

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 29, 1980

AFTERNOON SESSION

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the House. It's a great privilege for me to introduce to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the House, 45 students in the Speaker's gallery who are visitors from the Yorkton Junior High School in Yorkton, along with two of their teachers, Dennis Pomeroy and Miss Pattison. These students too are part of the large group who are touring the whole of Regina and visiting the legislature here. I know all of us here will be wishing them an interesting stay in the House and an interesting tour around Regina and a safe journey home. Thank you very much.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.S. MATSALLA (Canora): — Mr. Chairman, this is a great day for the Yorkdale school division area. This gives them an opportunity to come into the city of Regina and the legislature to see what their representatives are doing and the kind of legislative work that is proceeding here. I would like to join with the member for Yorkton in welcoming the student group to the legislature and I do hope that they have a very pleasant and enjoyable visit to our capital city.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues in welcoming the students here this afternoon. I know they will enjoy their visit to the legislature. We will be looking forward to meeting with them in a short while to discuss some of the procedures here. We wish you an interesting visit to Regina; may this visit to the legislature be very informative.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a privilege for me today to welcome 18 students from the Lucky Lake School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Audrey Weir, and parents, Gladys Paveo and Mrs. Milne, and their bus driver, Stan Milne. I would like to mention to the students that the House this afternoon (as soon as we have finished introducing you) will move into what we call committee of the whole. It is really third reading of Bill No. 13, so you will have an -opportunity to watch some of the debate that will take place on this particular bill. I hope that you will enjoy the proceedings of the House. I will be meeting with you immediately after you leave the Chamber for pictures and drinks. I hope that you enjoy your visit here and have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act (continued).

Section 1

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have had an opportunity to consider some amendments that have been passed, and quite frankly we are shocked at the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Unionest Party. The Leader of the Unionest Party in his resolution feels that no regulation may be made to prevent competition in the manufacture, distribution, leasing, sale, maintenance or use of computers. It's very pointed that he only restricts it to computers. Why by implication the Leader of the Unionest Party would allow a monopoly for such accessories as telephone answering, recording, mobile phones and accessories such as that is beyond comprehension. I think it was obviously poorly thought out and I don't believe that the hon. member realizes the implications of the proposed amendment. It is quite clear in statutory interpretation that by excluding a narrow area of computers, you are by implication saying it's acceptable in the other areas. I'm frankly shocked that such an amendment would be brought into this Assembly. It indicates, I suggest as well, a lack of comprehension about the bill.

Sask Tel — and I use that advisedly because I think, having talked to officials in Sask Tel, that it's the government that's insisting on this legislation — wants to continue a trend that started some four or five years ago when it extended far beyond the traditional role of Sask Tel into property acquisition, redevelopment of the Cornwall Centre, expropriation of property, building of hotels in the Cornwall Centre, a role far beyond the traditional and accepted role of Sask Tel. It's surprising.

Sask Tel, of course, is embarking on dangerous ground as it goes far beyond that mandate. I don't believe that anybody other than the government opposite endorses the action of Sask Tel in jamming the TV signals in Saskatoon. The only support for that operation is on the government benches. I don't believe that anyone other than those on the government benches opposite support Sask Tel's getting into compulsory and retroactive expropriation — retroactive in the sense that an amendment brought in last year allowed Sask Tel to be the vehicle for retroactively expropriating property.

So the government's sole defence to the bill is, oh, we wouldn't do that. We can give you the assurance that we wouldn't take the action that the opposition is saying we would take. We'll give you our assurance. Your assurance, Mr. Minister, isn't worth the paper it's printed on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — The public has no grounds and no track record by which to believe you when you say that you are going to put this to very limited usage. When you bring in a bill which allows the government to basically control all aspects of the computer industry and telecommunications, we don't believe you when you say, oh, we wouldn't do that because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who cares, he says? I think the public of Saskatchewan cares; and that particular attitude is precisely why the opposition has to fight this bill and intends to fight this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It's because you say, who cares? I'll tell you that we care, and I think the public of Saskatchewan cares although you may not.

When a government brings in a bill which says (and I'll come to the House amendment) that no person shall attach or connect to, or use in conjunction with, any part of a

telecommunication line of the corporation, any attachment without the express written permission of the corporation. That's a damnable piece of legislation, and that's a damnable section. And it deserves to be opposed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — How any government, with any sense of responsibility, could propose such a clause is beyond comprehension. It's wrong and you know it's wrong. An amendment, which says it won't have to be written permission, it will have to be in the regulations, is no better because all you have to do in the regulations is say you must have written permission. You can do that in the regulations. You can change the regulations tomorrow from the ones you propose. There's no review. It doesn't have to come back before this Assembly. All you have to do in the regulations is say you must have written permission. You've successfully avoided the act; you've successfully avoided the legislature; and it's perfectly legal. And you stand up and ask for that type of authority. He's proud of the fact that's the type of authority he wants.

When a government brings in a bill which says — 'no person shall advertise their offer for sale to the public any attachment whose primary advertised purpose is to attach to or connect to or be used by any person other than the corporation in conjunction with the telecommunication line of the corporation, unless that attachment is specifically permitted by the corporation to be attached, connected or used in conjunction with a telecommunication lines of the corporation' — that, as well, is damnable legislation. Because that means it Woolco or your local Robinson store (the Attorney General is against Radio Shacks, not realizing they're a franchise operation and are locally owned here in Saskatchewan by local businessmen) wants to advertise a telephone answering recording they would have to have the permission of Sask Tel. If Woolco wants to advertise a line of telephones, which they've been doing for years, they would have to have the permission of Sask Tel. And if your local TV or radio shop wants to advertise and use telephone recorders, or if someone wants to put in the yellow pages the fact that he sells mobile telephones . . . Let me tell you what they've been doing. You check your own telephone directory for heaven's sakes. Companies are advertising that they will sell and install mobile telephones. Now they are going to have to have your approval to do that.

You threaten everybody who has been in business in this province, who has carried on a business, with this type of legislation. And for some reason you're proud of it. You threaten every existing business in Saskatchewan that has either sold mobile telephones or has advertised or sold telephone answering recorders. That's what this bill does.

Then we take a look at what you do with the computer operation. When I am told in this Assembly that Sask Tel wants to go into computer word processing . . . They have no business being in computer word processing. That's a competitive retail operation Sask Tel is going into. That doesn't enhance . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says Exxon. If Exxon is so bad, why did you sign a deal with them in uranium mining? Why did you get into bed with Exxon and Esso (if they are so bad) on uranium mining? Somehow you're going to have to justify that; you can't have it both ways.

We have had multinational corporations and you are in fact saying that people with Xerox, IBM, or Olivetti, or AES, (being sold by Wascana Office Equipment and by local dealers) are no good. They're not competent; they're not qualified; the only one who can do it is your government. That's what you're saying. Local people who are selling

word processors should now be faced with the competition of the Government of Saskatchewan. That's precisely what this bill does: the member knows it.

You know we've been through this debate many times in other bills, and even the Attorney General has backed off on a couple of occasions. The government brings in a right to break into anyone's home; if anyone's home has a telephone answering service that doesn't have the approval of Sask Tel, the government has the right. You may not agree with it.

Every other bill has required a search warrant properly issued, because it's a dangerous power to have. The House amendment you propose still doesn't require a validity issued search warrant. Why shouldn't they require a search warrant? Why should you be exempted from the accepted law in this province that you must have a search warrant before you break into a man's home? Why should you be? The only exceptions are the drug prosecutions and customs and excise and income tax — very, very serious provisions in the law, requiring extraordinary remedies.

The corporation may seize any attachment mentioned in section 44.2 which is the one I referred to earlier. If you don't agree with the telephone answering service someone has in their home, you can seize it. That means going into the house because you don't expect them to stand outside waiting for you. You can break into anyone's automobile to get their mobile answering service, their telephone; you have the power. All that happens is every time you come back you say, oh, but we wouldn't do that.

In fact you will do it. Remember what you had to do in the expropriation cases? When some people didn't sign and sell their property, you brought in retroactive legislation to backdate the date of the expropriation. You undercut several local businessmen in the city of Regina, cut them off at the knees, when the Attorney General brought this bill in last year. Don't tell me you won't.

Why don't you bring in a bill which sets out the minimum you need, and be able to justify it. Don't come in asking for the maximum, asking for all the powers, and then say you won't use them all. Why don't you do as a responsible government would and come in with the minimum?

AN HON. MEMBER: — If you don't use them, you don't need them.

MR. LANE: — Come in with the minimum. You say you won't use them but you don't hesitate to cut off telecable in Saskatoon and jam its signal.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You didn't hesitate to threaten to cut my service off either.

MR. LANE: — You won't even take the normal judicial process to try to see whether you have a case. You just arbitrarily jam them. You don't have the courage to go to court to defend your position. And you ask the opposition to give you all these powers to do whatever you want in the field of computers, television and actually, household accessories. The amendments are an attempt to soften what is a bad bill, but they are ineffectual and they don't in any way, shape or form lessen the powers given. They don't in any way, shape or form require an obligation of Sask Tel or the Government of Saskatchewan to come before this Assembly for approval. They don't in any way require Sask Tel to justify its actions.

Mark my words that a year from now Sask Tel will be in the retail computer business. It will be in the retail office business on word processors, and as well, Sask Tel will have stopped the vast majority of communities from getting cable television and a number of channels because it won't allow the satellite receiving disc.

That is not the positive direction Sask Tel was originally to take. Sask Tel was originally established to supply service — not to stop service. Sask Tel was never set up to jam television reception; Sask Tel was never set up to stop people from getting cable television; Sask Tel was never set up to get into bad investments like CPN; Sask Tel was never set up to get into land assembly and expropriation. Sask Tel was set up to supply a necessary service to the people of Saskatchewan and for God's sake, get back to that basic premise!

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment just before the question takes place. I want to make an observation or two to the members of this House. First of all, I invite the members of the House to recollect the pattern and the flow of this particular debate. You will recall the speeches such as they were, yesterday — myself, the member for Regina South. I congratulate the member for Regina South on the wide extensive press coverage that he received on it. I thought it was a speech which was certainly worthy of that. Then followed by the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no, he got very large coverage by it.

I then recollect to the members of the House opposite that the Leader of the Unionest Party, (so-called) the member for Nipawin, then entered the debate and I think tried to crystallize the issues with respect to the monopoly control aspect of Sask Tel by this bill, as it related to computers and computer technology and the offspring. I think you all recall that. And then the Unionest Leader said, you have these regulations that have been on the floor of the House now for months; why don't you lift those regulations away from regulations and incorporate them in the bill, because the regulations clearly indicate that it was not a monopoly. You will recall that banter back and forth. And then after the intervention by the Leader of the Unionest Party, the hon. member for Moosomin entered into the debate and this is the way the proceedings ended yesterday. On page 3710 is the position of the PC official opposition, as of 5 o'clock yesterday. Now I realize almost 24 hours has gone by so anything could have happened, but this is their position.

I'm reading in part; he's referring to the committee. I could read it all but his intervention was about the regulations committee. I think members of the press will still remember this, and his quote is this:

It's that committee which could have a very meaningful input in terms of taking a look at the regulations you may propose from time to time.

And certainly the concerns are well expressed from the opposition. Get these words, Mr. Chairman:

We want to be assured, because you can change regulations by order in council any time you feel it's necessary. This is what we are looking at here — a situation where you can just up and change the regulations and make acoustic couplers or whatever kinds of couplers far more expensive for one particular group than for another or for yourselves, particularly in regard to computer technology. Mr. Minister, you say it's nonsense (because the

minister made some interjections). Obviously we don't think it's nonsense or we wouldn't be expressing these concerns.

In conclusion, I think that the regulations committee could be utilized in this particular way.

There are other quotations on page 3709 from the member but the essence of that PC position at 5 o'clock adjournment time was, come on, get those regulations implemented either by statutory amendment or by regulations committee review to assure us that you will not, by regulation, some way down the road unilaterally change the regulations with respect to computer technology. In other words, we were approaching some form of — I won't say consensus — an emerging consensus in this area.

And then the House reconvened today to consider Bill No. 13. The Leader of the Unionest Party gets up again, advances the idea which quite logically was the last item for discussion yesterday at 5 o'clock. He suggests an amendment. The Sask Tel lawyers meet with legislative counsel and prepare an amendment which in effect transfers now from regulation to statutory provision that safeguard respecting this area . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Thunder Creek says, nonsense, but he was not here for most of the time this morning. And I say to the hon. member for Thunder Creek what happened was — and I don't expect to convince you people opposite — that the member for Wilkie and others were expressing the view that that amendment, subject to a final look by caucus over lunch time, might just do the trick. It might satisfy the guarantees for competition in this area. They asked for early adjournment to caucus.

And so before lunch, consistent with that pattern of development, this caucus was, as of three hours ago, of the view that this statutory guarantee would provide the competition which was being sought. And I invite hon. members opposite to deny that was a reasonable and fair interpretation of the position taken by the PC caucus. They can't.

So they come back after lunch; the PCs have taken a look at it and they say that proposed solution or approach is no longer any good. Now I am going to ask the question, why the change from that perceived position since 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon? And I'll tell you why, Mr. Chairman, I have a few theories about this.

But may I say first of all that the Minister of Telephones accurately predicted before lunch that there was a fundamental, basic difference between Sask Tel . . . I made my speech yesterday and I won't repeat it again on privatizing and privateering Sask Tel on their side and ours. He said, I predict that they will vote against the amendment. Frankly, I felt before lunch that he was wrong. We had lunch together and I was convinced that the amendment would likely provide the Conservatives an honorable way out and give them a modicum of success on this bill for guaranteeing competition. It would allow the government a way out. I don't believe the government needed a way out because the matter was in regulations . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll repeat again, allow the government a way out. It makes no matter to me because it's not relevant to my argument. But the elements of a consensus for an agreed change were there.

The Minister of Telephones was right. Fundamentally it is more than just the guarantee of competition, it is the destruction of Sask Tel that's at issue here. Why the change, Mr.

Chairman, over lunch time? I say, Mr. Chairman, that the change over lunch time is very simple. I think the change over lunch time is that Mr. Devine, the Leader of the Conservative caucus said, you cannot accept a proposal or an amendment which comes from the former leader of the Conservatives, Mr. Colver, because the press will say that the Conservative caucus is following the line of the old leader of the Conservative operation, and as a result we need to oppose the amendment in order to show our differences from the Unionest Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that I am sick, and I must candidly confess to the hon. member that I am sick. I'm sick and tired of the childish, irresponsible flip-flopping position that the PC caucus is taking on Bill No. 13. But I ask you, Mr. Chairman, (and I'm not now speaking to the PCs because they have made their decision) but I ask you sir; I ask the other members of the House; I invite the press — you tell me what other rational explanation there is. They at 5 o'clock yesterday could have taken the position that the elevation of those regulations into statute was the wrong way to go. They could have taken the same position that the aspects of the bill which the member for Qu'Appelle (the future leader of the Conservative caucus) says — the fundamental arguments in Bill No. 13 — are wrong. They could have taken that position at 5 o'clock. They could have said, don't worry about the amendments. They are not acceptable to us because Sask Tel is into all these other areas. They could have done it this morning, and they didn't do it this morning. They asked an early adjournment at 11:50. Why, Mr. Chairman, on a simple one line amendment which everybody in this legislature and in this House and those who watch this debate know would have allowed them to say that they achieved their objective. That doesn't change the facts of the proposal, but they changed. You tell me why they changed? You say I'm being political? I tell you they changed because the simple fact of the matter is that their leader, Mr. Devine, living in the shadow of the Leader of the Unionest Party, living with the fact that he has no seat in this House, living with the fact of a serious caucus division on Bill No. 105, has told them that they have to drop, not a half a mile away from the former leader but a mile and a half away from the former leader. Anything that he proposed, they are going to oppose. That's the position.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make one last comment if I can as to where this leaves us. This leaves us now in the situation where the amendment having guaranteed (although the regulations would have done that) by statute, which the members opposite said, judging by the words of Mr. Birkbeck and others — competition statutorily agreed. Their having rejected that amendment, where does it leave us, Mr. Chairman? It leaves us clearly in the position pure and simple, as the Minister of Telephones has said, where the Conservatives are out to destroy Sask Tel in the future evolutionary development of telecommunications.

I am going to conclude my remarks today Mr. Chairman, by referring to the historical position taken by governments in this province to protect the end to end responsibility of Sask Tel. I said yesterday that in the 40 year history of this province every government, from Tommy Douglas to Woodrow Lloyd to the late premier, Ross Thatcher, to the Premier Allan Blakeney government, always adopted the end to end responsibility approach. The hon. Member says not.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to table for the members of this House a brief submitted by the former administration, 1971, of the late premier, Ross Thatcher; I hereby ask that a copy be tabled. I shall ask also that copies be forwarded to members of the press, if

someone will care to do that, in case they might want to take a look at it. I am going to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a brief submitted to the Canadian Radio Television Commission, dated April 16, 1971, submission by Saskatchewan Telecommunications, signed by the Honourable Gordon B. Grant, Chairman and responsible minister (and I would say a leading and respected member of the Thatcher administration) on the position of telecommunications and Sask Tel in the emerging era of 1971. I invite the press to read the report. What you will see when I give it to the press is a summary of the report. Don't accept my summary of it; take your own, if you will. But that submission by the Thatcher government said this, Mr. Chairman:

1. Sask Tel is the proper agency of the government to administer telecommunication policy in Saskatchewan (first paragraph, page 1).
2. Sask Tel must have control (I underline the word control) over the transmission and distribution system (first paragraph, top of page 4).
3. Sask Tel must avoid wasteful duplication of facilities or permitting specialized carriers to cream-skim the lucrative markets, in order to ensure an expanded quality, quantity and variety of all communication services (clause D(a) on page 3; What we're arguing this bill is doing and what they say they want to allow to be done).
4. The telecommunication carrier can facilitate the sharing of remote signal costs among all users on an equitable basis (rate averaging, which is what we've been saying in this debate).
5. Specialized telecommunication carriers serving the lucrative markets will impair the development and expansion of communication services to the sparsely populated areas of Saskatchewan (will impair — the top of page 7).
6. To be economically viable an integrated network should include both voice band and wide band capacities complementing each other under the electronic control and supervision of the telecommunications carrier.

There are other points in the brief. Those are the six fundamental points which the PCs fundamentally have opposed. They say that this comes from the socialist government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, these fundamental six points, if you transferred them to Alberta, are the same in their legislation. These fundamental six points have been the cornerstone of end to end responsibility of Sask Tel during the height of free enterprise philosophy of the late Premier Ross Thatcher.

I don't say this in a patronizing way to the member for Thunder Creek. Whether you liked him or you didn't like him, Ross Thatcher was a man who knew where he stood and how he got there and he did it with vigour and integrity, but he was not going to sabotage and privateer away Sask Tel. He wasn't going to do that; he wasn't going to barter it away. And nobody could say that the late Premier Ross Thatcher was some sort of sell-out to socialism.

That's what that brief says. Don't take my word. Take your readers and go through it point by point and tell me where I've gone wrong in the operation. That is the forty year history of Sask Tel. There is no other way that we could provide services to rural Saskatchewan without this kind of an operation.

That's not to say we're going to eliminate competition. The amendment which the member for Nipawin (the Unionest leader, so-called) will provide would guarantee from regulation to statute to competition safeguard. That's something I thought the hon. member for Moosomin yesterday seemed to be grasping hold of and accepting. That's something I thought the hon. member for Wilkie, this morning, today, was urging us to do in his interventions right up until 11:50 a.m.

We said we're going to do it; we bring it in to do it, and after lunch they change. Why? Because they looked at the bill, the amendment? No. Because they know something that Ross Thatcher didn't know? No. Because they spotted something that Ross Thatcher and Gordon Grant, in their socialist mentalities, let through? No. Because they're smarter than Peter Lougheed or Richard Hatfield or Sterling Lyon (and I have some views about the latter that I'm not going to express)? Because you think that they're a more able opposition to hold up this bill for five or six months? Because this issue is more important than deterrent fees, or any other issue that we've taken on in this House in the 13 years I've been here, inside and outside. And what great debates we've had. Why? All of that, Mr. Chairman, why?

And this position of Sask Tel — I tell you why I make the conclusion and I invite anybody to give me another rational explanation. You can't. You're reduced to that kind of a situation. You are reduced therefore to the position where this is indeed a major issue. Indeed this is an issue of the survival of Sask Tel because this section, which is the proposed amendment, does not satisfy them. They obviously do not subscribe to the six principles of Ross Thatcher's government which were embodied in Bill No. 13 — the control. They don't subscribe to that. If they don't subscribe to that and they say that it isn't Mr. Devine, who for political reasons is telling them to get some distance between themselves and Mr. Collver, then the only other conclusion is that Sask Tel is in jeopardy because then they'd believe what they say. Then they really do believe the member for Wilkie and the member for Qu'Appelle and all the others who attempted to say that Sask Tel should be piecemealed away — something they don't even allow in many parts of the United States with respect to carriers involved there.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the paranoia that this party opposite has about that man over there in the corner is driving them to absolutely ludicrous political policy positions. This is a ludicrous policy position because of your paranoia of that man over there. I tell you that you ought to reconsider. I am saying to you one more time before you dig yourselves in, you don't need to follow the man who has other ambitions and other purposes for advancing the views that he does. I tell you, before you say to floss Thatcher and Gordon Grant and Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd (forget about Allan Blakeney but some historian will say Allan Blakeney); before you say to all of the pioneers of Sask Tel in its infancy, (the member for Kelvington has the book; I invite you to read it), who struggled in those difficult years to build up this great telecommunication system; before you say to all of them, goodbye all those 40 years of work, don't dig yourselves in.

It won't matter a bit politically whether he advances that idea or I advance that idea or you advance that idea. For goodness sake, let's keep the integrity, the end to end responsibility of the carrier system in tow. Let's not forsake that principle because not even the most free enterprise of governments, the Thatcher government, was able to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I know that I made the remarks in perhaps somewhat colourful language

or inflammatory language. I honestly say to the PCs, you have something here. You have something here which we're prepared to adopt by legislation. You want to get on to Bill No. 105; you want to get on to other House business. The press knows what the effect of that amendment was and is. They know it because you said the same thing yourselves at lunch time when you spoke to them. You changed totally on a flip-flop and I say, do not dig yourselves in. Here is something which we can adopt and agree to this bill and get on with the business of safeguarding Sask Tel and get on with the business of debating Bill No. 105 and the other issues before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to provide some advice first of all to the members to my right who seem to think that by sending a note to Mr. Chairman I'm somehow developing a triangle. Those who have been in the Legislative Assembly before, might remember that in committee it is customary, when you wish to speak next, to send a note to the Chairman to tell him so. He puts you on his list and then you get up to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Make a ruling on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I'm not going to make a ruling on that. I just want to inform the hon. members that I haven't been keeping a list and I don't keep a list. I try to recognize members and give everyone an opportunity to speak. I recognize the first person I see. I happened to see the hon. member for Nipawin first; the member over here sitting behind me. I didn't see first. I saw the hon. member for Nipawin first and I called on him.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. However, I would suggest to Mr. Chairman that was the custom before this Chairman took the Chair and has been for some considerable time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take issue with what the Attorney General has said today. I am going to open by saying I'm absolutely shocked and amazed at my former colleagues in this House this afternoon, absolutely shocked. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say to the Attorney General that it is not my opinion that Mr. Devine did what the Attorney General suggested, because I think Mr. Devine is a first class Leader of the Progressive Conservative party and will be the next premier of the province of Saskatchewan. That's what I believe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — But for the benefit of members to the right, I do not believe the member for Qu'Appelle will be the next premier of the province of Saskatchewan, not if you tried to elect him for the next 30 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — I don't know where the members to my right are getting their advice on this, but I suggest it comes from the member for Qu'Appelle and I'm sorry he's not in this Chamber. The fact of the matter is that what you have asked for, in all of the debate I have listened to in this House, is precisely what the government finally gave in on this morning. You were successful. You did your job. For five months you pushed it; you

fought for it and you said, we want competition; and the government caved in this morning.

Mr. Chairman, now they stand up in this legislative Chamber and make themselves look ridiculous; I am shocked and disgusted. Mr. Chairman, they stand today in this Chamber and say that mobile telephones should be competitive. No one has fought against socialism in this province harder than I have for the last number of years; no one believes more in the free enterprise system. But I tell the member for Thunder Creek, and I tell the member for Qu'Appelle, and I tell the Attorney General that in free enterprise Arizona, telephones at the end of the line have to be approved. Mountain Bell requires an approval sticker on every single telephone answering device in the state of Arizona; it is required by law.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Nonsense.

MR. COLLVER: — He says nonsense. He should go down there to check, Mr. Chairman. I have had occasion of recent date to obtain just such a device from a place in Phoenix called the Price Club. They get seconds; they had some seconds and I was told they could no longer sell them. I saw them, but they could no longer sell them because Mountain Bell withdrew their permission for the sale of those products. Every telephone company in the world has that kind of protection, and must have that kind of protection.

I don't agree with Sask Tel taking all powers unto itself. I don't agree with the socialists wanting to monopolize everything and going into every single business in Canada. But my goodness gracious, they were willing to do exactly what was asked for by the Conservatives and the Conservatives would take all the credit.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not quite, not quite.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, I say to the members to my right that if they persist in this kind of display, if they persist in this kind of effort, the people of this province will never choose them. It is a very sad day when, on the very thing you've been asking for, the government finally caves in and you can go to your people and say, I did my job. They are the legitimate government of the province of Saskatchewan; they are entitled to pass laws after you present your case. I can tell the members to my right that saying something over and over and over, the same arguments in January, February and March, is not going to sell. They presented in this legislative Chamber the same argument. The same ones came from the member for Qu'Appelle today as were presented yesterday, as were presented during second reading, as were presented since that bill was introduced. Saying them over and over is not going to change anyone's mind. Once you have presented your case, it's presented and people know where you stand. You don't want the government into every business; if they don't know that by now, then you're not doing your job. Saying it over and over in this legislature is not going to make it so. The very thing, Mr. Chairman, which members to my right have been pushing for, the government finally caved in on as a result of their pressure — not mine.

I am absolutely shocked that they would then rise in this Chamber today, after they said to the press and to the television, how anxious they are to get on with Bill 105. I tell them I have been ready for nine days. I am ready today. I'll be ready tomorrow and no amount of repeating these arguments on Bill 13 is going to change that. If you are so anxious to get on with it, accept the success you have had and get on with it. If you have some other amendments, propose your amendments; but for goodness sake don't believe

that by repeating in this House the same arguments, the people of this province are going to listen.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am here right now with mixed emotions. I have very mixed emotions because I can't decide which one to comment on, the Attorney General or my former leader. I am disappointed with some of the comments of my former leader. I think his comments were inappropriate. I don't think we need him passing judgment on us. I will leave it at that point.

I return to some of the comments of the Attorney General. As I listened to him talk and as I listened to his arguments, at the risk of sounding a trifle corny, it reminded me of a little novel written by one George Orwell. It was entitled, 1984. Did any of you ever see that movie? If you didn't read the book, maybe you saw the movie. Remember the government had electronic access to every single household so that some unseen big brother (in the movie) could monitor what every single citizen of that country was doing? The government controlled all the electronics; the government kept every single citizen of that fabled country under surveillance. When I listened to the Attorney General today (I'd like to remind you this is 1980) I thought maybe the 1984 of George Orwell is not as far-fetched as many of us would think.

The difficulty we on this side of the Assembly have with this bill, as with the vast majority of bills of this type which come from you, is simply one of credibility. We don't believe your intent, because far too often you have confirmed that we should not believe your intent. Mr. Chairman, normally it is the Attorney General's style and his tactic to get up at about 4:45 in the afternoon. Then he'll whale blazes out of the opposition and kill the clock. Well, today we watched them do it again. He gets up at 2:20 p.m., goes on until about 2:40 p.m., and then vanishes.

A MEMBER: — He dishes it out, but can't take it.

MR. THATCHER: — If the NDP Whip would care to go get the Attorney General, I'd be happy to ad lib for a moment.

The Attorney General made reference to the governments of T.C. Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd, and spent some time dealing with Sask Tel as it was in my father's administration. Well, there is one area that I would say the administrations of T.C. Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd, and my father had in common and that was Sask Tel. In those days Sask Tel was doing something that it's not doing now. It was running a telephone company and continuing itself to running a telephone company. It was a neutral telephone company that was concerned with providing service and bringing top-notch telephone service to rural Saskatchewan. It was basically through three administrations . . . Welcome back to the Attorney General. I was afraid you might have left.

Back in the days of Tommy Douglas, and back in the days of Woodrow Lloyd, and back in the days of my father, Sask Tel concentrated on providing a service and was probably basically as close to a non-political entity as any Crown corporation could be. It wasn't a top-notch company.

Then the Blakeney government came to power in 1971. I think we all know what happened after that. You have turned Sask Tel into a political tool. You have prostituted Sask Tel for political gamesmanship. You have turned Sask Tel into a combination of secretariat and imported political hacks, and used it for your own political games. You have forgotten what Sask Tel was about. I'll point to one of the hacks over there that you

brought out of the wilderness and brought into the Assembly. He's typical of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll get there. I'm telling you about it. He is typical of the kind of people you put in Sask Tel.

Let's go into some of the problems you've had at Sask Tel. You lost your manager a couple of years ago. It is common knowledge that there was a morale problem in Sask Tel. It's common knowledge that you beat the bushes, that you advertised all over North America because of the morale problem and that you needed outside help to head Sask Tel. You kept that position open for an abnormally extreme length of time. Finally, you hired someone. That morale problem within Sask Tel has not been solved.

There still is a problem of competency in Sask Tel. Whatever happened to Sask Tel? When did you forget the basic premise that the job was to serve the people of Saskatchewan? Why do we have a bill like this in front of us when we don't need it, and when we have thousands of miles of rural telephones still above ground, facing the ravages of frost and wind? Let me tell you, in the case of Thunder Creek, I think we have the highest percentage in the province. I don't suggest we're discriminated against. I say we're discriminated against. Sask Tel, a long time ago, every since the Blakeney government took over, forgot its job was to serve the people.

Let's take a look at the job you did in cable vision. You kept Sask Tel basically under the direction of the Attorney General. You methodically, cruelly, kept cable television from the people of Saskatchewan when every other population centre and area had access to it, but you denied it. You denied it for rank political purposes down the road. And for what purpose? Let me tell you for what purpose. I'll give you a prime example.

One of the great benefits the people of Saskatchewan received from Sask Tel was the holding up of cable vision for about 2.5 years, and in one jurisdiction for example, it's costing about \$1.10 for Sask Tel to own the hardware. I'm going for numbers off the top of my head but they are pretty close. They pay about \$4.60 to Sask Tel for the use of the line per subscriber. Without Sask Tel owning that hardware they could do it for \$3.60 - \$3.60! If you want me to substantiate that, I can; challenge me to do so. You know it's true; \$1.10 it's costing them in Moose Jaw, and you know very well that it is.

Tell me, Mr. Attorney General, if you are going to talk from your seat — Caronport, Tuxford, Marquis are still waiting for it. Nine-tenths of this province is still waiting for it, so don't tell me about the great job that Sask Tel is doing. I've heard that Sask Tel's technical people say over and over again, under the existing technology, it is impossible to take cable vision to rural Saskatchewan, so don't tell me about the great job that they are doing because it is virtually zero. But what they are doing is, where they have it now, every single subscriber is paying more by Sask Tel having the hardware, than they would be if that hardware were owned elsewhere. Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well except, Mr. Attorney General, you know very well that I do know what I am talking about. You know that I'm dead on; you know that I'm 100 per cent right. The fact of the matter is we know, we believe, that you will do the same thing to the electronic industry, the mobile telephone industry and everything else that's in this bill if you have control of it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that Sask Tel, even though it has borrowed vast amounts of money, has done a lousy job in getting rural telephone lines underground in the province of Saskatchewan. Sure you've done some. Sure you can quote some miles. But it's not good enough. You've had time to get it all under and you should have had it

all under . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh you better believe it. I invite the minister. I'm quite confident that in your constituency Sask Tel is doing a marvellous job. But travel to someone else's constituency. Come and give me a couple of hours in Thunder Creek and I'll show you miles and miles and miles of lines above ground. That's where Sask Tel should be, not dabbling around in this nonsense.

Why is it that Sask Tel's equipment is so far behind every other telephone company in North America? Why don't we have zero plus dialling in Regina? It's brand new in Saskatoon. Everybody else has had it for years. It's standard equipment everywhere in North America. Even Newfoundland has it. Every state in the U.S.A. has had it for years. We don't have it in Regina. We don't have it in Moose Jaw. Saskatoon just got it.

Tell me about the mobile telephones; I'm a mobile telephone user and I was fed up with using that crappy piece of equipment that Sask Tel forced me to rent, so I bought my own. I bought my own and I bought it for one-third of the price of yours. It's about one-third the size, with about three times the range, and I own it personally. And I bought it in that horrible place known as Los Angeles.

Now, Mr. Minister, you are going to tell me I can't use that unit which is vastly superior to yours. You're going to tell me I have to use that pile of junk Sask Tel has as standard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't know why the government is so sensitive on this bill, probably because it is so typical of the philosophy of this government, which is to control everything. And the action of the amendment, as the Attorney General knows, is virtually zero. I think that amendment has been dealt with very capably by the member for Qu'Appelle and isn't really worth commenting on any further.

But basically behind this whole thing is the concept that has monopolized the thinking of the Blakeney government since 1971 and that is control with a capital C. Control everything! We all know that the action of the future is in the field of electronics. I don't think you have to be an expert in the electronics field; if you read anything at all, you know that the changes are coming so rapidly that they can hardly keep up with the patents.

But they are coming in this area because it is a competitive area and competition must be ensured. Mr. Chairman, there is simply no reason or justification for Sask Tel to be putting in a bill to control this industry. It has done very well by itself. Set the rules; yes, set the rules; there's nothing wrong with that. But to control it in the way that you're going to do it and the way past history says that you'll do it is outlandish.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I recall (if I can diverge for a second) a bill like this appeared in about 1973 which affected the livestock industry. It was called The Natural Products Marketing Act and there were some clauses in it like this — open-ended ones. And the minister in charge at that time, presently the Minister of Mineral Resources said, oh well, we would never use this kind of power. We would never do that. Nobody believed him then but I am sure the question was put by the opposition at that time, well, why put it in then? Why have it if you're not going to use it? And, of course, the answer (as I recall, not being a member at that time) was, well, in case we need it we should have it there. We may need it in the future.

Do you know what happened about one year later without a vote and without

consultation? Every single hog producer in this province was told, you now sell your hogs to the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Board. You established a hog marketing board and you consulted nobody! They woke up one morning and all of a sudden a group of government bureaucrats, a group of government appointed people, were running the hog business. Let's take a look at that hog business now. It's 1980 and that was about 1973. Back in those days we had about 1.5 million hogs going through this province . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I must caution the hon. member to keep his remarks on the bill before us. Passing references to the hog marketing commission I think are in order but long, detailed explanations of what has happened in the hog area probably are not. I'll call on the hon. member for Thunder Creek.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge your ruling except that I believe I was drawing an analogy of past history between two bills which may have pertained to different areas, granted. But I'm pointing out what happened in a bill that was written in a very similar fashion to this, affecting another segment of our economy. Here we have a bill that's written in a very similar fashion and I'm hypothecating what may happen under that. I respectfully pose to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the normal course of debate I should have the latitude to do that. I'll try to stay within the confines of your parameters but I would ask you to give me a little latitude on this. I'm pulling out of it very quickly.

Anyway, the result of that bill put the hog industry down from a kill of about 1.5 million hogs to the present 350,000. You changed the whole hog business; now two-thirds of it is run by the Hutterite Brethren, a huge operation. I say that respectfully about the Hutterite Brethren; they run superb operations, but they are the hog business of the government delving into an area in which it had no expertise or knowledge of the problems.

In other words, we'll create the problem, then we'll solve it. There's no problem here in the electronics business. You are not trying to solve a problem that has been brought up. You have created a problem, and it's the oldest NDP trick in the book. Create the problem, then we'll solve it. You know it's like your rent control. You put in rent controls and people get out of the apartment business. They let them go. Then you have problems and we have a Crown corporation like Sask Housing Corporation. We have to have more apartment buildings. The old NDP story — create a problem and then move to solve it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. I was wondering if you had anything to say about Bill 13?

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, the electronics industry and the technological changes coming in the electronics industry are far too important to be left to that crew in Sask Tel. The developments that are happening are unbelievable if you believe the normal courses and the normal channels. I don't want the Minister of Telephones having any input into the normal course of the development of that industry or the use of those products in this province. He doesn't have to. There is no need.

Now the minister yesterday (and I didn't get the opportunity to ask him a question) told us that this bill was the result of pressure from some quarters. I would like the minister at some point in time today to tell me where the pressure came from. Now, if he says it came from within Sask Tel I will attempt to keep a straight face and not laugh. But tell me what sections of the electronics industry asked for this legislation. Tell me what people

in Saskatchewan, outside of the top echelon of Sask Tel (if in fact they did), asked for this, Mr. Minister, I respectfully suggest to you that it came from within the confines of the New Democratic Party. I would suggest to the Attorney General in the case with the Minister of Telephones, don't tell him, don't give him the advice verbally. Write it down for him. He'll find it much easier to respond.

Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to get out of this Assembly more than we do. This bill may very well have been on the order paper for five months or whatever it is, but why haven't you been calling it? You didn't start to call this seriously until the past week. You know very well you didn't. You have been going through what has become the famous tradition — shove everything to the end of the session. Look at the important estimates we have to do which have been deliberately left until the end — agriculture, the Attorney General's department, the Executive Council, Bill No. 13, Bill No. 105 — and you're still dropping bills.

Mr. Attorney General, your tactics have become about as familiar and about as shop-worn as the carpet in this Assembly was until it was refurbished. Deliberately, you have left all the important items until the end and then you hang it on the opposition when these important things have to be dealt with. If we didn't deal with them, if we didn't put up a battle on them who would be the first on his feet to say, what a lousy, irresponsible opposition. No opposition — they didn't fight this; they didn't do that.

You left Bill No. 13 this late in the session and you left it there deliberately. We don't need you to consult us on digging ourselves into a hole; we can find our own holes. We can dig ourselves in quite adequately. When it comes to a bill which we have to fight, which is against everything we stand for, we have to fight it with what we have at our disposal. You left this bill this late in the session deliberately because in effect, by leaving it this late you're trying to pull closure on it. In a roundabout, sneaky way, you are trying to pull closure just like you're trying to do it to the member for (inaudible). You're trying to pull closure on his Bill No. 105.

Mr. Attorney General, we make no apology to you whatsoever for fighting you on an issue like this which is control, and we'll fight you on this or any other issue when your party attempts to politicize what should be a neutral Crown corporation (and I'll repeat again for your edification) on what was formerly a neutral Crown corporation, which was dedicated to providing a service until the Blakeney government came to power. I believe you were out of the Assembly when I made the analogy. If there was one thing the Douglas, Lloyd and Thatcher administration had in common it was a neutral, non-political Sask Tel, and it has been under the Blakeney government that Sask Tel has become highly politicized, useful tool for the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman, we have no apologies to make whatsoever. The issue here is control — control over the electronics of the future — and it is just too important to be left to the planning political secretariat of the New Democratic Party. We're here to fight you.

MR. ROMANOW: — Again, I want to make a comment in my capacity as House Leader, and as a member of this House and committee. I have here in front of me the whites of the legislature which are presented everyday. I invite the hon. member for Thunder Creek to take a look at it. Sometimes there is some interesting reading in it, and I think you will find that Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act, was introduced and first read on December 4, 1979. The hon. member delivered his second reading speech about five weeks ago, and it wasn't read a second time until May 21. You people did not let it go out of second reading until May 21. There is no

other way that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Nonsense!

MR. ROMANOW: — Nonsense. You check the record of the filibuster by the hon. member for Wilkie. Look, don't believe me; ask any of the press guys and they'll tell you the guy said in the Chamber every day. I've only started here — look at the material I have. He was taking pride you know. I'm digging in; this is the biggest thing since the Magna Charta. That was the member for Wilkie; he went ahead and did that, so don't blame us for the delay. Then when we call it at the first opportunity we have had to call it, all of a sudden we are trying to ram it down your throat. I think you can take as many days or weeks as you want in debating it. Point number one, on the House business. Point number two, Mr. Chairman, (and I point this out specifically to the hon. member for Thunder Creek and perhaps you would like to follow me and rebut me), I strained very carefully to hear whether or not the subscribed to the principles of Mr. Gordon Grant on telecommunications or the use of the words control, supervision, total control of the administration of telecommunications' policy in Sask Tel, cream skimming and on and on. Just take a look at the brief.

I say this to you, member for Thunder Creek, I am talking about this brief. This is ridiculous. This is where, in politics, credibility has something to do with success. I mean you guys are incredible in this operation. How can you twist this brief that way? The integration of Cable Television in the Canadian Broadcasting System, that's the title of the brief and the offshoots from cable vision, not television. Take a look at the brief and I tell you that. And it's incredible the kind of position you dug yourselves into because you have virtually . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sit down.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'm not going to sit down. I'm going to stand up and make my speech on this area for as long as I am going to. You people have dug yourselves in; you flip flop in private arrangements and you do publicly as well. You flip flopped publicly on postures that take . . . Yes, I will talk about flip-flopping. The hon. member for Indian Head is an expert on that at every stage in the game. Nobody could trust any commitment that you or any member of the party could make. Mr. MacMurchy notwithstanding. And I tell you I don't intend to make that mistake again as long as I'm House Leader in this legislature dealing with any of you people. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the hon. member for Thunder Creek (and I say this to him because the hon. member really has a little personality pique), I'm sorry I don't bow down five times a day and then thank him when he betrays me publicly. In any event, I say to the hon. member for Thunder Creek . . .

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — He's making insinuations against me that I can't be trusted and that I betray him and I demand he withdraw those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I'll take the opportunity to examine the record and we'll get back to the hon. member later. I will take the opportunity to see if there is a breach of privilege there, and I'll get back to you. A question of privilege is a very serious charge, and I don't want to . . .

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — I was called, one time in this House, for calling the members next to me traitors. Betrayal is the same connotation I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. When we talk about unparliamentary language, words like traitor, racist, are easy to pick up and I have always ruled that they are not breaches of privilege but they are unparliamentary language and I ask them to be withdrawn. That's easy. Questions of privilege are more difficult. The hon. member has raised a question of privilege; I'll examine the record as soon as I can and get back to the hon. member.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I should give you a little less work to do. I unqualifiedly withdraw any remarks which could be viewed as having said that the hon. member is untrustworthy. And having said that, I do want to say the record on all matters will speak for itself and I say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Thunder Creek . . . Well, I have made my point now and I think I have wasted the time of the House. But I do say that the six points here are fundamental, and you haven't told us yet whether you subscribe to them or not. Because I tell you Bill No. 13 is these six points. And you haven't told us whether you subscribe or you don't. I just want to know whether I'm right — the first time in 40 years Sask Tel is taking a different position.

The hon. member for Regina South is going to speak and I'm going to ask if you would please, pages, forward this to the hon. member. Just have him take a look at that and tell me where he stands on it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I will advise the Attorney General in due course. That day we will advise you where we stand on it. I would just like to remind the Attorney General of a statement he made in the House last night and I want to remind the Minister of Telephones of the same statement. In this House last night, Mr. Attorney General, you said the last thing in this House and I'll read it:

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the six months of debate on Bill 13 has the official opposition suggested the incorporation of the draft regulations in the legislation. It has only been mentioned since the member for Nipawin raised it. And I say the position of the PCs has been philosophically and fundamentally opposed to Bill 13.

Now that last statement is right. However, I would like to remind the Minister of Telephones that we spent five days in the Crown corporations debating and scrutinizing your Crown corporation last year. I'm going to read to you verbatim what was said and I can understand the Attorney General saying what he said last night, because he wasn't in Crown corporations. But what you repeated in this House this morning is no more than a parrot echoing the words of the Attorney General when you don't know what the hell you're talking about. I'm sorry, I withdraw that.

Mr. Minister, on April 10, I'll just read that part or if you want me to read it all I will:

MR. CODY: — We've had this tariff since 1928 and nothing will change other than that we think we should have, in legislation, that which we now have in tariff. Now I think that's only being reasonable.

MR. KATZMAN: — Why don't you put your tariff in legislation which points out yes and no to which items then, if that's what you're saying.

MR. CODY: — What happens when you have a technological change? Then you have to call the legislature into session to change the legislation. Certainly (and these are your words) you can't do that.

Now isn't it strange that in Crown corporations we spent five days (and I wish the member for Biggar were here today; he accused us the other day of spending more time on television than we did on Crown corporations), and you should remember, which we spent on Sask Tel in Crown corporations. You were there but you didn't recall it the day that the provincial treasurer . . .

Mr. Minister, it wasn't until the member for Nipawin yesterday made a similar suggestion, that the government side all of a sudden took notice. Coming from the Progressive Conservative Party your answer is, certainly you can't do that. It was argued far more than just those two lines that I read out today; it was argued for days, as you well know. We suggest it; you say, certainly you can't do that. The member for Nipawin suggests it; the government then decides, well maybe it's something worth looking into. Maybe we can take it from the member for Nipawin; it won't matter, because he's not going to be around for much longer. But let us not give Her Majesty's Official Opposition any credit at all. And that's exactly what you're saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Now, when you look at the amendment that was brought in, I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that I don't know whether it has been checked by your lawyers or not, but the amendment proposed today by your government and suggested by the member for Nipawin, is even worse than the legislation you had proposed under Bill 13. I'll tell you why, and you may just want to check this with your lawyers if you haven't already done so. Maybe this is your intention, maybe you want it worse than you have it now, for the very simple reason that by law, you are preventing a monopoly on only one item — computers. Now that, in fact, makes a monopoly of everything else by law. That makes a monopoly on answering devices, for example, that no court of law can change. So by presenting and proposing this amendment today, you have made Bill No. 13 worse than it was this morning. You would be the first to accuse us (if this bill had gone through, and we had discovered a year from now how bad the legislation was) of not doing our job of scrutinizing this horrible amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Take it out!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Take it out? You put it in! I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that we will — as a responsible official opposition — be presenting amendments today which will eliminate the possibility of creating a monopoly in any area of telecommunications, other than in the telephone system. You will get them. The member for Wilkie will be proposing these amendments today. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, and to the Attorney General, who is a lawyer and who has a number of lawyers working in his department, that to present this kind of amendment is irresponsible on the part of the government. You have created a far greater monopoly with that amendment than you had with Bill No. 13 as it stood yesterday.

You talk about flip-flops! Why would you call an opposition responsibly debating this kind of amendment a flip-flop? We never said we were for this amendment. I read to you out of Hansard what we asked for in Crown corporations. It has nothing to do with this amendment. The amendments we will bring in today will point out to you that you have not done your homework, nor have your lawyers, nor have the lawyers for Sask Tel.

Mr. Attorney General, the accusations you have been making today are absolutely shameful, coming from a legislator and the Attorney General of the province. It is not a

flip-flop to look over an amendment to determine whether or not it is responsible and whether or not it will in due course create chaos, as other legislation which you have brought into this House in past years has created.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . not accept his amendments and you then found . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Exactly the point. I am glad you brought it out. Mr. Attorney General, tell me why the minister responsible for Sask Tel was so adamant when we brought out the suggestion, back in April, to include this in the legislation? The minute it is brought out by this side over here . . . You say you are not in cahoots with this party! You say you are not working together!

MR. ROMANOW: — I don't care what you say . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I think the people of Saskatchewan will know what the government and the members to my left are as a team.

MR. ROMANOW: — You gave Mr. Collver a standing ovation last November.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — We may have given him a standing ovation last year, but you have been doing it ever since this session began this spring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out to the members opposite those facts which they have chosen to ignore today. I wanted to point out the fact that what we have done with this amendment is the responsible job we were supposed to do and that is to look it over and to determine whether or not it could bring repercussions further down the road. That is exactly what we have done with it. As I said earlier, the member for Wilkie will be presenting and proposing amendments to this which will be responsible. If you find those amendments to your displeasure, I would like to hear from the minister and the Attorney General the arguments they have against the kind of amendment we will be bringing in today.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, first I would like to react to the statements of the Attorney General and the member for Nipawin following the after dinner session. It seemed there was a great amount of dismay and disappointment that we did not come in and immediately adopt the amendments brought forth before dinner. As the Deputy House Leader well knows, I asked for time to study these. I spoke to the Chairman and I think that it is only responsible that we would look at this amendment and see how we think it affects the total bill. We have done that and as my colleague from Regina South points out, we will be bringing in amendments alter on this day. To say that we were not responsible in doing that, I don't feel is really a fair criticism. I think we did what we were elected to do. You brought in any amendment from your side of the House; we took that amendment into caucus, studied and are coming back with counter-amendments. To me that is what the legislative process is.

The member for Nipawin indicated that perhaps we were rather weak in that we had the government collapsing or fading on this and bringing in an amendment. I will agree that perhaps the government is deciding this bill isn't as great as it thought in the first place and it is making some change. But the member for Nipawin must realize that perhaps there are further changes that need to be brought to this legislation. That is why we, on this side of the House, have been continuing to debate this bill this

afternoon and will continue debating it and bringing in the amendments.

As I read the amendments the Minister of Telephones brought in, they dealt mainly with section 44.3, the monopolistic control possible under that section of the bill. The amendment indicates that perhaps that is going to be changed.

If you were to go back and look through all of our debate since we started debating this bill, you will see that one of our major concerns was section 44.2. Section 44.2 in its original form read as follows:

No person shall attach or connect to, or use in conjunction with, any part of the telecommunication line of the corporation, any attachment without the express written permission of the corporation.

That was how the bill was originally brought in. The minister, after considerable public pressure and concern (I think), in his second reading (if I am correct on that) brought in some House amendments. Those House amendments changed the last line to: 'where any attachment except as permitted by the subject of the conditions established in the regulations.' Now that is still the situation as it exists today. The amendment brought in by the minister has to do with the monopoly of the machines or technology that can be hooked on to the line. However, that is only one part of it and, as has been pointed out, it dealt mainly with computers. Now I think the hon. minister realizes that there are many things now, things that you and I don't know about are coming on the market that can be hooked on. That amendment only dealt with computers. The member for Nipawin, there are many things, as you realize, that are not computers which will be part and parcel of our way of life within the next short period of time.

However, getting back to the important part of this bill and that is the attaching of anything to the government's line. As I understand it, the way to attach is by an acoustic coupler. That, my friends, is where the control lies. The monopoly is one thing. We seem to see a bit of a change there. But I haven't seen any change by the government opposite in the attachment to the government telephone lines. To me, that is the important thing. That is what my friend for Thunder Creek talked about, controlling communication in this province now, and in the future.

Let me make a little analogy for you. The computer is one thing. We'll compare that to the buggy with the attachment, the acoustic coupler, as the horse. You don't go far in the buggy without the horse. Or it's like having a car with no gasoline. You can have the computer, but if you don't have the right to attach it to the line, you have nothing. You know that, Mr. Minister. That is what this member is talking about. That is one of the major concerns.

I want to read to this House what an acoustic coupler is because I'm sure that some of the fellows on the other side have no idea what these are. This is the essence of this bill. I haven't seen any amendment yet to allow the attachment of acoustic couplers to the Sask Tel line. It says here and I want to read this:

An acoustic coupler is a device which can be attached to as all, personal computer or a 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. The microphone and speaker of the handset sit into the cup-like receptacle on the coupler. Electrical signals from the computer are transformed into sound in the coupler. This sound is picked up by the microphone and 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 that the other 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 telephones. It is impossible for couplers to damage the telephone system. The machines come under their own manufacturer's warranty 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 working of commerce.

Many small businessmen, both now and especially in the future, would be unable to afford to assess 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 at the next couple of decades, 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 communications. This could potentially save a huge amount of energy now used for commuting to and from. Bill No. 13 would negate this possibility in Saskatchewan by making it far too expensive for the worker.

Bill No. 13's restrictions on acoustic couplers are 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 in Saskatchewan. It benefits only Sask Tel, by giving them a monopoly they neither deserve nor need. Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to see you come forth with an amendment if you would like to do that. I would like you to get up to explain why you think Sask Tel needs the exclusive right to control the acoustic couplers. That is the

whole, important issue in this bill. You'll get your chance to explain it. I've asked you to do this.

I would like to read from a letter from one of my constituents to tell you, (because you don't seem to understand the feeling of the people out there regarding this bill) why we have continued to debate it, why we see there are other changes needed. I've mentioned section 44.2. I mentioned section 44 where Sask Tel has the right to seize any material they think should not be hooked to the telephone line. Is there any type of warning for a person? Is there any type of appeal procedure in this bill? There is none whatsoever. There is exclusive power by Sask Tel to seize it, and that is it. For awhile they were going to cut off the services but you brought in a House amendment on that. I'd like to read from this letter from a constituent.

I am further concerned that no appeal procedure is contained in the legislation allowing the public to present their side of the case in question. Section 44.4 authorizing the corporation to seize attachments, there is no warning, no discussion, and no appeal. I do not at all understand how the proposed sections can be passed claiming public interest as the reason for their existence. To the contrary taken to an extreme, and I have the feeling that the day will come if this is passed, the government of the day will be able to determine what our province's citizens can see and hear. This is controlled information at its worst.

The constituent, a man who has a considerable business in my constituency, one of the biggest businesses, (not in the communication field) supplying one of the greatest needs to our constituency, says:

I have no desire to live in a province that leaves that possibility open.

MR. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Chairman, it's pretty obvious that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is very misinformed. He just simply doesn't know what the situation is. He talks about acoustic couplers. If he only knew that an acoustic coupler doesn't belong to Sask Tel, it belongs now to the subscriber. It's built right into the machine itself, and really all it is is just a little cradle which you hang your telephone into and there it goes; that's the end of it. We don't rent them or lease them to anyone and we don't own them. They are owned by the subscribers themselves, and the only possible way they can be used is by the piece of equipment itself having the coupler attached right to it.

We don't rent or lease them to anyone. We don't charge them for an acoustic coupler. So I don't know what the member is talking about. He obviously doesn't know what he is talking about, because if he did he would be square with this Assembly and tell the people exactly what he's talking about. But he doesn't know. Pretty obviously he doesn't, so I'll tell you one more time just so you understand. The coupler which you are speaking of, an acoustical coupler is a cradle you put your telephone set into; it is attached to the piece of equipment you have. There is no charge for it. We have no control of it now, and we will have no control tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What does section 44.2 say then?

MR. CODY: — Section 44.2 says that no person shall attach or connect or use in conjunction with any part of a telecommunications line of the corporation anything which isn't regulation.

Let me tell you what the regulation says about couplers:

. . . datasets connected to a telecommunications line of Sask Tel either acoustically, inductively, or by means of a coupler supplied by Sask Tel.

It says 'or by means' not 'and by means'. Surely the hon. member can read but obviously he doesn't want to understand. That's exactly what's happening.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet I just want to ask the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and the member for Thunder Creek a question. The question is, do they believe the Alberta government should have this power? This is the power they have and I'm going to read directly from their act. If the hon. member is looking for his copy, he won't have a copy of the latest amendments because I have them with me. If he wants to have a copy, I'll give him a copy. It says, under attachments, section 28(1):

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

Now, that's the wording in Alberta. There is no problem whatsoever in Alberta. They don't even have what we have, and are going to give you — regulations to this. They are asking for specific written permission before they can put any attachment on their lines.

Here in Saskatchewan, when we're going even further than that and allowing you to put in regulations what you can or cannot attach to our lines, you say that is somehow wrong. Surely you can't say your friends in Alberta — I'm sure they would be friends of yours. They're a Tory government. You're surely not telling us now that they are doing the very bad things we want to do to our computer industry. If that's what you're telling me then I don't know what the government of Alberta is doing with this piece of legislation. But it's there; it's law, and it tells you specifically what has to be done.

I'm going to tell the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley one more time that in Saskatchewan you are not required to lease from Sask Tel a coupler which is acoustically attached to a piece of equipment. That belongs to the subscriber. It's on the subscriber's piece of equipment. It's there now, and it will be there in future.

MR. W.C. THATCHER — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find it amusing that the minister of Sask Tel is comparing his government with that of Alberta. But he stops short in his comparison. He doesn't compare the 36.7 tax rate with the 53.5 tax rate. He doesn't compare no sales tax with sales tax, but the basic difference between the Government of Alberta and this government here is that the Government of Alberta (like the vast majority of Conservative governments in Canada) respects the rights of the individual. They respect the rights of creativity. They respect the rights of initiative. And they're not like your government, where they stifle the individual, where they stifle initiative, and where they stifle creativity.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Look what they did to Herman. They stifled him.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps it's just as well that the Attorney General left. He's been carrying the bill. It seems that in every set of estimates, if there is a little bit of trouble, they call in the Attorney General. We saw it in northern affairs. Now we're seeing it through these bills. Heavens, it's about time some of you ministers carried your own bills.

The Attorney General, when he was on his feet, made quite a thing out of what he perceived to be the continuity of Sask Tel policy for 40 years. I think that is what he said. He said Sask Tel policy has never changed and it has always been, through every single government which has administered Sask Tel, one of complete end to end use.

I suppose for my specific edification he held up a brief which came from Sask Tel under my father's administration and suggested that it was the identical brief, the identical philosophy, which is in Sask Tel today in 1980. He was chastising me, asking why I am opposed to Sask Tel's philosophy now. It has been the same for 40 years; it has never changed. I'm sorry the Attorney General isn't here. I sent him a note to please stick around, but I don't blame him for leaving.

Anyway, the Attorney General has made a great deal about the six points that he says were elucidated in the brief back in 1970. On the surface, there's not too much disagreement about the six points. When I was on my feet earlier I said the one common factor between three governments — the Douglas, Lloyd and Thatcher governments — was that Sask Tel was a non-political Crown corporation devoted to providing service to the people of Saskatchewan, useful service. I qualified the statement by saying that on the assumption of power by the Blakeney government, Sask Tel has simply become a highly politicized tool of the New Democratic Party and that Bill No. 13 is a prime example of the extension of that power.

Let's briefly examine the philosophy that the Attorney General said has remained unchanged for 40 years. This is the brief that was put in, in 1970, by Sask Tel to the CRTC, the brief which has never changed, and the philosophy which has never changed (if we're to believe the Attorney General).

On the very first page, it contains a line that reads something like this: the role of a common carrier is to provide the common facilities required to carry the message, the medium function.

Mr. Chairman, that about that, the role of the common carrier required to carry the message. There is no talk about the fact that the common carrier, being Sask Tel, should run the station. There is no mentioned about that, just the talk about a common carrier. Who's going to argue about the common carrier?

But under the Blakeney government you decided Sask Tel will run the cable vision. You will be the station; you will do it all. You forgot about the role of the common carrier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — This is a prime example that Sask Tel, under the Blakeney government, forgot about its original commitment that was there for 40 years, of being a common carrier. You were going to be the initiator. You were going to be the propagandist. This resembles the days of . . . Somebody by the name of Goebbels had a medium like that in the '30s.

One of the other functions of Sask Tel in that brief that's elucidated . . . (inaudible) . . . It is properly concerned with the content, quality, variety and economics of the message. Fine, we agree with that; you agree with that.

Oh now, isn't that interesting. The Minister of Telephones just said, we do not agree with that. I just listened to the Attorney General for half an hour saying that the philosophy of Sask Tel hasn't changed in 40 years. I just read one of its briefs and the Minister of Telephones says, we don't agree with that. It is properly concerned with the content, quality, variety and economics of the message. The Minister of Telephones doesn't agree with that. Tell me, Mr. Minister, what else don't you agree with? Mr. Minister, maybe there are a couple more things here that you might not agree with.

Sask Tel submits that the common carrier responsibility for the medium function will best serve the interests of quality, quantity, variety in economy in the message function for all communication services. Is that something else that you don't agree with?

Oh, he agrees with that one. Here's another one. I wonder if the minister disagrees with this one because this was also in the brief. Equal access to the use of facilities is available to all without discrimination. I won't even ask you that one. You and your government disagree with that one fully and I'm sorry the Attorney General isn't in here because he has been telling us, about the philosophy of Sask Tel not changing in 40 years. Well, let me tell you the philosophy of Sask Tel since 1971 whereby equal access to the use of facilities is available to all without discrimination is out the window. Tell the people in Saskatoon, tell the people running the cable vision in Saskatoon that the use of facilities is available to all without discrimination. Only under the government, only under people with a philosophy like that of the Minister of Health, only under people who would believe that the tactics of Goebbels, etc. In Nazi Germany would there ever have been an instance of jamming something like the House of Commons broadcast. Only under a government like this would the jamming of Saskatoon cable vision of House of Commons broadcasts occur.

I say it would never have happened under Tommy Douglas. Tommy Douglas would have booted the people responsible out like that, so would Woodrow Lloyd and so would my father; but under the Blakeney government, those tactics are acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — I wish the Minister of Health would do something useful like getting the Attorney General . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, I'm sure he'll be able to read all about it tomorrow. Mr. Minister let me read you another bit about that unchanged philosophy for 40 years.

The sharing of common transmission and distribution facilities with other operators and users will achieve the most efficient utilization; the sharing, Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister, that philosophy is long gone out the window under the philosophy of the Blakeney government. Another line — regulation of the common carrier ensures efficient service at equitable rates and again, without discrimination. Without discrimination — that is something I think you people over there have forgotten about.

Mr. Minister, let me stop at this point and point to a few facets of Bill No. 13. Let me relate them. Through this brief, which was made by Sask Tel in 1970, the words

without discrimination' appear frequently and freely. Let's use some of yours out of Bill No. 13. Let's look at some of the present day philosophy of Sask Tel, since you've turned it into a propaganda instrument; no person shall attach to or connect to; no person shall advertise; no person shall offer for sale to the public. (Oh heavens!) Where a person contravenes this, the corporation may refuse to provide telecommunication service to that person.

All through bill No. 13 there is nothing but discrimination.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Bill No. 13 reeks of discrimination and that is exactly what has happened to Sask Tel under the Blakeney government. Since 1971 Sask Tel has lost sight of what it was set up for. Sask Tel under the Douglas government, under the Patterson government, under the Lloyd government, and under the Thatcher government was employed to serve the people and respond to the needs of the people. And they did not a bad job. But under the Blakeney government, Sask Tel has stopped serving the people. Sask Tel has started manipulating the people, controlling the people, and long ago forgot about ever responding to the needs of the people.

Tell the people of Moose Jaw and Regina and Saskatoon and North Battleford why they were denied cable service for two and one-half years because of Sask Tel. I think the people wanted it. I think they asked their government, give it to us; give us what everybody else in Canada takes for granted. But Sask Tel, looking down the road, was not going to allow that stuff to happen. Oh no, they were going to get their way. Never mind what the people wanted; that wasn't Sask Tel's primary concern. Sask Tel's primary concern was what's good for Sask Tel, and more specifically, what's good for the New Democratic Party.

And all through Bill No. 13 discrimination is the watchword. Discrimination is the philosophy, and discrimination is the backbone.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Too bad the minister doesn't have one.

MR. THATCHER: — Isn't it interesting to contrast this with the Sask Tel brief of 1970, the one the Attorney General has held up as ensuring that the philosophy of Sask Tel hasn't changed for 40 years. And I'm sorry the Attorney General still hasn't reappeared.

Let's go back and do a little bit more in this brief.

Better overall planning and coordination of communication facilities to meet all needs and serve all communities by utilizing the great resources of a common carrier, expertise and experience.

And here's a lulu — here's one that Sask Tel has been a dismal failure in and a colossal bust:

Improving the economics of extending service to remote or sparsely populated areas with a multiplicity of services on an integrated medium.

The next sparsely populated area you get that cable to will be your first. You have failed; you are not trying; you are making no attempt to do so. You have failed completely.

But another administration — that was their plan. Are you asking to make an introduction? I yield to the member for Yorkton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The hon. member for Yorkton has leave to introduce some students.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — I would like to thank the member for Thunder Creek for allowing me the privilege to introduce another 44 students from Yorkton, from the Yorkton Composite Junior High School. I met with them in the halls before this and they had quite a time coming on the bus this morning. They had a flat tire and they had to bump over the rough roads at a very slow speed, so they didn't arrive when they had wanted to. But we hope their stay here in the Chamber will be informative and that the tour of the city, such as they will be having since it will be shortened, will be interesting as well. I would like all members to join with me in welcoming these students to our legislature and to our capital city.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the people on this side of the House. I hope the students enjoy their day in Regina and have a safe trip home. We're having a very quiet day in the Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 13 Section 1 (Continued)

AN HON. MEMBER: — Here comes the Attorney General.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, welcome back to the Attorney General. I'm torn as to whether I should repeat my earlier remarks for the edification of the Attorney General, but I understand he has been on television.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Looking good boy, if I have to say so myself.

MR. THATCHER: — I understand he has been on television talking about how Sask Tel is being maligned. Very briefly, Mr. Attorney General, I would like to recount to you the brief which you have been tossing at me for about the past 15 minutes and while I would like to go back to a few lines, I will refrain from the temptation. Nonetheless, Mr. Attorney General, I feel obligated to point out a couple of things about this brief.

Interwoven in the speech you made with a great deal of eloquence in this Assembly as the assertion that Sask Tel's philosophy has not changed in 40 years. There is no question that Sask Tel's philosophy did not change for a great many years. Once upon a time Sask Tel concentrated on providing service, but since the time this brief was put forward discrimination has been the watchword. And discrimination is interwoven all through Bill No. 13, discrimination against all segments of society and specifically the electronic industry.

Mr. Attorney General, I'm on page 6 of the brief that you described as a continuation of the 40-year philosophy of Sask Tel. And to the Provincial Secretary, would you stop bothering the Attorney General for a moment? I would like him to respond to some of

these lines.

In the brief there is a statement by Sask Tel that this is a more efficient regulation because there would be a distinct separation of common carrier and broadcasting functions. You say that the philosophy hasn't changed in 40 years. I say to you, when that brief was written, the intention of Sask Tel was never to go into the cable broadcasting business, ever. And yet what happened? Sask Tel immediately bounces its way into muddying up the licensing of the proposed licensees in Saskatchewan by applying for every single license. You tell us that the philosophy of Sask Tel has not changed?

In 1970, it asked only to be the carrier of the medium. Under the Blakeney government, under its penchant for control and propaganda and perhaps its down the road philosophy that ultimately we'll have electronics into every single home in true Orwell tradition, you took Sask Tel into the field of propaganda. You took Sask Tel into the area of being a propagandist, a propagandist for the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Attorney General, here is another line that came from that brief: 'less chance that consideration of medium ownership may influence broadcasting licences.'

Can you believe that, Mr. Attorney General? Sask Tel in 1970 saying that if they controlled the common carrier, there would be less chance that considerations of medium ownership may influence the broadcasting licence. And you have the gall to tell me the philosophy of Sask Tel hasn't changed in 40 years. The philosophy of Sask Tel has changed dramatically under the Blakeney government. Had it not been for the CRTC you would control every single cable licence. You would control everything that went on to that cable. And you tell me that the philosophy of Sask Tel hasn't changed.

I say to the people across the way (and man of you I don't think have even read Bill No. 13), Bill No. 13 is laced with discrimination. Bill No. 13 shows a complete disregard, a complete unacknowledgement of the right of an individual, and the right of people to compete. We have no hesitation in opposing this bill with everything we have. I say categorically, electronics development is far too important to be left to a highly politicized instrument such as Sask Tel.

Mr. Chairman, I could probably go on and on, but I invite the Attorney General to respond to some of these charges. I say categorically in closing, Bill 13 reeks of discrimination. It's a bill that Sask Tel does not need. It is a bill, if we are to believe the Attorney General and I don't in this area anyway, that Sask Tel has gone along for 40 years without. I say to the minister it's a bill that Sask Tel can get along without for another 40 years. We say to you, regulate the electronic business. Regulate it; set the rules, and be the appropriate referee where necessary. But you're getting into the business. You're going to control it. Eventually you are going to dominate it in this province. It is far too important; it is far too essential. You haven't the people. I can't think of anybody else who has the people, who should dominate it in the fashion that you intend to.

The minister says, there is maybe more power here than what we need. We've heard that one before. Every time a bill passed in this Assembly that gave this government more power than it needed, somebody was shafted within 12 months. Somebody always gets shafted and we believe that people will get shafted in the future. In short, Mr. Minister, we don't believe you. We think you'll

misuse this bill. We think you'll misuse this power just as this government has misused virtually every power that it has acquired for itself. We intend to fight you on this and we make no apology. We'll await the Attorney General to bail the minister out of this one.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 13 is not just An Act to Amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act, but rather, a piece of legislation that threatens the freedom and liberty of every citizen of the province of Saskatchewan. I do not say that lightly, nor do I say it to score partisan points in this Assembly. I say it because I know, and the people on the other side of the House know that I know, what the real intentions of Bill No. 13 are. Bill No. 13 is a concerted effort by the technocrats of the present government to have complete control of communications in Saskatchewan. Why, Mr. Chairman? I will tell you why. It is because there are certain dogmatic, doctrinaire individuals in the current government who have dedicated their souls to a document called the Regina Manifesto. In that document is a commitment for the socialization of communications. That is why we see Bill No. 13 before this Legislative Assembly. It is because the socialist government on the North American continent is blindly carrying out the goals of the Regina Manifesto.

There are those who have forgotten that we do indeed have a socialist government in this province. It seems that it is extremely old-fashioned or unfashionable to point out the truth about those who sit on the government side in this province.

The fact of the matter is that these people are socialists dedicated to complete state control, no matter which way you look at them. Bill No. 13 is a prime example of the dangers of this sort of philosophy.

I am very serious when I say that Bill No. 13 is a threat to freedom and that there will be those on the other side who will attempt to brush aside such a claim. I would suggest that perhaps there are those who suffer from oversensitivity to words such as freedom and liberty because they are an inherent part of the conservatism and not in line with socialist thinking. There are those on the other side who would claim that things such as freedom and liberty are out of date. I say such a claim is preposterous. To suggest freedom is out of date is akin to saying that the golden rule or the Ten Commandments is out of date. The Conservative approach is that freedom depends on effective restraints against the accumulation of power in a single authority. That is why we are so opposed to Bill No. 13.

Bill No. 13 is a dangerous bill. It represents and symbolizes all that I am opposed to. It is a threat to freedom and dignity of the individual because it has a collective mentality that big brother (in this case Sask Tel) knows best.

It is my belief that the maximum amount of freedom for individuals is consistent with the maintenance of social order, and we must maximize freedom or in the final analysis we will lose it. It is legislation like Bill No. 13 which erodes and chips away at the freedoms we know. Throughout history, government has proved to be the chief instrument for thwarting man's liberty.

This is what is happening here in the province of Saskatchewan with Bill No. 13. Absolute state power always restrains freedom and Bill No. 13 will swing this province down the road to complete state control. Freedom vanishes every time lawmakers give approval to legislation such as Bill No. 13. The tendency to concentrate power in the hands of a few deeply concerns me.

Mr. Chairman, it has been noted that Bill No. 13 is strongly opposed by the two largest daily newspapers in this province, and I'm speaking of the Regina Leader-Post and the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. Bill No. 13 is also opposed by such organizations as the Saskatchewan Library Association. For the record I would like to read a few excerpts from a letter which was received from the Saskatchewan Library Association, Saskatoon:

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 centring the knowledge base or by restricting them 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.

Further the new section 44 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 clause is so broad and ill-defined that virtually every tele-processing service that a library or information centre might use could be abridged or jeopardized by the internal policies of Sask Tel.

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. Gordon L. Ray, President, Saskatchewan Library Association.

Mr. Chairman, the letter from the Saskatchewan Library Association is just one example of the hundreds of letters which we, on this side of the Assembly, have been receiving from concerned groups and from citizens from every part of Saskatchewan in opposition to Bill No. 13.

I warn the government to take heed. The people of Saskatchewan will not tolerate such dictatorial legislation. Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 13 is of such a restrictive nature that not only does it give Sask Tel complete control of communications in this province, but it also severely restricts free enterprise and the activities of amateur radio operators.

I'm sure those on the other side of the Chamber are aware of that, but they are the ones who are wearing the horse blinders. They are the ones who are inflexible and blindly partisan.

Mr. Chairman, the Regina Leader-Post was right when it said on its editorial page that this government is becoming too dogmatic and socialistic. Bill No. 13 is clear proof of that.

Mr. Chairman, the Regina Leader-Post was right when it said on its editorial page that this government is becoming too dogmatic and socialistic. Bill No. 13 is clear proof of that.

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General has said he will not allow the opposition to hinder Bill No. 13. The Attorney General can give this House all the socialistic rhetoric he wishes but that will not alter the fact that Bill No. 13 is a threat to freedom.

Mr. Chairman, while I suspect my words will fall upon deaf ears on the other side, I will take a few moments to outline some of my reasons for opposing this restrictive bill.

Mr. Chairman, Bill No. 13 does the following:

1. The amendments will produce a more restrictive environment with regard to telecommunications equipment, and give Sask Tel a virtual monopoly on telecommunications equipment.
2. Bill No. 13 would prohibit all attachments to telephones except with the permission of Sask Tel.
3. Bill No. 13 would put the whole future of electronic information systems in Saskatchewan under the control of Sask Tel.
4. Sask Tel would be the sole authority to manufacture, distribute, or lease communications equipment in Saskatchewan.
5. Sask Tel would have sole control of many devices used by ham radio operations which would restrict their activities.
6. The computer industry would be more regulated because of Sask Tel's regulations on use of telephone lines for computer operations.
7. Bill No. 13 would give Sask Tel control of cable vision in Saskatchewan because of fibre optics, and an amendment that Sask Tel would control all of the communications.
8. Bill No. 13 has absolutely no provision for public appeal of any of its regulations, and has had no public input to date, in the regulations it is proposed to enact.

Mr. Chairman, many of the provisions of Bill No. 13 will be under cabinet control as opposed to Sask Tel itself, making it simple for the cabinet to unilaterally change or amend regulations.

In each instance Bill No. 13 is a threat to freedom.

I would like to point out that in light of the ongoing dispute between Sask Tel and the private telecable operators in this province, I am very concerned about the ever-increasing control the government has over our lives. It is a threat to our democratic institutions.

Mr. Chairman, time and time again, we on this side of the legislation have called upon the government to allow more public input into Bill No. 13. It is a well known fact that we have called for a standing committee of the legislature, to be established to hold public hearings throughout Saskatchewan on Bill No. 13. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the government has absolutely refused this request. One need not wonder why. The reason is they are afraid of public opinion and public input. They take the attitude that the technocrats, bureaucrats, and big brother knows best. Once again I challenge the government to allow public hearings on Bill No. 13. I dare them to.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to emphasize how serious Bill No. 13 is as a threat to freedom. If we allow this bill to pass it will serve only to erode individual liberty and freedom in this province. That is a sad legacy to pass on to future generations.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Chairman, in recent days it has become exceedingly clear that the dogmatic socialists on the other side of this Chamber and blindly committed to Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan

Telecommunications Act, which would be more appropriately called the bill to incorporate state control of communications in Saskatchewan.

I'm opposed to this piece of doctrinaire socialism, because I represent a philosophy which the vast majority of free thinking people in this province subscribe to. That is the concept that freedom depends on effective restraints against accumulation of power in a single authority. I make no apologies for defending that concept of freedom against the godless and dictatorial beliefs of socialism as manifested in Bill No. 13.

Lord Acton said, and I quote: 'Power corrupts men and absolute power corrupts absolutely.' That is what Bill No. 13 will do, Mr. Chairman. It will corrupt and restrict freedom in a province which can proudly boast to be the home of the author of Canada's Bill of Rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — There is no doubt the concept of freedom is threatened by Bill No. 13. I should like to quote the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, who, I am sure, would have been a leader in the battle against Bill No. 13 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I notice the minister has been getting very low in his seat this afternoon. He sat pretty high this morning, but he sure has been sinking out of this sight this afternoon. I don't blame him.

There is no doubt the concept of freedom is threatened by Bill No. 13. I would like to quote the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker, who, I am sure, would have been a leader in the battle against Bill No. 13. In a speech to the House of Commons on August 4, 1960, he said:

The principles of freedom are never final. Freedom is not static. It cannot be fixed for all time. It either grows or dies. It grows when the people of the country have it in their hearts and demand that it shall be preserved. I would be the last to contend that any document made by man, however impressive, can assure freedom. But I think that what we have done will provide an anchor for Canadian rights.

At the graveside of Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois, there is carved in marble a timeless quote which says: 'There is no weapon so powerful as the truth.'

I recall that, Mr. Chairman, because when I see the Attorney General make a spectacle of himself in this Chamber and revert to the role of hatchet man for the government — the Spiro Agnew of Saskatchewan — I know the truth has hit home. I feel sorry, Mr. Chairman, for the Attorney General.

My colleague, the hon. member for Wilkie, has spent countless hours of hard work, documentation, study and representation on Bill No. 13, and it troubles me when I hear the Attorney General suggest my colleague has never read Bill No. 13. Now, Mr. Attorney General, I say you should be ashamed of yourself to stand up in this Chamber and say my colleague never read the bill, when he's been working for months. A bill like Bill No. 13 needs months of hashing over because it's a bad bill. You know it is. It was then I began to realize the truth has hit home. The government is beginning to feel the pressure of an angry electorate — angry that they would dare to try to bring about such state control. Did the Attorney General hear what I said? State control in Saskatchewan,

that's what we're talking about? The Attorney General would rather call it socialism. What's the difference?

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Attorney General, what is the difference between socialism, state control, and communism? They are all the same thing? The Attorney General calls us, every day, the Devine Conservatives. I'm proud to hear him say Devine Conservatives. But I never hear anyone say the Blakeney NDPs; it's always the Romanow NDPs.

We never hear, Mr. Chairman, from tier no. 1; we hear from tier no. 2. Since I've been in this House, Blakeney has not come to defend himself on any item. He comes in and runs out. It's always this poor man here, who has to defend the whole works. At least we can put men up here to speak.

Mr. Chairman, at least on this side of the House we all can get up and speak on Bill No. 13. But over there you have only the Attorney General, who has to come and go to them all.

As I stated, Mr. Chairman, my colleague has put a good deal of sincere, hard work into Bill No. 13. I am proud of the member for Wilkie, who has put so much work into this bill. And the Attorney General has the audacity to say we have to go out at noon and change our tactics.

We don't have to go by what you say. Just because you bring an amendment in, we don't have to jump to what you say. We'll put our own amendments in. I'll tell you, Mr. Attorney General, he has some amendments. You'll get them when we're good and ready to give them to you.

I am sure the powerful language he used, in the course of his remarks, hurt and shocked a few of the so-called social intellectuals, who live in ivory towers. To them I say, wake up. This is Saskatchewan, not Cuba or Sweden. This is a province of people who have fought against tyranny and communism. Bill No. 13 is a threat to the people.

He must wallow in the mud and have his image tarnished to protect his government in a losing battle. One wonders what thanks, what appreciation his fellow party members will show him at the next election convention. Yes, one wonders just what they'll show. With the Attorney General's heritage and background, I would expect him to be opposed to such restrictive legislation as Bill No. 13. But the possibility exists that his last trip to China completely warped his thinking.

A recent headline in the Regina Leader-Post stated: Bill No. 13 Scares Telecommunications Industry. Well, Mr. Chairman, I assure you Bill No. 13 scares a lot of people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, if you think for one moment that only the Conservatives in this caucus are against Bill No. 13, I assure the Attorney General and the minister who brought the bill in that had he contacted the people . . . The Attorney General and the minister know that a group met in my office. I sent them to your office. Did you listen to them? No, you did not, because they're still . . . You listened, but you didn't do what they asked. They wanted Bill No. 13 dropped.

Mr. Chairman, this article in the paper, Sask Tel power play — if a private company operated a telephone system in Saskatchewan, would the provincial government give it

the power it proposes to give Sask Tel, given the long-standing record of the NDP against monopoly power? It seems certain that it would not.

The bill now before the legislature apparently would give Sask Tel the power to prohibit attachment to its telephone lines of any equipment other than Sask Tel supplies. The bill would give legislative approval to Sask Tel to manufacture and sell various telecommunications gadgets. The telephone company is already leasing some equipment at high rates, equipment which could be bought by a customer for a relatively small sum. Given the present, and likely future extent of such gadgets, the possibilities for control are horrendous.

It is pertinent that the Supreme Court of Canada refused a Bell Canada appeal of a federal court ruling that prohibited Bell from preventing consumers from owning and maintaining direct-dial automobile telephone equipment. In this case, Bell was relying on its own regulations and not the law. The decision has been interpreted as likely opening up the entire telecommunications market to competition.

Similarly, the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, CRTTC, last year ordered Bell to allow CNCP Telecommunications Limited to connect with its lines. Telegraph and telephone companies incorporated under federal legislation are subject to the jurisdiction of CRTTC. The Saskatchewan bill would effectively rule out competition in any telecommunications area related to the Sask Tel system which the phone company cared to enter.

The most startling area as far as the general public is concerned, (and that's who you refused to listen to, Mr. Chairman) . . . They refuse to listen to the public. The general public's concern would be that of home computer terminals which must be connected to the telephone system.

For business it would be in a variety of areas, for some of the possible ramifications are very serious. Minister of Telephones, Don Cody, said Saskatchewan telephones will never use its power to create a monopoly for selling its products. Well, then, why put it in there? Why put these powers in there if you're not going to use them?

AN HON. MEMBER: — You woke the Minister of Telephones up, Gerry.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — It will never make all the items required by its customers. This is not very reassuring and of course not at all reassuring for the items it does make. Sask Tel should be viewed essentially as a carrier. It is apparent this is a view of the supreme court and the CRTTC with respect to Bell Canada. No one has aired any reason Sask Tel should be viewed differently.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there was an editorial which appeared in the Regina Leader-Post titled 'Bill would grant Sask Tel more power than necessary.' It was dated April 1, and reads as follows. I urge the backbenchers on the other side to heed. I won't read all this bill. I'll just read the headlines. 'Bill would grant Sask Tel more power than necessary.' There's one in here:

Colin Turnbull, manager of the University of Regina's computing service says, our real concern is that we may be locked into a closed market place. The ominous thing about Bill 13 is that Saskatchewan Tel could have full power over how telecommunications are used in Saskatchewan. Bill 13 is wrong. It goes too far. It should be dropped.

Then the Attorney General says it's just the Conservatives sitting in this caucus that are against Bill 13. He never thought of asking the people.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, not only are the two major daily newspapers of this province strongly opposed to Bill 13, but also a vast majority of the people. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. The Attorney General speaks on behalf of his caucus.

Bill 13 is a piece of repressive legislation in that it ignores areas of interest to the users of telecommunication products and services, and, indeed, is destructive to the concept of free enterprise in the province of Saskatchewan.

My reasons for opposing this legislation can be summed up as follows:

1. The amendments will produce a more restrictive environment with regard to telecommunications equipment and give Sask Tel virtually a monopoly on telecommunications equipment.
2. The bill would prohibit all attachments to telephones except with the permission of Sask Tel.
3. Bill 13 would put the whole future of electronic information systems in Saskatchewan under the control of Sask Tel.
4. Sask Tel would have the sole authority to manufacture, distribute or lease telecommunications equipment in Saskatchewan.
5. Sask Tel would have sole control of many devices used by ham radio operators, which would restrict their activities.
6. The computer industry would be more regulated because of Sask Tel's regulations on the use of telephone liens for computer operations.
7. Bill 13 would give Sask Tel control of cable vision in Saskatchewan because of fibre optics (and that amendment that Sask Tel would control all telecommunications).
8. Bill 13 has no provision for public appeal of any of its regulations and has no public input to date in the regulation that it proposes to enact.
9. Many of the provisions of Bill 13 will be under cabinet control as opposed to Sask Tel itself, making it simple for cabinet to change or amend regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I resent it when I hear the Attorney General suggest that we on this side are undermining Sask Tel. That, Mr. Chairman, is not the truth.

I would like to use the words of John Diefenbaker in describing the Attorney General on his suggestion that we are undermining Sask Tel. He said:

If that person and the truth ever met each other it would be pure coincidence.

Mr. Chairman, along with others on this side of the House, I recognize the dedication and loyalty of all Sask Tel employees. Sask Tel made a significant contribution to this

great province of ours and it must hurt employees' morale when they receive a government sanctioned bulletin threatening them with job cutbacks if Bill 13 does not pass. That, Mr. Chairman, is what you might call undermining Sask Tel.

Mr. Chairman, such actions as threatening employees of a Crown corporation with job cutbacks is immoral and downright disgusting.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take the opportunity to point out that we on this side have called for a standing committee of this legislature to have public hearings on Bill 13. Let the people of Saskatchewan have some real input and I am sure the verdict would be that this bill would be defeated. Let the people say and it would never be passed. But you, on the other side of this House, do what you want to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, a group of Grade 9 students who have just arrived in the Speaker's gallery. They are from the Turtleford High School. They comprise two different classes. I have been told they started out as 41 members in total; 8 were unable to attend and 1 person missed the bus, so they are no longer 41 members. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell them that this is the committee of the whole, and they are observing the discussion on Bill No. 13, which is a bill to amend the Sask Tel act. I'll be meeting with them later, and I hope they find their stay in the city of Regina, the capital of Saskatchewan, educational and that their trip home is a safe one. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 13 — Section 1 (continued)

MR. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, I have a very important amendment to introduce to this Assembly this afternoon, which will give my colleagues the opportunity to voice their concerns about Bill No. 13. There are two or three points I would like to touch on first of all. One thing that really disturbs me is that the Attorney General stood up three or four times this afternoon, trying to deflect the issue on to the Conservatives, saying that it's our fault Bill 13 is dragging on. Mr. Attorney General, I tell you that this morning I couldn't get into this debate until 11:40. I was ready to get in at 10:30. Don't blame this opposition. It won't wash.

Then you say Bill No. 13 isn't important. Have you the courage to tell the people of Saskatchewan that Bill 13 isn't important. He said it wasn't important, Mr. Chairman. I am not only for Radio Shack or big corporations; if there is anything the Conservative opposition stands for, we are the freedom fighters for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — I will not be, and neither will my colleagues be, manipulated by you or by big business or by anyone, but I will listen to the people of Saskatchewan. Then I hear him say, you are trying to drag out the session. Mr. Chairman, it's a privilege for me — an honour — to be down here representing the Wilkie constituency. And Mr. Chairman, I

will represent my constituents and every other individual in Saskatchewan, but I'll tell you one thing, when the workload is over I want to be out of here too. Maybe it's not evident to some of the members opposite, but I'm a family man. I miss my family. I miss my wife. I'm here on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. I'm not staying down here purposely to be away from my family. Maybe some of the members opposite are — but I'm not.

Mr. Chairman, there are two major points with Bill No. 13. The first one is monopoly — total government monopoly of telecommunications in Saskatchewan. The second point is total control — control of the media, television, telephones; and finally, the ultimate end for them, total control of all the people and their lives in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, this morning or maybe it was this afternoon, the minister responsible for Sask Tel read a letter from our leader, Grant Devine. Mr. Chairman, you tell me where it states that the Leader of the PC Party doesn't have the right to correspond with the people of Saskatchewan. I can see where they don't want that, because they don't want the people of Saskatchewan to find out about the dangerous piece of legislation before this Chamber today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, this is just the direction this government is going. They don't want anyone to know what happens in this Chamber. That's why we don't have television cameras in here. That is evident as well.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this amendment. It is an Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act, proposed House amendment. To amend section 6 of the printed bill, amended section 44.1 of the act as being enacted by section 6 of the printed bill, by striking out 44.4 in the first line and substituting 44.5, add the following section after section 44.4 of the act, as being enacted by section 6 of the printed bill:

44.5: no regulation may be made to prevent (a) competition in the manufacture, distribution, leasing, sale, maintenance or use of computers, or any related equipment; or (b) the connection of any attachment to a telecommunication line of the corporation.

Mr. Chairman, that is an amendment, a real amendment to Bill 13. The minister gave me a copy of his amendment this morning, just before noon. Our caucus took its lunch break in the lounge, to go through it very carefully.

The first amendment was worded to leave out, related equipment, acoustical couplers. Mr. Chairman, this is the reason for the big fuss about Bill 13. It is not only the computers or the terminals but it is also the connection of the terminals to Sask Tel's lines. Now I want very much to clarify one point.

The Attorney General has stated that we want to destroy Sask Tel. That is false! I am a complete believer, and so are all my colleagues, in Sask Tel. Sask Tel is doing a very good job, whether it be in the cities or rural Saskatchewan. Putting the wires underground is a good program. I am the first one to compliment you on that. But, Mr. Chairman, we do not believe that any government needs the ultimate power and control that they are asking for in Bill No. 13!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — I am the first one, Mr. Chairman, to admit that Sask Tel's lines have to be protected. I agree completely. We want to protect the system. But also we want to protect the people of Saskatchewan and the rights of the people of Saskatchewan!

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to try to give you a short example of something else that isn't in this bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'll try to get it to his level.

Mr. Chairman, saw we have a firm in Saskatchewan, (we could call it the Wang firm) which takes the technology and develops a terminal and an acoustic coupler. They come to the government and ask to sell, (not ask to sell, they will be allowed to sell it) ask that this be used in the system to be connected to their lines. So, the government decides no, we don't like it. You can't connect it — the cabinet decides this. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say, what avenue of appeal does that private individual or corporation have? They have no avenue of appeal, Mr. Chairman, none whatsoever. Their door is closed. This is wrong, Mr. Chairman, very wrong and the Attorney General knows it's wrong and the minister of Sask Tel knows that it's wrong also.

What more powers; what more rights. We are coming into the '80s, Mr. Chairman. It is the '80s and it is going to be the '80s of technology, of rapid change in Saskatchewan and in the world. It could be the decade of progress, yes. But, Mr. Chairman, how much progress will there be in Saskatchewan with this type of a bill, this type of power? Where is business going to go? Where is private enterprise going to go? I know where they are going to go, Mr. Chairman, and so do the members opposite. They are going to go right past Saskatchewan — welcome to Alberta — that's where they're going to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, it's quite evident, the effect that Bill No. 13 will have on Saskatchewan. Why the government, when they have a bill before the Chamber, (this Bill No. 13 and knowing the powers they're asking for) would start to scramble the telecable signal in Saskatoon . . . I mean, talk about dumb politics. It's real dumb politics if you're trying to work it through. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the members opposite realize the implications of Bill No. 13. Because, Mr. Chairman, the scrambling of Saskatoon Telecable just shows what this government will do if Bill No. 13 is put into force in its original content.

I want to right now thank the Minister of Telephones for listening to some of our ideas. He' brought in some House amendments. He brought in another amendment today and the amendment I have there is just an addition to that. I don't think there's much wrong with it, Mr. Minister. I think it gives the people of Saskatchewan a little more protection. It gives them their chance to still retain their rights. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague for Thunder Creek brought out a very, very valid point this afternoon. Everyone in Saskatchewan should have the right to telephone service. They should have the right. But the way it goes right now, those rights of the people of Saskatchewan are being eroded by this government, and Mr. Chairman, I say that is very wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we have additional amendments to bring in to Bill No. 13, but in all fairness to the minister I will thank him for giving me the opportunity over the noon hour to look at his amendment, as I gave you the opportunity over the supper hour to take a

look at our amendment.

Now, I would like . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hear the Attorney General saying, we can deal with yours right now. You've been in the debate four times this afternoon. If you are hurting that badly, you can get back into it afterwards.

You know, there is another thing which amazes me with Bill No. 13 and the minister in charge of Sask Tel. I'm seeing this tired government over there and I'm seeing ministers who can't even carry their own weight. They need the Attorney General to bail them out. It's getting to be a weak, tired government which is run down. They've run out of ideas, Mr. Chairman, I can't believe that the members opposite can completely agree, in whole, with Bill No. 13 the way it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We had a caucus on it.

MR. GARNER: — They say they had a caucus on it. Mr. Chairman, last year Sask Tel turned a profit of \$25 million, and still increased the rates to the people of Saskatchewan. To me, Mr. Chairman, a Crown corporation is set up to provide service at the most reasonable cost to the people of Saskatchewan. A \$7 million increase . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . don't tell me what to do. I'm getting sick of you trying to tell me what to do. I don't listen to you; I never have and I never will. Mr. Chairman, how much more does this government want to tax the people of Saskatchewan? Just how much more? They want to keep adding additional taxing, additional powers; so what is the end result? It will not be known as the province of Saskatchewan, but the state of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister of Sask Tel would like to answer a few questions on that. First of all, I would like to know, Mr. Minister, who is funding the telethon system?

MR. CODY: — The federal government.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., Mr. Minister, who else is in on the funding of the fibre optics program?

MR. CODY: — Sask Tel only.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, it has been brought to my attention that SED Systems of Saskatoon is developing a special panel for Sask Tel to fit on the back of television sets. Is that correct? Could you bring me up to date on what you're doing with that?

MR. CODY: — There is nothing being developed of that nature that I am aware of.

MR. GARNER: — Is any other company developing, or have you requested any other company to develop any systems or equipment for Sask Tel?

MR. CODY: — Yes, we have.

MR. GARNER: — Who are they, and what are they developing for Sask Tel?

MR. CODY: — SED Systems is doing some work with regard to reducing the line load on multiparty lines.

MR. GARNER: — Are they the only ones, Mr. Minister?

MR. CODY: — To my knowledge, yes.

MR. GARNER: — What is the cost for that?

MR. CODY: — We are not quite certain because the program that they are in at this point in time has not been completed. It will be in the area of \$500,000 to \$600,000 likely.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I had asked you the other day about acoustic couplers re the connection to the terminal. You said you would be giving me that information. I believe that was yesterday. Do you have the information for me right now? The acoustic coupler costs, comparing renting and comparing buying from Sask Tel and from private enterprise . . .

MR. CODY: — We don't provide acoustic couplers. I told the hon. gentleman for Indian Head-Wolseley that this afternoon. If you had been listening you would have heard it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. It now being 5 o'clock I leave the Chair until 7 o'clock this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.