

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

May 7, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed very pleased to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, some 55 Grade 4 students from Ethel Milliken School. There are two classes I understand. They are accompanied by their teachers, Elaine Cozac and Delta Irvine. I am also informed there are eight parents accompanying the students today. They are Mrs. Wheatley, Mrs. Kwon, Mrs. Luna, Mrs. Warren, Mrs. Svenson, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Streitel, and Mrs. Phillips. I am pleased to see the parental encouragement and attendance in joining the students to attend the legislature and the proceedings. I look forward to meeting with the group at 2:30 p.m. for pictures and refreshments. I would ask all members on both sides of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students, parents and teachers to the Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D.W. CODY (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me today to have the opportunity to introduce to you and all the members of the Assembly, 15 Grade 89 students from the Aberdeen School Aberdeen, as everyone knows, is very close to the city of Saskatoon. Aberdeen has a very special identity. It is a very fine farming community. I want to welcome the students here with their teacher, Nick Peters, as well as two other people who are with them, Doris Peters and Corporal Bullock. We wish that you have a good day in the legislature. I know you have already had some tours around the city of Regina. I understand from you, while we were having pictures taken, that your tours have been successful. We hope the trip to the museum, which you will see a little later on, will also be successful. I must say I will not be able to meet with you later due to the fact I am giving second reading to a bill. However, someone will be meeting with you for drinks a little later and to answer any questions you may have.

I want to say welcome to Regina, welcome to the legislature and have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. B.J. PONIATOWSKI (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to the Assembly 53 Grade 8 students from St. Thomas School, who are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Frank Bryski, who is the vice-principal at St. Thomas School, and their second teacher, Gen Schulte. I had the good fortune, not too long ago, of being a principal at St. Thomas School for a couple of years. Therefore, it gives me particular pleasure to introduce the group to the Assembly today.

I also want to congratulate the staff and students at St. Thomas School for their extensive and excellent activities which they prepared with regard to Celebrate Saskatchewan. I had the pleasure of being invited to a number of their programs. These programs involved teachers and students in the main. But on one occasion there was

May 7, 1980

an evening program with a very large number of parents, which went over extremely well. I think they are to be congratulated for that. In closing, I know that all members will join with me in wishing you an interesting and enjoyable trip to the legislature and to the city of Regina. We also wish you a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to the Legislative Assembly a group of students from Walter Brown High School in Langham. They're in the east gallery. There are 33 of them, accompanied by some parents and their teacher. I suggest they are a very athletic group, from the knowledge I have of that community. I would like to indicate I will be meeting with them later and chatting about what happens in the House. I would like you all to welcome them here.

As well, while I am on my feet, I would like to join with the member for Kinistino in welcoming the students from Aberdeen. That is touching on my constituency as well, and some of the students will be from there. I welcome you all. Have a good trip home. I will see you later.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Dairy Workers' Strike

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. We are now faced with a dairy strike which has serious, perhaps disastrous implication for the producers and obviously serious implications for the consumers of Saskatchewan. Will the minister indicate in some detail what contingency plans the minister has to either end the strike or ease the financial burden on the producers and consumers. I particularly ask you to answer whether or not this government has drafted back-to-work legislation?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I think the hon. member will know the strike began at 12 noon, which is a little over two hours ago. I share with the hon. member his view of the seriousness of the situation. I report to the hon. member that all areas will be examined, both with respect to using the good services of the conciliator to seek the possibility of getting the sides together to negotiate a settlement, and other alternatives to be examined by the government virtually immediately.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary to the minister. The minister knows full well that many producers in Saskatchewan will not be able to withstand even a three-day strike. I very specifically ask you whether or not the government has drafted back-to-work legislation. Am I to take by your avoidance of answering the question that the government has not drafted back-to-work legislation?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, we are aware the situation is serious, that three days, as the hon. member indicates, would be extremely difficult for many of the producers in the province. I can't respond with respect to back-to-work legislation except to say that I have not seen, as the Minister of Agriculture, any back-to-work legislation.

I would point out to the hon. member — let's be realistic in this situation — the strike only began at 12 noon, which is two hours ago.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary to the minister. The strike may have only begun at noon, but it's been a matter of discussion for several months. I am sure the Department of Agriculture has been fully aware that discussions have been going on for some considerable period of time. I come back and I ask you a very specific question: has the Government of Saskatchewan drafted back-to-work legislation? If so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take the next question.

MR. LANE: — New question to the minister. On the question of back-to-work legislation would you indicate with some . . . I want to know what is going to trigger it, Mr. Speaker. I am asking what will trigger that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Nipawin.

Government Grants to ACFC

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — I would like to address my question to the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware that the Government of Saskatchewan provides in excess of \$15,000 per annum to L'Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the exact dollar figure. I take the hon. member's figure as being accurate. I am aware there is a grant structure or mechanism to the association.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney General aware that Irene Chabot, the president of the Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan (ACFC) has on behalf of the organization come out in favour of a yes vote on the forthcoming Quebec referendum on May 20? And is the Attorney General aware of any moves within his government to cut the grants to that organization?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the ACFC has taken a position as the member has indicated. I am not aware of any moves by the government to cut off funds to that association.

MR. COLLVER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll seek a new question. The member for Qu'Appelle.

Dairy Workers' Strike

MR. LANE: — A question to the minister. Would the minister indicate to this Assembly specifically what would trigger back-to-work legislation being introduced by the government?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I simply can't respond to a question of that nature. I report to the hon. member that negotiations have been taking place between management and their employees. Negotiations have been going on, on a contract, as I recall that concluded on March 31, so while they have been of some length, they have not been of a great deal of length. We have, so far as the government is concerned,

May 7, 1980

been looking at those negotiations with optimism rather than pessimism. We were hopeful that a settlement would be in place and I must say to the hon. member and all hon. members here that I was somewhat surprised when negotiations broke down and a strike was called today at noon.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Minister, a supplementary question to you. In light of the very heavy production costs involved with dairy producers today, such as high feed input costs, high interest costs and in effect the very high costs facing all segments of our economy and the fact that we are dealing with a perishable product (and as the minister well knows, as that milk gets poured away, everything gets poured away — the labour, the cost, everything else that went into producing it), would you deem a situation where producers were in effect pouring that milk down a sewer as sufficient to trigger back-to-work legislation at least as far as your Department of Agriculture is concerned? Would you in effect ask the Department of Labour to do something?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and I indicate to the hon. member for Thunder Creek that this government recognizes the seriousness of the situation. This government recognizes that there is a time frame involved so far as the producers are concerned and protection for the producers. I say to the hon. member as I said to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that in recognizing the seriousness of the situation we're looking at every alternative it is possible for us to look at. The initial alternatives we hope to see happen is that the two sides involved in the dispute will also recognize the seriousness of the situation, come back to the table and sit down with the conciliator to see if a settlement can be worked out as early as this evening.

MR. THATCHER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Minister. The minister has, in reply to my question, answered what he hopes will happen. But again to ask the minister, in the even that worst comes to the worst, the minister has already indicated in his answer that the time frame is short. Is the minister telling this Assembly that his department which has been forewarned of this strike for at least 70 to 80 days, has no contingency plan for producers? Are you telling us in effect that you have no game plan? Are you telling us merely that you hope it's going to work out? If it doesn't work out it is going to be the producers of our milk in Saskatchewan whoa re going to pay the costs for it. Do you believe that one segment of society has the right to do such a terrible thing to another?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take the member for Swift Current.

Grants to Texaco Canada

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. With reference to the introduction yesterday of retroactive legislation to eliminate any potential political opponents of yours, and since my time in this democratic institution has witnessed time and time again that your government does not support the aims and objectives of multinational corporations, can you explain why your government through the Department of Industry and Commerce . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I wonder if the members could keep quiet so I can hear the member for Swift Current. I wonder if the member for Swift Current could start over, please.

MR. HAM: — With reference to the introduction yesterday of retroactive legislation to eliminate any potential political opponents of ours, and since my time in this legislature or democratic institution has witnessed your government state time and time again that it does not support the aims and objectives of multinational corporations, can you explain why your government through the Department of Industry and Commerce granted money to Texaco Canada this past year in the amount of \$69,670?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take notice of that. I don't know the circumstances of the so-called grant.

Dairy Producers Co-operative Strike

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Question to the Minister of agriculture and I would suggest that the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development might pay attention as well. Certainly, Mr. Minister the Dairy Producers Co-operative has served the interests of the producers very well, as an organization which the producers support. And certainly, as a result of that, co-operation has served the consumers very well. The question Mr. Speaker, I feel should be to the Minister of Agriculture. What action is your department going to take in co-operation with the Department of Labour and the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development to assure that this very viable and, in fact, only source of delivery and outlet to the retailers, is going to be maintained for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, namely the producers and the consumers? Somebody has to take some action.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I've indicated to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, the hon. member for Thunder Creek, and I indicate to the hon. member for Moosomin that we share the concern with respect to the situation that is being faced. I say we are, as a government, going to consider all alternatives. I say to the hon. member that we don't share the point of view with respect to the collective bargaining that is shared by all hon. members opposite, that we were aware 70 to 90 days ago negotiations would break down, that a strike would be called. We take a more positive view of collective bargaining than the hon. members opposite. Albeit this set of negotiations at this point appears to have broken down, and the strike has been called. I would suggest to hon. members that they take the approach we're taking to make an effort to encourage the parties to get back to the table and settle as quickly as possible, because that's the best solution to the situation that we face today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Minister, that we have a conciliator by the name of Sig Walter who has been put in charge of bringing the two sides together, and for you as the minister responsible for the Department of Agriculture just to sit there and say that you're going to suggest that the two sides get together is not adequate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a question?

MR. BIRKBECK: — I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Are you prepared at this point to: (1) let the agricultural industry suffer as a result of nothing more than a jurisdictional dispute between two labour unions; and (2) leave this whole matter under the guidance of only one man, namely, Sig Walters, without taking any action as

the minister responsible for this industry?

MR. MacMURCHY: — With respect to the efforts of the conciliator, Sig Walter, I think everyone recognizes in this House and in this province the work that has been done by Sig Walters in resolving dispute between two parties. I indicated to the hon. members that his good office and his capacity is available to both sides to assist in bringing about a sensible solution to this dispute. I say once again the strike is only two hour old and I think to react like the hon. members opposite is not reasonable at this time.

Impact on Dairy Strike on FarmStart Loan Repayments

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware that of the approximately 800 milk producers in Saskatchewan, 573 have FarmStart loans? Will the minister recognize the disastrous implications for Saskatchewan dairy producers and waive FarmStart loan payments if the strike is a lengthy one?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I indicate to the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone that we will be as I said before, doing everything we can to see that this is not a lengthy dispute or a lengthy strike.

Dispute Between Unions

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of Labour. As you are aware the real reason that we have a dairy workers' strike today is because of the fight between the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union and the United Food and Commercial Workers. As you are aware, neither of these two unions will sit at the same bargaining table or in the same room.

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

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, when will your department get off its hands and cause these two unions to get together so that proper negotiations can take place so that the consumers and the producers do not suffer while you're sitting on your hands?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — I'm ore than a little disappointed that the member for Rosthern would deliberately attempt to mislead this House. Jurisdictional disputes or any difficulties that are currently being experienced between the dairy producers co-ops and the three unions involved (not two, but three — The Teamsters, the United Food and Commercial Workers, and the Retail, Wholesale Union) have no bearing on and have not been influenced in any way (at least none have been drawn to my attention) by the difficulties that have been manifested over the last number of months between the Retail, Wholesale Union and the United Food and Commercial Workers. The member is attempting to mislead the House and suggest that is the case.

Further, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that it is not my job, nor should it be the job of the Minister of Labour, to step in and attempt to resolve problems between two rival unions. That has not been the traditional role in the past in this province, since 1944. It will not be the role of the Department of Labour in the future. If the hon. member believes that's the role of the Department of Labour, then he has a much different conception of the responsibilities and duties of the Minister of Labour in this province.

We are going to make every effort. The Department of Labour is not sitting on its hands. Every effort has been made and will continue to be made in order to resolve what I acknowledge to be an extremely important matter.

We will be meeting with company officials and I will be talking with Mr. Walter again in a matter of moments after the question period in order to see what courses of action are open to us.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister you are aware there were 252 items brought to the bargaining table. The two unions which you referred to are not at the same bargaining table. Mr. Minister are you suggesting that for your political benefit by protecting the unions that you will let the producers and the consumers of this province suffer while you play party politics?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this House really believes that such a question justifies a response. The member is once again, proceeding on an assumption which is totally erroneous and accordingly, I think, doesn't justify an answer, at least not one that could be described in this House as being proper in accordance with the question that has been asked.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, after the process of collective bargaining has been served after many, many days, and after, shall we say, this Friday, when producers start dumping milk down the sewer, do you believe that it will help the milk producers of this province in continuing their operations against the difficulties they are now having after they know that the process of collective bargaining or collective blackmail, in this case, has been served?

MR. SNYDER: — Well I suspect that the hon. member, if he were in a position of authority, would have an entirely different approach than to allow the parties to consult and work out their difficulties over a collective bargaining table because that's not the nature of the creature from Thunder Creek. He just doesn't operate that way. We have not chosen to operate with the hard hand of government. We have believed that the collective bargaining process is the most civilized manner in which two parties can settle their disagreements, and in about 95 per cent to 97 per cent of the cases in the province of Saskatchewan that has happened. But it gives the opportunity to the member for Thunder Creek to stand there and beat his breast and give his anti-labour tirade whenever there's a breakdown in the relationships between the two components in the collective bargaining system.

It has to be said that collective bargaining is working in this province. There are occasions when we have difficulties of this nature, and of course, under those circumstances, they become very noteworthy and the press takes notice of the fact that those breakdowns have taken place. When 95 per cent or 97 per cent of collective agreements are signed with no fanfare at all, I suppose that's not noteworthy. We are going to make every effort. We will acknowledge this as an immensely serious problem when we are dealing with a perishable product and producers livelihoods are at stake. Accordingly, we intend to do everything possible in order to resolve this dispute.

Effects of Strike on Dairy Producers

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — A question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. It

May 7, 1980

is indicated that due to increased production costs, and increased costs anticipated due to the settlement of this present strike, that the consumers of Saskatchewan will be facing a minimum of a 10 cent per litre increase in milk by October. Mr. Minister as consumer affairs spokesman do you feel that it is fair that once again the consumer must bear the brunt of what seems to be a jurisdictional dispute between two unions?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, that's a hypothetical question. No one knows actually what the cost will be.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The industry indicates that a strike of even three to five days will virtually force approximately 285 dairy producers to permanently close their doors. Has your department considered the detrimental effects that would have on the consumers of this province if a significant number of producers did go out of business? To replace that we would have to import dairy products from somewhere.

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, obviously again that's an assumption that 285 producers will go out of business. No one know whether that would happen for sure. Obviously we would take that into consideration at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: — I just want to take this opportunity to remind the members that Beauchesne is very clear that questions must not be hypothetical. Order, order! I just take this opportunity to warn the members of that.

Labour Dispute at Port of Churchill

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. It appears that once again we could be seeing a labour dispute in the grain-handling industry and in particular at this time, at the port of Churchill. Again, serious problem already exist for the western farmer. My question to the minister: has the minister or will the minister communicate to the appropriate minister in Ottawa the grave concerns that a strike at the port of Churchill would have on the farmers of western Canada and to use all his efforts, in any way, to head off a strike in that particular situation?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Kindersley I report to him and to the House that I have Telexed both the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Labour just before coming to the Assembly on the seriousness of the matter at Churchill.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. Mr. Minister seems to have taken more action regard to a potential strike at Churchill than he has with the actual strike of the dairy industry here in the province of Saskatchewan. Would the minister mind expressing to this Assembly and the farmers of Saskatchewan just where his priorities lie and will he admit that he is more prepared to do some talking than give any action?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, I report that I can't recall the exact time frame where a conciliator has been involved but it has been some time. I would put three weeks to a month on it. Therefore the government has provided to the dispute between management and labour in the dairy industry, the good office of the conciliator, Sieg Walter.

Unsafe Materials in Schools

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, we have expressed concern about the conditions in the schools of Saskatchewan in the last few days — McClurg School, Kennedy School. And now most recently, the Lipton School has some unsafe materials in the school. I understand you have made some recommendations to the Lipton board. What were those recommendations?

MR. SNYDER: — I can't tell the hon. member in any precise way with respect to Lipton in particular, but I was looking at the report in today's Leader-Post that I expect caused the member to direct his question to me. The indication is that experts from the provincial labor department's occupational health and safety branch and others were called in this winter and once before to investigate the testing of formaldehyde vapours and other possible causes. I can only tell the hon. member that the Department of Labour is involved to the extent that our facilities and our staff are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I am getting all kinds of help from all kinds of members across the way.

If the hon. member was asking a question as to the activities of the Department of Labour with respect to the Lipton School, I understand my people were there; they conducted some tests and gave an indication of some preliminary difficulties that were involved. I believe they did not regard it as sufficient to warrant the closing of the school at Lipton. I understand, and I am sure the hon. member understands, that our particular concern is related to the teachers in the teaching institution because our mandate is to have the work place safe and appropriate for the workers in the particular establishments where they earn their daily bread.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Amendments to The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the government's intention to introduce later today a bill that will amend The Saskatchewan Farm Ownership Act. The amendments will significantly reduce the amount of agricultural land which non-residents of the province and non-agricultural corporations are permitted to own or acquire.

The proposed changes will bring our legislation into line with restrictions in force in other provinces of Canada. Further, Mr. Speaker, should the legislature approve these amendments the new limitations on corporate and non-resident holdings will become effective upon assent, but will be retroactive to May 6, 1980. This is being done in order to ensure that non-residents and non-agriculture corporations do not circumvent the intentions of the legislature during the period in which the amendments are in fact being considered here in the Assembly.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the Minister of Agriculture that we on this side of the House realize that this is a concern out in rural Saskatchewan, and we will be looking forward with interest to seeing the bill, and we will certainly have comments to make on its content at that time.

Point of Order on Question Period

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I noticed yesterday in question period my colleague for Arm River was cut off in the question when he referred to the cemeteries bill. Today the member for Swift Current was making reference to Bill No. 105, the Legislative Assembly bill, and he was allowed to ask his question. Can you explain why that ruling was made, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — To deal with the legitimate point of order with regard to the member for Swift Current today, I have the member for Swift Current and I have a cryptic note here which is about funds the government gives to some oil company. That's the note I have, with regard to the member for Swift Current.

MR. LANE: — Speaking to the point of order, would Mr. Speaker consider the record when it's ready, as to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley and to the apparent inconsistency?

MR. SPEAKER: — I would be glad to check the record to find out why the member for Swift Current was out of order today, if he was in fact out of order.

MR. LANE: — A further point of order. Would Mr. Speaker, mind advising me why I was ruled out of order when I attempted to ask the minister what would trigger back-to-work legislation, and what actions would cause back-to-work legislation to be brought in as it pertains to the dairy strike?

MR. SPEAKER: — Immediately prior to the member for Qu'Appelle asking the question with regard to back-to-work legislation, there had been a question and a couple of supplementaries dealing with the same issue. I had decided in my mind that the rules do not permit a member to multiply, with slight variation, a similar question on the same point. I think we had about three along the same line at that point.

MR. LANE: — On a point of order, I would like Mr. Speaker to consider, if we accept that reasoning why I was allowed to ask the question a little later?

MR. SPEAKER: — I thought it was in order a little later.

MOTION

Congratulations to Regina Pats

MR. J.L. SOLOMON (Regina North-West): — I would like to move, seconded by the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen) by leave of the Assembly:

That this Assembly congratulates the Regina Pats junior hockey team on winning the western hockey league championship and expresses its whole-hearted support for the Pats in their quest for the Memorial Cup, symbolic of the Canadian junior hockey championship, which is being held this week in Regina in this year of our province's 75th anniversary.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to call to the attention of the Assembly that hon. members, including Mr. Rousseau, have already indicated such support and urged the support of all the assembly. We join, I believe, with all members in wishing the Regina Pats well in their next two games, particularly tonight. We hope the point spread on the anticipated Pats' victories tonight and tomorrow night is high enough to carry

them into the final. They have a tough row to hoe. But no matter the outcome of the games, they have served this city and the province of Saskatchewan very proudly. No matter what the outcome, I think we stand behind them and are very proud of their efforts this year.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

MR. SOLOMON: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Speaker to arrange to have this motion provided to the Pats hockey team prior to tonight's game if that is possible.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Letter from Chief Electoral Officer

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I want to report to the Assembly that I received a letter from the chief electoral officer of Saskatchewan, wherein he specifies that section 210 of The Election Act requires:

Each registered political party in Saskatchewan to file an annual fiscal return with the chief electoral officer.

Section 222 of The Election Act states further that:

The chief electoral officer shall prepare and submit to the Speaker of the Assembly a report respecting the fiscal return of registered parties.

The report is enclosed. It is incumbent upon me, according to section 222(2) of The Election Act, to table it in the Legislative Assembly and I hereby do.

SECOND READINGS

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones) moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I go into a detailed discussion of the various amendments contained in Bill no. 13, I want to indicate to the members of the Assembly that in committee of the whole I will be introducing some House amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill No. 13 is to formalize, with legislation, what has been Sask Tel's policy for many years, namely that attachments of all equipment is prohibited except for that equipment which has been approved by Sask Tel. Mr. Speaker, the House amendments are being introduced in response to representations made to the government, including such organizations as the Credit Union Central, Federated Co-operatives, Co-operative Trust and -s Wheat Pool as well as The Co-operators. I propose these House amendments, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that this government recognizes the value of public input and that it must consider this input and satisfy concerns. Furthermore the House amendments are also a recognition of the fact that some of the clauses are not necessary. I must also be quick to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments will have no effect on the intent of Bill No. 13. I want to indicate at this time what these amendments are, so that our position will be

May 7, 1980

clear before we go to committee.

My first House amendment deals with section 44.2 which deals with the prohibition of unauthorized attachments. The words 'without express written permission of the corporation' will be deleted with the following substituted in their place:

except as permitted under and subject to the conditions established by the regulations under section 46.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, deals with section 44.4 in which I will delete all of subsection (2). At the end of my speech, I will be tabling the proposed regulations. However, I would also advise the House that the governing regulations will be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for approval. This will ensure that the ultimate authority over the attachments will rest with the provincial cabinet, instead of with Sask Tel management.

Mr. Speaker, I will now speak in favor of this bill as amended. As minister responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications, I can fully appreciate the need for this legislation. There are certainly basic principle of telecommunications which need to be protected and that is the purpose of this legislation, to protect those principles of telecommunications which are necessary to ensure the best quality and most economical service to all the residents of Saskatchewan.

However, before I explain the value of those principles, I will discuss the bill clause by clause. The first amendment, the new section 6.1 is basically one of housekeeping. The experience of Sask Power has shown the value of an executive committee on boards of directors. The experience of the board of directors of Saskatchewan Telecommunications has also shown us that an executive committee would expedite the business of the corporation. There have been instances where it has been necessary to convene a full-scale board meeting to deal with some issues which require immediate action. It would be much more efficient in terms of both time and money to have an executive committee which would be able to deal with some of the aspects of the business of the board.

Mr. Speaker, the executive committee and advisory committees would have only the powers given to them by the board. They would not be usurping any functions of the board, only facilitating the effectiveness of the board. This section of the bill will only provide for more efficient and effective handling of board business.

The two amendments to section 9(1)(b) and section 43(1) can be considered together. Section 9(1)(b) sets out specifically the powers of the corporation. Section 43(a) describes the activities in which it may become involved.

Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons for these amendments, essentially they are needed to provide a more solid basis for action by Sask Tel. At the present time, Sask Tel relies on the ancillary powers given to it by old legislation. These amendments will provide a more secure basis for the future operation of Sask Tel.

The field of data communications is growing rapidly and can be extremely specialized. One reason the field is growing rapidly is that the industry is on the leading edge of technology. New equipment is continually being developed. The new equipment is generally capable of more complex functions and is usually more compact and efficient. As a consequence there is a relatively short life cycle for much of that

equipment. To have Sask Tel maintain ownership of all computer communication equipment would quickly result in a large inventory for Sask Tel of still serviceable, but technically obsolete equipment. By selling such equipment the problems of inventory are avoided.

A second reason for these amendments is to allow customers to standardize their equipment throughout the province and in other parts of the country. Because of the unique equipment used for computer communication, there are some very specialized applications which require special design in installation. This amendment will allow Sask Tel to provide service for these customers. Where necessary it will be possible to design, build and sell custom equipment without building up inventory costs or being forced to pass up business opportunities because of the lack of special equipment.

An additional reason for the amendment is that the data communications business is extremely competitive and our competitors are selling terminal equipment. To maintain our competitive edge we need the option of meeting this competition head on. This amendment will permit Sask Tel to have that option.

Section 44.2 as amended prohibits the attachment of any equipment to any telecommunications line except as permitted under and subject to the conditions established by the regulations under section 46. The control of unauthorized attachments to Sask Tel's lines is not new. However, this will make it unmistakably clear that the relevant sections of the existing tariff have the authority of law. In that sense the proposed amendments are only reinforcing what has been in Sask Tel's tariff for many years. For example in 1928 each and every telephone directory given to a subscriber listed the conditions of service. The seventh condition read as follows:

The attachment or use of any electrical or mechanical connection or apparatus with the lines of instrument installed by the department is prohibited.

And the 1979 directory had under 8(d) of conditions of service:

No person shall attach to or use in conjunction with any part of Sask Tel's communication system or property any unauthorized electrical mechanical or other device, whether connected to such a system or property or not for any purpose whatsoever.

The bill does not bring new conditions to the provision of Saskatchewan Telecommunication's services; it does clarify and reinforce the existing conditions of service by spelling out clearly both the rules respecting attachments and the consequences of disregarding those rules. This type of regulation is neither new nor unique to this province. For example, section 28.1 of the Alberta Government Telephone Act reads as follows:

No person shall fix to any telecommunications equipment of the commission any equipment, attachment, device, apparatus or contrivance capable of transmitting or receiving messages passing through a telecommunications system of the commission that is not approved or authorized in writing from the commission or supplied by the commission.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba telephone system is at present taking a strong stand against customer-owned equipment being attached to their system. In addition,

Manitoba is attempting to discourage retailers from selling telephones directly to the public. The present policy of Sask Tel concerning customer-owned attachments to its lines will not be affected by the legislation. That policy currently permits some types of connections and can briefly be described as follows (and let me quote from some of the items of our tariff):

1. Most customer-owned devices including telephone sets are permitted to be attached to private lines owned by Sask Tel, subject to certain technical standards such as maximum electrical current.
2. However, customer-owned telephone sets are not permitted to be attached to the public-switched network.
3. General mobile telephones in motor vehicles have access to the public-switched network through a base station owned by Sask Tel and such instruments can be owned by the subscriber if they meet the required standards.
4. The following types of customer-owned equipment may be connected acoustically, inductively, or by means of a coupler supplied by Sask Tel: (a) automatic answering and recording machines; (b) computers and associated equipment; (c) data sets; (d) facsimile and telephoto equipment; (e) teleprinters; (f) cathode ray tube terminal equipment (which is a TV screen); (g) telemetering equipment; (h) alarm devices.
5. Any equipment which does not fall into one of those nine categories may be considered and if found acceptable would be added to the list set out in the regulations.
6. There are existing rules and conditions governing all customer-owned attachments. They are in the present tariff and are as follows:
 - (a) Direct electrical connection of customer-owned equipment to switch network facilities is not permitted except through specified Sask Tel equipment — a telephone limiter, connector or other protective device.
 - (b) Sask Tel does not guarantee that its facilities are, or will remain, compatible with customer-owned equipment.
 - (c) Customer-owned equipment may not be mounted inside Sask Tel equipment cabinets or housings. Sask Tel will supply points of connection accessible to the customer.
 - (d) Sask Tel may at any time disconnect an attachment or other customer-owned equipment if tests and/or inspections show that the customer is not complying with the general regulations in this tariff or the conditions set forth in this item. Breach of conditions stated herein by the customer will result in suspension of service.
 - (e) When a customer with customer-owned equipment reports trouble on Sask Tel's facilities and when a field visit proves the trouble to be in the customer's equipment, a charge is assessed for the time expended, portal to portal, based on customer work rates, rate (c) in the tariff.

(f) Occasional request for repairmen or maintenance of customer-owned equipment or cable not under maintenance contract with Sask Tel will be entertained subject to availability of staff. Again, it will use customer work rates, rate (c) in the tariff.

(g) Connection of communications systems to switch network facilities are prohibited.

(h) All rates charged and rules related to the use of Sask Tel's facilities must also be complied with.

So, Mr. Speaker, there you have a list of the kinds of customer-owned equipment which may now be connected to the lines of Sask Tel and the conditions of service governing that usage. The list of conditions and service will not be affected by the proposed amendments and we do not intend to restrict this list following the adoption of these amendments. These amendments and the regulations which follow will serve to reinforce our present policy and tariff.

Section 44(3) again as amended is a direct response to the new practice of some stores offering telephones for sale. A few stores have recently been offering telephones for sale to the public. Some are even making available to the public all the necessary adapters, lines and extensions to hook up customer-owned telephone sets. Such conduct results in the public being misled to believe that it is legal to hook up these telephone sets to Sask Tel's switch network. Most people are unaware of the fact this connection is forbidden and in some cases may constitute a criminal offence, for example, theft of the telecommunications service.

This amendment will help put a stop to this problem. In order to ensure the quality of equipment hooked to the system, it is essential that Sask Tel has control of its system. Without such controls the erosion of basic principles of telecommunications, such as universal access and end-to-end responsibility, will begin and with that erosion will come lower standards of service and higher costs to the general public who are to be served.

Section 44(4) again as amended is a logical and necessary addition to ensure that other sections of this bill are not contravened and in a direct reference to section 44(2). The clauses of this bill are required to ensure that continued high quality service which we now have, and have come to expect, can be continued.

The legislation may appear to a lay person as controversial and restrictive. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that it is not. In fact, it will ensure that one of the best telephone companies in Canada continues to provide top quality service. Surely access to a top quality telecommunications system is neither controversial nor restrictive. Since virtually all Saskatchewan residents have access to a worldwide method of communications, the system must be seen as contributing towards a better understanding of people. However, Mr. Speaker, the vitality and integrity of our system is being threatened. It is being threatened by the chipping away at the basic principles of telecommunications I mentioned earlier. Our system has been built on the basic principles and the erosion of them constitutes a grave threat to the continuation of our system.

The first basic principle is very fundamental. It is the principal of universal access. This

May 7, 1980

means that ideally every person in every geographic area can connect with every other person and geographic area. We have effectively reached that ideal. Sask Tel can now provide service to virtually everyone in the province. Even in northern Saskatchewan with its 22,000 widely separated residents, Sask Tel has made service available to all communities of 50 residents or more. There are few areas in the world that can be as competent and have a service comparable to the one we have in Sask Tel. The acceptance of the fundamental principle of universal access has provided the residents of Saskatchewan with a first-class telecommunications system.

The achievement of the standard established by that principle has been accomplished by the two accepted premises: price averaging and a commitment to service. The concept of price averaging is neither new nor unique to the telecommunications industry. It is a means to the goal of universal access. Essentially the concept means that your having a telephone is of value to me and as such I should be willing to subsidize your higher costs. Consider the example of anyone of us travelling in a remote area of the province who suddenly has a need for use of a telecommunications system. At that point the value of service may be \$1,000. Of course if price averaging were not in practice, there would be no telephone there to use regardless of the amount someone might be willing to pay for it.

In other words, there are times when your telephone may be of great value to me. With the existing pricing formula that value is taken into account and a common price is set, which permits the income of more lucrative telephone services to subsidize those which are uneconomical — an arrangement that is mutually beneficial. That is the benefit of price averaging. It allows a more complete system. It allows for universal access.

The second basic principle, Mr. Speaker, of telecommunications is the importance of end-to-end responsibility. The logic of that principle says that if a carrier's right to payment depends upon the delivery of the message, then it is irrational and unfair to take away from the carrier the responsibility and control over any part of the system essential for the delivery. For example, A calls B and uses \$10,000 worth of Sask Tel lines and switching equipment for three minutes. Subsequently A refuses to pay for the call because the telephone instrument purchased by B for \$40 directly from a retailer malfunctions. In such an example Sask Tel would not get paid for the use of its \$10,000 worth of equipment, through no fault of its own. It would cost more to establish fault than the value of the call. Even if the person does not dispute the call, the reputation of Sask Tel would be tarnished and the customer would be deprived of the top quality service now available from this company.

When no one is responsible for end-to-end delivery, the end result is obvious. The quality of service will decline and the overall costs will rise and have to be passed on to the customer. End-to-end responsibility is necessary to ensure the compatibility of equipment and attachments. Without compatibility, duplication of effort and equipment is the natural consequence and will inevitably result in higher costs. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, to be responsible for the delivery of the signal without being able to control all the equipment involved is illogical and unfair. To deviate from the principle of end-to-end responsibility would clearly result in poorer service at increased cost. It would be step backward, a step few people would want to take.

The third principle, Mr. Speaker, of telecommunications, is the principle of primary function. The logic of that principle says the telecommunications system is a lifeline for service and not a clothes line for hardware. In other words we must not permit the

primary function of a reliable and economic delivery system to be subverted to the demands of equipment retailers wishing simply to increase their sales. To imperil the effectiveness of Sask Tel's primary responsibility in order to benefit retailers in their efforts to market gadgets is false freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want anyone to be left with the impression that Sask Tel wants to provide only telephone service. There is a wide array of services that will soon be available that are legitimate telecommunication services. The Manitoba Telephone system soon will be field testing a project involving such services for home-owners as alarm systems, remote meter reading, remote control of heating and medical alert. Alberta Government Telephones is also field testing a similar project. The point is simple. Such services are an extension of the primary function and can be operated best by the telecommunication's company that has end-to-end responsibility.

The guiding principle of primary function leads us to the conclusion that our goal must be service, not private market development. To carry any other theory to its conclusion we would be in an era of throw away telephones where no one would be responsible for repair and maintenance. The waste and inefficiency involved would be unacceptable.

The fourth principle, Mr. Speaker, of telecommunications has to do with market size. If the size of the market is limited and universal access is accepted, then it is critical that the market not be fragmented. Fragmentation would only result in higher costs to users. In a limited market any fragmentation that would take place would be of a cream-skimming nature. There are always segments of a market that are more profitable than others of course. To remove only that profitable portion would necessarily increase the costs to other segments of the market. Without access to the total market, the benefits of price averaging are lost and would even threaten the principle of universal access.

Mr. Speaker, those are the four basic principles of telecommunications: universal access; end-to-end responsibility, primary function; and market size. Each is important in its own right, yet each is closely dependent upon the other. To erode one is to threaten the entire system. It is clear that to maintain and follow those four principles will ensure the survival of the system with its high standards and economy. The final result of a system based on those principles is the best possible system at the lowest possible price. The amendments will make it clear to CN/CP telecommunications and other specialized carriers, that Sask Tel will not be forced into permitting these competitors to interconnect their facilities with Sask Tel for the purpose of cream skimming the lucrative business and leaving Sask Tel with the responsibility for servicing the none-economic markets. Fragmentation and cream skimming will result in a higher total cost of telecommunications to our residents since rates would have to rise. There may be individual savings as a result of cream-skimming but the rest of the subscribers would have to pay the higher costs. The end result would be that the total telecommunications bill would be higher. It makes simple economic sense to follow the principles I have just mentioned. I would hope that the opposition sees fit today to agree with this bill because if they do not, it indicates to me that they are interested only in allowing cream skimming for their private enterprise friends at the expense of the subscribers of the province. I think that is a very serious thing.

Mr. Speaker, given those principles and their value to telecommunication, it becomes immediately apparent that they must be maintained. As I have said, the erosion of even one of those principles will threaten the entire system. If the integrity of the system is to be preserved (and it is clear it must be preserved), then there is only one possible

May 7, 1980

course of action. We must ensure that Sask Tel maintains control of the total system.

The reputation of Sask Tel is clear evidence that control of the total system results in the maintenance of high standards, good service, the lowest possible costs. The existing system is one of the best in this country, if not in North America, if not in the world. From that premise there is a rule of logic that must be accepted. To the western cattlemen, to the people over on the opposite side and farmers it is, if it ain't broke, don't fix it; to the eastern windjammer captain it is, if you're winning the race don't start frigging with the rigging. And that's a good principle for the boys across the way to have a look at.

To begin the path down the slippery slope of fragmenting the telecommunications market potential, by allowing interconnection with competitors and certain customer-owned systems, would only erode the system we now have. Preventing that first step down the slippery slope is the only way to ensure the integrity of the system.

It is not a question of restraint, or of trade, or denying basic rights. Those questions have nothing to do with the issue at hand. The issue is the maintenance of the integrity of the system. Without the ability to ensure end-to-end delivery, the entire basis of telecommunications is subverted, and that is the first step to lower standards of reliability, poor service and higher costs.

Mr. Speaker, there are two points of interest in this matter that I will draw to your attention. The first point I want to bring to our attention is that as a purchaser of a large number of telephones, Sask Tel has indirectly helped to create jobs. There are now telephone equipment assembly plants operating in this province that supply most of Sask Tel's residential telephones, which ship telephones to all corners of the world and supply jobs to Saskatchewan residents. Had Sask Tel not been in the position it is in with respect to end-to-end responsibility, there is no reason to believe that these plants would now be here in the province of Saskatchewan.

A fragmented market, Mr. Speaker, would not have had the stability that the establishment of assembly plants requires. An assured market did that, and I must repeat that market was assured because Sask Tel has end-to-end responsibility.

The second point I want to bring to your attention is the tremendous investment Sask Tel has in telecommunications equipment. Many people only think of the telephone on their desks or in their homes as the extent of Sask Tel's investment. Of course that is only a part, a very small part of the total investment. As of December 31, 1979, Sask Tel had an investment of nearly \$0.75 billion. That is over \$1,200 of investment for each and every telephone in use in the province. That is a point which opponents of this amendment would do well to keep in mind.

Customers do not just rent a telephone. They are renting a system that is worth nearly \$0.75 billion.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, there are some views of others, some in and some out of the industry, that the members of this Assembly, and particularly the opposition should be aware of. The first view is that of an esteemed professor, Eugene V. Rostow. Dr. Rostow is Sterling professor of law in public affairs at Yale University. He is dean of the Yale Law School, and has an international reputation as author, scholar and public servant. In discussing the American experience of trying to introduce competition into a situation of natural monopoly, he concluded at this time:

The effort has not been a success in my opinion. It is producing lower communications rates for big business users of communication services, but at the price of higher overall costs and of inevitable increases over the long run in the rates for household and small business subscribers. The entry of the competing suppliers of services has proved possible, not through the working of market forces in the competitive mode but through regulatory devices which subvert the normal regulations of competition, and thus lead to a pricing pattern which does not maximize the economic welfare of society as a whole.

On the contrary, the competition which has been introduced is not competition at all in any sense an economist can recognize. It is shot through with restraints on competition to protect the new entrants, the duplication of excessive facilities, and rules which thwart the optimal utilization of economics of scale and integration of the network.

Moreover, by promoting the break-up of the integrated network into a series of fragments, the process, if long continued, would foreclose the possibility of introducing advanced, high-capacity transmission, and switching facilities which would be economic only in a fully integrated network.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that when he defined 'natural monopoly' he said that it is:

The situation where the telephone network as a single supplier can provide society with network communication service at lower real costs than are possible under the alternative industry structure.

The second view, Mr. Speaker, that must be heard, is that of C.L. Brown, chairman of the board of AT&T in the United States. In the keynote address to last year's annual meeting of the Canadian Telecommunications Carriers Association, he made several interesting and pertinent observations. In discussion the role of the public in the debate surrounding the issue of monopoly and competition in the U.S. telecommunications industry, the attitude of the public has been one of indifference, and he said:

In the recent hearings by the communications subcommittees of the House of Senate just about every party at interest was heard, except the general public.

Mr. Brown also raised two interesting questions that are critical to the debate here today. He asked and I quote:

Is ours a unique enterprise endowed with unique accountabilities and, therefore, committed to service as our first responsibility? Or, are we to be simply competitors, among competitors in motivation or one from another and free to enter and free to leave whatever markets profit might dictate?

Whatever markets profit might dictate — that is an important statement. That is not merely a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker. It is the heart of the matter. In his conclusion he emphasized the service objectives of the industry, and in rather simple terms also outlined the goals of the telephone industry. In Mr. Brown's words, the service goals of our industry are to assure:

May 7, 1980

that when a customer dials a set of numbers he can do so with reasonable confidence that first, a phone will ring and second that it will ring at the right house.

The third view I wish to draw to the member's attention is that of a premier of a Canadian province. In discussing the question of monopoly or competition, he unequivocally supported the monopoly system for such industries as hydro and telephones. Perhaps I should quote that gentleman. The gentleman is Premier Richard Hatfield of New Brunswick. I believe he is a Conservative Premier in that province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Richard Hatfield, the Premier of New Brunswick, the Conservative.

In his address in 1979, at the meeting of the Canadian Telecommunications Carriers Association, he described his experiences growing up in a small town in New Brunswick, the experience he gained as Premier and his travels as Premier. Then he said:

Therefore based on that experience (and not based on having listened as you have to the best intelligence of many people) I have come to the conclusion that what we should continue with in this country, given the complexity of the problem, given the complexity of the kinds of issues that are involved, given the kind of country that we have, I am convinced that we should continue with the monopoly system.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that all of these gentlemen are respected and knowledgeable in their respective fields. Their opinions, therefore, should be of some importance and worthy of attention.

The important sections of this bill are the sections to be added after section 44 of the existing act. These four sections in reality only provide definitions, conditions, and consequences necessary to assure the integrity of the system. They are, as I indicated a moment ago, not new to the conditions of service. They are now being formalized and refined.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the bill. I have outlined the basic principles of telecommunications. I have described the value and worth of each and the consequences of their erosion. Based upon those principles, logic, and common sense, we reach the necessary conclusion that those principles must be protected by statute and that is the purpose of this bill. It clarifies and formalizes the existing regulations in Sask Tel's tariff.

I think the bill is necessary. I think it's a bill that's good for all of the people in Saskatchewan. I'm very pleased today to have the opportunity to give second reading to Bill No. 13.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I have seven documents which I wish to table for ready reference so the hon. gentlemen don't have to use their research people's time. I will table them. I will indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, what they are: (1) the proposed regulations governing attachments, (2) the general tariff as of October 1979, (3) an information page — anyone can find this in two minutes by going to their respective lounge because it's an information page from the Sask Tel directory which tells you what the act says, (4) section 28 of the revised statutes of the Alberta Government Telephones Act, (5) Alberta Government Telephones' general tariff regarding basic services, (6) the Manitoba Telephone Act, and (7) the Manitoba Telephone Systems'

general tariff.

All of these are conclusive that this bill is good for the people of Saskatchewan and as a result of that I think the opposition is going to have a difficult time in voting against this bill, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure.

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleague said, now we're going to hear from the people. What do people want and what do people think of Bill No. 13?

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments to the Mickey Mouse amendments made to this bill today. The only thing these amendments have done is they've taken the control and the power out of Sask Tel's office and put it in the cabinet's office with one exception, Section 44.4(2) but I will read 44.4(1) first:

The corporation may seize any attachment mentioned in section 44.2 from any person who contravenes this section.

Now, what they did take out, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and I think the people of Saskatchewan will. But I know why they took it out, Mr. Speaker, because they were afraid of the opposition. The section they have taken out, Mr. Speaker, reads:

(2) Where a person contravenes section 44.2 or 44.3 the corporation may refuse to provide telecommunication service to that person for a period of not more than three months.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this points out they know they can go so far and they then have to start backing off. Before we're finished this debate, they're going to be backing off a lot farther than they've backed off already. In four years the back-door Premier can come in the back door. Mr. Speaker, now to go to my speech.

Throughout history it has been proven that those who suppress individual liberty and freedom soon fall victim to their own ways.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — This is a warning which I send to those on the opposite side of this Chamber as I rise to oppose Bill No. 13. If the ducks to the left of me would be quiet we could get through this a lot quicker. I do so, mindful of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this is a dangerous piece of legislation, geared at taking away the basic freedoms; indeed it is a concerted effort by the NDP government to eventually control every aspect of communication in this province. Bill No. 13 symbolizes the big brother socialist mentality of the present government. We on this side of the House, have very serious reservations about this bill which I shall discuss today.

The bill to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act is a clear indication that the socialist government will not rest until they have the same type of state control of the media and communications which exists.

AN HON. MEMBER: — In Alberta?

MR. GARNER: — No, not in Alberta — in Moscow and Peking where your Premier and Attorney General visited last year. Maybe that's where they got the idea of Bill No. 13,

May 7, 1980

from Moscow and Peking. Mr. Speaker, when various organizations, clubs and individuals take the time to communicate their strong objections to any piece of legislation I contend that these people deserve to be heard. During the course of my remarks I shall take the liberty to discuss some of these objections to which in each case I contend the present government has not been listening.

Take for example, Mr. Speaker, a telegram which was sent both to the Premier and the minister-in-charge of Sask Tel from the Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers Association dated March 11, 1980.

The Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers' Association understands a bill has been placed before the Saskatchewan legislature to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act. CBEMA has serious concerns with the nature of these amendments. Members supply a wide variety of business equipment used in Saskatchewan, including data processing, dictating and word processing equipment, much of which is used in conjunction with and attached to facilities of Saskatchewan Telecommunications. Users of this equipment include the Saskatchewan government, hospitals, universities, banks, credit union, wheat pool, as well as many business organizations.

The technology of such equipment is undergoing rapid change, which is improving price, performance and increasing the variety of products available. It is therefore critically important that organizations obtaining equipment should have access to the wide choice which is currently available to meet their needs.

The benefits of freedom of choice are being recognized by many jurisdictions. There is a trend toward less restrictions in the use of business equipment with telecommunications facilities.

A Bell Canada application before the CRTC and the telecommunications industry of the Alberta (listen to this) Public Utilities Board are evidence of the growing recognition of the need for a less restrictive environment. We are concerned that the amendments to The Saskatchewan Telecommunication Act will produce a more restrictive environment.

We believe the amendments will decrease the efficiency of institutions and businesses within the province of Saskatchewan and create difficulties for organizations intercommunicating with other provinces. The amendments will also result in needless and costly administration, an administrative burden for government and industries in Saskatchewan.

CBEMA members urge you, therefore, to open this subject to public input and debate before proceeding with legislation which may not be in the interest of your province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I note an article from the Regina Leader-Post, March 28, 1980 — Concern Expressed Over Bill. The article went on to say?

A number of users of telecommunication devices have expressed concern about a government bill to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act. The bill, which has received first reading in the legislature, prohibits all attachments to telephone equipment, except without the express written

permission of Sask Tel.

This now means expressed written permission of the cabinet. It's just like flipping a coin one side to the other. No change.

But Cody said Thursday, the bill is only attempting to put into law what is already in effect in the Sask Tel tariff. He said privately owned devices such as automatic answering and recording machines, general mobile telephone services, computers and related equipment and facsimile and telephoto equipment will be permitted as before.

The requirement that Sask Tel couplers be used to connect the equipment with telephone lines will also be unchanged.

On March 31, Mr. Colin Turnbull from the University of Regina expressed concern over the restrictive and monolithic nature of Bill 13.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to take into consideration the letter and brief sent to me by the Saskatchewan Library Association. I urge those on the government side to pay special attention. It reads:

Dear Mr. Garner: I am writing to express the concerns of this association over the contents of Bill No. 13 — An Act to Amend the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act. Saskatchewan Library Association is a non-profit organization whose members represent a wide spectrum of library workers in Saskatchewan. The primary business of the institutions for which our members work is to provide information to their patrons or to provide access to information in other locations. Many of these institutions are public libraries whose primary goal is to provide information to the general public as a free service, free not only in the monetary sense, but free from political, religious, cultural or any other biases.

It is very important to our membership that information be freely available to all those who seek it. Any attempt to restrict access to information, by censoring the knowledge base or by restricting or monopolizing communication channels, is against the interests of our members and very definitely against the interests of the clientele that we serve.

Library patrons come from all walks of life and all parts of the political spectrum. Our membership is aware of the ongoing revolution in the information systems that the merging of computer and telecommunications technology is producing. We welcome systems such as telidon and fibre optics network, which potentially offer a much better access to stored knowledge that can be provided by manual print-based systems. However, attempts by various vested interest to monopolize this new technology could prevent our members from exploiting it in the best interests of the people.

In this context we must strongly oppose passage of Bill No. 13 — An Act to Amend the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act. The amendments to section 9 provide Sask Tel with the authority to manufacture, distribute or lease telecommunications equipment or attachments. The new section 43 gives Sask Tel the necessary freedom to finance or enter into joint ventures

or contracts to accomplish this end.

This is explicit authority to begin a vertical integration of the telecommunications-teleprocessing industry in Saskatchewan. Further the new section 44.4 provides Sask Tel with the power to exclude by fiat, any competitive products or even advertisements for competitive products from Saskatchewan's market place. The primary purpose is so broad and ill-defined, that virtually every teleprocessing service that a library or information centre might use, could be abridged or jeopardized by the internal policies of Sask Tel.

Bill No. 13 does nothing to provide guidelines for Sask Tel policies and it makes no provision for appeal (I want the members opposite to get this) in the event that an individual or a company is denied permission to connect. Neither does it provide for the public disclosure of the reasons for denial, or of the guidelines under which permission or denial decisions are made. (Open and shut cases, wearing three hats, judge, jury and executioner).

Although we would welcome the opportunity to participate in an advisory committee (section 6) such advisory committees will be powerless to defend individuals or companies who are denied access to the telecommunication-teleprocessing services of their choice, as described in section 6. Such committees are not an answer to the criticisms raised above.

SLA and its membership acknowledge the importance of a freely available telecommunications network of the kind currently operated by Sask Tel.

We also acknowledge the necessity for protecting the electrical and computational integrity of such a network. However, the amendments proposed in Bill No. 13 do not address this problem directly. On the contrary the amendments clearly give Sask Tel the right to vertically integrate the whole telecommunications industry in Saskatchewan and by virtue of section 44 the power to do this by force of decree.

The Saskatchewan Library Association has no choice but to strongly oppose such legislation because it puts the whole future of the electronic information systems under the control of one corporation. This is unacceptable in a free society. The Saskatchewan Library Association respectfully requests an opportunity to discuss these matters with you in greater detail in the near future. Sincerely, Gordon L. Ray, President, Saskatchewan Library Association.

I would just like to waver from my speech a little bit right there, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was a busy MLA before this bill. I was having a holiday practically. Since Bill No. 13 has come in, the Sask Tel telephone hasn't quit ringing. It is almost impossible to keep up with the mail. The people want to meet.

In Crown corporations, I asked the minister, how many briefs have you had? Oh, just a few. And he calls this a couple. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can't tell me people in Saskatchewan are only calling Jim Garner, the critic for Sask Tel and they are not calling the minister. They are calling my other colleagues, too. Something is fishy, Mr. Speaker. Something is very fishy. I am inclined to believe that maybe the government members opposite are getting a lot of calls but don't want to admit it.

Mr. Speaker, bills like this are going to extend this Chamber, as I think I have stated once before. We may miss summer. We may even miss Celebrate Saskatchewan. We may have to hold it off until 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a press release:

In a letter addressed to Don Cody, Minister of Telephones, the Saskatchewan Library Association has stated it has no choice but to strongly oppose Bill No. 13. An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.

The association, a non-profit organization whose members represent a wide spectrum of library workers in Saskatchewan, states in this letter that Bill No. 13 would put the whole future of electronic information in Saskatchewan under the control of the corporation.

Now it has been change around a bit. It is under complete control of the cabinet. They just flipped the coin on the other side.

Therefore it would restrict access to communication channels and to be stored information. The primary purpose of the institutions for which the members of the Saskatchewan Library Association work is to provide information or access to information. New technology is producing the emergency of information system which potentially offer better access to stored knowledge than can be provided by manual print-based systems.

The new section 44 provides the corporation with the power to exclude by far any competitive products or advertisements for competitive products from Saskatchewan's market place. The bill makes no provision for appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to turn to the concerns of the amateur radio operators in Saskatchewan in opposition to Bill No. 13. For the record, I will read a couple of these concerns to the members opposite, since they are not seemingly getting any opposition or any phone calls or any briefs. We had better let them have the benefit of some of the calls and some of the briefs which we are getting. It reads and I quote:

Dear Mr. Garner: I wish to register my opposition to the bill introduced this month in the legislature, referred to as Bill No. 13 (I'm begging to think now, Mr. Speaker, that's why they named it 13, because it's an unlucky number. This is an unlucky bill for the people of Saskatchewan.) and in particular, to its adverse effects on many of the close to 1,000 radio amateurs of Saskatchewan. I feel sure the present government is well aware of the many, many instances over the years in which radio amateurs have and continue to play such an important role with communications, in disasters, emergencies, distress cases of one kind or another, without thought of remuneration, visions or grandeur, etc, but as a service to the public. That's what amateur radio is all about — service to the public. It's recognized in the International Telecommunications Union, the federal government, as the amateur radio service and the denial of the use of certain pieces of equipment would endanger many of the services performed by radio amateurs.

May 7, 1980

A former leader and premier of this province (I want the members to listen to this — I'm reading a letter. These are not my words. I think it could be one of your supporters who is leaving.), Mr. T.C. Douglas and his cabinet recognized the importance of radio amateurs by authorizing call letter licence plates for their cars many years ago. Verbal assurances that this bill is not intended to interfere in the daily activities of radio amateurs, who may use certain types of connections, for these strictly non-commercial, non-remunerative facets of their hobby, notwithstanding. I am sure all Saskatchewan radio amateurs would feel less hostile with the insertion of a paragraph spelling out these assurances, rather than relying on the thoughts of people who may have differing viewpoints on this subject. Yours truly, Mr. X, a former NDP supporter.

I would like to draw attention to the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — X and O's.

MR. GARNER: — I've got an O letter coming up later on. I would like to draw attention to the fact that it was a former leader of the NDP and premier of this province, Tommy Douglas, who recognized the importance of radio amateur by authorizing these call letters. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Douglas, a real champion of freedom, would have to say about Bill No. 13? I am sure he would not be amused by it.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to continue with letters from other amateur radio operators. One reads:

Dear Mr. Garner: We are concerned about Bill No. 13 which is now before the House. We are both ham radio operators and find it a fascinating hobby. But if Bill No. 13 is passed, it is going to take a lot away from our hobby. We would like you to do all you can to at least have an amendment added so that ham radios would not be affected by the bill.

We have had amendments presented here in this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, but as I have stated, they are Mickey Mouse amendments, by flipping the coin from Sask Tel to the cabinet or from the cabinet back to Sask Tel.

We will be introducing an amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I guarantee you, it won't be a Mickey Mouse amendment. It will have some guts to it. There will be some content in it, and the amendment will be what the people of Saskatchewan want, not what a little socialistic group wants to control.

Mr. Speaker, I have another one I would like to do and this one is especially for the Minister of Agriculture. I would like you to pay particular attention to this one, Mr. Minister. It's from the Last Mountain Radio Club, and it reads:

Dear Mr. Garner:

The members of the Last Mountain Radio Club had requested that I write to you regarding the proposed legislation pertaining to Sask Tel, known as Bill No. 13.

We, the club members, wish to express our strongest objections to the intent

of this legislation, as it would apply to radio amateur 'Phone Patch,' VHF 'Autopatch,' message handling computer interfaces, etc.

These devices are valuable tools in the day-to-day operation of amateur radio communication. Any legislated restrictions against the use of these devices could have serious implications for the emergency message handling systems that perform back-up duty during emergency situations.

On behalf of the Last Mountain club members, I would ask you to pass our concerns to the members of the Saskatchewan legislature. Please indicate to them that we, as amateur radio operators, should be exempt from any legislation which would jeopardize this effective emergency network.

The Last Mountain Radio Club, Mr. Speaker, represents the following districts: Southey, Strasbourg, Nokomis, Lipton, Govan, Wynyard, Imperial, Raymore and Liberty.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the following letter is very representative of the concerns amateur radio operators have in opposition to Bill No. 13.

I am writing to express my concern regarding certain aspects of Bill 13 re: Sask Tel tariffs. I am the operator of amateur radio station VE 5 ZZ, advanced certificate. As you may know, amateur radio operators are required to pass rigid examinations in electronic theory, operating laws and procedures and radio telegraph code, unlike CB radio operators. In addition to communicating on a worldwide basis, amateurs provide a vital service in providing links in emergencies and for persons in remote areas away from telephone services.

Amateurs in every state in the United States and all provinces of Canada have two devices that assist in this. The first is the 'Phone Patch.' This enables an amateur to connect his transmitter to a telephone. A third party can then use the amateur station to communicate to another amateur. This is used extensively by military and civil service personnel in the Arctic to keep in touch with relatives and friends in southern cities.

The second device is the 'Autopatch' which enables an amateur with a VHF transceiver to access the telephone system via a repeater interconnection, to be able to summon police, ambulance or civil defence authorities is extremely valuable.

Federal regulations specify that both 'Autopatch' and 'Phone patch' operations be strictly non-commercial, and amateurs are extremely conscious about observing this regulation.

Sask Tel has intimated that it will look the other way, and tolerate the use by amateurs of these devices. However, I would not like to rely on a bureaucratic whim. Therefore, I am opposed to Bill 13 as it stands. I am speaking for myself and my fellow radio amateurs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the concerns of the computer operators in the province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who signed them? Yes, they will start the witch hunt now, Mr. Speaker. They want to know who it is? Let's start the witch hunt.

May 7, 1980

The members opposite want to start the witch hunt. Who sent you the letters? Start the witch hunt. I suppose you want to know the computer companies' names so you can start cutting into them too.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Table it.

MR. GARNER: — The Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources says table it. Why didn't you table the information on the \$2 million you are going to pull out of the heritage fund? You didn't table that. In a letter, Mr. Speaker, addressed to Mr. Garner, Legislative Building:

As I have mentioned to you and Bob Pickering over the phone I do not like the modification of section 44 of The Saskatchewan telecommunications Act, by the addition of section 44(2) which forbids the use of various attachments to Sask Tel's communication lines. Specifically I object to not being able to use acoustical equipment.

In my business of supplying computer services I utilize a time-sharing computer run by another Crown corporation, Sask Com. In order to do so I use a computer terminal with a built-in acoustic coupler which enables me to use a normal telephone line to access Sask Comp's computer.

According to 44(2) I can obtain written permission from Sask Tel to use my terminals. However since Sask Tel is in the business of supplying similar terminals I suspect they would try to force me either to use their equipment, thereby turning my terminal into an expensive paperweight, or go out of business if I cannot absorb their charges. Since I seem to be under the impression that Sask Tel also supplies computing services, the latter of the two options would seem to benefit them ore.

Also with respect to section 44(2), if my request for permission to use my terminals is denied, the amendments to the act do not indicate if there is any formal avenue of appeal, or whether they even have to outline their response for the rejection.

Another problem in my case was that I was forced to purchase my present specialized terminal because Sask Tel did not rent my specific type of terminal due to a low foreseen demand. (Sask Tel was asleep again).

I cannot see any technical problems with connection of my acoustic device through telephone lines since I assume that these devices have been deemed acceptable for use with phone lines by at least the U.S. federal department, as well as probably some Canadian federal departments.

I would also think that if I wish to access other computers not located in Saskatchewan and Sask Tel prevented me from using my terminal that this could be seen as interfering with interprovincial trade and communication.

In summary, I can accept Sask Tel having a monopoly on telephone lines. However, if the attachments to these lines have no detrimental effect on the operation of those lines I see no reason for Sask Tel to qualify my use of rented lines. I wish to be able to choose the equipment from competing organizations where I may receive some benefit in either reduced prices, or

specialized equipment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the matter of acoustic couplers which seem to have raised the most controversy in this bill.

An acoustic coupler is a device which can be attached to a small personal computer or computer terminal, and be used to communicate with or control other computers and give a user access to huge amounts of information stored in computer data bases. The coupler is electrically attached to a computer and mechanically attached to a telephone handset.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How much are they?

MR. GARNER: — My colleague says, how much are they? I think I should stop right there, Mr. Speaker, because acoustic couplers can be purchased outright from many corporations for \$296. That's what they want but Sask Tel wants about \$160 to hook them up and then \$40 a month for the rest of your life. Now, is this the New Deal for People, Mr. Speaker? This is not a New Deal for People. Incidentally, the acoustic coupler you get from the private enterprise companies is much better than the acoustic coupler that can be purchased or rented from Sask Tel.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. We have too many people participating in the debate. According to the rules, the member who has the floor (and I recognize the member for Wilkie as having the floor) is the one who is doing the debating now. I know other members, along with myself, would like to hear what he has to say in this debate.

MR. GARNER: — The coupler is electrically attached to a computer and mechanically attached to a telephone handset, Mr. Speaker. The microphone and speaker of the handset fit into cup-like receptacles on the coupler, that is the acoustic coupler. Electrical signals from the computer are transformed into sound in the coupler. The sound is picked up by the microphone in the telephone handset and transmitted over the phone lines like any other sound. Signals arriving at the computer as sound from the phone are picked up by a microphone in the coupler and converted back into electrical impulses which the computer understands. In this process the coupler is connected to the telephone system indirectly, just as a human being is when speaking on the phone. The only thing with a direct electrical connection to Sask Tel's wiring is Sask Tel's own phone. It is impossible for couplers to damage the telephone system.

The machines come under their own manufacturer's warrant and are serviced by the manufacturer or the local retail outlet. Sask Tel is under no obligation to service couplers and no owner of one would expect them to. By making the use of acoustic couplers illegal, the government is restricting free speech, potentially restricting free press and restricting the lawful workings of commerce and business.

Many small businessmen, both now and especially in the future, would be unable to afford to access their computers at their places of business where more and more of them will be keeping their financial and other business records as the prices of personal computer systems continue to drop. As we look to the next couple of decades, Mr. Speaker, we will see that more and more people with jobs which do not involve physical labor will be conducting their work far from their offices, at home through the use of computer communication. Mr. Speaker, we are in the age of computers.

If this Bill No. 13 comes in, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan doesn't go a step ahead.

May 7, 1980

Saskatchewan goes 10 steps back. We'll be shutting the down communications, computer and new technology just because of a socialist greed to control all communications in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this could potentially save us a huge amount of energy now used for commuting to and fro if these small computers are set up through small businesses. Bill No. 13 would negate the possibility in Saskatchewan by making it far too expensive for the worker. Bill No. 13's restriction on acoustic couplers is absurd and unfair. Hundreds of thousands of these devices are at work throughout the world, totally harmless to telecommunications and immensely beneficial to people in all walks of life. The forbidding of the use or sale of these devices in Saskatchewan does not benefit a single person. It benefits one thing only — Sask Tel — by giving them a monopoly they neither deserve nor need.

Moving on with objections, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter which was addressed to my colleague, the member for Regina South, which contains many key reasons why Bill 13 should not be allowed to pass.

I wish to protest in the strongest possible terms the vicious, confiscatory and totally undemocratic measures proposed for addition to clause 44 of this act. Certainly I have nothing but the most absolute contempt for any government that would even contemplate the passing of such repressive legislation.

Sask Tel is charged with a responsibility for the provision within Saskatchewan's borders of all communication cable for use by the citizens of this province. This responsibility has been assigned in an environment in which no competitor is permitted to provide such service.

Surely in such a single vendor situation, the seller of the service has no moral right to deny access to anyone prepared to pay the prevailing rate, nor to make any judgment with respect to how desirable or otherwise it may feel the particular usage to be.

The Attorney General wants to break up Sask Tel now. Maybe we are getting the message across, Mr. Speaker. Maybe he is listening. That's good.

The proposed legislation would permit Sask Tel, based on any frivolous whim, or otherwise, to deny to those not currently in favour with the company the right to engage in any communications activity, to market computer and other services and equipment requiring the use of communication lines, to purchase such services and equipment from the vendor or vendors of their choosing.

Many will have read articles in recent months about the coming age of computer terminals in the home, connected over communication lines to computers which will offer a variety of services. All such terminals and even the marketing of them, of advertising as to what they will enable the consumer to do, becomes illegal under legislation. It is not curious that such devices will be legal if marketed by Sask Tel, but not if they are marketed by someone else. (If they are marketed by someone else, will they be legal? Will they be allowed?)

Hardware costs in the computer industry have been falling over the past

decade at a rate of approximately two times per year. I can assure you that this would not have happened, and today's cheap technology would not be available, if any single vendor had been permitted to force all competitions out of the market place through legislation.

Anyone who believes that Saskatchewan consumers will be better off, depending solely on the benevolence and computer services skills of any single vendor, Sask Tel or otherwise, rather than in the open market we have lived in through the past decade, is a damned fool (and I am quoting from the letter).

I repeat, anyone who believes Sask Tel would, or even could if they truly wanted to, provide a level of service and expertise in a closed market to match that which the consumer will have available under the status quo is a complete and total idiot.

Clearly Sask Tel is not pursuing this legislation through any benevolent wisdom on its part. There is absolutely no doubt that the repressive legislation, if enforced, will be detrimental to consumers and small businesses in this province.

Why then does Sask Tel want it so badly? Sask Tel wants to be able to force the users of communications services to buy all associated equipment and ultimately the services themselves from Sask Tel. The consumers will suffer but Sask Tel will be able to wring an even greater level of profits from the taxpayer. (Mr. Speaker, last year, if the minister is listening, Sask Tel turned \$25 million in profit.) Evidently \$25 million is not enough to sate the avaricious appetites of the power hungry management of this corporation!

I can see only four arguments which Sask Tel might use to support this legislation which can be argued with even a marginal degree of conviction on their part. The first that Sask Tel knows best and will ensure that customers receive the best service at the lowest cost is simply false.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Big brother, big brother.

MR. GARNER: — Big brother is right and if you had been here earlier, Mr. Attorney General, you would have got the message.

I have already dealt with this one and to anyone who has observed the happenings within the computer industry generally over the past decade, it is hard to believe anyone could be so dense as to swallow this line of absolute crud.

The second argument is that Sask Tel has an obligation to ensure that its equipment is not used for immoral purposes. Since when did Sask Tel become a police force? This is not their problem and most certainly not a function I have any desire to empower Sask Tel to deal with. It is simply not a valid argument.

Thirdly, Sask Tel may argue that users may damage its equipment in some way by attaching improperly designed devices. Has some legislation been passed which relieves me of a liability caused by cutting through a Sask Tel

May 7, 1980

cable? Surely the same situation prevails here.

Perhaps some sort of standard setting body is needed. Such bodies now exist for certifying plumbing supplies, electrical supplies, etc, and could also perform a function in this area. But surely it makes no more sense to have Sask Tel performing this function than it would make to have General Motors certifying the quality of all automobiles manufactured.

I am skeptical that this really is a serious problem; however if Sask Tel seriously believes that such a body is necessary, then let our government push for it's creation as an impartial national body with no personal interest in the products being reviewed.

I want the members opposite to remember this point because we're going to be calling for a public review board. It isn't just us calling for a public review board; it is the people of Saskatchewan calling for a public review board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Not a public review board set up by a bunch of technocrats from the government side. We have technocrats and we have bureaucrats. I'd like to call them socialisticrats . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm not going to use that.

Finally Sask Tel may claim that they really have no intentions of enforcing this legislation. If such is the case then surely it isn't needed and everyone's time can be saved by dropping this matter right now. How can we be expected to trust someone else who asks for a bit club claiming all the while that he does not intend to use it?

Well, why ask for something if you don't intend to use it? That would be like a farmer buying ten tractors and only using one of them. That's government, NDP logic. O.K. I understand.

I appeal to you, and to the other members of our legislature not to be hoodwinked by any such out-and-out lie fabricated by the management of Sask Tel.

Finally, if the legislators of Saskatchewan cannot be convinced that this is extremely bad legislation for the province, I would ask them to consider their power to enforce restriction against interprovincial communications.

Under this legislation Sask Tel has the power to refuse me access to communication lines to Toronto, Vancouver, or wherever, which I may wish to use to assess computer files there, unless I agree to use Sask Tel equipment at this end. Clearly such powers are beyond the legal scope of the provincial legislature.

Apart from being incredibly bad legislation, it is legislation which is ultimately doomed to being thrown out. It is the wish of this government to push Saskatchewan citizens back into the dark ages, and at the same time display itself across our nation as a band of bungling idiots. surely our citizens deserve better than this. I appeal to you and to the general level of sanity which I hope prevails within this legislature to seriously consider the

consequences, stemming from this bill to deny its passage.

Yours truly, (and I don't think this man will mind if they want to go witch hunting him. I know, it's been on radio and that already.) Colin C. Turnbull.

Try your witch hunt on him. You won't snowball him. You wanted names. You have one.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to add to this debate. At this time I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — HIGHWAY TRAFFIC BOARD VOTE 15

Item 1 (continued)

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Chairman, last night we were having a discussion regarding the non-issuance of permission to one Randy Wangler of Wilkie to take the actual driving test. Mr. Chairman, I have given this thing some thought. I believe it is important that something be read into the record of what this situation is all about. I want to proceed to do that with a few brief words.

This very unfortunate young man, and I am sure every member of this Assembly has reason to hold this young man in high regard for his efforts to overcome the financial and personal effects of an unfortunate farm accident, surely commands everyone's highest respect. Having said this, I must say that, we, as an Assembly, both government and opposition, have a responsibility to the public of this province as well. This responsibility is simply to ensure that those who operate motor vehicles on our highways and whom we all meet on the roads have a reasonable degree of competence. In short, Mr. Chairman, it is to ensure that we can all drive in an environment which we can assume is reasonably safe.

Having said that, I know that everything we can do cannot change the habits of those people who break the law and who are a continual danger. That is something we can do nothing about except have our law enforcement people intercept them and charge them whenever they are caught.

Over the years past, governments have established a board to be as free as possible from political motivation and to give us this assurance that competent drivers operate vehicles on our roads. Over the years, our board and similar bodies across the country have found it desirable to meet and to determine standard procedures and tests so that people moving across the country are treated as equally as possible. Thus, the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators came to be formed. Federal government, all the provinces and all of the territories are represented at this conference. All of their recommendations are reviewed by a council of ministers consisting of ministers responsible for transportation in each province. Each recommendation becomes the stated, accepted practice and the official position of CCMTA.

There is obviously a long history in all jurisdictions in North America of driving restrictions for medical reasons. When this problem was approached by CCMTA, long before my time, they wisely decided, in my view, to seek the advice and recommendations of the Canadian Medical Association. The Canadian Medical Association

May 7, 1980

accepted this task. After their recommendations were reviewed by CCMTA for practicality and other considerations, the council of ministers approved the standards in 1973. These standards were adopted by the highway traffic board and I understand have worked most successfully since their adoption.

We now have a young man applying to the board to set aside these standards. There has also been a great deal of publicity generated by the member for Wilkie. I suppose that is his privilege. I question the motives. He was talking last night about taking the politics out. Well, I wish he would. Because thus far, Mr. Chairman, from this side and the board (I want to assure the House) no decisions, none at all have ever been political. The thinking of the people opposite, Mr. Chairman, astounds me.

There was another matter not so long ago in this House when the member for Rosetown-Elrose asked about a one-eyed person who had been denied by the examiner, mistakenly. It was re-examined. I said I would look into it and ask the board to review it. The board did review it with no recommendation from me. They decided that particular person should be granted his class 3 licence. But the member sends a note across to me thanking me for my influence. Well, I sent a note back to him and told him, and reminded him, that there was no influence on my part. It was simply a review. They in their wisdom and their judgment, are the ones who make the decisions, not me.

This young man appeared before the board on two occasions asking the board to set aside, in his case, standards which have been so carefully considered and adopted by the board. The standard in question is not a matter of the ability to pass a written or a road test. The standard represents the judgment of qualified people, of the ability of any individual to perform the driving tasks involved for large vehicles in an emergency situation. As I stated last evening, there is no way to test a person in such an environment. We must rely on the judgment of professional people who are able to make judgments of the consequences arising from an emergency situation.

I am informed that the original CCMTA review of these standards was considered by both driving and management representatives of the transportation industry, in addition to the medical association, not of Saskatchewan but of Canada.

The member for Wilkie has talked at length about compassion. Mr. Chairman, the government has a record, second to none, when it comes to compassion. The government set up the first of two appeal committees, as a committee in the highway traffic board, which exist in Canada. This committee's primary purpose is to ensure the rigid enforcement of our standards and laws do not work impossible hardship on Saskatchewan citizens. The committee consists of person who can all easily relate and to whom we can all easily relate as peers. It is made up of four ladies, two men of the cloth and two respected senior citizens. This committee, it seems to me, is an excellent example of this government's concern that compassion be considered in our handling of these matters.

We talk about care of the handicapped and considering the handicapped and it seems a bit strange when they talk about compassion and our lack of concern for handicapped people. My department is probably one of the only ones in Canada that has moved forward and initiated action to provide buses for handicapped people so they can go back and forth to work each day. We are paying now in every community 75 per cent of the capital cost of ongoing grants to maintain them.

In all the major centres, Mr. Chairman, in Saskatchewan is an innovative and expensive program which considers, talks about and acts on behalf of handicapped people. Mr. Chairman, these people acting as a quorum of the board have reviewed this total matter on two occasions and have reached the conclusion that it is not in the public interest to allow this young man to hold a higher class of licence than the class 5 which allows him to drive ordinary vehicles and small trucks.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation where an independent board has firstly, very carefully established standards on the best information and advice they could obtain, a committee of the board established to review the application of such standards to ensure they are applied with concern and compassion. Finally, their decision was that the standard applicable to this young man should stand.

Mr. Chairman, in my view we have an example here of a situation being handled in the most responsible manner which reasonable men and women could expect. Nevertheless, the member wish to impose on me a responsibility contrary to the advice of all of these qualified people. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, it's a responsibility which I have no legal authority to perform. The only action available to me is to recommend a course of action to the board.

Notwithstanding the previous statement, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared . . . And this is not something which has happened because I have written to the eight people who wrote to me on the invitation of presumably, Mrs. Wangler, and I suppose the suggestion by the member for Wilkie to start a letter-writing campaign, Well, the eight letters I received from friends and relatives have all been replied to telling them what they had not been told, that the matter is under review. I have said notwithstanding the statement on the situation up to now, I am prepared to consider this matter further to completely ensure that this young man receives every consideration possible. I will ask the chairman of the highway traffic board to take this particular case back to CCMTA at their meeting in Yellowknife in June and ask the CCMTA to review the standard as carefully as they possibly can and make a recommendation of the council of ministers who will be meeting in Toronto in September.

I am prepared to accept the decision of that group and I would sincerely hope the members opposite would be prepared to do likewise. I point out, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in having standards which provide for equality of treatment across this country if every government subsequently erodes the standards by unilateral actions under political pressure. There should be no room for political advantage in a situation like this.

This is why this government supports the concept of an independent board and even more important, Mr. Chairman, has established a special committee within that board to ensure the public obtains a hearing from their peers to deal with the exceptions which are bound to arise with any standard established by human beings.

I could speak at length, Mr. Chairman, about the member for Wilkie's handling of this matter. To do so would serve very little purpose. If the member would like my guidance in future, he might at least try and I would suggest he do so by letter. I'd like to have it in writing because he has not handled all the information in the past with at least the efficiency that would be expected of an hon. member. Last year, Mr. Chairman, using the theory that a lie will go around the world twice while the truth's getting its shoes on, he chose to take advantage of another unfortunate person, a former land bank farmer. While all the neighbours knew, Mr. Chairman . . .

May 7, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — May I raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you. The Hon. Minister of Highways is referring to a lie that could go around the world twice, something to that extent. If the member is suggesting that any member from this side of the House on this particular matter was lying, and it seems that he was, I think it's incumbent upon that member to withdraw that particular remark. It's clearly an insinuation that a member on this side of the House is a liar.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, that's the truth. That particular statement is an old adage. If there's any offence taken . . . An untruth will go around the world twice or gossip will go around the world twice. The fact of the matter is it was gossip. The tragedy of it is, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I would caution all hon. members to be as temperate as they can in their remarks. I didn't take from the remarks of the minister that he was referring to any hon. member as being a liar. I would say he was getting into an area of discussion and debate that had taken place sometime previous in the House. I would suggest we try to stick to item 1 and matters that come up under item 1 in the highway traffic board.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to something that had occurred in the House. I was referring to the behaviour of the member for Wilkie who cut out of whole cloth a half truth about a situation that is very similar to this, and suckered the press into giving it a lot of publicity. You bet you did. While the neighbours around knew, Mr. Chairman, of this particular situation, the general public across the province did not know.

Of course the member took advantage of that situation. He had all the facts. The facts of the matter are, Mr. Chairman, the member took advantage of a person. The only way the land bank could answer was to further destroy the reputation of that person. The situation is exactly the same in this case. He has taken advantage of a situation not at his request but at your request. You're the one who injected yourself into this and lobbied the Wanglers to take the cause up. Ask them, Mr. Chairman. I have evidence otherwise.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Prove it.

MR. KRAMER: — Prove it. I am simply saying, and I'll allow the thing to stand this way. Mrs. Wangler asked a friend of mine should I allow Mr. Garner? Mr. Garner came to see me and he wanted to take this up. That's what you did. Prove it. I am simply saying if they have to take my word for something in this House, - mc I have no fear of who will be believed. Mr. Chairman. . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I would ask all hon. members to refer their remarks to the chair and to not carry on conversations back and forth from your seats.

MR. KRAMER: — The validity of the opinions of the opposition are to be judged by the public. In closing, I will say on this matter, I have made a commitment to this Assembly which I feel is eminently fair and reasonable. I will close my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by inviting the member for Wilkie to join me in seeking the best solution for this young

man's problem, having regard to the legitimate concerns of the public. It's all very well to take an emotional problem . . . (inaudible) . . . But, Mr. Chairman, let's remember this. I have to take and the board has to take the responsibility for what might happen with a one-armed driver in a roll over if the truck catches fire. He could break that one arm quite easily and not even be able to climb out. There are a hundred and one things that could happen.

In my opinion it is not a kindness to put a handicapped person on the road behind one of those large power units that is unpredictable on ice and expect him to be able to handle it. Not only is his own life in danger but the people who are facing him on the road could also be in danger.

I will rely on the collective advice of the experts across Canada rather than the inexperienced advice, based on irresponsibility, from the member for Wilkie.

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Minister, I had hoped we could start out his afternoon a little more progressively than we finished off last night.

First of all, there are two or three points I think we had better clarify, on your friends and my constituents. I bring this to your attention, the Chairman's attention, and to the attention of the House. I'll say this outside the House anywhere, not just in here.

The mother came to my office around December. She said (and I can't quote exactly), Mr. Garner, we're having a problem trying to get Randy a class 3 licence with air. Will you help us out? I did not go to her. Now, let's get this clarified right now. I will say this outside those doors right after. I know who your friend is but I'm not going to get into it; if you want to go into back alleys, that's up to you. she came to me.

About a week later, just as I started digging into it, she came back to me. She said, Jim, I would like you to back off this case for a little while. A certain lady in the town of Wilkie said she can go to the minister and handle the case for me and Randy will get the licence. I said, Jenny, (that's Mrs. Wangler I'm referring to) that's fine. My concern is that you have no problems with government and Randy gets his licence. Of course, we were in session at the time. So, I backed off.

This lady in Wilkie, who I am sure the Attorney General and all members opposite know, took care of this and was in touch with her government and her minister. Of course, we got zero results, nothing. I will also say this outside the Chamber.

But Mrs. Wangler came back to me. We're going to clarify this right now. Mrs. Wangler came back to me and rather humbly said, Jim, I'm sorry, I made a mistake. I shouldn't have taken the case away from you because, after all, this certain lady had no results. Jim, will you take the case again? I said, of course, you're one of my constituents. I'm very concerned about Randy. He's a very fine young man. I will take the case.

So, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify these points as to who is telling the truth, or anything else, that is the way it happened. This is the way it is. I took the case. I sat in this very seat once we got into the spring session, and wrote a note. We do this all the time and I'll be the first to admit, I did not send an official letter to the minister. But I tried to telephone. The minister is out of town or the minister is busy. I said when can I meet with the minister? This is just conversation with his secretary. Well, such and such. So I sent him

May 7, 1980

a note over. When I sent him the note over he took the note, just like this highway budget, tore it up, threw it down. He didn't even correspond. This is the kind of co-operation.

Now that is my fault? No, that's not my fault, Mr. Chairman. We talk about responsibility. And then the minister tries to blame me. Tries to pass the buck onto me. This is one buck you're not passing on to me, Mr. Minister. But now that's enough of that. We have that clarified, Mr. Chairman. We'll move on to this.

My colleague, the member for Arm River, has spent most of the afternoon on the phone in this case because he's as concerned about this case, and so are the rest of my colleagues, as I am. He talked today to the motor vehicles board in Manitoba. Do you know what their answer was? Listen carefully. We will give the young man, any man, the opportunity to take the test, whether he has one arm, no arms, or no legs. He gets the opportunity to take the test. There's a little bit of freedom in Manitoba.

Now we go right back to square one, Mr. Minister. You let him take the written test. It was your department that took him half way up the mountain and put him on hold. You were talking about people being treated equally. Well, let's have some equality in this case. And I am the first one that will work with you if possible. I will try (no, my colleague says, it's not possible) to work with you. You say you don't want politics. I don't want politics in this either. I didn't want it to come to this Chamber. I wanted the politics left outside. My concern, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Of course I can't prove it. If we would have had television cameras in the Chamber, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, point of privilege. The member for Wilkie is raising an outright fabrication. He never sent a note to me at any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I have to take remarks made by all hon. members as being statements of fact from their point of view. That's not really a question of privilege, it's a question of debate. The hon. member for Wilkie.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, we talk about emergency situations. The minister had clarified it, and I agree with him. He states no one is trained for emergency situations. There is no way. But now there's one other avenue, Mr. Minister, and I throw this out. I was in conversation with a gentleman at the Moose Jaw Technical Institute, an Al Munroe. I was trying to get hold of a gentleman by the name of Doug Spring, who is the chief instructor of truck drivers' courses for commercial trucking at the technical institute. I wanted to know if they would give this young man a personal evaluation. Mr. Munroe told me over the phone this morning, yes, Mr. Garner, we will give this young man a personal evaluation of whether he is capable to drive that truck.

Now I'm not asking for the sky. I throw this out to you, Mr. Minister. I know, and I haven't even talked to my young man because he's most likely still our working, that if you will go by the decision, I will abide by the decision of Mr. Doug Spring to give him a personal evaluation of whether he is capable to drive that truck. If you will abide by that decision, I will. I haven't talked to the young man. I will abide by that decision, too. Now I'm throwing it right into your ball park, Mr. Minister. Let's have a personal evaluation by a very qualified instructor as to whether this young man should be able to drive the vehicle or not. Now, I throw that out to you, Mr. Minister. Will you accept that?

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, Doug Spring has already been asked about this when we were investigating all these avenues last year. He said no way would we recommend

a licence for a one-armed driver.

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Chairman, considering what's been brought to this House by the member for Wilkie (who's going out the door now — I presume he doesn't want to listen to anything other than what he says), I would like to suggest that if the minister were to intervene in this specific case, then I will ask him to intervene in about 10 other cases. I brought these to the attention of the department over the years in which I've been involved to try and have some influence brought to bear in so far as the doctrine and regulations brought in by the recognized authority are concerned. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister personally intervened in the specific case, then it would be politics at its worst. I think anybody opposite who wants to be fair-minded would realize this.

I would like to suggest that all of us can remember cases of people who do believe they should have licences under varying conditions. I would like to tell the member for Wilkie that he may believe he is doing wonderful, political stuff here today and last time, but I would like to ask him — if the member cared to listen — if the minister personally intervened and granted a licence to this young lad whom we're talking about and this young lad got out in a truck or vehicle or whatever it may be and backed over one of his family maiming or killing that person, then what would you say to the minister?

You would look at the regulations. You would say then, oh, Mr. Minister, the CCMTA has said you should not have allowed this individual to have that licence. But if this had happened, I could hear the very intelligent member for Wilkie (and that's debatable at the best of times) stand up in this House and say to the minister you should be taken to court for allowing such an individual to have a licence of that nature.

Now, all of us appreciate the fact that maybe some regulations could be amended. He shakes his hand, he brushes his head, and he sits backward in his chair. He doesn't want to hear the truth. But surely, when he has heard what's been said today, when the minister has said he will take it to the council of ministers in September so they jointly can look at the situation, what more could he ask? At least he's accomplished that much?

Mr. Chairman, really if you stop and think about it for a moment, when you have people on a board or on a commission who are put there for a specific purpose to try and regulate certain areas of our society — whether it be driving or whatever it may be — surely that individual realizes that those regulations are set down in print. If you're going to allow a minister of any department to by-pass all the regulations which people with authority have established, then why would you possibly expect to establish any committee or any commission to ask them for their advice . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The hon. member for Regina South, with his intelligent voice, hasn't said an intelligent word in this House yet this session. It's clearly understandable why he would try and avert attention at any time.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, if there are any responsible people on that side and they go to Alberta for an example, or they go anywhere else for an example and they listen to the number of elderly folks in our society who unfortunately have reached the age where they can't obtain a licence . . . My father was one of them at 85 years of age, in Alberta. Every year he had to have a driving test, an examination, eye, ear and all the rest of it. That's not too far from Edmonton, if I might say. Every time they had to do that. Finally the year came, Mr. Chairman, when my father was told, we are sorry; we shall not grant you a licence.

May 7, 1980

He was going to do everything. He went to lawyers; he went to everybody else to try to tell them he should have a licence to drive a vehicle. But if my father had hit somebody on the highway, or had done anything else — backed over somebody in the farmyard where he worked and lives, then what would have happened to the people who had granted him the licence?

My mother, at 87 years of age, drove a car. At 88, she could not longer get a licence. That's happening all over the country and the people opposite know that. You are trying to make an issue out of an unfortunate situation for political purposes only, and you should be ashamed of yourselves. You are trying to get a minister to intervene with established regulations which are meant for the good and welfare of the people of his province and the people of Canada.

It amazes me when I hear someone who is a superintendent of schools or allegedly was a superintendent . . . I don't know why they would ever hire him to tell a schoolchild anything. But now he comes in here saying he knows all about everything. I get a kick out of some of those opposite, Mr. Chairman. Her ewe are looking opposite; they're experts on everything and know nothing about anything. I might suggest this is exactly the situation we have now.

Mr. Chairman, all I would like to say is that, I'll plead with the minister at this time to take the situation as he has already said he would do, to the CCMTA, take it to the council of ministers to try to get some uniformity across the country which we have already been able to obtain. It's fine to make a political issue out of it. That's wonderful over there. But you're trying to ask someone to do something that's not in the regulations or in the understanding that recognized authorities have come out with.

I'm asking the minister not to bow to the political whims of the hon. member for Wilkie, because that's all it is. It's a whim today; tomorrow he'll forget about it. You don't have to go far in the Wilkie constituency to find out exactly what he is doing in this area. All I'm saying is this, Mr. Chairman. If the minister will do what he has said he will do in the fall, surely that should be satisfactory. I for one then would expect we will have some continuity of purpose in this House.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister of Highways that we should go along with what the medical association says on this. I very much agree, that's why I spent a good part of the day on the telephone. I've been talking to almost every province in Canada today — British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. Then it was too late down there and I had to quit talking.

So I will agree with what you said, Mr. Minister. I phone the superintendent of motor vehicles to see what they would do with a handicapped person who was missing one arm, what they would do to get a class-free licence there. They read me the same statement every time. It's an impossibility; you must have two hands to drive a vehicle — two arms, I'm sorry. That's what I heard from British Columbia; that's what I heard from Alberta.

Manitoba said it's only a guideline from the Canadian Medical association. I talked to the registrar there and he said they give each and every person a chance to take a test. If he can prove he can drive, he drives. He'll get a licence.

Now in this province . . . The member for Moose Jaw, as far as I'm concerned, said absolutely nothing. We are talking about a 19-year-old man who is strong and healthy. And we have in this province right now, handicapped persons who have no arms at all and they are driving. They have a licence to drive cars. We have some complete handicaps. We are talking about an entirely different situation here. We are talking about a young man who has strength in both arms. He has his arm down this far.

But anyway, I was getting no place other than this one in Manitoba. Then I started thinking maybe the minister is giving us a story and he doesn't know what he is talking about when he says that the Canadian Medical Association tells us the guidelines we have to go by. I started talking to several doctors in Canada today and they said it would be the first time the NDP ever listened to them. Why are they now?

I also started to phone trucking associations in Canada today. I talked to Mr. Felsen today. This is his suggestion on it. When a man loses one arm, it isn't too long before you have as much strength in one as you have in two. He said he definitely suggests he should have a chance to take the test. He said most handicapped people have proven that there are less accidents with the handicapped because they are more careful.

There are many people who get licences in this province with two arms, two legs; they have everything. They just get it because they have all the facilities. When you are handicapped, you are really careful.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should be rapping the drunks, not the handicapped.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Now, I just have one question I want to ask you first, Mr. Minister. Are you saying he cannot obtain a class 3 licence with air because he has only one arm? Is that the main issue here, one arm?

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, it is. That is the issue as I said before. The rules are not my rules, but those of the Canadian Motor Transport Association. You can phone doctors at random but our official advisors, the Canadian Medical Association, safety branch, made the recommendation. They met a little over a month ago in Winnipeg. They considered two of these problems. One was diabetics. The other, again, was one arm. You say he has his arm down to here. The boy in question has four inches of arm. That is the situation. Now, did you say you talked to the motor vehicle administrator in Manitoba?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — The registrar.

MR. KRAMER: — The registrar. That is not the person. The person in charge is Mr. Peter Degalla. Was it Peter Degalla you talked to? Well, he is the man who makes the decisions. When we asked Mr. Degalla, the man who makes the decisions for the board in Manitoba, he gave us an emphatic no. That's on record. The conversations with our board are on record. Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is that on information services or what?

MR. KRAMER: — Well, all right. Mr. Chairman, I am simply saying that the correspondence between the various boards in this country are not something to be taken lightly. They are recorded. I was wondering whether it was Mr. Degalla. That is why I asked because this is the person we rely on.

May 7, 1980

Some of them have made exceptions. There are some jurisdictions that have made exceptions. They have said to our board, look, we have got ourselves into trouble, for heaven's sake, don't make the mistakes we did.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — This is just what I wanted to know to make sure of the circumstances here. He is not obtaining a licence because he has only one arm. Because I am going to tell you, Mr. Minister, this man has two arms. I talked to the doctors today from the Canadian Medical Association. They said that the Minister of Highways is all out to lunch because he has two arms. He has an artificial arm. You get one leg cut off and see if you can walk. But you put an artificial leg on and you walk. And he said there is absolutely no reason . . . I talked to the head man of the Saskatchewan Medical Association today. He phoned other people and said you are taking the people of Saskatchewan in this House for a ride.

Talk about politics coming from these people over here. It's coming right from you, Mr. Minister. This man has two arms. It's artificial, but he says we consider it two arms. Now if I'm wrong, prove me wrong. He said he should take the test because he has two arms the same as you can have many parts of your body replaced artificially. This man is considered to have two arms. That's the first question. He said, no way he can get a class 3 licence. There is no way if he's only got one arm. I said he has an artificial arm. No problem as long as he can prove he can use the artificial arm. So he says you are absolutely wrong, Mr. Minister. Absolutely wrong.

I have the phone number that you can phone to check this one out; it's 244-2196 in Saskatoon. And if I am wrong, then prove me wrong. But the man has two arms. We're on the wrong issue here. In no way, Mr. Minister are we asking you to give the man a licence. We're asking you to give the man a test. And, if he's got two arms, whether artificial or not, he gets a chance to take that test. There is no way that you can stop him because the law says so. You make the law. You people over here are so sure here. You think we were going to sit here last night and take what we took from you, saying the Canadian Medical Association says they tell you what to do?

Do you think for one moment, Mr. Minister that I would go for something like that. That's why I've been on the phone this afternoon talking to people in Saskatchewan. There are a lot of people in this country with artificial arms driving big trucks. Now, don't you tell me there aren't, because there are. They have them. They are driving them in British Columbia, in Quebec, in Ontario, right now probably all over Canada, but they have two arms. One is artificial, now don't forget that — artificial!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Chairman, we have documented correspondence from the proper branch, the safety branch of the Canadian Medical association. Their recommendations to the Canadian Motor Transport . . . This evidence can be provided I have no doubt because that is the advice I have. It's in the records of the Canadian Motor Transport. Not only that, you can phone people at random. We have a doctor, Dr. Thom is our particular adviser in Saskatchewan and we rely on his recommendations. He is the person that recommends for Saskatchewan. But overall I say it's all very well for the member for Arm River to stand here and say he phoned some doctor. These doctors, some of them are just as irresponsible as the members opposite.

We rely on this board, not me. They keep suggesting the minister is not going (and I want to repeat this ad nauseam) to interfere with the board. No way. The board is advised and co-ordinates with the other jurisdictions. Regardless of what the gossip is,

these are the rules. I can't pick phone numbers at random, nor will I. I will rely, Mr. Chairman, on the advice of the people who have been chosen by the Medical Association of Canada to look into the safety and to judge on what is safe and what is unsafe.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I wonder if the minister would mind answering a question. you mention Dr. Thom. Are you talking about Ian Thom in Regina?

MR. KRAMER: — That's correct.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I'm sorry. I did give the wrong number to the minister, in case he does want to phone. Maybe he is not interested. It was the doctor who sits on the board that advised it just two weeks ago. He's the man. Phone him and find out. The number is 652-6279 or 653-1466 in Saskatoon.

MR. KRAMER: — Dr. Brand is the doctor's name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! The member for Wilkie has the floor.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, we're going to keep at this for a while. McLurg High School . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you have one? I'll give you the name. Just be quiet and listen.

To Whom It May Concern — Randy Wangler

Randy took shop from Grades 9 to 12 inclusive. He has taken woodwork, drafting and welding. In spite of his handicap, he was a most capable shop student. He was able to operate oxygen acetylene equipment without any assistance. I feel Randy is quite capable of handling machinery and that his handicap will not be a hazard on the highway. Yours truly, Edward Weber, Principal, McLurg School in Wilkie.

Another one.

To Whom It may Concern

The members of this detachment have had opportunity to observe Randy Wangler operate heavy duty equipment. We feel he does so in a safe and capable manner, taking into consideration his handicap. Yours truly, Corporal Thornton, NCO in charge, Wilkie Detachment, RCM Police.

Mr. Chairman, RCM Police in the local town have observed the young man operating heavy equipment and stated 'We feel he does so in a safe and capable manner, taking into consideration his handicap.'

Mayor of the local town.

Dear Sir: Re: Randy Wangler's class 3 driver's licence.

We watched Randy drive large trucks with air brakes on heavy equipment on farms: for example, backhoes and front-end loaders, etc., in their construction yard and in my opinion very skillfully regardless of his handicap. In order for Randy to support himself in Wilkie in the future, driving

May 7, 1980

this type of equipment is very essential. Please consider his future of employment. Sincerely yours, Stan Bertsch, mayor of the town of Wilkie.

Mr. Minister you have received these. Where the problem came up is that you allowed the young man to take the written test. Ah, you're shaking your head. Now come on, let's play fair ball here. If you would have said to the young man before he took that written test, before he got his hopes up:

I'm sorry, Mr. Wangler, with your handicap you cannot get a class 3 licence. But no, you started him on the ladder. He took your written test and he passed it; he passed it very well. Then the young man comes home saying, I passed my test, I can go for my driver's licence now. he goes back for his licence and what does the government say to him? No, you cannot take it.

What kind of justice, what kind of freedom is this in Saskatchewan? Just what kind of freedom is this? What kind of a right? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Theatrical nothing. I am concerned, maybe you aren't.

Mr. Minister, is that standard procedure for you to allow him to take the written test and then when he comes for the driver's test, refuse him? Answer me that.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:07 p.m.