to see those books, not necessarily every individual in the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. LANE: — By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The statement was not restricted to potash or mineral exploration and is it the Government's intention to use this policy that has been stated to be able to check into any company whether they are supplying service, products of any nature, any company dealing with the Government, any company that does business with the Government, is it the Government's intention to use this

power, as so stated, to be able to investigate their books?

MR. MESSER: — I think the question is hypothetical. Certainly the situation that the Government is confronted with at any particular time would bring about the decision as to whether or not that kind of action should be taken and whether it is within rights of the Provincial Government to so undertake it.

Vacant Floors in Avord Towers

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services.

Is it correct that recently almost four floors of Avord Towers that were rented by the Department of Education have come free and are now vacant at a cost of more than \$300 a day? How long will it be before those floors are filled and what department is going to move in to occupy the floors of wasted space in the Avord Towers? Would you also indicate what the cost per square foot is for the building into which the Department of Education has moved, the new building which was constructed on College?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Government Services): — I am extremely flattered, Mr. Speaker, that the Member would believe that I would have that kind of information on my fingertips. I will take it as notice, but surely the Hon. Member will be aware that that is rather delightfully technical information. I am sure that you wouldn't expect that I would have that kind of information with me.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. SNYDER: — I will take it as notice and I will provide the information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Minister is putting the point that I probably should have put.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering whether the four floors were vacant

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Next question.

Weigh Scale Checking

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question on highway traffic and I wonder if I might address it to the Minister of Highways.

I think many people in the area where there is a weigh scale sometimes feel they are discriminated against as far as tests on vehicles, purple gas. And I wonder if there is any set pattern, whether communities are checked other than a point like Estevan where there is a weigh scale. Are they checked as often or are these farmers really checked more often than other places?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — The jurisdiction of weigh scales is under my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, formerly under the Attorney General, however, there is absolutely no selection of areas. They have been placed there years ago at strategic places to check on loads. I don't think we have placed new ones in the last three or four years. I think, frankly, they are not as useful as many people may believe. I believe the portable weigh scale is something that our enforcement people will have to use in order to be able to challenge weights anywhere in the province. That is what I would recommend.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I hope the supplementary is more pointed than the question was. Would the Member go ahead with the supplementary.

MR. LARTER: — I will leave it, Mr. Speaker.

Key Money Being Charged by Landlords

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

In light of the recent television program on our rental program in Saskatchewan, is the Minister of Consumer Affairs aware that key money is being charged by landlords to prospective tenants?

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — I am not aware that any key money is being charged. I say to all people of Saskatchewan not only to people in the House, if you know of any specific instances of it tell or pass on the information to the Rentalsman and it will be investigated. That is what the office is there for.

MR. STODALKA: — In response to your answer, does this mean you have received no complaints?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, that is right.

Spartan Acres Cattle Guarantee

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Could you tell me how much SEDCO lost on the Spartan Acres cattle guarantee?

MR. MESSER: — I would suggest that that is a matter that can be more appropriately asked in Crown Corporations.

Rent Control Legislation

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to

direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs again dealing with the rentalsman and rent control legislation.

It is my understanding, Mr. Minister, that the offices of the rentalsman have literally been flooded with, not only inquiries from tenants, but with appeals from landlords to have their rental adjusted or increased beyond the guidelines. Would the Minister tell me when he expects all of these appeals will be dealt with, as an approximate length of time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Our goal is to have the applications dealt with by the end of April, when the refunds must be made.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that would be your goal but realistically speaking when do you expect to have the appeals dealt with.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — By April 30, 1976.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question again, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding as well from advice that I have received from landlords who have had their appeals dealt with that the rentalsman is taking the position on advice from the Government or from your office, that a proper return on an investment for a landlord in matters of this nature, is six per cent. Would you confirm whether or not that is the instruction the rentalsman has?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I could say, no, that is not right, but I will provide you with a somewhat more complete answer.

The return which we allow them to put on their documents for the purpose of asking for an increase is eight per cent, not six per cent. But it should be noted that that is a minimum. If, within the rental control legislation they are realizing a higher rate of return than eight per cent, and many of them are, of course, they can keep that. All we are saying is that as a minimum we won't see you get less than eight per cent, but if through efficient operations or whatever you get more than eight per cent that is fine.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister in a position to tell me whether any landlords who have made appeals have been granted more than eight per cent as a return?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am not in a position to tell you what disposition has been made of any applications. Sorry.

MR. MALONE: — Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister not aware that bank interest at this time pays far more than eight per cent and that anybody with an investment like

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! That is a comment. The Member for Nipawin. Has the Member for Nipawin got a question?

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, it is a new question.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Wascana.

Direct Assistance to Renter's Program

MR. MERCHANT: — I wonder if he would indicate the pledges made in 'New Deal '75' and in the program that was put out under his name as one of the Regina candidates, to introduce a direct assistance to renter's program, whether that is being shelved as a pledge to the people of this province or whether the rental control was to replace direct assistance to landlords which was promised in the campaign?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I recall in the last Legislature, when I was an executive assistant and not a Member, we went around this hoop as well, the Opposition asking the Government, when are you going to keep your promises. I say to the Member for Regina Wascana that that promise will be kept within the term of this Government whether it be three, four or whatever years. But it has not been shelved, it has simply not been kept at this point in time. But it will be kept before the next election.

Does Government Have Any Foreign Currencies

MR. R.L. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Does the Government of Saskatchewan have any foreign currencies of any substance through its Treasury Board or through any other agency?

MR. SMISHEK: — I am not quite clear on the question of any loans that we have from other countries.

MR. COLLVER: — I will rephrase it then. Are there any foreign currency deposits, does the Government of Saskatchewan have any deposits of foreign currencies either here or overseas in the accounts of its Treasury branches or of any other accounts that the Government has?

MR. SMISHEK: — Not that I am aware of.

Collisions With Animals on Highways at Night

MR. D. HAM (Swift Current): — A question again to the Minister of Highways rephrased. In light of the numerous collisions at night with domestic animals and wild life, has the Government of Saskatchewan considered a study or have they studied the use of halogen head lamps?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, the night accidents are something that concern all of us. I think the Member's question is sort of in two parts. One concerning game, and one concerning general collision. Both of them can be serious. Now halogen lights are a recommendation, the use of halogen lights are a recommendation of the Legislative Safety Committee. They did recommend that we

proceed to introduce halogen lights by law, if I remember correctly. However, there are some misgivings, because in the United States, we are informed, that halogen lights are now outlawed in 48 states of the USA where they have been introduced some time ago.

Regarding game, in fact, we introduced, when I was Minister of Natural Resources, reflectors in certain areas where there were deer crossings, high deer populations, we find that there has been a real reduction in the accidents caused by traffic collisions with game in those areas where the deer mirrors have been installed.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister could make it just a little bit clearer to me. You indicated the Safety Committee recommended the use of halogen headlamps but they are not being used now. What is the reason why?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, we have some serious doubts as to their value. The whole package of safety will be discussed later on in the session during legislation.

Semi-Trailer Units on Municipal Roads

MR. W.H. STODALKA: — A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the Minister aware that many rural communities in Saskatchewan are serviced by large semi-trailer units that travel on rural roads and the municipal roads in the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! That question doesn't convey to me an urgent need to have an answer.

Mandatory Requirement of Land Bank Act

MR. S. CAMERON: — Question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the mandatory requirement of the Land Bank Act that the appeal committee under that Act only be established after consultation with the advisory council, can the Minister tell us whether or not there was prior consultation with the advisory council before the appeal committee was appointed?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Very obviously the Member would know that there was not consultation with the advisory committee because no advisory committee was appointed. However, an advisory committee is now in the stages of being appointed and will soon be appointed.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How could you then appoint the appeal committee because the Land Bank Act makes it specific that it is mandatory you consult in advance with the advisory committee. How in those circumstances could the appeal committee have been appointed?

MR. KAEDING: — Well, I think the fact was that there was an urgency to get an appeal board appointed. It would have been rather

ridiculous for us not to appoint the appeal board if the council hadn't been appointed at that time. We have now taken the decision to appoint the council. And certainly any further recommendations will be put through the council.

MR. CAMERON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Land Bank Act says the appeal committee can be appointed only after consultation with the advisory council. It goes on to say that the advisory council shall be appointed, mandatory language. I ask the Minister why it has taken this length of time to appoint the advisory council and is that not a blatant breach of the law?

MR. KAEDING: — I don't think it is a blatant breach of the law. I think there is nothing in the Act that says it has to be appointed immediately. I think that we are now taking the action which is required.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Qu'Appelle.

MR. CAMERON: — I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am not going to allow a further supplementary.

Farm Fuel Rebate

MR. J.G. LANE: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the announced policy of the Government on the maximum \$200 farm fuel rebate. Has the Government had representations from either farmers or farm organizations expressing deep concern about the policy because the individuals most heavily penalized by the Government's policy are the small, mixed farmers who have a heavy or high fuel usage all year around and not seasonally. Has the Minister had any representations along those lines because of that specific problem?

MR. KAEDING: — No, I have not.

MR. LANE: — Are you saying you have had no discussions with any farm organizations with regard to that specific problem and is the Government considering changing its policy to take into account small, mixed farmers who are hampered or hurt because of the restricted amount of the rebate?

MR. KAEDING: — No, we've not had any representations from any farm organizations in this regard. I don't think it is our intention to change the policy. I think we stated at the time that very few except the larger farmers would be affected and our statistics are proving that to be a fact. That only about 17 per cent of the farmers who applied for rebates would have got more than the maximum. In many cases those are not people in the livestock industry but they are large grain farmers.

Announcement Re Public Address System

MR. SPEAKER: — Before I call Orders of the

Day, I will ask Members to take note about something I have to say about the public address system in this House.

I would advise all Members to keep their hands off the microphones and to not blow in the microphones. This is for a very good reason. The microphones are set and can be easily damaged if someone takes hold of them and attempts to twist or turn them. There are no implications on anyone at this time because of my comments here. I just want to avoid the possibility of Members not having mikes at their desks because of being broken and not being able to replace them.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-In-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. D. G. Banda (Redberry) for an Address-in-Reply.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I am not Mr. Merchant, fortunately. I am pleased to enter this debate on the Throne Speech. I look upon this Throne Speech and I wonder where it is missing and where it should be complimented.

I will start with a topic that I enjoy discussing, labor. I am glad the Minister of Labour is in this House today. First of all there is nothing mentioned in the Throne Speech about labor. I am wondering, for in the past labor in this province has gotten much abuse from many sectors of the economy. I note that in the past years in labor legislation it seems to me that the Government has taken one side and the former government took the other side. It seems that somebody has forgotten that government is a referee and not a player. If any of you have had any thing to do with a sport at all, you will notice the referee who does not follow the rule book and does not referee fairly and justly to all, that the game is not worthwhile for the spectator.

What has happened in this province is that with labor the Government has been very biased. Be it an NDP Government or be it a Liberal Government. It is time that the Government should be taking its proper place in the labor field and being a referee and not a player. It is time that labor and management work together for the betterment of this province. It is not up to this House or any other House to turn labor against management and vice versa.

I approve our new control program but I wonder why the Government is only looking after government employees. Are they trying to protect themselves by saying, look at it, guys, that is all we can give you. We are going to be nice guys but if you put up a big stink, make a large noise, we will let you have more. Then is that why they won't turn it over to the Federal Government? I wonder.

I notice also in the Speech that Canada's economy is down and Saskatchewan's now exceeds \$6 billion. I wonder who is taking credit for that?

AN HON. MEMBER: — We are.

MR. KATZMAN: — I am glad to hear the Minister

across the way say, we are. I thought the credit went to the agricultural people. I am glad to say that in this province today because of a buoyant wheat market that we have a buoyant economy. But I do not think this Government is totally deserving the credit. I think the farmer deserves the credit for that.

Gentlemen, a big industry in my area is the dairy industry. Presently, the dairies are being told they are overproducing again but we have got more quotas to sell and we need you to make larger operations. We are putting all our charges to you up higher and costs will be higher. Your income will be less though. I am concerned with that. I am concerned because I remember several years ago the government got involved and said, gentlemen, we will give you up to \$6,000 low interest rate to buy female stock. We developed a glut of poor quality cattle in this province and today we are feeling the effects of it. Government interference caused that. Similar to a gentleman who started something in the province where instead of planting wheat and oats we were told to plant hay. We are now short and the world is suffering because we don't have the grain.

We hear a lot today . . . I can wait as long as you wish to talk gentlemen. I am not in that big of a hurry.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech shows many Bills that we will see before this House. Some of them I agree with, some of them I am opposed to. With that I will make my comments as we see each Bill placed before the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing in this province, two major industries being attacked by this Government, one of them has pulled out of the province and the effects are showing in Swift Current and Estevan. One of them today is feeling the pinch as we hear they are about to take it over, government control of it. All kinds of challenges are set forth. Mr. Speaker, history will tell and only history will tell if these were good moves or bad moves by this Government. In my opinion they are very bad moves. The same as we saw moved in the House the other day with reference to something else that was lacking in the Throne Speech about our super grids. Nothing is laid out and therefore deserves no comment at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this Throne Speech is lacking in many areas especially in the labor field and therefore I cannot support the motion.

MR. B. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't really planning on entering this debate because it was my view that we had an understanding by which it would only last about 15 or 20 minutes and I just didn't feel that there would be enough time for me to get into a speech in that time that was allocated for the Throne Speech for this year. But because an arrangement was broken, we are into a full scale debate for which we really weren't prepared to any large extent. I want to mention to the Tory Party in that context that having broken that agreement, they have really lost a lot of confidence within this Legislature and I believe that if they continue that sort of conduct in the next four years that Party will virtually disintegrate right before our eyes. Mind you I don't wish that on them, because I would like to see the Tories around in 1979. Not too well, limping a little bit, but around. Perhaps the Liberals won't agree with me in

that context, but I certainly would like to see you around.

I want to say just a few words about potash. And, you know, we sat for a long time, we sat for a long time in the previous session. We sat for a long time and in retrospect I'm wondering why and I'm sure the people of this province are wondering why we sat for a long time.

They are wondering why because they know that valuable tax money was being spent. Not because of constructive criticism but because of the tactics of obstruction. People are saying no. This type of behavior on the part of the Liberal Party has some serious implications about the functioning and the role of this Legislature. In those long weeks we saw a filibuster which this House has never seen before. And you know it is amazing how the Liberal Opposition never learns, they never, never, never learn. They just can't recognize a good thing when they see one. It is mainly for this reason, Mr. Speaker, it is mainly for this reason that they have only formed the government seven years in the last 32 years in this province. And those seven years were years that the people of Saskatchewan will not easily forget. Seven years characterized by oppressive labor legislation, deterrent fees, downgrading of the Department of Industry and Commerce and Co-operatives, business failures all over and a loss of population.

You know, it is very interesting to note that the Members opposite like to disassociate themselves with those years of 1964 to 1971.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Just like in the Bible.

MR. DYCK: — That's right. Those Liberals across the way want to disassociate themselves completely from those seven years of Liberal administration from 1964 - 1971. But it isn't going to be that easy, because it is on their records and we don't have before us a new breed of Liberals. We have before us the same old Liberals with the same old philosophy just some different faces. But the people of Saskatchewan will remember, they won't forget.

Liberals always exercise bad judgment. For example, our Crown corporations in this province are doing well in my view. Saskatchewan Government Insurance, in my opinion is the best insurance company in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — This was fought by the Liberals. They just don't recognize a good thing. Hospitalization was fought in 1947 by the Liberals.

Sask Power is one of the best power corporations in Canada and in the early 1950s the CCF Government promised to bring power to every farm in the province. The Liberals said it couldn't be done but it was done. One Member opposite who isn't in her seat, the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) said that one worker in the private sector is equal to ten workers in the public sector. I am very sure the people in Sask Power would be interested in that remark and would be interested in who said it.

It always amazes me how people think that just because a corporation is privately owned that it is going to be efficient, and just because a corporation is publicly owned it is going to be inefficient. Well, Bell Canada is a privately owned corporation and I'll tell you that doesn't mean that they are more efficient than Sask Tel. As a matter of fact I would take Sask Tel over Bell Canada any day of the week in terms of their rates and their services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — It is believed that somehow the private insurance companies are more efficient than public insurance. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would take Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office with their rates and service over any private insurance company across this country. And remember IPSCO the fight the Liberals put up over that a few years ago. I believe that at that time there was about \$12 million involved. The Liberals fought our involvement in IPSCO. Well, IPSCO is alive and well and expanding today.

Liberals just don't recognize a good thing when they see it. And of course medicare, let's not repeat the Liberal position on that issue. They don't look at the pros and cons of a given program. They look at it and if it is progressive, if it helps the ordinary man, they're against it. And Liberals don't even support the small and independent businessman of this province. They are not fighting for the little guy who lives in this province, who contributes to his community. They are rather front men, patsies, minions for the large international corporation.

You know from 1964 to 1971 the Department of Industry and Commerce was actually downgraded in those years. Liberals don't care about the small and medium sized business firms. If your sales aren't already in the millions the Liberals just can't be bothered.

During those years from 1964 to 1971 the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart) and the late Premier were busy addressing groups in New York, New Mexico and other parts of the United States, trying to attract capital to Canada. And during those speeches that they made to the Chambers of Commerce and other business groups in the United States they were continually running down the province of Saskatchewan. But then they were saying, but now the socialists are out and a new order will be established and they expected that there would be a deluge of investment capital into this province but it never happened. They failed in their own capitalistic backyard. And where they have failed the New Democratic Party has succeeded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — Liberals are saying that potash is a bad deal, they say that it is a bad deal. I remind them of the pulp mill. Almost \$60 million of government funds, public funds, out of a total approximate figure of investment of \$65 million and they got 30 per cent equity in the Prince Albert Pulp Mill.

I want to remind them of the sale in 1967, of trillions of cubic feet of natural gas to a Calgary based firm for between

two and three cents per thousand cubic feet. And I want to read a little quotation from the Leader-Post dated September 18, 1967:

Northern Canadian Oils of Calgary will purchase and develop 60 thousand acres of proven gas lands in the Hatton fields from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Announcement of the intention was made in Calgary by R.F. Rubin, President of Northern Canadian Oils. Cost of the purchase is estimated to be at \$4 million for 68 thousand acres of natural gas reserves. It is the intention of the company to be in development of the property to meet new delivery commitments to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the provincially owned power and gas utility.

Development work involves the drilling of 107 gas wells in this proven field in southwest Saskatchewan. Northern Canadian already has extensive land holdings in the Hatton, Medicine Hat area. Acquisition of the properties from SPC will bring the reserves up to an estimated 375 billion cubic feet. Completion of the 107 well drilling program will bring to 223 the number of gas wells the company has in the area.

Now, Natural Resources Minister, Dave Steuart who is the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation told the Leader-Post Thursday morning a statement will be issued answering a charge by the Opposition Leader Woodrow Lloyd that the Government is preparing to sell 68 thousand acres of natural gas land near the Hatton Gas Field. However, at noon, Mr. Steuart's office said that he had left to drive to Saskatoon and had made no mention of a statement that was to be made. From Saskatoon he was believed to be heading for Prince Albert West constituency.

And what I say is that he was more concerned about his own re-election than he was about the welfare of the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — They sold trillions of cubic feet of natural gas for between two and three cents per thousand cubic feet. I say that that is a bad deal. And I want to say more about that bad deal in another debate.

They say that our investment in potash will bankrupt us. Well, that has been said before by other Liberals. Let me give you some information about the fiscal responsibility of our Government over the years. And a little bit of information about Liberal comments about impending bankruptcy in this Government.

Did you know that when the CCF took office in 1944, the province had a debt of \$218 million and assets of \$73,200,000, a net debt of \$144,800,000. In 1963 assets exceeded liabilities by \$23,400,000.

I want to quote Mr. Allen Guy on medicare in 1961:

It will prove so costly that the province will be in no position to consider improving any other fields of

health care, including dental, optometry, drug, mental or other services. With the result that these services will be behind, and will fail, and fail forever.

Well I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to this House that we have a health care program in all its respects is excelled by none in any province in Canada right here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — I want to quote Mr. Coderre, former Liberal Member for Gravelbourg. October 17, 1961:

This Government has borrowed so much money, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt if the next generation, or the next, or the next, will ever be free from the so-called perpetual interest charges.

That's a direct quote from Mr. Coderre. You know talking about debt and talking about service of this debt, the Liberals should consider their counterpart in Ottawa. Talking about the Federal Liberal Government I might point out that they are so far in debt, that it requires between \$2 billion and \$3 billion to service their debt per year. Merely to service that national debt to be paid for by the taxpayers of this country.

I wanted to talk on some other topics, very important topics. Housing, the inflation and the lack of initiative taken by the Federal Government into these areas. But I want to say in ending, where the Liberals have failed the New Democratic Party has always succeeded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DYCK: — Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting the motion.

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member opposite is quick to give advice to both the opposition parties. But they would not listen to two-thirds of the people in this province on the potash issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — The Premier was so convinced that two-thirds of the people in the province were against the potash takeover that he used the taxpayers' dollars to try to brainwash these same citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — He hired out of the province media people after the potash Bills had become law.

When Members have to continue to go back into the '30s and '40s to try to find something to talk about they're really grasping at straws.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — I would like to talk about just a couple of things in the present and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words regarding a proposed grasslands park to be established in southern Saskatchewan.

A few weeks ago a hearings board was appointed by the Minister of Tourism and Natural Resources appointing three people to the board. Each of these individuals were from urban centres. One from Calgary, one from Saskatoon, and one from Regina. There was not any rural representation on this board yet the entire park area in question is in rural Saskatchewan far from the city lights.

I asked the Premier in this Assembly to add two rural people to this committee. He indicated he would not object to that idea provided it was brought to his attention by the people of the area which it was and that there would be no objection from the Federal Parks Department. It is my understanding that the provincial government when approached by the Federal Government objected to this proposal. My colleague from the Shaunavon constituency (Mr. Anderson) and myself spent yesterday and the day before in Ottawa meeting the Minister in charge of Parks Canada as well as the Director of Parks Canada and his officials.

I am pleased to say that we had a very cordial meeting with this group and that an advisory committee of two people both being rural representatives will be added and will be working with the hearings committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — There will be a specific study undertaken to find the practical solution to that problem

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — We were also assured that the ranchers in the area would be receiving a letter with further information on many of the points we raised on their behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — We were told that the leases will not be left without adequate supplies of water when the core area boundaries are made final.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — I was very much disturbed by the reports I found on the economic survey impact of the park. It was commissioned by the joint federal-provincial committee on the grasslands national park and it was written by three people in Manitoba from the Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of Manitoba. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have capable people in this province who could have done a much better job than was done on this survey.

In the opening remarks in this survey it's stated how very little value this survey really was. The estimates presented here and in the text required a considerable amount of judgment because the analysis is based on the data that was collected during the time of this study. They did no research, they just gathered up a few items, they didn't get a complete survey and I'd like to just show you a few of the things that are in this particular thing.

It was stated that there are 39 ranching units in the area and the assumption throughout the entire survey was taken then there were 39 households involved. All the costing expenses through the entire survey was based on 39 families. I'd like to point out that on these ranches, and I know them all, there are in most cases, two families and in many cases hired help as well who have families. This puts it over 100 per cent out. These are the figures used throughout this survey.

On page 4, item 7 of this survey it states and I'd like the farm Members to just listen to this one, it states that, 20 per cent of the gross receipts are all you spent on operation purchases in your area. Now I made out my income tax, not very long ago and it was over 66 per cent of gross income went into expenses.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . .for all you millionaires.

MR. NELSON: — You fellows can interrupt and you can bug me and you can catcall as you want to call it, but I shall not run away and cry, only to come back another day, I'll stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — On page 4, item 7 of the survey, it's stated this was 20 per cent. The impact suggested on page 5 and 6 cannot be considered at all, as the assumption is only that there were 39 ranches.

I would also question the figure of 65 head of cattle on these ranges and they have taken this from the per head carrying capacity of the area, but they did not take into consideration that these ranchers lived outside the park area. They have deeded land and their wintering headquarters outside that area and certainly are able to summer many more and I would suggest that that number should be nearly doubled.

On page 12 . . .

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the Point of Order?

MR. BYERS: — I just would like the Member to clarify the statistics he quoted. I understood him to say 65 head of cattle. My recollection of reading that report is that there are 6,500 head.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, if I did say 65 head, 6,500 head is correct. I would certainly like that point cleared as I believe it

would be closer to 15,000 than 6,500 head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — On page 12, mention was made of the local villages and they mentioned Mossbank and Ponteix for example, that are 80 to 100 miles away and yet Ferland, Fir Mountain, Meyronne, Woodrow, Killdeer and McCord in the immediate vicinity were missed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many people live there?

MR. NELSON: — Quite a few, quite a few. On page 15 they used the census figures only pertaining to the villages they mentioned before, and by missing out all these villages naturally the entire results of that page and the survey they did on that were entirely wrong.

On page 29, the survey assumes that the land or rights to the same would be passed on to sons or daughters only. However, in the memorandum of intention it indicates clearly it was heirs, which means anyone the rancher wishes to designate as his heir.

On page 77, the towns and villages listed within the 30 miles radius, two towns were missed, they also missed four stores. The total number in this particular area they said was four stores, it is actually eight stores. They are only 100 per cent out again.

I went through this survey very quickly and I'm certain I missed many other inaccuracies. I believe there are entirely too many mistakes to put any faith in this survey whatsoever.

I am certain that those who wrote the survey never left Winnipeg, in fact, I'm almost positive of this fact. I would hope that the entire survey would be scrapped and that the hearings board, as well as the people involved would be told that this information in this survey should not be considered in any way in making the decision on the grassland park.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — Another immediate concern in this province and in my constituency is certainly the peoples' rights in the Coronach issue. I asked Mr. Messer on Tuesday, if he had agreed to meet with the Surface Rights Association as they requested in their letters to him of February 2, and February 26, to discuss the terms of mediation. His answer was, yes. I'm pleased to say the yes, was made a fact the following day and not before I had asked him.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. That is not true. I ask the speaker to retract it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Is the Minister making a Point of Privilege?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of

Privilege. The reference that the speaker makes to the meeting was made prior to my answering the question in this House and not after the fact and I ask the Member to retract.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I was told as early as about two hours ago by the people involved in the area, who wrote the letter, that they were not contacted until the day after I asked the question. If they are wrong then I will withdraw that statement, if they are right I would like to have it stand.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege, I ask that the records of this House be clarified now. Either he goes by his evidence that he has and sticks to it and not undertake to then apologize at a later date, which is not satisfactory to me, he should undertake to correct and retract now and seek out better information then now has available to him.

MR. MALONE: — Speaking to the Point of Privilege, I would suggest to the Hon. Minister that the Member has made it quite clear where his information is received from, he is repeating that information to this House, to the best of his knowledge it's correct. It's strictly a debating point. If the Minister wants to challenge it, he's free to rise and challenge it any time he wants in the debate. But the Minister's character or honesty or anything else has not been called into question.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would ask the Minister to wait until such time as I have an opportunity to check the record, because I'm not clear as to all of the events and at that point I could, if necessary, bring a statement back to the house.

MR. MESSER: — Speaking to that Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, either the Member has his facts right or he does not. He asked the question in the House, I believe it was last Tuesday as to whether or not I had arranged to have a meeting with the organization that he makes reference to. My answer to that was, yes. He now says that I had not made arrangements for that meeting until after he asked that question and that he has evidence to show that in fact I contacted the organization after the question was asked. Now, it's either right or it's wrong. Either his facts are right or wrong. And he has talked to the organization. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the Member knows right now that he is not telling the truth in this House.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Privilege, the Member has made it very clear that he is giving information that he received from the people in this organization. He said he was advised by them that certain events happened. He is repeating that advice to this House. That's all that he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! As I said I will check the record and refer the matter back later if necessary.

MR. NELSON: — The Minister does seem very edgy in this particular problem, and I would urge the Minister to give this matter his

immediate and personal attention. These people are fair people, their requests are not unjust and they need answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — The attitude of the Minister and his department has been arrogant, it has been slow and stalling in these procedures and it is hoping to divide the people. These people have farms and families, they need to have a settlement at a very early date.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — As I have already spoken in this debate, I wonder if the Member would entertain a question.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'll accept a question over here behind the bar at any time, if that's his wish.

MR. BYERS: — In view of the Member's statement that he made a trip to Ottawa to discuss the proposals, National Grassland Park with Parks Canada, is the Member prepared to tell this House if he made a specific recommendation to the Federal Government to cancel the federal . . .

MR. LANE: — A Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the Point? Order! What's the Point of Order?

MR. LANE: — The Point of Order I believe if I recall the Hon. Minister went through a long diatribe in this particular debate the other day and he's already spoken and he has lost his right to speak again.

MR. SPEAKER: — May I ask the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg if he said that he would permit a question?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He said at the back, behind the bar.

MR. SPEAKER: — All right, next speaker.

MR. D.H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I must preface my remarks today with the proverbial, I had not intended to speak in this debate, but, much as the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley did yesterday or the day before. But unlike the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald), I do not have any particularly burning reason to stand on my feet and speak to the Speech from the Throne. The Member for Indian Head-Wolseley felt moved to speak about the conduct of certain Members in this House as it related to the tradition of the House and indeed how it threatened the very basis of parliamentary procedure in Canada. He

gave a very formidable speech. In fact I was respectful through the whole speech as it was given. I must say that I certainly would not want to be the object of the enmity of the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley when it comes to misconduct in the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this debate but, quite frankly my Whip asked me to. I think he asked me to for two reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Heavy hand . . .

MR. LANGE: — That's right. I think there are two reasons why my Whip asked me to speak in the House. The first is quite obvious that it was no doubt to fill the vacuum left by some of the speeches by Members of the Opposition and I might add some speeches by Members on this side of the House. The other reason that the Whip likes to ask a backbencher to give a speech once in a while is because it maintains the illusion that somehow backbenchers are involved in government business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MISS CLIFFORD: — You wrote this one yourself.

MR. LANGE: — All by myself. In fact it's not even written yet. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Throne Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Now, once again as a Government backbencher you either rise in support of the Throne Speech or you are in the washroom when the vote is taken. Of course, it's also said in backbencher circles on this side of the House, that if you give enough positive speeches for the Government, if you say enough things about the Government, if you vote with the Government enough times, that someday, maybe you too will be chosen to represent the Government at the opening of say, a new rink or perhaps a regional library and an opportunity like that should not go amiss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, supporting the Throne Speech is one thing, but speaking about the Throne Speech is quite another. Now it's not that I don't want to speak about the Throne Speech, it's just that there is nothing in the Throne Speech to speak about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Especially since I don't curl. But in absolute defence of the Government I must remind the House that it certainly was not our idea to have a Throne Speech.

As a matter of fact if it had been our idea to have a Throne Speech, the Throne Speech would have had some substance in it, as did the last Throne Speech which talked about the potash issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — But now that even potash is virtually a dead issue in North America I suppose it doesn't even pay to make a speech

on the potash subject.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat at a loss about just what will I speak about and I thought perhaps I would talk about, for instance, why the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley is no longer the Member for Milestone. But that would necessitate explaining why the Member for Bengough-Milestone is no longer the Member for Assiniboia-Bengough and I thought that wouldn't work either.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, to avoid any more conflict in the House and to avoid any more confusion or altercations such as we have just seen a few moments ago and to avoid incurring the wrath of the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley should I extemporaneously step out of line with regard to conduct in the House, and incidentally, to avoid talking about the Throne Speech, I have chosen rather to talk about a subject which is dear to the hearts of all the MLAs in this Chamber, indeed in this province. It is a topic furthermore, which has far ranging implications for the future of this province, its people and its economy. It is a topic not only of great gravity and of great interest, it is a topic which is not only moving, but I'm sure it will bring tears to the eyes of my colleagues in the Liberal corner of the Chamber. It is a speech for which I have had many requests to give and up to this . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — . . . time I have never attempted to give a speech on this particular subject.

So, Mr. Speaker, due to popular request the topic I have chosen for my address and reply in support of the Throne Speech is the feasibility of establishing an inter-city rail passenger service between Regina and Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — I know that the Opposition has been waiting a long time for this speech and even though I've never dealt with the topic before and even though I'm quite unprepared with only a few notes before me, not quite clear on what I may say; in spite of the fact that my speech may be somewhat incongruous; nevertheless I think that my speech, when it's put together in spite of lack of notes and its incongruity it will certainly be as good as the speech which has just preceded mine and probably as good as any that have been given with regard to this particular debate so far.

Mr. Speaker, if I may break my speech for a moment to make an introduction of someone who has just arrived in the west gallery. I should like to introduce my young nephew whose name is Adam Fox Lange. He is only three months old, but he is already taking a very active interest in public affairs. He is sitting in the top row of the gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — How's that for killing some time, Paul?

Well, Mr. Speaker, before getting into the intricacies of the feasibility of an inter-city rail-passenger service between

Regina and Saskatoon, and its economic potential to the people of those cities and the political implications to the MLAs of all of the cities involved. I should like quickly perhaps, if the House doesn't mind to review the necessity of transportation to society. Very quickly. I don't think there is anyone in this House who does not realize the importance of transportation both to the direct social and the economic development of any economy. They further realize that transportation policy will set demographic pattern. Not only does transportation policy affect the demographic pattern of any particular country or community, it can be instrumental in the social development of an economy as well. We need only remember the historical development of Saskatchewan as we realize how the railroad was instrumental in maintaining and developing town sites within Saskatchewan. And then, as passenger travel switched from train to the road mode, how those same communities felt their demise in the advent of highways and roads.

Now because of future energy and resource restrictions in the world, because of our expanding population to maintain the existing level of mobility that they have now, it is not conceivably possible to maintain an exponential growth in the highway, rail and air system as we know it today. It is simply beyond technical capability for everyone in the world to have the high degree of mobility that North Americans have through the automobile and through air.

So on one hand it is technically impossible to maintain that kind of mobility; but on the other hand society will want increasing degrees of mobility in the future. The question which we must face as legislators is how is society going to travel more but consume less energy, and how, in the process are we going to make greater use of transportation resources. There is no question in anybody's mind about the necessity of an integrated transportation policy; no question that we can't afford intermodal competition and that only complementary use of the various transport modes will mean greatest efficiency in the future. That does not mean that any mode need be deleted. Each mode has a specific purpose. But none of the modes should compete. All modes should co-operate and should be complementary.

Now, of course, there is no question that rail should be the backbone of any integrated transportation policy using the other complementary modes. From the standpoint of economic and environmental advantages, from the standpoint of land use, air pollution, noise level, energy efficiency and conservation, resource allocation, safety, comfort, cost per ton mile, there is no question about the viability and feasibility and economy of rail versus the other modes. But in Canada, there seems to be a predominance of air and of road, rather than of the rail mode. It appears as though Canada may repeat the same mistake that the United States has made with regard to its transportation policy. When in 1956 the American Congress voted some \$26 billion for expansion of the highway traffic system, it also meant the degradation of the rail system in that country. And it was only about five years ago when the United States embarked on a new program called 'Amtrack' which was a Congress subsidized experiment in rail transportation in the northeast corridors between many cities. It was not until then that they realized the feasibility of rail transport and the fact that it could indeed compete with the automobile. Within a couple of years Amtrack obtained 40 per cent of the regular airlines business and last year the American Congress, to expand Amtrack, voted an extra

\$3 billion for expansion of those particular corridors.

MR. LANE: — In dense urban areas?

MR. LANGE: — In dense urban areas, true.

Now it appears that the United States belatedly, is presently doing something about faster transportation as it regards people movement in the dense areas of the country, with further plans to expand into less heavily populated areas.

Now in spite of the historical development of rail in Canada; in spite of its significance to the development of Saskatchewan, indeed western Canada; in spite of the fact that it was rail perhaps that tied the country together as a nation; in spite of the fact of the regional disparities of Canada; in spite of the fact of the resource conservation that is necessary and that is implicit in rail; in spite of the fact that rail is used implicitly in our food system, in production, in distribution and in processing; in spite of the fact that rail is instrumental in any kind of industrial development; in spite of all of the logic behind rail; in spite of the fact that Europe is some 20 years ahead of Canada in rail development; and in spite of the fact that belatedly the United States is going towards more passenger service and rail development instead, in Canada, where we have regional disparity, a great deal of track, that track is being abandoned, service is being disrupted, and passenger service is being taken off the lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is this happening in Canada when at a time when we need more passenger service than ever before in the history of the country? The reason for it, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple, and it relates once again to the infamous Federal Government that we have in Ottawa.

In Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, we have a Ministry of Transportation with upper echelon civil servants who think airplane and highway, nothing else. Airplanes, roads and trucks, but not trains. Five hundred bureaucrats, who think airplanes, roads and trucks. Because airports and highways are the 'in way' to travel, because rail is not socially acceptable, mostly because there is no service associated with it, because of that kind of psychology, money that is spent from the Federal Treasury on airports and highways is regarded as an investment by the Canadian taxpayer. But money that is spent on the railroad by the Federal Government of this country is regarded as a subsidy by the Canadian taxpayer. Airports and highways are glamorous, therefore, it's an investment, but railways somehow are not used very much because of their service, and therefore money spent on the railways are regarded as subsidy. And they bandy about phrases such as - allow it to pay its own way, and free intermodal competition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a dim ray of hope in the federal transportation scene a couple of years ago when in the '74 election the Prime Minister and the then Minister of Transport, Jean Marchand, announced that if elected, as an election promise, if elected they would seek parliamentary approval to establish an all-rail passenger service in the Dominion of Canada. And it would include luxury high speed intercity passenger rails, \$500 million to modernize rail passenger service, the four hour Montreal-Toronto via Ottawa passenger commuter, and they talked about experiments to be done in intercity corridors elsewhere in

Canada and indeed in western Canada, and they talked about grants for innovative technology in transportation design. They talked about a new Crown corporation called the Canadian Passenger Transportation Corporation, and they talked about taking over the rolling stock and the employees of the passenger division of CN and CP and operating them as a common public utility. Marchand said, relative to that, that they would amend the National Transportation Act to give Federal Government the capacity to manage passenger service, quote Jean Marchand - "in the national interest, instead of leaving it to companies whose objective is to make a profit".

Now these were grandiose promises, and once again, as a result of the campaign that went on the Federal Liberal Government was re-elected. But did we hear anything about fulfilment of those promises since that election? Other than the 1974 Throne Speech, which alluded very gently to the subject of passenger transport, we have seen nothing but studies and surveys and promises and abandonment of passenger service in Canada.

In 1975 when the long awaited Transportation Policy came out, what did we have, the same anti-rail perspective that had been evidenced for the last 10 to 15 years in Ottawa by 500 bureaucrats and the Cabinet.

Once again, Trudeau had won. Trudeau had successfully wooed the Canadian public to the point of seduction, only to bolt from the bed and leave the people of Canada in anticipatory anguish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — Now how can this happen? How can it be that the logic of rail is so evident to anyone on the street, or indeed, to any bureaucrat that you want to talk to individually. They will all agree that of course rail is the most economic, the most feasible, the most functional way to go. But how can it happen that in the face of that kind of logic exactly the opposite is happening in Canada, that rail service is deteriorating, that the lines are being threatened, for abandonment, that freight and grain service is also going down. But it relates again to the National Transportation Act and it relates again to the federal Ministry of Transport.

Now last year, for instance, when it was suggested that passenger service be discontinued in western Canada on one of the other of the rail lines, they emphasized the cash subsidy on passenger travel of \$112 million direct subsidy. And they lamented the fact that the Canadian public should have to pay \$112 million direct subsidy for passengers on train travel. But there was no acknowledgement by the Ministry of Transport, no acknowledgment whatsoever, of the fact that there is no indirect subsidy paid to the railroads. That in fact the railroads must build and maintain their own right of ways, their terminals, their rolling stock and ancillary services. Not that I have any sympathy for the railroads, but nevertheless it is important to acknowledge that they receive no indirect subsidy whatsoever, only direct subsidy on passenger service of \$112 million. Whereas, the MOT also pays subsidy for airports, airlines, bus companies, shipping firms, all of the airport meteorological and navigational aids, the roads, bridge, dock construction, maintenance, snow clearing, harbor dredging, and it goes on and on. All of the indirect subsidy that is paid by the Ministry of

Transport, out of the pockets of the Canadian people, to other modes of transport across the Dominion of Canada.

In fact, here is a copy of the estimates from the fiscal year now ending, from the Federal Government at Ottawa, and under the section - Transport - it is important to recognize that out of the some \$858 million that the Ministry spent last year, \$389 million of that is in payments to airports, direct payments to airports, \$282 (almost \$100 million less) is in direct payment to surface transport, and \$159 out of that is in direct payment to the marine aspect of transportation in Canada. That is \$389 million to air . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Good figures, Dave!

MR. LANGE: — Thank you very much. \$389 million for air, \$282 for surface transport, all surface transport, including \$112 million direct subsidy to passengers, \$159 to marine, out of a total budget of \$858 million.

And the National Transportation Act emphasizes, and the Minister of Transport emphasizes that there was a direct cash subsidy to the railroads for passenger service of \$112 million. Barely one-tenth of the total payment of the Ministry of Transport for one year. Furthermore, we hear nothing about the \$250 million annual deficit of the airports in this Dominion. In fact, the Prime Minister and Marchand were outraged at being prevented from spending the \$500 million it would have cost for the Toronto Airport, and it is worthy to note that \$400 million has already been spent on the Pickering Airport, just to obtain the property and do feasibility studies. But nothing is said about that by the Ministry of Transport. Nothing is said about the \$19 million deficit that Air Canada runs simply between Ottawa and Montreal for business executives. Nothing is said about the \$25 million that was spent in the STOL aircraft which lost \$2 million the very first year of operation, or over \$20 per passenger carried. No complaints about that from either the Ministry of Transport or the Minister responsible for transport in the Dominion of Canada. And at the same time those people will admit to the feasibility and the viability and the low energy consumption, the pollution, the capacity, the comfort and safety of rail. In fact, just to document that, I have here the June, 1975, the interim report on intercity passenger movement in Canada, done by Transport Canada. Again, it states in here, just summarizing, that from the standpoint of land requirement, from the standpoint of comfort, from the standpoint of flexibility and reliability, safety, energy, capacity and pollution, that rail is far, far ahead of any other mode that we might have. The Ministry of Transport, Canada, June 1975.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that they admit that rail is the very best mode to have, they are suggesting that we should scrap it because they don't make dollars. But they are not suggesting scrapping Mirabel at a cost of \$1.5 billion to the people of Canada. They are not mentioning anything about the new Malton parking terminal which is being expanded at a cost of \$126 million of capital investment. They don't mention the runway extensions to Quebec, Hamilton, London, Windsor airports - \$43 million capital expenditure; the new Calgary Airport - \$75 million capital expenditure; improve the Vancouver Airport - \$27 million capital expenditure; a new jet air traffic control function for the Dominion of

Canada at a cost of \$75 million.

Mr. Speaker, capital investments by the Ministry of Transport, out of the pockets of the people of Canada, in one year of \$1,850,000,000 for aviation alone. And they are complaining because they are also paying less than the amount of interest on that capital expenditure to maintain a passenger rail service in this country. How ridiculous can a Ministry of Transport be in its logic and at the same time suggest that we should conserve energy, conserve resources and plan for future economic development of our country?

Just to show how entrenched the thinking and the bias against rail is in Ottawa, not only in the bureaucracy but in the Cabinet, it might be necessary to mention a little bit of chronology.

In the summer of 1974 the Canadian National put forward to the Hon. Jean Marchand, the then Transport Minister, a five year plan for CN in which they asked for some 47 odd passenger cars. That was in December of '74. The letter was not acknowledged until March of '75 when Marchand said, it will be studied. And furthermore said, do not order any passenger rail cars, which incidentally take two years to produce, until the National Transportation Act of June, 1975 comes down. That indicates the very fact that they did not want to make an order which takes two years to deliver, indicates that the Minister of Transport had already a foregone notion that they would not expand passenger rail service and that the new National Transportation Act would indeed reflect that - as it indeed did. In October of 1975 when Otto Lang was new Minister of Transport, Minister in quotation marks, it is interesting to point out that the Member of Parliament Les Benjamin asked for that five-year plan that CN had earlier submitted to Marchand.

The new Minister of Transport said in the House of Commons, October 22, 1975, that he was unaware of any plan that had been submitted by the Canadian National Railway. In fact that Minister's office called the office of Les Benjamin the following day to ask for a copy of that very submission that the CN had given to the Ministry of Transport almost a year before. That Minister of Transport is suggesting that rail passenger service be discontinued in Canada without even knowing that the CN has some perspective for rail passengers, and that it wanted new machinery. That same Ministry, that same Cabinet is also, (it is interesting to note), giving a direct Canadian grant to the country of Mexico to purchase 200 passenger coaches. On the one hand we can grant money to another country to purchase coaches made in Canada for rail passenger service but at the same time we cannot allow the CN to purchase those same coaches which take two years for delivery.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this seems slightly confusing, if you think this is a confusing mess I wish that all of us could have been at the Saskatchewan Hotel this morning when the Minister of Transport addressed the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. It is very, very difficult, and if you were there then perhaps you can confirm that it was very difficult to know what the Minister of Transport, the Hon. Otto Lang, the Minister of Transport, responsible for future policy for the Dominion of Canada, it was very difficult to ascertain just what he did say in the course of 30 or 40 minutes.

He talked about real costs, that was one thing I remember that he talked about. He didn't exactly say what real costs were but that really wasn't important. He said that sometimes the real costs might be applicable but then sometimes the real costs might not be applicable, and so you didn't know just what he was talking about, whether the real costs were applicable or whether they weren't applicable. Just when you thought you were getting the threat of an idea of what he was saying, then he turned to talk about a 'user must pay' policy. He talked about a 'user must pay' policy in terms of real costs but that some might pay and some might not pay. He didn't say what the definition of bridges or airports, or whether it was just rail or whether it was his executive jet in which he flies out from Ottawa. But he did allude to user must pay. Then he said, although the user must pay the Crow's Nest statutory rates will be maintained. Now whether they would be maintained at the high level or at a low level or at no level was not clear, but the Crow's Nest statutory rates would be maintained, at the same time the user must pay.

Then he talked for a little while about the individual and how the individual would decide for himself in Canada which mode he was going to use. What he was really saying was that after an individual deciding that he was simply too poor to ride the airlines in Canada he would take the bus or the train. While he was taking the bus or the train, he would pay his own way, in fact he would for the costs of providing that service. Now if the user, the individual who was deciding for himself happened to be in particular economic strata in our society, so he could not afford the airplane, then he would decide for himself that he would take the bus or the train, and he would pay his full fare.

If however, another individual was deciding that he could afford the ticket to go by air, that that individual would pay the ticket, being only one of 10 per cent of the people in Canada who can afford to fly or who do fly, the other 90 per cent of the Canadian population would pick up the subsidy for that particular individual. So he suggest that the individual will decide for himself in our country which mode he will use for transportation, the subsidy being given by 90 per cent of the population to the 10 per cent that use air travel at a cost this year of capital investment of \$1,850,000,000.

He didn't mention while he was talking about the individual deciding for himself the fact that the Federal Government has very subtle ways and not so subtle ways of deciding which mode those particular individuals will or will not use, through simple subtle mechanisms like price fixing or advertising for instance, on one mode and not on another or through service or direct or indirect subsidies. He didn't mention any of that, he merely said the individual in our society will decide which mode to use.

Then he went on to talk about how we would save money in our transportation network. And in the next breath he talked about competition between the various modes, we would save money, but at the same time we would have competition; at the same time we would have the 'user must pay' policy but we would also maintain the statutory rates. We would include in all that, the real costs, (well sometimes we would include the real costs, but other times we might not), it just might depend. He climaxed

his speech when he brought to the floor of the SARM convention some of his basic trains of logic. He talked about this theory of realism.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is a theory of realism? He didn't explain what the theory of realism was but he asked the delegates of the SARM to please understand that we must use a theory of realism when we are talking about transportation as it relates to Canada and the various modes. After going on for 30 or 40 minutes with this kind of political rhetoric and leaving everyone in a state of confusion, he finally finished up by saying, "but for goodness' sakes, let's not allow ourselves to engage in political rhetoric!"

For a half hour or 40 minutes, there was not a single theme from the Minister of Transport of the Dominion of Canada; for a half hour or 40 minutes there was no coherence of speech, there was no continuity of thought, there was no logic in idea. Most important, there was no empathy or feeling for a Ministry of Transport or for the people of Canada. There was no discussion about human need or what we need as far as service to people is concerned as it relates to Canadian transportation. Nothing but confusion. I must say that if nothing else, there were 700 people who left that hall this morning who felt that if that is the Minister or Transport for the Dominion of Canada, then they finally understood what Marchand was talking about two years ago when he said transportation is a mess!

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no question in any of our minds about exactly what is happening in western Canada with regard to transportation. Rail lines will be abandoned, whether we have a Hall Commission or not, rail lines will be pulled out, through coercive tactics, by Cargill, Continental, CN, CP, colluding with the Federal Government, we will ultimately lose rail lines and we will lose service.

There is no question in the back of our minds that there is going to be more trucking, by hook or by crook over a long term period of time. There is no question in our minds that passenger service is going to be discontinued, certainly diminished in western Canada. Of course we will have an opportunity, much as we have an opportunity to present to the Hall Commission, our submissions with regard to transportation, we will be able to submit to the CTC on May 10, and May 17 in Regina or Saskatoon, our ideas with regard to passenger service as it relates to those particular cities and indeed western Canada.

Now, of course, I do not believe in a regulatory commission that does not regulate, and that is exactly what the Canadian Transport Commission is. It is nothing more and never has been anything more than a puppet for the Ministry of Transport in Ottawa. It is a regulatory commission but it does not regulate but it is a scapegoat for a Minister who is totally incompetent and who is totally inept and who does not want to take the responsibility for the ministerial decisions that he makes against his own province. So on the one hand you have a Canadian Transport Commission, an inept, incompetent, regulatory commission that does not regulate, being the scapegoat for a Minister who sets the policy but does not want to take the responsibility for the policy that he sets. That is the kind of vaudeville act that we will go through in Regina and Saskatoon. But ultimately the writing is on the wall, there is no doubt, will be a discontinuance or deletion of passenger service in western

Canada and as a result of that, as a result of the shortsightedness of the Ministry of Transport, and in particular the Minister of Transport. Who else do you blame except the Minister for a policy that is set? As a result of that shortsightedness, western Canada will lose yet another potentially valuable service.

Now, Otto Lang and the Ministry of Transport's desire to eliminate passenger service brings into scope the need in Saskatchewan for a north-south passenger rail service for Saskatoon, Regina and Prince Albert initially. If the Federal Government will not do anything for western Canada, then quite obviously we may have to do for ourselves what we have done many times before. Western Canadians are certainly resourceful people, particularly when they have their backs against the wall, as we soon will have with Otto Lang behind the sights.

Now we have an opportunity in Saskatchewan to exemplify the utility aspect of rail. Furthermore, we have the opportunity to exemplify intermodal complementary use of all of the passenger transport modes. We can do that in Saskatchewan, we can do for cheap money and we can do for great effect. It is possible presently, to have a rail passenger service from downtown Regina to downtown Saskatoon to have people transport on a scheduled basis running several times each day and to have freight on an inter-city rail service without expending any more than probably in the order of magnitude of \$5 million.

Now the first question that will come to mind probably is, is it socially acceptable? If you had a commuter, if you had an inter-city rail passenger liner between Regina and Saskatoon, would people ride it? I think we can answer that question quite readily. Not only can we allude to the Amtrack experience in northern United States where they have taken 40 per cent of the air travel from the airlines and put it onto very comfortable trains, high speed trains, but just for interest, the interest of the House, I have here a map of the southern part of Saskatchewan which shows 1956 (a mere 20 years ago) the passenger services that were available to the various communities in the province. I hope Members will be able to see the massive lines that there are on this particular map which indicates the passenger facility that was available to virtually every small community in the province.

MR. LANE: — No grassland park there either!

MR. LANGE: — And the grassland's park had passenger service through it in three lines in that area. Stick with me and it may happen again.

This indicates that there is a potential for rail use, that there is still a latent knowledge about the possibilities, the potential of rail travel in Saskatchewan. That latent knowledge is evidenced to anyone who has been to any of the Hall Commission hearings in this province and has listened to local communities talk about the potential creative use that could be made of the existing rail beds if they were upgraded, if they maintained in the future. There is no question that there is a latent knowledge, a latent desire and a latent participation in people in Saskatchewan to use rail if rail service is provided for them.

So with proper service, with proper advertising, with proper promotion, and perhaps with subsidy in the right places, a rail passenger service could indeed be socially viable.

Now the next question you might ask is: whether that service is technically viable or whether it is financially viable for a government to operate. Well, let's review the rails. We have about 160 miles of rails between Regina and Saskatoon. Those rails are all 100 pound steel number one rail lines. They handle speeds of anywhere between 80 miles an hour for roughly 41 miles, 75 miles per hour for 37 miles, 70 miles per hour for 29 miles, 60 miles per hour for 13 miles, 50 miles per hour for 6 miles and leave 16 miles for 45 mile per hour speed, you can average 50 miles per hour, which is a time of two hours and twenty minutes, from downtown Regina to downtown Saskatoon. Stations already exist - the Union Station in downtown Regina and the CPR Station in Saskatoon. We don't even need connecting spurs because with the CN connecting spur coming from Melfort to Prince Albert passing the Robin Hood Flour Mill will connect to CPR in Saskatoon. There is not a connecting spur necessary there. There is also the old CN spur coming in from southwest Saskatoon which connects to the station. The rails are in place, the facilities are in place. With doing nothing more than a few expanded switches, a few improved sidings and utilizing the spurs that are already in place, a trip could be made in two hours and twenty minutes.

Furthermore, it is technically possible for us to simply put in an order for light rapid and comfortable train vehicles which have been researched at a cost of some many millions of dollars of the Ministry of Transport in Canada, and which are manufactured in eastern Canada and which are available to us. These LRC locomotion powered passenger units will achieve speeds of 140 mph. They have the comfort of the interior of a modern aircraft. Everything can be done on them from serving food to movies. So it is certainly technically possible. The track is there, the stations are there and the technology exists. There are only six freight trains moving on the Regina-Saskatoon track per day, and it is conceivable that those freight trains could be staggered to allow another six or seven runs per day by commuter vehicles going both ways at once, allowing for scheduled commuter rail carrier every couple of hours throughout the day.

Is it financially possible? Well presently the bus route between Regina and Saskatoon which has four buses per day, is one of the most profitable runs in Saskatchewan. It is used to cost-subsidize the rest of the operations of STC. That bus route could be taken off that road and those buses used elsewhere in the province. As a result of taking that passenger service off, the passengers from the bus service could be transferred to that same intercity rail passenger liner. And furthermore under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government we could make it a matter of policy that civil service and Cabinet Minister and MLAs should ride the commuter service. Now we are spending at a minimum \$1,000 per day as a government for civil servants moving between Regina and Saskatoon and back. We are spending at a maximum \$3,000 a day. It is very difficult to get the figure, but it is no less than \$1,000 a day. That gives us \$300,000 per year revenue. We get another \$600,000 to \$700,000 per year revenue out of the STC bus service. That gives \$1 million in operating revenue already, not to mention an expanded service, not to mention the fact that we might attract executives as it runs from downtown Regina to downtown Saskatoon, not to

mention the fact that we might attract many, many other people who are interested in the concept of rail utilization. It might be an extremely viable operation. Furthermore it is possible for this Government alone to administrate the program since we have already a Crown corporation in the form of the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation, also the Canadian National Railway fortunately is the one that owns the roadbed between here and there and they are capable of administering the program. And furthermore we have Saskatchewan Power Corporation which in the future could electrify the lines, which gives another potential possibility.

So, for a mere several millions of dollars and some organization among the municipal, provincial and federal governments, we could indeed have an exemplary rail passenger service between Regina and Saskatoon. Not only would such a service make proper use of the existing facilities, not only would such a service consume less energy, not only would such a service cost less for road transport, not only would such a service provide less for road transport, not only would such a service provide a greater freight capability at higher speed and better delivery, not only would it provide downtown to downtown service with less time and less money for the passengers and more comfort and more safety and more reliability, not only would it cut costs but it would make money. And not only that, it would exemplify to the Federal Government, and indeed to the people of Canada, the utility aspect of rail and the creative potential of rail for low dollar values.

Now the opportunity has never been greater because as a result of the discontinuance of rail passenger service, either through Regina or through Saskatoon, whichever the case may be, it will be necessary to upgrade the rail service going north or south. Perhaps in the future we will even have a total discontinuance of east-west service if we have the same perspective of the Ministry of Transport that we have been experiencing for the last few years.

So it is extremely necessary to have an exemplary model of rail passenger service. I don't think there is any Member in this House who doubts the viability of such a service. I don't think there is any Member in this House, probably very few members of the public, who would not support such an experiment simply to see whether or not it would work. It doesn't need to be delegated; it doesn't need to be thrown to a committee, it simply needs a decision to be made, and a decision to be followed up by the various people that are involved.

Now the last question that you might want to ask is: if such a service is politically possible. Obviously, it is socially possible; it is technically possible; it is financially possible; it is administratively possible, but is it politically possible?

Well, certainly it is politically possible from the standpoint of the public as evidenced by the submission through the Hall Commission hearings. Furthermore there is an ad hoc order in council dated in the early '70s that spent \$10 million in a ad hoc fashion for the Government of Ontario train, the GO train that runs from Toronto to Richmond Hill which is a commuter train. A \$10 million ad hoc order in council spent by the Government of Canada, which sets a precedent for the rolling stock for such an experiment. By that ad hoc order in council the Provincial Government probably could get support from the

Federal Government in direct subsidy for the purchase of rolling stock for such an operation.

I don't want to call it an advantage or a disadvantage but the Minister of Transport for Canada is a westerner and furthermore his area is the Saskatoon area and surely he should see the sense of such a rail liner going from Regina to Saskatoon, to Prince Albert and eventually extended in both directions from that main spine.

Now if he doesn't see the sense then certainly he has a former executive assistant who is sitting in the Liberal caucus in this House, who should be able to bend his ear. And certainly that executive assistant would not deny the advantages of a commuter run between Regina and Saskatoon. Furthermore, he has a brother-in-law who sits in that same caucus, who should also be able to get his ear. And that brother-in-law should be able to appreciate the advantages of an inter-city rail passenger service between Regina and Saskatoon.

More than that there is a former MLA of this House, who is now the Parliamentary secretary to that very same Minister and he was in the House a very few minutes ago. Now there is someone who understands the problems of western Canada and also someone, I might add, who is extremely reasonable and for whom I have a high degree of respect. As a matter of fact it would be far better to see him as the Minister of Transport than what we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANGE: — To add to that, we have a Liberal alderman from Saskatoon, who also sits in that caucus. Now certainly that Liberal alderman would not deny the fact that it would be advantageous to have an inter-city rail passenger service between the two basic cities.

MR. LANE: — You have the Mayor sitting in front of you.

MR. LANGE: — I am coming to that. Please don't get ahead of me.

Not only that but in our Liberal caucus we have the MLA for Prince Albert, the former mayor of Prince Albert, the Leader of the Opposition and one who would certainly like to see such a service extended to the city of Prince Albert at some point in the future or, perhaps, simultaneously. Certainly he and his caucus and all the advantages that they have within their caucus can bend the ear of one Hon. Otto Lang and persuade him that perhaps it might be worthwhile to try an experiment on commuter rail between Regina and Saskatoon.

Still speaking about the Opposition, it is important to note that we have the Leader of the Conservative Party who used to live in Saskatoon, but more important than that, I understand, who also has a particular liaison with the CNR.

Coming to this side of the House we have the Mayor of Regina, who is also a legislator, sitting no more than an arm's length away from me. Certainly the Mayor of Regina would not deny the possibility of an inter-city rail passenger service between the

two cities.

It is also timely at this particular moment that the Regina Study for what is to be done for the Union Station and its rail yards, is also reaching a conclusion in the next several months and that a design, such as this, could very well be integrated into it. Again, at very little expense.

More important than that, perhaps, is the fact that we have a provincial transportation Minister who is extremely amenable to the suggestion and furthermore whose constituency touches on the very rail liner that we are talking about. It is conceivable that in the future he could come to work on that rail liner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody doubts the viability, nobody doubts the social acceptance, nobody doubts the necessity for doing such an operation, nobody doubts what it would do for the service to the communities that are interspersed along those lines, the nine communities in between Regina and Saskatoon and nobody doubts what it would do to expand the economic scope of both the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, because no longer would we have to talk about building new homes in Regina, we can now talk about having satellite developments somewhere out on the commuter line and for those people moving in and out on high speed rail each day.

MR. BAKER: — I am for that as long as they don't go to Saskatoon.

MR. LANGE: — I am getting the feeling that I am being pressured. Well, Mr. Speaker, to summarize. We have 18 MLAs, involved in this particular project in the two cities. We have seven Cabinet Ministers involved in these two cities, two mayors and their respective councils. We have two Ministers of Transportation, one for the Province of Saskatchewan and one for the Dominion of Canada and we have the Parliamentary Secretary for the Ministry of Transportation, also located in Saskatchewan.

This obviously provides a nucleus around which we can develop such an experiment in inter-city rail line capabilities.

Now, if we were to add to that nucleus of MLAs, MPs, Ministers, one Premier, two mayors and their respective councils, if we were to add to that the respective bureaucracies from the federal, provincial and municipal levels, what sort of a program could we come up with?

Well, I am willing to wager that after those bureaucracies and those Ministers and all of the principals who would be involved had discussed and interpreted and misinterpreted and rediscussed and directed and adjusted and redirected and qualified and co-opted the whole plan, that if it were conceivable that a Regina-Saskatoon inter-city passenger rail line could be established through logic simply by making a decision today, if through logic it could be established in three months. I am willing to bet that by the time all of those principals got through with it, after it had gone through all of the bureaucracies, that that same inter-city rail passenger service could be implemented in less than five to seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to take part in this debate. It is a debate that has the Opposition in practically total disarray. They just can't figure it out and simply because they really don't have any alternatives to offer to our NDP Government and the leadership of Allan Blakeney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Now the Opposition speakers so far have scored no debating points whatsoever, so I will allot as much time to their remarks as they are worthy of receiving, none.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal to say and I understand that there has been agreement among all party Whips, Liberal, Conservative and NDP and there are Members who have commitments at home and the weather being what it is, I would ask leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:37 o'clock p.m.