

characteristics of a private bill, since it does affect the interests of specific individuals or corporations as distinct from all individuals or corporations of a similar category. If I were a procedural expert like my colleague in front of me I would get off into quite an orbit on this, to use the appropriate terminology tonight. But I do not want to get above my depth, so to speak. However, I am wondering if the minister might consult his advisers in this field, men learned in procedure like the minister from Nova Scotia who is a very able parliamentarian, and reflect upon the value and virtue of regarding this piece of legislation as a hybrid bill. It is clear that what we are setting up is not a public corporation. It is not owned by the Crown on behalf of the public, and therefore it is not a public corporation but rather a private one.

Therefore, some of the procedures followed with regard to private legislation should be considered and conceivably invoked. If this is declared a hybrid bill, of course, the bill would have to be adequately advertised. Second reading would be followed by referral to a special committee of the house or of both houses, and full opportunities would be given to members of the public, the third sector to appear before a special committee.

● (8:20 p.m.)

I do not intend to press this point because I expect to receive an assurance that in the standing committee every opportunity will be given to allow interested people to present their views on this important and, in many ways, unique piece of legislation. I agree with the minister that this is a very complex bill. It is a lengthy bill. It is confusing, and sometimes it is contradictory. I was brought up to appreciate good English rather than legal English and this always places me in difficulty when I start to read the statutes. I find that schedule B is one of the most massive omnibus sections I have ever encountered. It seems that everything which had not been thought of earlier has been dumped into this omnibus schedule. Many of the things I thought lacking in the statute I later found in B. So, it is extremely important that this bill be given close scrutiny in the committee.

It is clear already that one section of the tripartite group is not as happy about things as the minister's speech would lead us to believe. I refer to the common carriers. They were in Ottawa not long ago and I read in one of the great newspapers in the land, the *Globe and Mail*, that they expressed certain

Telesat Canada Act

reservations about this bill. I should like to read some of the comments made in an authoritative article written by Terrence Belford on the day following this meeting.

Trans-Canada Telephone System is not happy with some parts of the federal government's domestic satellite bill... The working of some clauses in the bill and the implications of others, have prompted the system to act.

System officials have held discussions with the federal Communications Department and have received verbal assurances that some changes may be made.

I was surprised at the limited nature of the changes to which the minister referred tonight. Many things were brought up. One spokesman pointed out that there is no definition of "common carriers"—just a list. Incidentally, I should like to congratulate the minister upon adding the Island Telephone Company, I myself noticed the omission on the first day.

An hon. Member: No causeway, but telephones.

Mr. Macquarrie: With all his faults, the minister is not always wrong, and that was a good move. The report states:

Mr. Krupski presented the system's view: "We could not really be part owner and be on the board of a company which is in direct competition with us. This has to be made quite clear and it is not in the bill.

We feel that interpretations should be reflected in words. There is no disagreement in principle, I am sure, but the bill does not reflect the apparent agreement.

So he believes that something which is apparent should become linguistic, and this is not really an unfair suggestion. He ends by saying:

I'm sure the government will be very co-operative and consider our questions in this matter, but where we go from there I'm not too certain. It depends on what agreements we can reach with the government.

So all is not sweet harmony even at this stage as far as the common carriers are concerned. I hold no brief for the common carriers although the minister, in his other role as Postmaster General, might well associate with that body and learn something from them. As he says, they have established a fine record. They are improving the service and lowering the cost. Whereas he, as Postmaster General—we all know what he is doing. Service is deteriorating and costs are increasing. So perhaps some cross-pollination with those carriers might not be a bad thing. In any event, if the common carriers, experts in this field