

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 29, 1980

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Non-Controversial Bills Committee

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 54 — **An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act** as being non-controversial.

MR. SPEAKER: — When will this bill be read a second time?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to report Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Embalmers Act** as being non-controversial.

MR. SPEAKER: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

MR. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on this bill be waived.

Motion agreed.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed.

QUESTIONS

Federal-Provincial Negotiations

MR. R.L. ANDREWS (Kindersley): — Question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. In the House of Commons yesterday in response to the so-called economic separation statement, Mr. Trudeau made it quite clear that the federal government intends to give up very little by way of economic powers to the provinces. Given the prevailing view in central Canada that the West can only gain at the expense of the East, would the Premier agree that much of the momentum gained following the referendum for renewed federalism has been lost in view of the recent Trudeau-Lalonde statements on this matter?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — My answer is no, I do not agree that the momentum has been lost. I think that clearly the momentum from the referendum is carrying on, and it is clear in the minds of most people that changes to the constitution are going to have to be considered and considered seriously. With that in mind, various negotiating parties are staking out some initial ground. I am not very happy with some of the initial statements by the federal government on their negotiating stance, but it's not unusual when entering negotiations to take a fairly firm position as an opening negotiating position.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in view of the apparent reluctance on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan to firmly state its position with regard to the forthcoming constitutional conference, can we assume that the Government of Saskatchewan supports some of the statements with regard to constitutional change being made by the national NDP? In particular, on May 22, 1980, in the House of Commons, Mr. Nystrom's statement with regard to constitutional change, reads as follows:

We (meaning the NDP) believe that during the next negotiating round, the idea of a special place for Quebec in a renewed federation should not be ruled out.

In other words, a position of a special status for Quebec. Does the Premier of Saskatchewan support that view that Quebec should in fact in the renewed federation have a special status?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't interpret the remarks attributed to the member for Yorkton-Melville the same way that the member for Kindersley does. I interpret them as saying this is no time to rule out very many things if, as the Prime Minister has announced, so far as he is concerned virtually everything is negotiable and so far as our government is concerned, a great number of things are negotiable, so long as we can obtain the things which we think are crucial to Saskatchewan's continued welfare. I would not wish to rule out virtually anything at this stage of the game, since I think that we should see what the various opportunities for appropriate compromise to the benefit of Saskatchewan are, before we start ruling out particular solutions.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Perhaps the Premier is under a misunderstanding, because the report in the Globe and Mail of May 22 indicates the Prime Minister, for example, insists on a charter of rights and freedoms which would include language rights in a new constitution and secondly, that the federal parliament must have real powers applying to the whole country.

That indicates that at least two fundamental areas are not negotiable on the federal position. Would the Premier respond to those and indicate whether he is under a mistaken impression as to the Prime Minister's position and we come back to the question raised by the member for Kindersley as to the statement by Mr. Lalonde?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Prime Minister said, and those are the only things that aren't negotiable. Surely one can hardly express alarm at the proposition that the Parliament of Canada should have jurisdiction covering all Canada. There is no way to have a united country with a central parliament, that does not have jurisdiction in parts of Canada. So I must say that one did not alarm me.

When he talks about entrenching a bill of rights, I am a little more concerned, since I have taken a position qualified on the matter of entrenching the bill of rights.

But that is surely a short list of things on which one will not negotiate and we, for our part, would think our list of things would include a clarification in the constitution of the ownership, management and taxation of resources and having said that, most other things are negotiable, although obviously we expect to obtain some more significant changes than that.

MR. LANE: — Question to the Premier. Of course I was responding to your statement that everything was negotiable; in fact not everything is negotiable.

The actions of the federal government over the last two days, and I'm referring to Mr. Lalonde's statement and the strong statement by the Prime Minister yesterday, indicate that we are embarking on a confrontation over the constitution. Does the Premier feel, as I do, that an impediment to a fair discussion of the constitution will be Mr. Lalonde himself, and he will be a symbol of confrontation and that it would be in the best interests of the constitutional negotiations if Mr. Lalonde were removed from such a sensitive position?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to advise the Prime Minister on whom he should have in his cabinet. I have enough difficulty deploying the forces in our own ranks. I know you will be sympathetic. I would be even more sympathetic if I felt that I had members opposite . . . (inaudible) . . . I do want to say, however, without pressing the matter, that I felt the statements attributed to Mr. Lalonde, at least on the electronic media (I didn't see them in the press), suggesting that (as I recall them, and I may recall them inaccurately), the position of the Government of Alberta was akin to economic sovereignty with political association are ill-advised.

Meeting Prior to Constitutional Meeting of June 9

MR. LANE: — A further question to the Premier. Given the ill-advised statements of Mr. Lalonde, would the Premier consider an emergency meeting between the four western premiers prior to the constitutional meeting of June 9 to make sure that we're one in direction before we go in, so that if we run into a confrontation position with Mr. Lalonde, who is picking on and attacking Alberta, we have some unity going into that meeting?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the hon. members that our government will be in touch, and is from time to time, with the Alberta government and may well be in touch with the Manitoba and British Columbia governments. We have a history and tradition of co-operating in a number of these areas, which tradition, I expect, will carry on.

Day Care Centre Concerns

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Social Services. The Regina Day Care Association is registering a very serious concern about the operation of the A-1 Alliance Day Care Centre here in Regina. Members of the Department of Social Services gave us assurance that this problem had been resolved earlier in the year. Still, as late as yesterday the day care association again registered the very real concern that they feel the A-1 Alliance Day Care Centre is not operating properly. What has the department done to investigate the

operation of the day care centre, and to try to correct the problems?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am not fully briefed on this. I know that the Department of Social Services has dealt with this matter in some considerable degree. My understanding is that a new board of directors was elected to the A-1 Alliance Day Care Centre (now renamed) on September 29, and that a good number of changes have taken place since September 29, changes which for the most part are known to the old board as well as the new board. The points raised by the Day Care Association of Regina are points which have to do with the operation of the centre prior to September 29, 1979. So far as I am aware they are not alleging they have evidence of any financial mismanagement or any neglect of children which postdates September 29, 1979.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Premier, as late as last night the association had a meeting here in Regina. They still register a very serious concern of child abuse and child neglect in that day care centre. They state the parents are afraid to register their concerns openly because there is no place else for them to take their children in Regina. My question to you is: is there a shortage of day care facilities? What is the Department of Social Services doing to meet that shortage?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of that question and obtain detailed information from the department.

Highway Accident at Swift Current

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Highways. Yesterday a tragic accident occurred on the highway near Swift Current, causing great loss of life. Is your department planning a full-scale investigation of that tragedy so that kind of thing won't happen again?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, the statement that it was a tragic accident is certainly almost an understatement — young people from all over Canada, most of them university students as I understand. Certainly it is a sad situation. The provincial coroner will be making a statement at noon today. I guess I could say it's more than a foregone conclusion that there will be a thorough investigation of any accident which causes loss of life, whether it be one or 20 or more. That follows as night follows day. We have information now and in fact I have some pictures that were taken which my staff brought in from Swift Current. The only thing we don't know is whether there was rain at the time. Visibility was excellent. It is a section of road that has a good wide shoulder; obviously there had to be some serious human error involved somewhere.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The reason for the question obviously, Mr. Minister, is that it was such a tragic accident and because the conditions were such (the size of the vehicles and the circumstances) surely an investigation by the Department of Highways into all of the events surrounding the accident would be in order. I ask you again, will your department, as a department, conduct a full-scale investigation of that accident to attempt to prevent it from happening in the future?

MR. KRAMER: — As far as preventing accidents from happening, I will make no such commitment. Certainly we will be investigating. Our people are already studying every phase of that unfortunate scene. I haven't the supreme power that can prevent accidents from happening.

Permits for Feed Barley

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I understand there is pressure being brought to bear on the wheat board and various federal departments to provide import permits to bring American feed barley into western Canada during the drought crisis which we are suffering here in Saskatchewan. We have 350,000 tons of barley held by grain companies. I think there is about 700,000 tons of barley held by grain companies. I think there is about 700,000 tons of barley held by the Canadian Wheat Board and about 200,000 tons on the Prairies for a total of some considerable feed barley in the system. I wonder if the minister would urge his federal counterparts not to provide these permits but rather to provide a catalogue of where the Canadian feed permit, until our domestic barley is used up, would cause serious problems in our grain industry as well as our beef industry.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, I'm not aware of the point he is raising with respect to permits. I think the hon. member is aware of the position of the Government of Saskatchewan that there should be attention focussed on board grains and we have brought that to the attention of the minister. There has been a positive response by the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. Now, that's one side of it, a positive response without really indicating what will be done; and on the other side, we requested the federal government to instruct the grain transportation authority to stop allocation of cars for non-board grains so an assessment can be made in that area — a stoppage for two weeks and then to take a look at it. We have put forth proposals to keep board grains and non-board grains, which are in the country elevator system (particularly barley), here in Saskatchewan. We will certainly do all we can to pressure the federal government to follow up on the issue that we have put forward and on the issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also follow the suggestion of the opposition and the suggestion of the federal member for Regina West, in the House of Commons yesterday, to urge the grain companies and in particular the wheat board to clean grain on the Prairies to export standards so we can keep the screenings here on the Prairies to be used as feed? I would point out again that the federal member for Regina West (who is well known to all members opposite) has urged the federal government to move in this direction.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the cleaning of grain on the Prairies, I think that is a matter to be dealt with by the grain companies. I indicate to the hon. member that if he is suggesting (as I took it the hon. member for Thunder Creek has been suggesting) that we abandon the country elevator system in favour of inland terminals, to clean grain in inland terminals, that is not the position of the Government of Saskatchewan and I doubt it to be the position of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. While it may be the position of the farming expert for the constituency of Qu'Appelle, it is not the position of this government nor the Department of Agriculture, Saskatchewan.

Opposition Request for Order of Business

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. It is my understanding there has been a tradition the government would let the opposition know the order of business for the day. Last night we were not informed of anything and after repeated requests today, I was handed a slip of paper as question

period opened. The line-up was given as Bill No. 13 and Bill No. 105. Mr. Attorney General, with the fact that the payment to the Unionest Party will be coming up on June 1 (the deadline for it), could you explain to me why Bill No. 105 was not put ahead of Bill No. 13 so that meaningful debate could take place on that bill?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, first of all, there have been no repeated requests as the member says.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Three times this morning, three times!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, O.K. I withdraw; I'm wrong; there were three requests. I'm not going to involve myself in that area because the tradition has always been to arrive at an agreement for House business by all sides, which agreement is honoured and not subsequently denied publicly as was done by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle yesterday. I feel, under the circumstances when I try to do my best to accommodate all of the interests of all of the members of this House, it simply doesn't work. As far as I am concerned, we will simply call the business as required.

Secondly, on the question of the bill, Bill No. 13 has been around since December, Mr. Speaker — since December! That has given more than ample opportunity for their views and other views and for passage of that bill and consideration of Bill No. 205 today or weeks before that time if the opposition had so chosen. But they don't. They do not choose to call and to debate Bill No. 105. They choose to drag other matters. I can't stop that.

Closure of Bill No. 13

MR. TAYLOR: — Due to the fact that the payment for Bill No. 105, the payment to the Unionest Party, is on June 1 and the fact that Bill No. 13 is in committee of the whole and because of the desire to debate Bill No. 105, are you not really forcing closure on Bill No. 13 by this line-up today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, from my point of view, I want the opposition out there arguing for the Radio Shacks and the CP technologies for the next three years. I would not want closure at all. But I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan and the members of this House that this so-called responsible opposition has had this bill on the table since December of 1979. Now Mr. Speaker, we have seen in this House potash takeover legislation debates; we've seen deterrent fee debates; we've seen CIGOL oil debates. We've seen major debates certainly equal to if not more important than Bill No. 13 and ultimately in the end all of the legislators act responsibly. Amendments and bills are passed — but not this time, not with this opposition on Bill No. 13. There is no closure. You can take as long as you want to debate Bill No. 13 and to go to Bill No. 105, I really suspect it's because you want to protect your former leader that you're not getting to Bill No. 105.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Attorney General, are you telling me that your refusal to put Bill No. 105 first on this order paper today indicates that you think the debate of Bill No. 105 is not a priority in this Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'll take a new question. The member for Bengough-Milestone.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I'll yield to the member for Qu'Appelle.

MR. LANE: — We had a precedent-setting action by the House Leader today in submitting the list of House business during question period to the two opposition parties. Would the Attorney General indicate why he has chosen (and he submitted the list to the opposition; he made that choice) to debate Bill No. 13 ahead of Bill No. 105 when the payment to the Unionest Party is due Friday or June 1?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons for this. First of all, the opposition is basing an assumption of payment to the Unionest Party on June 1. I think that that is far from a certainty, both legally and factually. We'll see what happens after June 1. I think therefore that that is the wrong assumption.

The second point is, Mr. Speaker, I regret again to the member for Qu'Appelle, Bill No. 13 has been debated for over six or seven months inside and outside this House. We went at it virtually the full day yesterday. The arguments have been absolutely repetitive. They've been filibustering arguments. Members of the press or others will verify to me that there has not been a new thought from the opposition on this bill in weeks. Now Mr. Speaker, if they choose to debate it that way, it's up to them. But I called Bill No. 13 because I felt that after six months the opposition surely was on the verge of showing it to go through so we could . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

CONDOLENCES re SASKATCHEWAN HIGHWAY ACCIDENT

MR. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the legislature and the people of Saskatchewan were shocked yesterday at the tragic accident near Swift Current which has claimed the lives of more than 20 people. The loss of a single life in a highway accident is a tragedy, but when 23 lives are suddenly ended in this terrible manner, it is difficult to find words to describe the feeling of shock and loss, even by those of us who did not know the victims personally.

On behalf of the Saskatchewan legislature and all the people of Saskatchewan, I wish to express our heartfelt sympathy to the families of those men, many of whom have come to our province from other parts of Canada and in particular from the province of Newfoundland.

I am sure that our prayers will be for the recovery of those injured and for the families of all who have been involved in this tragic accident.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the opposition I would like to join with the Premier. It is a very sad day for Saskatchewan and certainly for the families of the young men who were involved in this fatal accident. Our prayers and sympathy are with those families.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — The feeling is certainly unanimous. I do hope that out of such tragedy comes at least knowledge and that the government will investigate, as

much as it can, in order to try to prevent it in the future.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I wonder if I may have permission to introduce some guests? Seated in the east gallery is a group of 17 Grades 9 and 10 students from the Ceylon School. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. Neil Haggquist and the bus driver, Dale Scott. I will be meeting with the group at about 11:15 a.m. I hope they find the proceedings in the legislature this morning interesting and informative and perhaps educational. I would ask all members to join with me in wishing them a safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House it is a great privilege for me to introduce 47 students from Yorkdale Junior High School in Yorkton. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery, along with two of their teachers, Mr. Tony Mazur and Mr. Orest Machusek and their bus driver, Mr. Wayne Ruf. This group of students comes from the area surrounding Yorkton and they are in Regina today along with two other groups from the same school to tour our capital city and to see various places of interest here, as well as to see us in action here in the legislature.

I would like to ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the House and to wish them a very interesting day in the House and in Regina and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.S. MATSALLA (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, the Yorkdale School Division therefore is partly in the Canora constituency and, therefore, this group of students included some students from the Canora constituency. I'd like to join with the member for Yorkton in welcoming the group of students and their chaperones. I do hope that they have an enjoyable and a pleasant day here in Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, like the members for Yorkton and Canora I, too, would like to join in welcoming the students from the Yorkdale School. Some of the students will be from my constituency which borders Yorkton. I'd like to welcome them here, and wish them a very interesting morning and afternoon in the House and in Regina, and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.

Section 1

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle) moved that Section 1 be stood.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 13

Berntson	Rousseau	Muirhead
Birkbeck	Swan	Duncan
Larter	Pickering	Andrew
Lane	Garner	McLeod
Taylor		

NAYS — 30

Blakeney	Mostoway	Matsalla
Pepper	Banda	Lusney
Smishek	Kaeding	Long
Romanow	Hammersmith	Johnson
Snyder	Kowalchuk	Nelson
Kramer	MacAuley	Thompson
Baker	Feschuck	Poniatowski
McArthur	Byers	Lingenfelter
Shillington	Cowley	White
MacMurchy	Cody	Solomon

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Yesterday in this Assembly . . . After it calms down, Mr. Chairman, I'll be happy to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member for Nipawin has the floor.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly can stand here as long as the members want to continue their conversation in the House from their seats. If they want to continue, that's fine.

Yesterday in this Assembly I asked the minister responsible for Sask Tel, if he or the Government of Saskatchewan, through this Bill 13, were desirous of getting into the computer field — the field of sales, service and maintenance of on-line computers. He answered definitely not, and said that it was in the regulations; he had tabled the regulations and he wasn't going to prevent . . . I'm sorry; I was putting words in the minister's mouth. He said that he did not want to prevent competition in the field of computer sales, service, technology and maintenance, and that he was happy to have that competition and there was no intention on the part of Bill 13 to prevent competition from developing. He also said that there was no way he could put a clause in the bill that would reassure those who were concerned that competition would not develop as a result of this bill, even though he wasn't trying to stop competition by introducing the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to provide the minister with a clause that can be inserted into the bill that will not affect his right to regulate, that will not affect the Lieutenant-Governor's right to put forward the necessary regulations to act on things between sittings of the legislature. I'm going to provide this clause for him. If he refuses to insert this clause then the fears of the members to my right are correct. If he does not refuse to insert this clause, or one similar to it, then the members to my right are creating a

tempest in a teapot, because the minister has already given his word that the bill is not intended to prohibit or prevent competition.

So I would like to read the minister this clause that can be inserted in the bill. If the minister would like to respond then we'll see whether he is in fact misleading the people of Saskatchewan by saying he's not going to prevent competition, or whether the members to my right are attempting to create a tempest in a teapot to get some press coverage.

No regulation under this act shall be enacted by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council which will act to prevent competition in the sale, manufacture, transport, operation, programming, maintenance, or other use of computers.

A very simple clause. The point is the entire furor raised by members to my right pertains to competition in the field of computer technology. The letters read into this debate pertain to the competition in the field of computer technology.

Now, members to my right, I know, have also brought up the cable TV issue. I don't think that this particular bill, knowing the government's stand on cable television in the past, knowing that the debate has gone on in this House not for six months but for four years on cable television, knowing that you disagree with cable television . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You may disagree with it but the debate has already occurred here for the last four years and will continue to occur until the next election. Members on this side of the House do not agree with the government's position on cable TV; members on that side of the House do. As a matter of fact cable television was an issue in the last election. They won the election. So they have the right to make the policy.

So I'm going to sit down now and ask the minister if he will insert that clause as a House amendment into the bill, in order to completely calm the fears of those who believe the government wants to prevent competition in the field of computer technology.

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I obviously haven't had the opportunity to look carefully enough at the amendment that the hon. member for Nipawin offers to know whether or not it would do something which we did not want the bill to do. So I can't really say at this point in time whether I am prepared to accept it or not.

I say again to the hon. member that we don't want to do anything which would prevent at some particular point in time, a company coming into Saskatchewan with some new technology and possibly not being able to put a piece of equipment on stream, because we have a chunk of legislation here which we'd have to wait for one year to have amended by this legislature. I don't want to see that happen. We want all of the companies that we can, in the computer business and in whatever business there is, to be in Saskatchewan, to hook onto our lines, to attach to our lines because anything which is attached to our lines gives us revenue. The more revenue we get, the bigger the pool; the bigger the pool the less revenue we have to receive from the general public. That's what we are here for, to try to get a better deal for the general public. In that regard, I don't want to do anything which would circumvent this. I just caution the hon. member I am not sure whether or not we want to consider this. I am asking my officials at this point to have a look at it, to consider it, and to make sure we are not going to circumvent some new piece of equipment coming in and hooking on and at the same time losing revenues. Two things would happen: one, we wouldn't get the revenue; two

we would be keeping someone out of the province, and we don't want to do that. That's not our intention at all. So if in fact the amendment wouldn't do that, we may well consider it. But at this point, I am not quite certain whether we should or should not. I am asking my officials to take a good look at the situation. As a matter of fact one of them is doing that right now. We will consider it.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Minister, I do want to emphasize the point being made by the members on this side of the House. I think they have a good point. I think the minister would probably agree they have a good point. What concerns them about the bill is providing to a monopoly organization. It concerns me as well, which is why I voted against second reading of the bill. I will vote against third reading unless there is an amendment of this kind in the bill.

I don't think the Attorney General's comments were well taken yesterday in terms of suggesting that somehow a politicization has occurred to destroy Sask Tel or its position as a telephone agency. Well, Mr. Chairman, you and the members to my right may politick all you like in the House. That's up to you. If you think that's well taken . . . They may do it too. You're pointing at them, Mr. Minister that's fair game.

I am saying there is a real and valid concern on the part of people who are involved in computer technology. Because it's such a vast field, because it's so new, unless competition is allowed to enter that field . . . The minister will know that traditionally large organizations have not been the best way to present new fields to people. It takes too long to get through very large organizations with the kind of new technology which is developing. The minister admits it. He says the field is changing so rapidly that someone is going to come in with a new piece of technology next September or October; they're going to come up with an important change. Sask Tel cannot act quickly enough, in such a rapidly changing field, to provide the kind of service the people of Saskatchewan want in this area.

The minister wouldn't suggest that Sask Power should get into the sale, distribution and manufacture of stoves. It's nonsense, because Sask Tel can't provide people quickly enough with the kinds of stoves they may want. Competitive organizations will do it at lower cost, at a lower price; they will do it in a better way; they will more rapidly respond to the wishes and to the needs of people. But no one is suggesting (at least I haven't heard in this legislature any one suggest yet) that Sask Tel should get out of the provision of telephone lines in the province. If they are suggesting that, or if anybody suggests that, I am sure every single person in Saskatchewan would look at them as foolhardy at best, and foolish at worst.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, no one is suggesting that. No one is suggesting we should have six companies providing telephone lines out behind peoples' houses and you get to choose which line you want. Well, if that's what he wants, then he will be looked upon by the people of Saskatchewan and by the people of his own constituency as being foolish. The cost of that is so prohibitive that the service could not be provided anywhere, even in the cities. To suggest for example (and no one even suggests this) that in the city of Regina we should have two cable television companies — perhaps two providing a totally different service could . . . One of them flopped anyway and it has cost your government \$2.3 million. It's nonsense to suggest that the people of a city the size of Regina could possibly afford such competition; it just won't wash. You'd bring in that competition; all the companies would go broke; nobody would make enough to

keep the thing going and people would end up without the service. So the minister is quite right in suggesting that Sask Tel must maintain a monopoly position in the provision of those kinds of services.

What concerns everyone on this side of the House, what concerns me and what concerns the people in the field of computer technology, is the fact that this new and rapidly developing field ends up becoming monopolized by the monopoly. They will pass regulations behind closed doors (the Lieutenant-Governor in Council does) in order to favour their own baby, Sask Tel, to the detriment of outsiders. That's what is concerning the people here. Now, the minister says he is looking at this clause. I would like, before I take my place in this debate, to find out what his reaction is to the clause. In other words he says, yes, I'll bring in a House amendment to that effect, or similar words.

Then from my point of view, I must say the concerns expressed by members to my right are nothing more (as I said earlier) than a tempest in a teapot. If that is put in the bill there is no way the Lieutenant-Governor can act to do what they say he can do at this point. That is why I would like to have the minister tell me whether or not to pursue the debate and argue and fight and go through the rest of the day.

I too, for the benefit of members to my right, would like to get on with Bill No. 105. To be quite frank and quite sincere with the Attorney General and others in this legislature, I have been a little disappointed, as the Assistant House Leader and the House Leader will know, to be placed halfway down the list every day and to have to come in here to listen all day on the strength that the bill might come up. I've had without question the best minute by minute attendance of any single member in this House for the last 10 days . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no. That's a fact. I've had the best minute by minute attendance here because Bill No. 105 might come up at any moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Another Barry Goldwater.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, it has bothered me and I would like to get on with it, Mr. Chairman. Although the members to my right may not agree, I would very much like to get on with the debate and attempt to convince the members here of how onerous that particular bill is. That will happen in due course. I would, however, like to suggest to the member for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order.

MR. COLLVER: — I would like to suggest to the member for Qu'Appelle that, with all deference and respect, if they really consider Bill No. 13 that urgent, whether or not the Unionest Party gets paid on Friday is really not significant to the people of Saskatchewan compared to whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan is going to monopolize the computer technology for the next 50 years. I would like to suggest that to them, but they may not agree with that.

The point is, this is an important bill. The government is bringing it forward and the debate is going on. These people have said, you're trying to monopolize the field. You've said, I'm not trying to monopolize the field; there are the regulations and I've given my commitment to the House. So I say to you, here is a clause you can put in your bill that won't affect you one way or another; it's not going to affect the bill. You can still make regulations, you can still bring people in as quickly as you want. But what the Lieutenant-Governor in Council cannot do is to make a special rule for Sask Tel to the

detriment of everyone else, ruling out competition in a particular area of computer technology. Surely, if you say that's true, if the regulations say that's true, that is not a bad thing or too much to ask the minister to do. Now, I hope the minister has had ample opportunity to examine this clause. As I say, I don't want to take my place until he tells me one way or another. If I have to sit here waiting for Bill No. 105 while the members to my right continue a tempest in a teapot, fair enough. If I have to sit here and help them to defeat an onerous bill that provides Sask Tel with far more power than it should have, so be it.

But I honestly would like the minister to respond to that, to let me know if he will bring in a House amendment like that. It doesn't have to be exactly those words but similar to them, to prevent the Lieutenant-Governor in Council from preventing competition in the field of computers. If that's true, if you say yes, fine and dandy.

You can see all the attendance I've had to put in in this Chamber during the last 10 days waiting for Bill No. 105 to come up. I'd like to prepare myself for the forthcoming debate. I can also assure the member for Qu'Appelle, whether or not the payment comes tomorrow that Bill No. 105, I doubt very much, will come to a vote tomorrow. They may think it will. I even doubt very much whether the member for Qu'Appelle will get a chance to talk about it tomorrow or Monday or whenever.

But be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, the point is I would like the minister to answer that question. Surely he's had ample time now to tell me whether or not he will put this clause in as a House amendment. If he says yes, then rest assured the tempest in the teapot may continue but that's what the press is going to print.

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's pretty difficult for me to out of hand say yes at this point because we have our lawyers looking at it right now. It was a worthwhile amendment. We will have a look at it. We are not suggesting that we won't have a look at it. We do want to consider it. I think it should be considered seriously because we want to make very sure that everything in it is within the framework of what we can accept in a piece of legislation. We're going to give it serious consideration. Hopefully, we will be able to accept it and put it in the bill. If we can, fine.

But I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member for Nipawin, that is not going to stop the member for Wilkie. There's no question about it. The member for Wilkie is not interested in whether there is competition in the field or anything like it, neither is the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley is only interested in one thing. We know what he's interested in. He is interested in protecting CNCP. Everybody knows what the private enterprise opposition is all about. We know what they're saying.

The hon. member brought up a good point. That's one thing about the hon. member for Nipawin. He at least brought up a few good points; that's something the opposition for the last four days hasn't done in this House. The member for Wilkie hasn't brought up a new point in all the time I've sat here from the very first day he made his second reading speech. He hasn't brought up one new point.

The hon. member for Nipawin brought up a point which I think is very interesting. He said, well I'm sure we wouldn't want to make this a political issue. Of course we wouldn't want to. We didn't want it to be a political issue. But I can tell you, member for Indian Head-Wolseley, member for Wilkie and member for Qu'Appelle, we didn't make this

political — your leader did. There's no question about that. And I'll tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to read a letter your leader, Mr. Devine, sent out to make it political.

That's the reason why we have a controversy today, not because the people of Saskatchewan are upset about this bill — not at all! The people of Saskatchewan aren't upset about this bill. I've only had a mere 30 letters which I had to answer out of my office, 18 of which were directed to me as the minister. The member says on a television program or on a radio program. I've had loads; I've had to have secretaries wading through the mail. That is simply not the case, and he knows it.

Mr. Chairman, there is just no doubt that the opposition wanted to get on to some little issue. So they thought, well, here's a good one because it does two things for us: (1) it causes suspicion in the minds of the public; and (2) it does, in fact, help our private enterprise friends. So what did the Leader of the Opposition do, or the Leader of the Conservative Party (he's not the Leader of the Opposition because he'll never get into this House)? What did he do? He wrote a letter on May 7, 1980 to all of his business friends, so to speak, business friends. He thinks they're his business friends. They're not all his friends. Some of them are also friends of the Government of Saskatchewan. They're not all friends of the Conservative party. We have a copy of the letter. I'm just going to read what the letter says, just to indicate to you the kinds of scare tactics that the Conservative Party would use in trying to attract the business community toward them on this particular bill. He says:

Dear Sirs: I am writing to you to express my deep concern over the Blakeney government's proposed Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.

The Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Party feels that this bill is repressive legislation, in that it ignores areas of interest to the users of telecommunications products and services and indeed is destructive to the concept of free enterprise in the province of Saskatchewan. Please allow me to briefly illustrate my reasons for opposing this legislation.

First, the amendment will produce a more restrictive environment with regard to telecommunications equipment and give Sask Tel a virtual monopoly on telecommunications equipment.

Mr. Speaker, that is simply an untruth. The member for Qu'Appelle says it is not! Well, all the member for Qu'Appelle should do sometime, if he ever does his homework and isn't in his law practice when he should be in the legislature doing the nation's business, and if he ever were doing his job (which he is not doing), is to read the legislation and the regulations which I tabled. What does it tell you? There is not a restriction in that piece of legislation that we don't have today in the tariff. He made no bones about the tariff whatsoever. And he goes on. Here is one thing he did say that is right. I'm going to give the man credit for having at least one statement in his letter that is right.

Second, the bill would prohibit all attachment to telephones except with the permission of Sask Tel.

He's correct. There's no question about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We did not. It will be in regulations. We said that. We have struck the 'with express written

permission' out of the bill and it will be by regulation. I guess he's partly right only, but I'm going to give him full marks for that.

Thirdly, Bill 13 would put the whole future of electronic information systems in Saskatchewan under the control of Sask Tel.

Mr. Chairman, I have never read such a piece of nonsense in a letter in my life. A person who would put that down in writing simply doesn't know the facts or else ignores the facts. There's little question about that. There's little question that all the Conservative Leader was trying to do is stir up some kind of suspicion among the public. And he goes on.

Fourth, Sask Tel would have the sole authority to manufacture, distribute, or lease telecommunications equipment in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, I have never in my life heard such nonsense in a letter, complete, utter nonsense. After all, let us be honest. How could we possibly manufacture all the things we would need in the telecommunications industry in Saskatchewan? It wouldn't be possible if we did want to do it; and secondly, we don't want to do it, because we believe in people like Northern Telecom and fibre optics coming here to Saskatchewan and setting up a new plant.

That is something the hon. member, when he was with the Liberal Party, couldn't possibly attract to this province because they didn't trust that party, and they certainly wouldn't trust the one he's now with. I'm not sure which party he'll be with next, but I'm sure there will be another one because he hasn't seen his way clear to get to the top so far. Maybe he'll try a new one. And he goes on:

5. Sask Tel would have sole control of many devices used by ham radio operators which would restrict their activities.

Mr. Chairman, once again that is a complete falsehood. There is just no question. We have talked to the ham operators. I've had letters from ham operators, and I'm sure the hon. members for Nipawin and Wilkie and Qu'Appelle have had letters from the ham operators. We have met with the ham operators and we have allayed all the fears that the ham operators have, every one of them. They are quite happy to see the bill proceed the way it is and as a matter of fact, if I wanted to, I could read a letter which the member for Wilkie read into the record. But he failed to read the next letter, which I'm sure he must have received, from a man by the name of A.E. Davies, VE58Z, Moose Jaw. The hon. member read into the record the complaint the man made, but he didn't have the decency to read the thank you he gave to the government for coming to them and giving them the things they wanted to have with regard to emergency services. It makes some difference, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member can do that but he won't come out with the kind of letter which might be a congratulatory one.

The Leader of the Conservative Party goes on:

6. The computer industry would be more regulated because of Sask Tel's regulations of the use of telephone lines for computer operations.

Obviously the researchers who wrote the letter for him didn't know the facts, because that sentence doesn't even make sense (saying nothing about it being a falsehood). It's completely false. There's no such possibility. But obviously his researchers wrote the

letter for him (because I don't think he would have written a letter like that himself. I doubt it, but obviously he's signed it). Again this shows you, Mr. Chairman, that it is simply not the case and he goes on:

7. Bill 13 would give Sask Tel control of cable vision in Saskatchewan because of fibre optics and the amendment that Sask Tel would control all communications.

There is zero to do with fibre optics in this bill. Fibre optics was announced some period of time before we had an opportunity to even give second reading to the bill and had nothing to do with it whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, what the Leader of the Conservative Party is really saying in his letter is that he opposes Sask Tel getting into fibre optics. He opposes not only fibre optics, that's bad enough, but he also opposes the fact that every community in this province such as the town of Wilkie, and some fine little communities like Cudworth, Kinistino and Wakaw, should have the opportunity to have cable television like we do in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that shall be heavy on that member's head come the next election because I am going to tell every single soul in my constituency, and I think everybody else will too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODY: — Mr. Chairman, the letter goes on and on and on and he finally ends up saying something to the effect that we should be stopping this destructive piece of legislation. That's why, Mr. Chairman, the member for Wilkie could get up and make a speech for one and one-half hours, reading into the record letters from manufacturers. I tell you, I could read into the record lots of letters myself. I am not about to do that, but I do want to share just a little clipping with you to show what the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan is really all about with regard to this bill. It is to show just whom they are really for. This clipping is from Business Week, April 28, 1980 and it really highlights something.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who put it in?

MR. CODY: — I will tell you who put it in. You'd better believe we can tell you who put it in. It is put in by the editor of the Business Week magazine.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's his name?

MR. CODY: — It is not necessary to mention his name. He talks about one of your best friends.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's John Twigg!

MR. CODY: — Well if it's John Twigg, he made a good job of exposing the friends of the Conservative Party, that's for sure. But here is a real example of why the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan are opposing Bill No. 13; they are opposing it because they believe Saskatchewan Telecommunications should not, with any stretch of the imagination be in competition in the computer industry. But they say, oh yes, if Exxon gets into it, that's great. That's fine. That is exactly what the article says. It's entitled Exxon's Next Prey. You know what that means, Mr. Chairman? That means that Exxon Corporation, one of the largest, if not the largest in the world with regard to the oil industry, is now venturing into a brand new industry. The industry they are in is the industry of computers and word processing. And yet the members opposite say, it's a

shame if you (the people's corporation) get into this business. That's a bad thing. We are only a corporation one-twentieth of 1 per cent the size of Exxon. But you people are the ones who have indicated to us we shouldn't be in it but it is O.K. if Exxon is in it.

I could read you article after article. I can tell you that even giant corporations such as IBM and Xerox are very nervous about the fact that Exxon is getting into this field because they know that with the gigantic amount of resources behind them they don't have a chance in this industry.

This crew has set up a new corporation and they call it International Business Machines Corporation. That gigantic corporation, just for starters, thought — we are not going to get into it in a big way. But they, in their first research operation, are already into it for \$200 million — twice as much or in fact more than Sask Tel would be able to invest if we stayed in it for years to come.

Yet, the hon. gentleman for Wilkie says, ah, but it is a good idea if Exxon is in. But you people in the Government of Saskatchewan, you people, who are out here as a Crown corporation protecting the people of Saskatchewan, shouldn't be in it. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, we are in it because we believe we should be in this business. It is a communications business. We believe we should be getting revenue wherever we can so we can average the rates throughout the province, so that in fact we can keep the rates reasonably low for all of the people in Saskatchewan. I think that is a commendable way to go about it and that's the reason why we have to have Bill No. 13.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know much about the minister's comments on what the members to my right have been doing or what the Leader of the Conservative Party may be sending out to people. But if this has anything whatsoever to do with the comments I was attempting to make to the minister . . .

I want to see the people's business in Saskatchewan get done; I want to see Bill 105 come before this legislature. I think it is an interesting topic and one that members to my right will be well advised to take a position on pretty quickly publicly.

But the point is, Mr. Minister, that exactly what you said is what's concerning everyone here. We understand that Sask Tel is going into that business. We understand that Exxon is in the business; we understand that a great many corporations are in the business. We understand that there are a large number of private people who are also in the business — Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan residents. And that kind of competitive atmosphere has served the people well and the minister says he is not going to prevent that.

You can't have it both ways, Mr. Minister. You can't say there is no way that Bill 13 is going to be used to prevent competition from developing in this rapidly expanding technological age. There is no possible way that this is what we're designed to do. We're not going to step on Exxon; we're not going to step on Western Business Machines; we just want to compete. That's what you said.

In this legislative Chamber you are the government; you finally make the decisions. That's the system and that's the way it should be. But behind closed doors you are going to use the power given to you in this bill to thwart not only IBM, Exxon, Xerox, but to thwart the aims and ambitions of Saskatchewan people who want to get into that new

technology in the private sector. That's what concerns the people on this side of the House.

I know, unfortunately, what it is like to deal with lawyers and I can understand the problem that you've been having in the last three-quarters of an hour, to get some lawyers to give you a comment on a simple little clause to put in a bill. Surely three-quarters of an hour is sufficient time for your lawyers to examine that clause or to come up with a clause that would be similar; one that would satisfy both the needs of Sask Tel and satisfy what you are trying to say to the people, that you're not going to use this bill to thwart the aims and ambitions of these people who want to get into this new area.

The member for Qu'Appelle from his chair, was yelling across about Sask Tel bill being used to thwart the aims and ambitions of the cable companies. I must be perfectly honest with the member for Qu'Appelle that I don't see it that way myself. The CRTC controls cable television. The Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Quebec and the Government of Alberta have been fighting within the constitution to try to gain some measure of control over the provision of this information without success to this point.

There are constitutional conferences coming up. At those constitutional conferences I am certain that is going to be discussed; I am certain that provincial governments are going to want a measure of control over that kind of service, whether they be NDP governments or Conservative governments (there aren't any Liberal governments and I suppose there aren't any Unionist governments either). Well, it's pretty new. I suppose if you suggested back in 1935 that there might be a CCF government, there would have been a lot of people who laughed too.

The point is, that is a constitutional matter; that's a constitutional question. The constitution in Canada is just being reviewed. The members to my right have suggested the urgent need for constitutional change. Perhaps they can use their good offices in helping to make that presentation to that constitutional conference.

So to suggest that Bill 13 is a way to circumvent a new constitution that we haven't even seen yet is a tempest in a teapot kind of argument. I don't see how they can make it and I don't think they should make it. I think they are ill-advised to make that kind of argument on this bill.

The one area of argument that is reasonable and realistic is the argument that the bill can be used to thwart the ambitions of these people who want to enter into this new field of computer technology. Because of the concern of the government about Exxon, because of the concern of the government about IBM, the government could, behind closed doors, shut off the little people who want to get into it. That's what they fear and quite frankly, it's what I fear. If you want to do that up front in this legislature then you have to face the kind of debate that you get in the legislature. You have to face the kind of debate that you get in your own caucus. You have your own members to contend with if it has to come here.

What the members to my right are concerned about and what I'm concerned about is that 19 people representing 0.25 per cent of this legislative Chamber, and in fact, even less than that . . . One person primarily because having never been in government, I don't know how your government operates, but I don't think that every order in council is made by the entire council. I think there's a smaller group that makes orders in council. What concerns everyone here and should concern the backbench members

on the other side is that in this new field of technology, individuals, small people in your constituencies, are going to want to enter into the business in the private sector. They don't want to go to work for Sask Tel. They don't want to work for Exxon or IBM or anybody else. They want to go out and become involved in this very exciting new venture that is going (and the minister knows that as everyone knows here) to be an exciting future; there are people in Saskatchewan who want to go into it. We are concerned that those few individuals can change the rules behind closed doors to thwart those ambitions. And that's unacceptable.

By placing a clause into the bill that will say precisely what the minister has said publicly, so that if there is any change to be made it has to come back here to this legislative Chamber, before those aims and ambitions can be thwarted, I say to the Government of Saskatchewan if you do that, you calm all those fears out there. You say, go ahead and get into this business in a private way if you like. We want to protect the revenue of Sask Tel and we have that right; you do have that right. We want to protect Sask Tel as an end to end supplier of telephone service, and you have that right. But the minister said, we don't call it an end. In other words, it's past the end — the computer; it's past the end — the stove, or the fridge, or whatever; that's past the end. End to end is the provision of service. We want to protect that. You have that right and you should protect that, Mr. Minister. I noticed an official just came back. I wonder, do you have an answer yet to my question?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we still do have some concern. There's no question about that, but we may well be prepared to consider (and I am just going to put it that way) an amendment which would be along the lines that the hon. member for Nipawin suggested to us. But I want to be crystal clear, so there will be no mistake as to what we are doing. We are not suggesting that we will not at any particular time be in the computer business. That is not, I hope, what you are suggesting. What we are suggesting is that we are not concerned with competition of any kind. That is great as far as we're concerned because 99.9 per cent of the business, which will be done in the province with regard to computers, will not be done with Sask Tel; we just don't have that capability, nor do we want to get into that kind of operation. That's not what we are here for. We want people to be here to get into that business, to hook and attach to our lines, so we can get some revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Put it in the bill.

MR. CODY: — The hon. member for Regina South says, put it in the bill. He didn't have the foresight, Mr. Chairman, to even suggest putting the regulation in the bill. Not one of them had that foresight until the hon. member for Nipawin made a slight mention of it.

I can tell you right now that I had that in the original bill, but I decided at the time that I wasn't sure whether it should be left there. It was a problem. I felt we might have. As a result I took it out of the bill prior to the printing of the bill. We have now taken another look at it and we may well be able to consider the amendment.

I would rather have the bill the way it is because I think as it is the bill is right, I believe you should have, at all times, broad legislation and then narrow its scope down by regulation.

We may well be able to offer the amendment. At the point in time when we get to that portion of the committee of the whole we will perhaps consider it.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know about the minister but quite frankly I would like to end the tempest in the teapot. Now perhaps you want it to continue, Mr. Minister, I believe this would end it.

Mr. Chairman, the point is this: the minister will not explain why he just says, we may introduce the clause. I say to the minister, he knows the rules of this legislation as well as anyone else. When you get off item 1 you can't go back to item 1. The fact is if he commits to making a House amendment to this effect at this stage, then certainly so far as our side of the House is concerned, the tempest is finished because the minister has put into the bill precisely what he said was the intent of the bill.

Now I say to the minister, if there is a problem with putting this in the legislation, explain to all hon. members in this Assembly what the problem is. What service and what action of Sask Tel would this prohibit or hinder? Sask Tel is getting into the business; it doesn't prevent Sask Tel from getting into the business. Sask Tel wants to provide the service; it doesn't prevent Sask Tel from providing service. All it does, Mr. Chairman, is say to Sask Tel you can't (within your own body of regulation) make a regulation which says we are in the business, but we are going to compete more fairly than the other guy, because the other guy is depending on our lines. Now the minister knows that and every member of this Assembly knows that.

All of a sudden three little guys in Yorkton set up a little computer business to compare with Sask Tel. Because it takes Sask Tel five months to make a decision which those guys could make in 10 minutes, because it takes Sask Tel months and months and months to put together its proposals and those guys are out in the business field and can hustle quickly, they start to get some customers. They are doing a good job; people are happy with them. But they have to use Sask Tel's lines to do the job.

Now Sask Tel is in the business. They pass a regulation behind closed doors; it never comes before the people, which says, here is the regulation for you, but Sask Tel doesn't have to do that. We say that's unfair competition. That is directly and diametrically opposed to your stated objects. So I say to the minister, other than that particular role (which I agree if you put this clause in the bill it will prevent you from doing that), is there anything else, any other activity of Sask Tel that this kind of amendment would prevent from happening?

MR. CODY: — No, Mr. Chairman, not that I am aware of. I don't think there is any great problem at all. The hon. member again makes a very good point in saying that if we keep the amendment in, it will stop the tempest in the teapot. I don't agree with you. The tempest in the teapot is still going to be there to your right. There is just no question about this. That particular opposition is not worried about whether this amendment or any amendment is in. They are worried about sitting here to try to protect a certain segment of society and that's their friends . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I may try to find out; I just may do that. But I don't have nearly as much trust as you do with regard to having the opposition come forward and say to us, yes you put that amendment in and the bill will be fine.

I'll tell you what I am going to do, Mr. Chairman. I am going to put in an amendment. Then I am going to challenge the opposition to vote for this bill. I am going to see if the opposition is really serious. I am also going to see if the member for Nipawin is serious. I am going to put an amendment in to this bill along the lines although not exactly as the member said and I will see whether the opposition is really serious about giving the

opportunity to Sask Tel to compete with their friends. I am going to give them that opportunity.

I am also going to challenge the member for Wilkie and the member for Moosomin right now and ask them: are you or are you not going to vote for this bill? If they say they are not going to vote for the bill, then it is pretty obvious what this debate has been all about. There is no question what this debate is about. I know the debate has been about the people of Saskatchewan versus private enterprise, multinational corporations. That is what the debate has been about.

I am going to offer this amendment, then we're going to find out whether the opposition is very serious about protecting the people of Saskatchewan. We'll see what they are going to say. I will read the amendment to you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fine, you have a few more amendments to come, the member says. It is pretty obvious they have no intention of supporting this bill because they know the bill will protect the public of Saskatchewan. They are not interested in the people of Saskatchewan. They are interested in the multinational corporations. This has nothing to do with the people of Saskatchewan of course . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it has obviously hurt the member for Wilkie. That's exactly what it is supposed to do. It's about time the member for Wilkie found exactly what we were talking about in this bill. He now has found it; just now he recognized exactly what we are talking about and he knows it. Add the following section after section 44.4 of the act, as being enacted by section 6 of the printed bill, restrictions on regulations. The amendment will read as follows:

44.5 No regulation may be made to prevent competition in the manufacture, distribution, leasing, sale, maintenance or use of computers.

That will go into the bill, Mr. Chairman. I just want to challenge the opposition to give clear passage to this bill and vote for it. I want to see that happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I wonder if we could give leave to the hon. member for Yorkton to introduce another group of students.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to the House, through you, a group of 36 students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by two of their teachers, Garry Penteluke and Christine Ooi. These students too are from the Yorkton Composite Junior High School, a very fine school located in the city of Yorkton. These students come from all surrounding areas of Yorkton including the Pelly constituency, the Canora constituency, and the Saltcoats constituency. The members for Pelly and Canora are out talking with another group of these students and I will be very pleased to meet with them a little later. I would like all members to join with me in wishing them a very interesting and informative stay in the House, a very interesting stay in Regina and a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Committee of the Whole — Bill No. 13 (continued)

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, I have a few things I would like to discuss further on this bill. Naturally, I would like to look at the amendment a little better

but it looks like it's a very good start. But the thing that disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is the minister of Sask Tel says that there are no new points coming from the Conservative opposition in this House. There weren't any new points raised in second reading and now that we are in committee of the whole, you can only raise points in this House. If members opposite don't grasp them, you can't blame us. You can't blame us at all.

The Attorney General yesterday afternoon said maybe fibre optics. I mean, what direction is this government going?

I have a news release here: March 6, 11:00 a.m. Sask Tel to build world's longest fibre optic system. And yesterday the Attorney General says, maybe. What direction is the government going? We have the minister in charge of Sask Tel announcing a fibre optics program. Later on we have the Attorney General saying, well, now it's maybe. Is this the way you deal with business in Saskatchewan? Is this the way this government is going to deal with business? I say it's wrong!

You commit in one department and the other department turns around and says no. The minister in charge of Sask Tel said yesterday afternoon or morning when the member for Moosomin was raising a point about couplers . . . It had to do with the answering service. This is a prime example, Mr. Chairman, of why we got into this debate. I don't have all of the quote but one of the things he did say was, use our coupler.

Now, it doesn't matter whether it's a coupler on an answering service or whether it's an acoustic coupler. Why does it have to be 'our coupler' as the minister states? I'll tell you why. The government wants to control all the couplers.

Now, to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. I have a question for you. What is the cost of leasing an acoustic coupler from Sask Tel as compared to outright buying an acoustic coupler from another manufacturing or distributing firm in Saskatchewan? What is the difference in cost between renting the acoustic coupler and buying it outright for the individual citizen of Saskatchewan?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to say exactly what the difference in price would be, because it makes some difference which piece of equipment the coupler is attached to. If it's attached to an answering service or computer, or whatever — that makes a difference. We don't have the rates with us. I'm not here to answer specific questions with regard to dollars and cents items, so I don't have it. I can probably get the answer for the hon. member but I just don't have that available to me.

I know that if you look at what the hon. member for Regina South was saying yesterday about automatic diallers, we might be charging \$10 or \$12 a month. It is difficult to say, because of the various types and pieces of equipment we might use a coupler for.

MR. GARNER: — I asked you over the noon hour then, and we'll use an acoustic coupler that hooks up to an in-house computer. I think you understand what I mean by an in-house computer. I would like the comparisons. The reason I ask that question, Mr. Minister, is very obvious. Section 44(1) of the printed bill: in section 44(2) to section 44(4) attachment means any wire, line, equipment or any acoustical, electrical, mechanical or other device not owned by the corporation. That's why I'm asking that question, Mr. Minister. It's fairly obvious I would like that information.

Now, Mr. Minister, another point which is brought forth — you want points. What about

the manufacturing firm in Saskatchewan that comes out with a new computer or a new acoustic coupler? What about that firm? If Sask Tel or the cabinet, by order in council, doesn't give that firm permission to hook to Sask Tel's line, what other means of appeal are there? If they come out with this new, modern computer and Sask Tel doesn't want answers on some of these things, Mr. Minister. We have to have the answers because the way the bill is right now, and the information I have, there is no road and no line of appeal from it.

Yesterday or the day before I heard the Attorney General on a radio show stating that the Conservative opposition was either dragging their feet or stalling debate on it. Mr. Minister, until the people of Saskatchewan, not just your corporations, are satisfied with Bill No. 13 and the new amendment . . . If they are satisfied then I am satisfied. But until they are satisfied with it, no . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now we hear the Attorney General again. My buddy gave it to us. You know it's just like the way games are being played in calling the House business today — the little games that are being played. And we know who is playing the games. The new little triangle, the political triangle in Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now he wants to start bringing in former leaders. You are the one, Mr. Attorney General, who is making the little deals . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. I would ask the hon. member for Wilkie to address his remarks through the Chair to the House, and I ask other members to allow the member to continue his remarks. The hon. member for Wilkie. Order.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, rather than continuing an argument with the Attorney General, is it possible that we could ask the committee to rise and report progress so that I can study this amendment?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just call it 12 o'clock.

MR. GARNER: — I'll call it 12 o'clock so I can study this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It being 12 o'clock I leave the Chair until 2 p.m. this afternoon.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.