

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Sixteenth Legislature
46th Day

Tuesday, April 23, 1968

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Lieutenant Governor.

MESSAGE FROM HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Mr. Speaker: — The Lieutenant Governor transmits Further Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1969, and further Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1968, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. the Premier (Mr. Thatcher):

That His honour's message, the Further Estimates and the Further Supplementary Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Could the Provincial Treasurer give us some intimation of what these are about?

Mr. Stuart: — Well, this is the Executive Council to the change in the salary; this is the Speaker's sessional allowance; the indemnity and expense allowance for the Members, 59 Members; the office of the Leader of the Opposition, a substantial boost, not political.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

ORDERS FOR RETURN NO. 49

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government a question directed to the Provincial Secretary. When can I expect the Return No. 49 ordered by this Assembly on March 14?

Hon. D.V. Heald (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, if that's the Return the Hon. Member discussed with me yesterday, is that the Return you discussed with me yesterday, I'm advised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) that it will be down today and probably be tabled tomorrow.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 169

Mr. Steuart: — On behalf of the Hon. Minister Mr. MacDonald, I move that an Order of the Assembly do issue to rescind Order for Return No. 158, dated Tuesday, April 16, 1968 and that an Order of the Assembly do issue, in substitution therefore for Return No. 169 showing:

(1) What amount of assistance was issued to recipients in the Northern Administration District in the months of April, 1967; July, 1967; October, 1967; January, 1968; to (a) families on long term aid, (b) individuals on long term aid, (c) families on short term aid and (d) individuals on short term aid.

(2) The total number of persons assisted in each of (a), (b), (c) and (d) above.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order on this Motion. Beauchesne, 14th Edition on page 167, Citation 200, reads:

An old rule of Parliament reads that a question once been made and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again and must stand as the judgement of the House.

Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the House might be used in the discussion of motions of the same nature and contradictory decisions would sometimes be arrived at in the course of the same session. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday April 16, the House made their decision on Motion for Return No. 158. If Motion for Return No. 169 were to be carried now, it would mean that any time a motion had passed in this House that at a later date the majority group of a House could upset the decision of a former ruling of this House. Therefore I suggest that once a decision has been made according to Beauchesne's Citation 200 on page 167, the first paragraph, I would like to suggest that the Motion for Return No. 169 is out of order.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I just want to point out that there is no attempt in this Motion for Return to rescind the original Order for Return to deny any information the Member for The Battlefords was not in the House. He was and I didn't have an opportunity to discuss it with him. There was no terminal date and it would have cost the Department many thousands of dollars to try and check back and find all the information. So all we have attempted to do in this particular Order for Return is to put a terminal date on it. We've discussed it with the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and he has agreed that this will provide him with the exact information that he wants by making it terminal, so that the information can be obtained on a much more reasonable basis and provide the exact information that he wants.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, on this Order for Return I would suggest I'm not objecting. I can see what you are trying to arrive at, but I think the principle that's been established is bad and I think if leave had been asked to add to the original motion we could grant it. But I hate to see a precedent brought in where some previous one can be rescinded because it does then make the minority group helpless. I think, if the Minister had asked leave to add to that motion for clarification, that it wouldn't upset our rules and therefore we would know that we're protected under the rules.

Mr. MacDonald: —I would have been happy to, but I was taking the advice of the Clerk.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, don't blame the Clerk, you're the Minister.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, . . . the issue of this Order was done by leave of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — A point of order has been raised as to whether or not this can be done and I'm just looking for the correct authority. I can tell you what the correct authority will say but I can't tell you where it is to be found in Beauchesne. This . . . index that Beauchesne invented. Yes it is not unparliamentary because I was referring to an individual other than a Member of the House. In fact he has already left for parts unknown, . . . probably just as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Well until such time as the Clerk finds the correct citation in Beauchesne, Erskine May, page 411, has this to say:

But the practical inconvenience of a rigid rule of consistency, especially where the House as a whole wishes to change its opinion, has proved too great for a body confronted with the ever-changing problems of government; and the rule prohibiting reconsideration of a decided question has come to be interpreted strictly according to the letter so as not to prevent open rescission when it was decided that this is desirable.

Technically, indeed, the rescinding of the vote is a matter of a new question; the form being to read the resolution of the House and to move that it be rescinded.

When the correct citation in Beauchesne is discovered wherever it's got to, I think if my memory is correct, it will say as follows: "That a matter already decided by the House may not be reopened for rediscussion excepting on a distinct motion for the rescission of the same." Therefore this Motion is in order. This Motion does however propose two questions. They have been tied together I imagine in order to indicate to the House what the true situation and intention is, but it is nonetheless a double question, one being for the rescission of a previous Motion for a Return and the other that an Order of the Assembly do issue for another Return in substitution therefor. The question will be debated as one Motion, but if the House wishes me to

April 23, 1968

split the question into two parts before voting on it I will do so.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I've no objection under the explanation that this Motion for Return was withdrawn and another one substituted. The point I was raising was that I realize, when checking the other motion, that he didn't give dates of termination beginning and end. The point I was trying to establish is that this doesn't become a precedent that, once the motion is passed, you can just rescind. As I suggested to the Minister, had he asked leave to add to the motion, it wouldn't have been what we may think, setting a precedent. For those reasons and so on and at this state of the session, I'm not going to object, if the House wants to put this through, because I realize what it's for. But I just don't want to see a precedent started where we could have a motion passed and then rescinded and then as a minority group we would be helpless.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I agree with the Member for Wadena that this shouldn't become an established practice of the House. Of course. Here is what Erskine May, page 413 has to say:

With regard to the whole matter it may be stated generally that the reason why motions for open rescission are so rare or why the rules of procedure carefully guard against the indirect rescission of votes, is that both Houses instinctively realize as an incident above referred to shows, that parliamentary government requires the majority to abide by a decision regularly come to, however unexpected, and that it is unfair to resort to methods whether direct or indirect to reverse such a decision. The practice, resulting from this feeling, is essentially a safeguard for the rights of the minority, and a contrary practice is not normally resorted to, unless in the circumstances of a particular case those rights are in no way threatened.

I fail to see how you are going to add the necessary words to a motion already passed unless you rescind the motion and word it afresh. We would be into procedural difficulties here all over again.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I suggest we put the question . . .

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — CLOSURE OF COMMUNITY HOSPITALS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville):

That this Assembly recommends to the Government that no community hospitals be closed —

- (a) until it has been conclusively established that alternate services will be available on a year-round basis;
- (b) without prior consultation with hospital boards and communities affected;

- (c) without a minimum of 12 months notice;
- (d) until alternate use has been found for hospitals which are structurally sound and in a good state of repair;
- (e) until a thorough study has been conducted into the needs of affected communities, including the concentration of senior citizens in the area, travel conditions and distance from alternate hospital services, and other pertinent factors.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Grant (Minister of Health):

That the words after the word "assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

commends the Government for, —

- (a) not closing small community hospitals until alternate service is available on a year-round basis;
- (b) rebuilding several of those community hospitals;
- (c) consulting with hospital boards and considering community interests in any proposals for closing community hospitals;
- (d) making provision for a large additional hospital in Regina to serve southern Saskatchewan;
- (e) providing for an extension of the University Hospital in Saskatoon, and
- (f) instituting the new and centralized teaching program for nurses' training.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it has been some days since this Resolution originally found itself on the Order Paper and it has been some days since it was amended. I think we would have to agree that the amendment by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) now seems to be an attempt to gloss over the matter which the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) raised initially when he moved the Resolution in the first place. The amendment alternately, Mr. Speaker, attempts to heap commendation of the Government and chooses to ignore the central issue that has troubled many Saskatchewan communities since December 30, when the Minister arbitrarily announced that SHSP grants would be cut off from the eight community hospitals. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the public concern that was generated by the Minister's announcement that the hospitals would have their grants cut off could have been avoided if this Government had not been so intent upon using the issue as a political stepping stone, ever since the Hospital Survey Report was published in 1963.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, don't quarrel with the objectives of re-assessing the hospital plan and making a determination from time to time with respect to the best and the most appropriate manner of providing hospital services for the 900,000 odd people which our hospital services plan has responsibility for. Our Government prior to 1964 recognized this responsibility and accordingly the Hospital Survey Committee was put into motion.

However, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite almost to a man used this Hospital Survey Report to their own political advantage. They embarked on a campaign to distort the report. They attempted to convince Saskatchewan communities that were mentioned in the report that a giant Socialist bureaucracy was about to descend

April 23, 1968

upon them and remove their hospital without warning or without consultation.

The 1964 Hansard, Mr. Speaker, of this House makes it clear that Liberal Members were not concerned with the facts of the case. They chose instead to distort and to deceive. I see no real advantage in a review of statements made by Members of this House in this connection. Members of the Liberal party who contributed to the confusion, the fear and the unrest are very much aware of the fact that they did a disservice to these communities in attempting to make the report of the hospital Survey Committee a political issue.

Following the 1964 general election, Cabinet Ministers of the new Liberal Government continued to subterfuge for a number of months. No doubt many of these communities were convinced that the election of the Liberal Government had meant the salvation of their community hospital. At least one Minister claimed that the Government had consulted with hospitals concerned, had sat down with them, had helped them to make their operation more efficient, thus making it unnecessary for the hospital to be closed. It is interesting to note that the Minister concerned has been asked for his resignation along with other Liberal back benchers, if the hospitals in their constituencies are to be closed. Another Minister, I understand, made it clear that he would resign if the hospital in his constituency was closed. We look forward to hearing from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and other Members who I'm sure will be wanting to speak on this Resolution.

The extent to which Members opposite were using the Hospital Survey Report to accomplish their own objectives was very much in evidence during the Moosomin by-election, Mr. Speaker. Like other Members, I spent some time in that area during the by-election campaign in the town of Broadview in particular. Broadview as Members will be aware has a hospital that was mentioned in the report for eventual conversion. After a few visits upon residents in the town of Broadview, it became clear that the Liberals had been hard at work. Liberal canvasses had left the impression that the closure of the Broadview hospital was a fait accompli. In the light of this, and in keeping with the statements made by the Liberals in and out of this House, both before and after 1964 general election, I think it might be worthwhile to read into the records of this House the position that the former CCF Government adopted in connection with hospital closures.

I believe it is appropriate to recall the statement that was issued by the then Minister of Health, Mr. Blakeney, when the Hospital Survey Report was received in April of 1963. Among other things, Mr. Blakeney said this:

Steps directed toward closure, however, must be well-planned and proceeded with in an orderly manner, after consultation with hospital boards and medical staffs involved, as well as with hospitals in adjacent areas. It will also be necessary to consider special problems peculiar to the particular community which may be affected by the closure.

Further in his statement, Mr. Blakeney referred to hospitals suggested for alternate use, saying, and I quote him again:

The recommendation for the continued use of an additional 21 limited-function hospitals, pending later consideration of their conversion to some alternative use, reflects an important and difficult aspect of the planning in the hospital field, namely, the adaptation of treatment facilities in the light of technological, scientific and social change and the problem of obsolescence. As suggested by the Survey Report, some of these limited-function hospitals might well be adapted as offices for physicians and public health personnel. Others might prove to be suitable, with some modification, as small nursing homes, or as homes for the aged. The possibility of their adaptation to serve as dental clinic facilities, or as additional health centres with well-equipped diagnostic facilities, can also be explored. Adaptation of these resources represents a long-term challenge and will require careful study and appraisal of their most appropriate use.

This is the end of the quote from the former Minister of Health, Mr. Blakeney at that time.

I think from this, Mr. Speaker, it was made clear that the Government of that day contemplated no hasty action without considering all of the ramifications involved. In August of 1963, in a letter to the Chairman of all hospitals affected and to municipal reeves, Mr. Blakeney said, and I quote him again in part:

From the foregoing, you will see that the report of the Hospital Survey Committee recommendations are being studied by the Government, but have not been accepted as Government policy. I made it clear in a press statement at the time the report was made public that, if decisions were taken as a result of the report, they would be made only after consultation with local groups most closely affected. Some factors which are now important were not considered by the Committee. For example, the introduction of the Medical Care Plan appears to have had a discernible effect on patterns of hospital utilization. There is every reason to believe that in most cases considerable study will be necessary before the Committee's recommendations could be accepted or rejected. In any case no hasty action is contemplated. I think I can assure you that there will be no sudden discontinuance of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan benefits to any hospital and no major changes will take place without careful study and that no hospital will be closed or converted to alternate use without full consultation with the hospital authorities concerned.

Now from this, Mr. Speaker, I think there can be little doubt concerning the willingness of the former Government to work out arrangements which would have met with the approval of affected communities. In the main, Saskatchewan people are sober and rational people. However, without warning, and after having given the assurance that their community hospitals were not in danger, this Government through the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) dropped their bomb on December 30. Many residents learned that their hospital was to be cut off from the SHSP grant when they read about it in the newspaper or heard a report on radio or on television.

April 23, 1968

These people, Mr. Speaker, were not only shocked and angry that they had not been consulted before the Government chose April 1st as an arbitrary date for closure, but they were also mystified by the rationale used in deciding which hospitals would be closed. Neudorf and Maryfield had not been designated for closure in the Hospital Survey Report and yet they were among the eight that were to be closed on April 1.

It seems reasonable to expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should be prepared to tell us how it arrived at the decision to close these particular hospitals. As yet, we are unaware of the criteria that were used in making this judgment. Knowing the Premier as we do, we wonder if he may not have risen on the morning of December 30, 1967, with a bad taste in his mouth and decided by the eni-meni-miney-mo method that these eight hospitals should be given the axe. In any case, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no consistent formula used to determine which will close and which will remain open. This in itself has created a good deal of fear and unrest in areas where the hospital is regarded as a rather borderline institution.

Pages 79, 80, 81 and 82 of the Annual report of the SHSP indicate hospitals where construction was either underway or completed in 1967. Among these are hospitals which were named in the Hospital Survey Report for closure in 1963. In spite of this, a number of new hospitals were built in areas here closure was recommended. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that confusion reigns supreme on this whole matter? Dodsland Union Hospital, mentioned for closure, has just completed a new 10-bed hospital; Edam, Lady Minto Union Hospital has just completed a new 8-bed hospital — it too was named for closure; Midale Union Hospital, a new 8-bed hospital has just been completed; Vanguard Union Hospital has also completed a new 10-bed hospital within the last year; Spalding Union Hospital has had their project approved for a new 12-bed hospital and construction is about to begin, I understand.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not too much to expect this Government to lay down some uniform guidelines in order that these communities will know with a degree of certainty that their hospital will be operating in a year's time. Surely it is not asking too much, Mr. Speaker, if we suggest that continuing study be given to the whole matter with respect to all pertinent factors, local and otherwise, being taken into consideration.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to retire this matter from the political arena, and approach the problem on the basis of consideration of the needs of individual communities along the lines suggested by Mr. Blakeney, the former Minister of Health and enunciated again, I believe, in large parts in the Resolution that we are discussing today.

Undoubtedly, some of these smaller hospitals will be closed. Others will be converted to alternate use. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish once again to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) the somewhat overcrowded condition and the long waiting list at the Saskatchewan Training School in Moose Jaw. In a letter which I wrote the Minister of Health sometime earlier this year, I suggested to him a stepping-up of the program of releases of the mentally retarded who are untrainable and requiring custodial care with referral perhaps to some of these community hospitals that have been named for closure or conversion.

The Minister replied to my letter suggesting that only about 3.3 per cent of the mentally retarded were considered as suitable for care in these hospitals under discussion. While operating under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan these hospitals have stipulated that children should not be ambulatory nor should they be severely deformed and that the most readily acceptable should have an intelligence quotient of not over 30.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to suggest to the Minister (Mr. Grant) again that the entire facility of an eight or a ten-bed hospital might very well be earmarked for a group of mentally retarded children in this particular category, in order to relieve the stresses and strains on the Saskatchewan Training School, and at the same time provide adequate facilities for the retarded in communities which are anxious to make use of a hospital which is about to close in their area. Many other suggestions for the use of hospitals that may be converted have already been made. I hope the Government will consider or give consideration to using these resources to the best advantage of all concerned without the kind of hasty and ill-conceived approach that became evident on December 30th, last.

This Resolution I believe, Mr. Speaker, as it was originally presented laid down specific conditions and recommendations which I think are minimum of that which should be met. The Minister (Mr. Grant) has gone at least part of the way by rescinding his closure order for April 1st, and I hope that Members opposite will recognize the value of the Resolution before it was desecrated by the amendment which was moved by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I hope that they will see fit to support the original Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated to participate in this debate and to voice to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan my objection to the manner in which the hospital in the small community is being closed off by this Liberal Government. The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) in speaking in this debate on this Resolution suggestively asked what Opposition Members would propose and what would be their position with regard to the closing of the small community hospital. May I point out to the Hon. Member that the proposition is clearly spelled out in the original Resolution on the Order Paper.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — And the Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) in moving the Resolution very ably and thoroughly placed the proposal before this House for consideration. Was the Hon. Member for Cannington out of the House at the time or did he simply not want to hear? May I suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the Hon. Member for Melville will have more to say about the Resolution. Other Members from this side of the House will be pleased I am sure to have the opportunity of placing on record their position on this question. I would suggest to the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) that he be in his seat during this debate and pay careful attention to what Members on this side of the House have to say about the closing of small hospitals.

April 23, 1968

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — On a point of privilege, I was here, I was here all the time during the debate. As a matter of fact the Members opposite should open his eyes sometimes.

Mr. Matsalla: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment proposed by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) removes the proposals recommended by the Members on this side of the House. I would suggest therefore to the Hon. Member for Cannington to review our proposals and I am sure that he will find them to be good, sound recommendations that should be worthy of his support. I ask and I challenge the Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and place their position on record with regard to the Government's method of closing the eight small community hospitals announced December 30th, 1967.

Is the Hon. Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) where the Leroy hospital was closed prepared to defend the Government's action on this matter? Would the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) place his name on record in support of the initial method by the Government to close the Qu'Appelle hospital? What stand is the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) taking with respect to the manner in which the Hodgeville hospital was closed.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — They're not closed.

An Hon. Member: — Four are.

Mr. Matsalla: — Is the Hon. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) in support of closing the Frontier hospital? Would the Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) who obviously believes that policies of this Liberal Government can do no wrong rise to speak in support of closing the Prelate hospital? Is the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) prepared to place on record a defence for the method this Government used in closing the Willowbunch hospital?

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because the small community hospital has for many years provided the much needed and important service to the community. The hospital held a very high institutional position in the hearts and the minds of the community people. The people in every way were proud of the hospital and the facilities it had available. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, because the removal of the community hospital and the health services is a damaging blow to the small community from the standpoint of its economics and survival. I am concerned and so is each and everyone of my colleagues on this side of the House about the effect the closing of the small community hospital will have on the health and welfare of the people in the area. People whether in a small community or in a large community are entitled to convenient and adequate health facilities. The health of people should receive top priority. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I ask myself upon which small hospital will this Government force closure next? The people in the Canora constituency and in the neighbouring constituencies are wondering whether the Government is going to strike at their community hospital next. We are concerned that if the Government follows the policy of closing small hospitals as it did to close the eight hospitals earlier this year, the two hospitals at Invermay and Norquay will meet the same fate. At Invermay the bed capacity is 11 and at Norquay the bed capacity is 15.

Both of these hospitals have provided and continue to provide very good service to their community. The hospitals are giving the people of the Canora Union hospital district and adjacent areas invaluable health services. I want to say in this House that people would most strenuously object to the removal of these facilities.

I might point out, Sir, that recently the hospital board and the Government found it advisable to spend thousands of dollars to extend facilities of the hospitals. It would seem that because of these capital expenditures one should not be concerned about the closing of the hospitals. Normally this may be true but with the sudden changes of policies of the present Liberal Government and its unpredictability of action, there is good reason for concern. It did it before and it will do it again!

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I said that the small community hospital had a very high position in the hearts and minds of the people. It can be said that the hospital is virtually the most important building in the town. From day to day, 24 hours a day, the hospital stands ready with life-saving devices. I firmly believe that from the records of the hospitals many cases could be picked out as emergencies which if not attending to be the hospital in the community the patient in question would have had little chance of survival. It must be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that many a life had been saved through the facility of the small hospital. Through you, Sir, I would like to remind the Government that many a small community hospital was built and established through the co-operative effort of the community people. They built the hospital to serve them and their community. I must admit, Sir, that the Government assisted in the construction and the operation of the hospital, but because of that surely the Government did not acquire full authority over the hospital — the authority to say with a whim whether the hospital should continue to operate or be closed. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the manner in which this Liberal Government closed the hospitals in the eight small communities about three months ago is quite evident of Government arrogance and disregard for local authority. This Liberal Government did not prior to its announcement consult with local hospital authorities and local organizations about the closing of the hospitals. The Government literally invaded the small communities in question and in no uncertain terms ordered the hospitals to close. The Government used the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan as a tool to withhold payment of the operational grant to the hospital and in a high-handed Liberal style stated that the hospitals will be closed. The hospital boards and the people in the areas concerned were shocked to hear the news. Disaster befell the communities. They had a feeling that they will no longer have their hospitals. One might say they were actually taken away from them.

Following receipt of the Hospital Survey Committee Report in 1963, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals prior to 1964 and after used the Report absolutely for political purposes. The Report, as we all know or should know if we only want to, was not endorsed and specifically accepted by the former CCF Government. However the Government did support it in a general way. The Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) then the Minister of Health, upon receipt of the report commented in April, 1963, and I quote:

Steps directed towards closure however must be well planned and proceeded with in an orderly manner after

April 23, 1968

consultation with the hospital boards and medical staffs involved, as well as with hospitals in adjacent areas. It will also be necessary to consider special problems peculiar to a particular community which may be affected by closure.

In August of 1963 he communicated with the chairmen of the hospitals affected saying:

I made clear in a press statement at the time the Report was made public that, if decisions were made as a result of the Report, they would be made only after consultation with local groups most closely affected.

He further stated:

There is every reason to believe that in most cases considerable study will be necessary before the committee's recommendation could be accepted or rejected. In any case no hasty action is contemplated. No major changes will be made without careful study and no hospital will be closed or converted to alternate use without full, consultation with the hospital authority concerned.

What did the Liberals say about the report since 1964 and prior to the 1967 election? A Report by the Leader-Post April 13th, 1964, on an address by the Premier in Rosetown stated:

Mr. Thatcher said that despite the large number of hospital beds in major centres there were still long waiting lists of persons seeking treatment. He said it would not make sense to close the small hospitals under those conditions.

The Member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) in the Legislature in 1964 said:

They serve their people and they serve them well and they still can. Decisions to close hospitals should be made by hospital boards only. It's a crime that the Government should even consider closing them.

The Star Phoenix of February 23, 1965, reported Mr. Steuart the Provincial Treasurer, then Minister of Health, as saying:

I don't think the Government has the moral right to use the power of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to force these hospitals to close.

That was our Provincial Treasurer. A report in the Leader-Post on June 25, 1965, covering the by-election campaign in the Moosomin constituency stated:

Mr. Steuart reiterated his Government's policy of not closing small hospitals but of helping them operate more efficiently and economically.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the 1967 Hansard what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) said in the Legislative Chamber on February 23rd, 1967, and I quote:

Our Government does things differently, Mr. Speaker. As soon as we took office we sat down with the hospital

authority and established a better spirit of co-operation. By working with these people we have been able to improve standards and slow down the rate of cost increase and by this combined effort we have preserved hospitals in our rural areas that the NDP were going to close down. Some of these that come to mind are a few in my own area of the province, such as Qu'Appelle, Montmartre, Maryfield, Lampman.

Then there came the new Saskatchewan announcement by the Hon. Minister of Health. A report in the Leader-Post of December 30th, 1967, stated:

Eight Saskatchewan hospitals will close this spring when Government payments to them will be discontinued. The hospitals are located at Frontier, Hodgeville, Maryfield, Willowbunch, Prelate, Leroy, Neudorf and Qu'Appelle. Payments to the hospitals will stop effective April 1, 1968.

The quotations I just made, Mr. Speaker, gives this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan a clear and a true image of the shammy and humbug attitude of this Liberal Government in dealing with the closing of small community hospitals.

Other comments in this regard made by Members of the same Government carry the same dissimulated flavour. It all boils down to the fact that the Liberal Government simply cannot be trusted.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the motion proposed by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) requesting commendation of this House would appear to be a kind of a salve to heal the wound inflicted by the Hon. Minister and his Government when he announced the closing of the eight small community hospitals. The people in the Maryfield and Qu'Appelle area became most disturbed over the closing of their hospitals and lost all trust in the present Liberal Government. According to a report in the January 26, 1968 issue of the Leader-Post a meeting of 300 people at Maryfield passed a resolution calling for the resignation of the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I note that he is not in his seat. And according to a report in an issue of the same date of the Leader-Post a meeting of the Qu'Appelle people decided to ask for the resignation of their Legislative Members . . .

An Hon. Member: — He's not here either.

Mr. Matsalla: — . . . the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the people of these two communities had every reason to feel and act in the manner they did. The Liberal Government and their Members through their deceitfulness betrayed the people of their community. So here we have a Government that only two or three years ago saw the important need for the small community hospital and lauded the services it provided for the local people. The Liberal Government pledged itself not to close the hospitals but instead to assist in more efficient operation. What has changed since two or three months ago? The communities affected I am sure remain about the same. It is only the Government 's position that has changed. The Liberal Government's attitude since October 11th is beyond comprehension. It has made a complete about-turn from its position prior to the election. This not only applies to the small community hospitals

April 23, 1968

but to nearly all areas of Government. What would the closing of a small community hospital mean to the community? First, it would mean the removal of important health services from the area, the services that the people had virtually provided for themselves and their loved ones. The people depend upon the services of their hospital. It has become an intimate part of the residents of the community. With hospital closure there would be tragic loss. Sick people requiring hospital and medical attention would face inconvenience and possible death due to further travel and delay. Sick people would face waiting lists in order to see a doctor and arrange for a bed in a larger hospital. There would be more crowding at the doctors' offices and larger hospitals. Experience and records show that waiting lists in hospitals situated in larger centres are from 30 to 90 days. It is difficult to understand here the Government's thinking with respect to accommodating greater number of patients in a lesser number of hospitals beds, when presently there is an acute shortage of hospital beds. Does the Government estimate that with the introduction of deterrent fees that less people will be admitted to the hospital or because of deterrent fees the people requiring hospital attention will take their recovery chances by remaining at home out of the hospital? How unchristian and inhuman can a Government get to be!

An Hon. Member: — You ain't seen nothing yet!

Mr. Matsalla: — The Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, following the October 11th election completely lost touch with the people. It no longer is interested in the health and welfare of the small community. It is very obvious that this Government believes that dollars are more important than the health of the people. I want to remind the House and this Government that the wealth of the community and province and national depends upon the health of its citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the closing of the small hospital would weaken the economic structure of the community. The immediate effect would be the loss of qualified professional people who are closely associated with the hospital, that is the doctors, the nurses, the druggists, technicians and other hospital workers. The loss of hospital services from the community would have a quick and direct effect on the volume of business conducted in that community. People would naturally tend to do their business in the larger town where they may be seeking the services of the doctor and the hospital. Hence the closing of certain businesses may follow. There is every possibility that with the change in the community service centre the educational set-up in the area would gradually be affected. There is likely to be a reduction in the student enrolment and a problem of obtaining qualified teachers. This Government should not overlook the fact that the hospital in the small community in many cases is what made the community what it is today. People, particularly the retired, the weak and old choose to live in a community where there are accessible doctor and hospital services. I submit, Sir, that before this Liberal Government acted upon its decision to close the hospital in any of the small communities it should have had enough modesty and courtesy to consult on this question with the local authorities concerned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — I am confident that in nearly all cases, if the Government used fair play and laid the facts on the table, suitable arrangements could have been made for the expected closure of the hospitals. But no, this Liberal Government chose to act in an arrogant and a high-handed manner, and dictated to the local hospital authority what will be done. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this Government displayed its complete disregard and neglect for local government authority. This kind of dictatorial action and hypocrisy, Sir, is most undesirable in our free society. I further submit, Sir, that the Government in closing a small community hospital should, as I indicated earlier, consult with the local hospital boards. In this consultation every effort should be made to plan for continued beneficial use of the closed hospital. As long as the Government is willing to co-operate in this direction, I feel confident that the local board along with the interested local organizations would be very reasonable in planning for alternate use of the hospital. In almost every case the hospital building is in good condition and its facilities could be made to provide uses other than a hospital.

I would like to at this time express appreciation to the Minister (Mr. Grant) that after due consideration he saw fit to approve conversion of the present old hospital in Canora for use of the first floor as a nursing home. It is noted that the space will provide for at least 20 to 30 beds.

It should be recognized, Sir, that the people in the community are really in the best position to help decide what the alternate use may be. They are the ones who know the community best. They are well acquainted with the economic and social conditions of the area and the health service requirements for the community. I, therefore, firmly believe that consultation with the local hospital authority is democratically mandatory and certainly most advisable if the greatest use is to be made of a closed hospital. I strongly feel, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendations of the original Resolution are worthy of consideration because they do furnish reasonable good guidelines for the Government to follow.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I look at the Resolution moved by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) then I looked at the amendment moved by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant). I think that anyone who looks at the amendment will reach the conclusion that the purpose of the Minister's amendment is transparent. The original Resolution dealt with a single problem, that of the closure of small hospitals. This is an important problem. We do not say that it is an easy problem. We do say that it is of importance and great concern to some 30 or 40 communities in this province. It is well worth receiving two or three hours of the time of this Legislature in some relatively concentrated consideration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The Resolution would have been a good opportunity for the Minister to make a definitive statement of Government policy on the matter. Instead, the Government has decided that it does not wish to discuss the matter of small hospitals in detail and

April 23, 1968

with precision. It would rather muddy up the waters by introducing an amendment which looks like a summary of the health programs of the Department of Public Health with a paragraph in the amendment to deal with every branch of the Department. Including in the amendment reference to such things as a centralized teaching program for nurses' training can have only one purpose, to divert attention from the very real problem of closing small hospitals.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) has criticized Members on this side of the House for being unwilling to state flatly that if we were the Government, we would or would not close this or that hospital. This, Mr. Speaker, is a specious criticism. We were the Government and we acted the way we did and our actions can be judged on that basis. It would be very easy for me to stand up here and say, "If we were the Government and if I were Minister of Public Health, I can assure you at Hodgeville that your hospital would be open." It would be very easy for me to do that. But it would similarly be irresponsible for me to do that. Clearly it is not the function of the Opposition to make decisions like this. It would be easy for us to take the irresponsible course which the Member for Cannington suggests. Now mind you, these are the tactics that the Liberal Opposition used when they were in Opposition. When the Liberals were in Opposition they were very free to state flatly . . . Mr. Speaker, the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) wants to put a question to me or to have the floor for a moment.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Member for Regina Centre for letting me interrupt him at this time. I want to welcome through you, Mr. Speaker, a group of grade four, five and six students from the village of Stornoway in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Knight and their bus driver. I am sure that all Members of the House will want to welcome them to the Chamber this morning and wish them a very pleasant stay in the city and all its points of interest, and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I join with the Member for Yorkton in welcoming our guests.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Back to the mean stuff.

Mr. Blakeney: — Now that the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Stuart) is in his chair, it certainly encourages that sort of approach, "Back to the mean stuff," he says.

I want to say that when he and his colleagues were in Opposition they didn't hesitate to go about assuring people flatly that if they were the Government no small hospital would be closed. I could go through all of the quotations which have been given before. However, I will just confine myself now due to the fact that the ex-Minister of Health is in his chair, simply to quoting the Hon. D.G. Stuart when he was Minister of Health. I'll leave the other quotations aside. But may I again quote the oft quoted one:

I don't think that the Government has the moral right to use the power of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to force these hospitals to close.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I have another great list of quotations. It may be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this is precisely the power that is being used.

Mr. Steuart: — Where?

Mr. Blakeney: — May I point out that the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) announced in December that the SHSP payments for eight hospitals would be cut off on April 1st. And my understanding is in fact up to this point, four closures have been accomplished.

Mr. Steuart: — None one!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) has changed the policy of the Government, but all I am saying is that, if he has a policy statement on the question of small hospitals, why didn't he stand up in his place and give it on this Resolution, instead of introducing an amendment which is designed to divert attention from this problem. If the Government has a definitive statement why doesn't it publish it? I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the previous Government on the question of small hospitals did have a definitive statement and did publish it. It has been quoted twice in this House. I won't quote it again. But we said what we were going to do and that's what we did.

I did not, when I was Minister of Health, engage in the practice of announcing that hospitals would be closed summarily and then from that point of advantage negotiate with the community, which is presumably the tactic engaged in by the Minister of Public Health. Either he meant his announcement in December or he didn't. If he meant it, it was grievously precipitous and if he did not mean it, it was a negotiating tactic totally unworthy of him. He has no position to take except one of those two positions. I prefer to believe that he meant it when he announced in December that benefits would be cut off in April. He announced this without consultation. I prefer to feel that the pressure of public opinion caused him to change his opinion. I hope that that's the case.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that we on this side of the House do not say that no small hospital should be closed. I have made my point clear on that and I won't take the time of the House again to reiterate our position.

Mr. Speaker, we are puzzled by the actions of the Government with respect to some of the new community hospitals which are referred to in the amendment by the Member for Regina South, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). Some small hospitals for which permission has been given to build new buildings, are the very kind which it is now argued should be closed. I want to make it clear that I am not necessarily criticizing these decisions to build small hospitals. I do not have all the facts. It is a fact, however, that for example, a new hospital was built

April 23, 1968

at Edam, which is 16 miles from Turtleford and approximately 40 miles from North Battleford. I ask the Minister to explain the rationale of why a hospital is built at Edam, which may be thoroughly justified, and why one is going to be closed at Maryfield or Hodgeville? This move by the Government was the subject of a laudatory editorial in the Leader-Post in August of 1967 entitled, "Edam's Happy Story." I think the significance of August, 1967 will not be missed by many. Because August was immediately prior to the announcement of an election. But by December 1967, instant austerity had come not only to the Department occupied by the Provincial Treasurer, but to the Department just vacated by him, the Department of Public Health. The Leader-Post of December 30th carried this news story:

Eight Saskatchewan hospitals will close this spring when Government payments to them will be discontinued. The hospitals are located at Frontier, Hodgeville, Maryfield, Willowbunch, Prelate, Leroy, Neudorf and Qu'Appelle.

Since that time there has been a good deal of public pressure. The Minister has issued an equivocating statement — and that's all I can call it. We still don't know what the Government policy is. Certainly, it did not give the assurance which the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) evidently feels should be given, or evidently feels that it is our job to give. Nor does it give the measure of assurance which we gave to these very hospitals when we were the Government. We didn't tell them, "Under no circumstances will you close." We did say, "Maybe it will be necessary to close a hospital and here are the things that will precede any closure. When those things start to happen you will know that closure is being considered."

The public and the people in these communities have a right to a full and clear statement of the policy of the Government with respect to small hospitals. I would have hoped that the Minister would have used this occasion to give us that statement. Instead, he has by this amendment drawn a whole netful of red herrings across the trail and wishes instead to talk about the Base Hospital at Regina and centralized teaching programs, the University Hospital at Saskatoon and about everything else except small hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, these are interesting topics and on the right occasion I would be perfectly happy to talk about the Base Hospital in Regina. But I am not going to talk about it now. I don't think that the Base Hospital in Regina or the centralized teaching program is uppermost in the minds of Hodgeville, or Leroy or Qu'Appelle. The public in these communities and all the other threatened communities are entitled to three things. I suggest this to you, Mr. Minister, the public are entitled to first, a clear and unequivocal policy statement from this Government; secondly, full and adequate notice and consultation before steps are taken to threaten their hospitals; thirdly, fair play in putting into effect the Government policy. Now first with respect to a policy statement; where does the Government stand with respect to the 1961 Hospital Survey Report? More particularly, where does it stand with respect to the closure of small hospitals? Well I ask how anyone can tell. We have had statement after statement from the previous Minister of Public Health and his Cabinet colleagues and I have already quoted the effect of these. We have had pronouncements to the effect that not only would the Government not use its power under SHSP to close small hospitals, but that it was morally reprehensible for it to do so. Then, without any indication that the Government was

even reconsidering this policy the meat-axe falls, the axe which was so carefully hidden during the last years of the first Thatcher term and which was taken out and sharpened immediately after October 11th.

This is simply not good enough. The public are entitled to a reasoned statement of Government policy of this major issue. Until there is such a statement of policy, acknowledged as such by the Minister and his colleagues, no one of the 40 communities threatened can rest secure. I say 40 because there are about 40 hospitals which are on the same lists as Maryfield, Neudorf, Qu'Appelle and the others, the lists in the Hospital Survey Committee Report.

Any Government is entitled to change its policy. What it is not entitled to do is change its policy without any advance warning and without advising the public and without announcing in clear and unmistakable terms its new policy.

The second thing that I think that the hospitals are entitled to is full and adequate consultation. The Minister, in introducing his amendment purports to commend the Government for its consultation with local hospital boards. To the extent that he has consulted them of course, we commend him too. We would commend him still more if this new devotion to consultation had not been so obviously extracted from him by an enraged public. His original announcement in December without consultation was inexcusable. No amount of sophistry or retroactive consultation can erase the fact that the Government opposite was prepared to close eight hospitals without any prior consultation with the communities involved.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If the Government has seen the error of its ways, so much the better. However, the public will be forgiven if they feel that the Government's belated conversion to the need for consultation came about only after the Legislature is in session and will last only as long as the Legislature is in session. The public will be forgiven if they believe that after the session the Government will once again resume its high-handed course of action of closing hospitals without consultation.

The Government can clear this up, it can issue a simple statement of policy, it can pledge itself to a policy of not closing any hospital without full consultation and it can advise each and every community concerned of the pledge of the Government.

Now the third thing that I said these hospitals are entitled to is fair play. The people in this communities concerned are entitled to an explanation from the Government of how it reaches its decisions of which hospital to close and which to rebuild. The Government issues a new and different reason with respect to closing small hospitals every time it is issued. We have heard stories to the effect that some or all of these hospitals are unsafe. In fact, the previous Minister, the Member for Prince Albert West has said on several occasions that some of these hospitals are a hazard to the patients. If he believed this, then it was his clear duty to close these hospitals under the provisions of The Hospital Standards Act. The Hospital Standards Act provides that the Minister can and has every right to close small hospitals which fail to come up to the standards

April 23, 1968

which he might prescribe. However, he did not have the courage to tell the people in these communities that their hospitals were not up to standard. In many communities the local people simply would have said, "Well, what do you want us to do and we will do it." This wouldn't have solved the Minister's problems. In many communities they would have taken appropriate steps to build the hospital up to standard. It was not the fact that the hospital was not up to standard, but the fact that the Minister wanted to save money which was the real reason for insisting on these hospital closures. Now I don't object to this. I just object to him saying that he wants to close a hospital because of standards when he really wants to save money. He had every right to close them based on standards and he didn't do it.

Mr. Stuart: — We rebuilt them! Now name some.

Mr. Blakeney: — Alright I am going to name some that he rebuilt and I am going to ask him the basis upon which he started to rebuild these and closed others. That is what I want him to tell me.

Mr. Stuart: — Name one that we closed.

Mr. Blakeney: — He wanted to save money. This is why he is unwilling to use his powers under The Hospital Standards Act. Instead he decided arbitrarily that he would cut off funds from the Hospital Services Plan. This the Minister decided, and this the Minister announced. No amount of chirping by the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Stuart) will erase that announcement.

Mr. Stuart: — Name one that we closed then. You are the chirper.

Mr. Blakeney: — From this sort of decision, no amount of diligence by a community in rebuilding its hospital or correcting any defects in the structure will save the hospital.

Mr. Stuart: — Name one.

Mr. Blakeney: — Now I want the Government to answer this question. If the people of Maryfield rebuild their hospital, is it safe from closure? Will it be closed or will it not be closed? Does it depend upon the quality of the hospital or does it depend upon some other criteria as yet unannounced? It is, therefore, not good enough for the Minister to hide behind the fact that some of the hospitals may not be up to standard. I think that without exception the communities would be only too willing to put their hospitals up to a proper standard. And certainly the standards cannot be all that bad or the Minister or the previous Minister would have closed the hospitals.

If the decisions are not made on the basis of hospital standards, on what basis are the decisions made? Many of these communities would like an answer to this question. I for one would like to know what standards the Government applied in deciding that Hospital A should be rebuilt, and Hospital B should be closed. I look at two hospitals such as Leroy and Spalding. Leroy is 15 miles from Watson, 40 miles from Lanigan, 45 miles from Humboldt. Spalding is 15 miles from Watson, 30 miles from Humboldt, 30 miles from Rose Valley. It seem to

me that on the basis of location, a case can be made for keeping both hospitals open or for closing both hospitals. What seems to be altogether remarkable is the decision that one hospital is to be rebuilt and the other closed. And this is what has been decided. Leroy will be closed and Spalding will be rebuilt. I would appreciate the Minister, if he enters this debate, explaining to us the basis upon which it was decided to rebuild Spalding and close Leroy. I can make exactly the same comparison with respect to Vanguard and Hodgeville. A case can be made for keeping each of these hospitals open. A case can be made for closing each of these hospitals. I think it is a bit weak as this case. What I would be very interested to hear are the arguments which led to rebuilding Vanguard and closing Hodgeville. I would hope that someone on the Government side would explain the logic by which it was decided that the hospital at Maryfield should be closed but, let's say, the hospital at Beechy or Midale should be rebuilt. I am not criticizing a construction of any particular hospital. I am just trying to get a grip on the criteria used in deciding that Hospital A should be closed and Hospital B shall be rebuilt. Every argument that the Minister advances to justify his intended closure of hospitals like Maryfield, Neudorf or Hodgeville could be applied with equal or greater force to some of the hospitals which the Government has decided to rebuild.

The suspicion lingers, Mr. Speaker, that the hospitals in question or some of them are not getting fair play. If they are getting fair play, then the Government should have no objection to making public for everyone to know the basis upon which it makes its decisions about whether a hospital should be rebuilt or closed.

I commend to Hon. Members the brief presented to the Department of Public Health by the citizens of Maryfield Union Hospital District. They list eight criteria which have been advanced as reasons why small hospitals should close; they apply these criteria to their own hospital, and they refute with considerable force the criteria as they apply to Maryfield. It seems to me that the people of Maryfield and the other communities threatened are entitled to know what criteria the Government used in selecting their hospital for closure. Unless the Government makes known its criteria, unless the Government advises these people and the public why these hospitals were selected for closure, there will be every reason to doubt whether or not the Government proposed to be fair and impartial in its decisions with respect to small hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is admittedly a serious one. The Government has created the problem by the arbitrary way in which it announced the closing of these eight small hospitals. These communities are alarmed. Some of them are less alarmed than they were before because of the apparent change of Government policy. Other communities are very uneasy. The future growth of these communities, the making of sensible planning decisions by individuals and organizations in these communities are being held up while the Government makes its position known. In many, many communities in this province there is apprehension and some fear about losing their hospital, apprehension spreading all the way from the apprehension of merchants that their business may be damaged to the apprehension of senior citizens that they may have readily available hospital care removed from them. These are natural apprehensions. The Government should see that they no longer continue to exist.

April 23, 1968

The Government should do three things. Firstly, it should issue without delay a clear policy statement setting out its policy with respect to small hospitals. This policy should set out with as much particularity as possible — and I am prepared to admit that there can't be perfect particularity — the criteria which will be applied in closing small hospitals. Secondly, the Government should give an undertaking that no hospital will be closed without the full and adequate consultation and study which I suggest the situation merits. Thirdly, the Government should give a clear and unequivocal undertaking that all hospitals will be treated fairly and equally, that the Government will not play favourites, and that the Government will advise the public the reasons for making a decision when a decision is made.

Mr. Speaker, I don't object to the items mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Grant in his amendment. How could anyone object to this? It would be like objecting to motherhood. Who could object to the extension of the university Hospital in Saskatoon? Or the new centralized teaching program for nurses? I want, Mr. Speaker, to go along with the comments made by the Minister of Public Health, on his diversionary Resolution because I don't want to dispute the eminently worthy and estimable items he mentioned in these comments. But I do want to suggest that some of the ideas contained in my remarks are worthy of a decision by this House and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move as a subamendment, seconded by the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) that the period in Clause (f) of the amendment be deleted and that the following words be added to the amendment.

And urges the Government forthwith to give firm written assurance to communities with small community hospitals that no small hospital will be closed by action of the Government unless:

- (a) there has been adequate prior consultation with the hospital board concerned,
- (b) adequate notice has been given, which notice should ordinarily be at least 10 months,
- (c) that there are proper and convenient alternative hospital facilities available to residents of these communities,
- (d) that closure will mean an improvement in the overall level of hospital services available to residents of these communities, and,
- (e) that special studies have been made into problems the hospital closure in a particular community would create in retaining a doctor in the community, in giving service to senior citizens in the area in related matters, and the results of such studies are made available to the communities concerned.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order! May I draw to your attention to the fact that a subamendment is supposed to be offered for the purpose of strengthening the amendment. I now draw your attention to the subamendment which has been moved by the Member for Regina Centre and seconded by the Member for Moose Jaw South.

Now I want to draw your attention to the original motion which I quote in part, "That this Assembly recommends to the Government that no community hospitals be closed etc." I refer now once more to the subamendment. Section (a) says, "unless

there has been adequate prior consultation with the hospital board concerned.” This is a duplication of section (b) of the original motion which says as follows: “without prior consultation with hospital boards and communities affected.” Section (b) of the subamendment says “unless adequate notice has been given, which notice should ordinarily be at least 10 months.” This is a duplication of section (c) of the original motion which states: “without a minimum of 12 months notice.” Subsection (c) of the subamendment says “unless there are proper and convenient alternative hospital facilities available to residents of these communities.” This would appear to me to be a duplication of section (a) of the original motion which says “until it has been conclusively established that alternate services will be available on a year-round basis.” Subsection (b) of the subamendment would appear to be entirely new. Subsection (e) of the subamendment would appear to be a duplication of subsection (e) of the original motion. Inasmuch as a large part of the subamendment is a duplication of a large part of the original motion, and because if one part of a motion is out of order it makes the whole motion out of order. I rule the subamendment to be out of order.

Debate continued on the amendment.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I’ll try to be rather brief on this. I wish to deal in some detail both with the Resolution and with the amendment proposed. You will notice that the Resolution asks that this Assembly recommends to the Government that no community hospitals be closed. It then outlines the conditions that must be met before a hospital is closed, such as to establish an alternative service, have prior consultation, without a minimum notice of twelve months until a thorough study has been conducted into the needs of affected constituencies, including the concentration of senior citizens in the area, travel conditions and distance from alternate hospital services and other pertinent factors. This is what they want to limit the discussion to, they don’t want to consider the amendment, because the amendment is broader. The amendment commends the Government for not closing small community hospitals until alternative service is available on a year-round basis. I listened to the Member from Regina Centre and I noticed how carefully he skated around the closing of hospitals. We asked him to name one hospital which this Government has closed. He didn’t name one, not a one did he name. He can’t name one, Mr. Speaker, because the records of this Government reveal that not one hospital in Saskatchewan has been closed through any pressure of SHSP. Not one. Now he makes another statement and I wish he were here. He’s one of these fellows you know that gets up with a great pomposity and righteousness and delivers a speech and then scuttles out of the Chamber. I want to answer a few more of the things he said. He said, “What is the criterion upon which you build hospitals? Who decides where you are going to put the hospital? Who decides when you are going to close one?” Then he says the former Minister of Health went up and down and discredited these hospitals calling them fire traps. They were fire traps, he said. He said this was a discredit to these communities who worked so long and diligently to build up health services in the community. The best the Minister could say is they were fire traps and a disgrace to the community. He left it at that. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to say. Why didn’t he complete the story? It is true, the former Minister at that time said they were fire traps. He named them, the

April 23, 1968

Doddsland hospital built in 1913, the Beechy hospital 40 years old, one door in a frame building. If they had had a fire, you couldn't get a patient out at all. Goodsoil, exactly the same condition. Edam, exactly the same condition. These were fire traps, these were unsafe to even put people in. What happened? Doddsland rebuilt a new hospital; Beechy, the fire trap was torn down and a new hospital rebuilt; Goodsoil, the fire hazard eliminated and a hospital to replace it; Edam, fire-trap gone, Edam today has another new hospital. These are the actions this Government has taken in regard to hospitals. Where these were a fire hazard and a danger to the sick people of those communities, they have been replaced with new hospitals to serve those areas. Then he asks: what are your criteria for closing hospitals? What are your criteria for building hospitals? He says we should have a definitive policy and the people should know what this definitive policy is. I ask him: what was his definitive policy when he was Minister of Health? What was his policy with regard to these fire-trap hospitals which I spoke about, which he thought was a dastardly thing for the Minister to be going around the Province saying that these hospital were fire traps? What was his definitive policy in regard to closing hospitals?

I notice the 1961 report prepared for the Government. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the day and the Minister particularly did not even attempt in any way to indicate that this was a Government report. He didn't indicate who the authors were and who asked them to prepare the report. It didn't want to claim parentage for this report at all. You couldn't find any information from any Government department, particularly the Minister, as to whose report it was, and what action they were taking on the report. They didn't take one bit of action on that report, either to say that it had some good recommendations or that it was a bad report or an indifferent report. When the people of those days asked about these hospitals that were listed to be closed, what was their answer? Did they have a definitive policy? Did the then Minister say over a certain number of years, this hospital, this one and this one will be closed? No! Did he say we propose to close Prelate hospital in one year's time, or two years' time? Did he say anything about closing these hospitals? No, he did not. Neither did he give them a commitment that the hospitals would be kept open. He left everything as it was. That was his definitive policy of those days. Now he says you should have definitive policy which says you should have consultation with the local boards. They should have full and adequate notice and he says you know there should be fair play between these hospitals. I want to come to these eight hospitals, because there is one in my constituency and I am conversant with it. He is trying again desperately to stir up an issue to cause fear and uncertainty, not in the minds of those people, those eight hospitals, but in the minds of all other small hospital districts in this province. This is what he is attempting to do.

Where do these hospitals now stand? Not one of these hospitals has been closed, as the result of Government action. Let me tell you this that the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has been out to each and every one of these communities. He has sat down with the hospital board, he has met with the people of the community, he has sat down and discussed alternative uses, how we could bring better medical care to these communities, where we could integrate them into an overall policy, in which we could give quality rather than some quantitative care. This is what he has been busy doing and there is not a hospital board or any one of the eight that the Minister

has not been personally with them. Each hospital board that he sits down with is negotiating an arrangement which will be to the greatest advantage of that particular community. What may be of advantage to this community in point A may not be of advantage to the community in point B. So you can't have a uniform policy in regard to each hospital. I'm going to tell him how far these negotiations have gone.

For two hospitals, negotiations have been completed satisfactorily, in which the type of service which has been established with them has met with the satisfaction of the people and they are getting the type of service now that they have agreed to as in the interests of the community that they are serving. We come to two other hospitals, two hospitals near together, both are older hospitals. The question arises: what one are you going to close or are you going to close both? Now the Minister here again has been out and has been negotiating with both hospital boards. They have agreed to set up a committee, I think it was with Judge Hughes if my memory serves me correctly, as chairman of the committee, who will look into these two towns and their hospital needs and will recommend a location for a single new unit hospital that will serve both these areas. How is that not consultation? Is that not looking after problems? Is that not working hand in hand with the local communities to improve the hospital services which they are receiving at the present time? I think the Opposition had just cause, Mr. Speaker, to not want the amendment, because they want to restrict the realm of discussion to these particular eight hospitals. They don't want the amendment, because they want to restrict the realm of discussion to these particular eight hospitals. They don't want the people to know about the provisions for the extension of the University Hospital in Saskatoon. They don't want the people to know about the Minister's plans for instituting the new and centralized teaching programs for nurses' training. They don't want the people to know about the Base Hospital plans for southern Saskatchewan in Regina. They don't want the people to know these things. They just want to create and continue a state of fear in the minds of every small hospital that they may be the next one that this Government will move in on.

Let me assure you of this that this is the Minister's approach to the closing of these hospitals. Every one of the hospitals which were listed for closing within a reasonable period of time will have alternate services that meet with the approval of the community. Others will be replaced, instead of two small hospitals, with one more centrally located hospital constructed to better standards, giving a greater improved health service to the whole area than the two smaller hospitals were doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — When this is over, not one hospital district will be without hospital and medical services.

It's fine to talk and criticize. They say, oh, but there is some reason, something can be said for closing these hospitals. No doubt some of them need closing, but what did they do? Look at their record. I am told and we in the Government are told and the local hospital boards are vocal in telling it that with the two Ministers of Health that this Government has had, almost every small hospital in Saskatchewan, has been personally visited by the Minister, something that never occurred in 20 years under the CCF. They tell us that with the former Minister, if you got an appointment with him at all after months, you

April 23, 1968

didn't get an answer to your question. Not one of these boards was able to come in and sit down and find out what was going to happen to them. They tell us again neither hr nor the other fellows interested themselves in coming into the local communities and visiting the hospital board, to ask: how are things going? I'd like to go through your hospital and see what it looks like. I'd like to see it! Never, never were they out to visit a small hospital, and if they did, I'd like them to stand up and name one or two, because we haven't been able to find out from the boards. They sit in their ivory tower here and talk about hospitals and the injustices that this Minister is supposedly doing to these small hospitals in Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, the small hospitals today recognize there is a hospital problem, they recognize that changes are necessary. The only thing that they are asking is that during this period of change that their local hospital services be not disrupted too quickly without sufficient planning and care, that they be replaced by other types of services of advantage in many respects of greater advantage to the community than what they enjoyed before. This is precisely the policy that the Minister is following. This matter of closing of the eight hospitals will shortly be a thing of the past. This debate has been a desperate attempt to resurrect it, not because they think they are working in the interest of these eight hospitals, but to transpose and extend that fear to the other small hospitals in the province. That was the purpose of this Resolution, no other reason for it. This is why they were opposed to the amendment showing this and the facts of what the Minister of Health has been doing for hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is a creditable record and as time goes on, we will see the concrete results of this man's efforts in looking after the hospital needs of the local areas as well as the total complex of quality hospital care for the Province of Saskatchewan. It is for this reason that I take pleasure in supporting the amendment which commends the Minister and this Government for their actions in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I can assure the Member who has just taken his seat that we on this side of the House are not going to hold our breath waiting for the actions of the Hon. Minister of Health. If we were to hold our breath, I don't think we would last very long. But I can also assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention of rivalling the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) in the verbosity or loudness or even in clarity of expression that he has displayed this morning. Any time that the Government opposite gets into a jack-pot, Mr. Speaker, gets into a fix regarding policy, the Hon. Member for Maple Creek jumps into the breach and with loud words and a manner which is more fitting to a pulpit, tries to hold the fort for the o opposite. I thought probably this was coming, Mr. Speaker, when I saw the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) over in the seat next to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) getting all the latest information regarding visits which the Minister of Health made to hospitals throughout the province, these eight hospitals in the province the Minister has visited, since December 30th, not prior to December 30th. Now the Minister of Mineral Resources gets up and tells us what a wonderful man this Minister of Health is, that he is able to do all these things now, after pressure has been put on him by local hospital boards and by the Opposition here. What a contrast to the dictatorial manner in which he acted before December 30th, 1967!

Mr. Speaker, sometime later in my remarks, I hope to get down to discussing the amendment and the Resolution which have been presented. Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that last December 30th, was indeed a black day. It was a forerunner of the black day which we had March 1st, here in the House. On December 30th last, Mr. Speaker, eight hospital districts in the Province were shocked, shocked not by the visit of a Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health came around to visit them after December 30th. They were not shocked by his visit, but they were shocked by his announcement, announcement that hospitals were to be closed without consultation. This came as a very great shock to the Member for Maple Creek, who heard of one of his hospitals being closed. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Member for Maple Creek was leaving the Chamber, but I see he is just going around for another consultation. I am sorry to have brought his name in because I am sure he wasn't shocked. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Maple Creek knew all about what was coming, even though his people, his hospital people had no idea what was going to come before December 30th. He knew the hospitals were being closed, he had been consulted. But did he tell the people in his district, in his hospital area that their hospital was to be closed? Oh no! The officials of his hospital district inserted an advertisement in the Leader-Post, sometime after December 30th, protesting the closing of their hospital. They mentioned that their local Member, Mr. Speaker, assured them that their hospitals were not to be closed. The Member from Maple Creek is one of those people who assured his hospital board they're performing a worthwhile service in their community and that their hospital would not be closed. After December 30th, the Minister of Health goes around and visits the hospital, assures them that he is interested in them, interested in the democratic procedure. But before December 30th, neither the Minister of Health, nor the Minister of Mineral Resources thought enough about democratic procedures to consult with the local hospital board regarding the closure of their hospital. But on December 30th, the Provincial Government announced that grants to hospitals in those eight communities would be curtailed, not a year later, Mr. Speaker, not six months later, but three months later. Hospital boards had to work quickly in order to save their hospitals. They had to put pressure on the Government, they had to put pressure on their local Member. The people in the Maple Creek constituency whose hospitals were being closed had to put pressure on their local Member — if he dared to go back into his constituency after December 30th. He probably would be able to go back now because he said the Minister of Health has visited the hospitals, he has talked with the hospital officials regarding their problem. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, that it is too bad that the Minister of Health didn't find it necessary to consult with these people even by telephone, prior to December 30th last. Now he can go around to visit them, because of the pressure which was being put on by local hospital boards and by the Opposition in this Legislature. This Government didn't believe in local consultation, prior consultation with local bodies before December 30th. The Member for Maple Creek can get up in this House now and make a good fellow of the Minister and say this is the first time a him has darkened a door in some of these hospitals. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that he did after the action which he took last December 30th. Last Dec 30th the Government acted with its usual meat-axe unilateral approach re-this matter of life and death to many smaller hospitals. The people in the communities of Gravelbourg, Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, Humboldt, Shaunavon, Maple Creek, and Melville know just what

April 23, 1968

happened last December 30th, . . . I should mention Cannington, this is right — I'm sorry the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is not in his seat at the present time, a Member who sits in his seat most of the time, but finds it necessary during this debate to absent himself from the Chamber. I am sorry, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) is camouflaging the fact that the Member for Humboldt has seen it necessary to absent himself from the Chamber too. But I recognize the broad back of the Member for Nipawin across the way. The Member for Nipawin is in the fortunate position of having no small hospital closed, but he is still across in the seat of the Member for Humboldt with his back to us here, making us believe that the Member for Humboldt is very much interested in the problem of closing smaller hospitals.

Then the Minister of Mineral Resources talks about the fear which is being spread abroad by the action of the Opposition. We want to spread fear of what is going to happen he says. Mr. Speaker, we don't have to spread fear. The people of the Province of Saskatchewan know what is going to happen, they found out last December 30th, Mr. Speaker, of Mineral Resources, and the hospital officials in your constituency found out. They found out in spite of the fact that you told them that their hospital would not be closed as it was performing a worthwhile service. The Minister of Health on December 30th spread the fear which erupted in your constituency, not the people in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. We are now assured that democratic procedure is followed by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). I want to congratulate him if it is true, as the Minister of Mineral Resources so loudly expressed this morning, that the Minister of Health has visited every one of these hospitals trying to allay the fears which erupted last December 30th. Two of these communities which were frightened, fearful of what was going to happen, favoured me with resolutions following December 30th. The communities of Leroy and Maryfield sent me copies of the resolutions which they presented to the Government protesting the action of the Government opposite. Both of these hospitals, Mr. Speaker, are in Government Member' seats. Both are absent at the present time from the Chamber. As I mentioned earlier, the Member for Nipawin is holding down the Member for Humboldt's seat the Member for Cannington has seen fit to leave the Chamber during this debate. He is probably phoning to find out if any other of his constituents is demanding his resignation because of the fact that he misled them into thinking that this hospital, the hospital of Maryfield would not be closed. The Minister of Mineral Resources who has just left the Chamber hasn't informed us whether or not his resignation was requested.

Both these briefs from the Leroy Community Hospital and the Maryfield Community Hospital stressed the effect that the closure of a community hospital would have on the community and the individuals in the community. Leroy's brief termed the effect of the closing of its hospital as a cancerous annihilation of their rural life. If this doesn't express fear, Mr. Speaker, felt by these people as the cancerous annihilation of our rural life, then I don't know what fear means. The Minister of Health was responsible, Mr. Speaker, for this fear which is expressed by the people from Leroy and the people of Maryfield at the closing of their hospitals.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — George, I'll buy your lunch if you quite now!

Mr. Willis: — The Member for Souris-Estevan is only too anxious to make speeches, Mr. Speaker, from his seat. While the Member opposite are making speeches from their place he would do anything possible to try and keep people from speaking. But I am sure that I'm not in that much need of a meal, Mr. Speaker, that I should sit down at this time in order to join my healthy friend across the way at a meal downstairs. It seems to me that during this debate, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) has gotten up in his place and has expressed some of the fear which his constituents felt over the closing of Maryfield. He has assured them again that everything is going to be alright, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is going to go around and visit them. He is going to give them more than three months to make up their mind whether their hospital will be closed or not. But I must point out that the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker), who is not in his seat at the present time, has not seen fit to rise in this Chamber yet and defend the Government on this action of closing the hospital at Leroy. I am glad to hear the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) this morning get up and tell us that the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) is now rectifying the mistake he made last December 30th and is going around consulting with these people as to the best method to meet the problem which they have regarding the small hospitals remaining open.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Legislature, and as a part of the democratic system of government in Saskatchewan, I am convinced that the people in these small communities affected by their closure or announced closure of last December, have a strong case as to why their hospitals should not be closed. But I am even more convinced that they have a stronger case in their rights to be consulted and to play a part in the making of a decision, the results of which affect their communities so vitally. I want to congratulate the Minister of Health, who is now going around trying to rectify the mistakes that he made. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he is to be congratulated going around and actually visiting these hospitals, seeing just what shape the hospital is in and consulting with the hospital boards before he takes such drastic action as cutting off their grant and forcing them to close with a three-month notice.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that every citizen in Saskatchewan is concerned over the democratic rights and procedures, and every citizen who is concerned over the democratic rights and procedures has cause to be alarmed over the dictatorial actions of this Government prior to December 30, 1967. This is even more true that the actions of our elected Member are at variance with their words of reassurance which tended to lull many communities into a false sense of security. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) has now returned to the Chamber and he is hiding in the aisle over there and he is not in his seat listening to the debate or getting ready to take part in the debate. I would advise the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) to vacate the chair of the Member for Humboldt so that he can be ready to take part in this debate and assure the people of Leroy that he is concerned about their problems caused by the December 30th announcement of the Minister of Health.

The five communities which were affected by the December 30th announcement by the Minister of Health inserted a large ad in the Leader-Post on February 2nd, Mr. Speaker. The ad

April 23, 1968

states emphatically that the Minister of Health was not around to see them before December 30th. The ad states that there was no prior consultation with any of the local hospital boards. In fact many of the people in the community heard of the announcement, and this includes the officials of the hospital board, Mr. Speaker, either by radio or by reading the announcement in the local paper. The ad goes on, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the most condemnatory feature of the ad was that public assurance was given by Government Member prior to December 30, 1967, that small hospitals performed an important function and would not be closed. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the ad was referring to the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker), the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), who was so loud in his praise of the actions of the Minister of Health since December 30th. But these people before December 30, 1967, Mr. Speaker, assured the people of this province, the people of their constituency, that their hospitals were performing services which they couldn't do without, important services, and assured them that their hospitals would not be closed. And then on December 30th the Minister of Health without prior consultation, without visiting the hospitals to see what condition they were in, announced that the hospitals would be closed as of April 1st. Either the MLAs were not consulted by the Government prior to December 30th or they gave assurances with their tongues in their cheeks, Mr. Speaker, if the Government did not consult the back benchers, if they did not bring this matter up in caucus, then the Government was at fault even acting more dictatorially than I thought it could act. And if the back benchers opposite knew that the hospitals were to be closed, if they were giving assurances to the hospital boards knowing that this was so, then they are to be condemned as much or even more so than the Members of the Government.

Those responsible for making the decision, the Members of the Cabinet, set the example for their supporters by speaking one way and acting another. In April 1964, it was stated that Mr. Thatcher said that despite the large number of hospital beds in major centres, there were still long waiting lists of beds in major centres, there were still long waiting lists of people seeking treatment. And Mr. Thatcher said that it would not make sense to close the small hospitals under these conditions. Mr. Speaker, how times do change! In 1964, they speak one way and in 1967 have the Minister of Health act another way. In the Star Phoenix of February 23, 1965, the then Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) — an election took place and we had a new Minister of Health in 1965, Mr. Speaker, - was reported as rejecting recommendations for closing or converting 50 of Saskatchewan's small community hospitals. The Hon. Minister said, "I don't think the Government has a moral right to use the powers of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to force these hospitals to close." Now we have a new Minister who doesn't believe that.

Mr. Steuart: — Name one we closed.

Mr. Willis: — The Minister of Health now said that eight were to be closed last December. Now I admit, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that the Minister is going around visiting the hospitals, or at least we had the assurance of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) that the Minister of Health was going around visiting these hospitals, assuring them that they will

not be closed without prior consultation. But it was too bad, as I mentioned earlier, that he didn't go around and assure them before December 30th. But he drops his bombshell on the community December 30th. A bombshell which says, "I don't care about your community, we can have a cancerous annihilation of any community which depends upon a smaller hospital." He cares now! That is right. It's too bad though that he hadn't cared before December 30th and it is too bad that he hadn't come into this Legislature and told the Members of this Legislature that he was contemplating taking such action. In the place of this he tells the people in small constituencies that their hospital is to be closed in three months.

Liberal words, Mr. Speaker, are one thing; Liberal actions are another. Sometimes before the election they are one thing and often after an election they are another thing. Sometime after one election they use words of one meaning and after a second election, words of a different meaning.

However, Mr. Speaker, so great was the reaction of the announcement by the Minister on December 30th, that the Government decided to reconsider its decision and I admit it was about time that this reconsideration was given. I am convinced that all that has been granted is a short reprieve, plus of course a visit by the Minister of Health to the hospitals which he had condemned to a three month death. It looks like this is just a short reprieve, that the Government made up its mind last December and the consultation underway will prove to be mere window dressing, window dressing with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) putting in an appearance at the door of these hospitals and saying to the local boards, "I am sorry that I hadn't consulted you prior to December 30th, but I am around now to look into the situation to see whether or not your hospital should be closed, see whether or not your hospital is a fire-trap, see whether or not your hospital is necessary to furtherance of our health programs in Saskatchewan." It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that he hadn't seen fit to go around before December 30th.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think that this amendment which has been offered to the Resolution is mere window dressing, that the Government is not concerned about the real problems which are facing the people in the smaller communities, in particular the eight smaller hospitals. The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) is one of the Members who has a hospital in this constituency which, as announced by the Minister of Health last December, was going to be closed. The Member for Melville is taking action here by bringing before this Assembly concrete proposals of what the Government should do. As the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned this morning, we are not opposed on this side of the House to closing of a hospital, if that closure is warranted, if the Minister goes around and visits the hospital board, if he sees for himself that these things should be. The Member for Melville has laid out five different items here which should be taken into consideration before any community hospital is closed.

Mr. MacDougall: — George must be trying to . . .

Mr. Willis: — The Member for Souris-Estevan, Mr. Speaker, thinks of nothing but his stomach, and I am sure that it is in a position where he can't help but notice that he has a stomach.

April 23, 1968

But as I was mentioning before the Member for Souris-Estevan so rudely interrupted me, the Member for Melville has said that no community hospitals should be closed until it has been conclusively established that alternate services will be available on a year-round basis. Now before December 30th there was no concern about this by the Members opposite. Hospitals were to be closed. They were to be closed with only a three-month notice. The Member for Melville has said that he would not object to community hospitals being closed but that there should be prior consultation with hospital boards and the community affected. I want to congratulate the Minister for taking the steps since this motion was introduced, after the hospital boards began to raise such a fuss throughout the province, to call on these boards and assure them that he is concerned about what is happening.

The third part of the motion introduced by the Member for Melville says that no hospital should be closed without a minimum of 12-months' notice, twelve months, Mr. Speaker, not three months as announced by the Minister without consultation back on December 30th.

Then the next part of the motion says that until alternate use had been found for hospitals which are structurally sound and in a good state of repair. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is possible with the great need that has been stressed on this side of the House for hospitals and beds for people who need hospital care on the long-term basis.

The last part of the Melville Member's Resolution states "until a thorough study has been conducted into need of an affected community, including the concentration of senior citizens in the area, travel conditions, and distance from alternate hospital services and other pertinent factors." Surely, Mr. Speaker, 12 months is a minimum time to look into the items which are mentioned here, twelve-months' notice to any hospital, that the Minister will call around and his Department will consult with them and they will see what can be done regarding their hospital before they give notice that the hospital must be closed.

Then we come to the amendment which has been proposed by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted. He doesn't believe in 12-months' notice. He doesn't believe that there should be alternate services on a year-round basis. He doesn't believe that there should be prior consultation even though now he is going around talking to the local hospital boards, putting in an appearance and inspecting their facilities. He doesn't believe these things because he says, "All of this motion presented by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) must be ruled out." And in place of that he starts the amendment with the word, "commends the Government" for first, "not closing small community hospitals until alternate services are available on a year-round basis."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the height of hypocrisy. Here is a Minister sitting over there who last December said hospitals must be closed in three months' time. He said it without prior consultation. He said it without looking into the situation. He wasn't concerned whether or not the community disintegrated. But now he commends the Government. For what? For not closing small hospitals until alternate service is

available on a year-round basis. Well, all I have to say is that he has been converted and converted quote recently, and not converted, I should say by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) who got up this morning and commended the Minister for since December 30th visiting these local hospitals and probably condoned the action of the Minister in giving three-months' notice, now 12-months' notice. I think that the Member for Maple Creek should have been condemning the Minister when he made the announcement last December 30, that there was no alternate use for the hospitals, that they were to be closed, period, come April 1st. Section (b) commends the Government for rebuilding several of those community hospitals. Some of these rebuilt community hospitals were mentioned this morning, certainly none of the eight which were affected by the announcement of December 30th.

Section (c) commends the Government for consulting with the hospital boards and considering community interest in any proposals for closing community hospitals. This is quite a concession, Mr. Speaker. Since December 30th the Minister has consulted with local boards. Prior to December 30th last, there was no consultation and evidently no intention of consultations. The meat-axe approach was in evidence. The people in the various districts rose up in arms and the Members of the Opposition rose up in arms with the result that the Minister since has consulted. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is quite a concession for the Government opposite.

Then again section (d) commends the Government for making provision for a large additional hospital for Regina to serve southern Saskatchewan. All I can say here, Mr. Speaker, is one word, when? And the people of southern Saskatchewan want to know too, when this hospital is going to be started. It is one thing to put money into a suspense account to be held over next year, or the next year, or the year after, but, even when this hospital is started, it will probably be five to ten years before it is used.

Mr. Grant: — Three to five years.

Mr. Willis: — Three to five years, then, Mr. Minister. I can remember going by a hospital in Calgary about 15 years ago. The structure was all up. I went by it again in 10 years and the structure was still standing there and it was still not in use. Now, if the Minister is going to have the hospital operating here in five years, it is not going to be a very large one. I know that the Minister promised this three years ago. This means eight years altogether since the time it was promised until it is fulfilled. Probably the people of Regina and southern Saskatchewan would be pleased if it would be available in eight years. But, I, Mr. Speaker, have to be shown in regard to this.

Then the Minister commends the Government for providing for an extension at the University Hospital in Saskatoon. Commendations are in order, Mr. Speaker, for the Government opposite for doing this. But again we ask the question: when will this be available? And section (f) commends the Government for instituting the new and centralized teaching program for nurses' training. Well I too want to commend the Government for all of these things which the Government is now doing, Mr. Speaker. But it seems to me that there are some things lacking from the list of commends. We could also add a (government) part here, commends the Government for the new tax on the sick, Mr. Speaker. This is

April 23, 1968

lacking. Why didn't the Minister have this here? We have a tax on the sick, deterrent fee, which is going to keep people out of hospital. It will say to the people, "You can't go to those hospitals unless you pay an extra deterrent fee." This would have made a very good addition to this list of commends.

Then we could also have had another one, (House) would be the next one, commends the Government for announcing that there is going to be a drug program in Saskatchewan for announcing the same in 1964, for announcing again in 1967 that it would have a plebiscite to institute a drug plan. There seems to me to be something lacking in the commends. The Government is to be commended for making such an announcement. Liberal words, Mr. Speaker! This is what the people of Saskatchewan expect from the Liberal Government opposite.

Then in section (i) we could have commended the Government for its concern regarding dental care for the people of Saskatchewan. Surely the Liberals have talked about this. Surely this is coming. Surely the Minister of Health could have included this in his list of commends. But he didn't Mr. Speaker. I say that it's too bad that he hadn't given the full story regarding the situation here. I am sure that the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) would have mentioned this, if he had only thought of it this morning, that he could have added it the list of commends which the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) had introduced here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make way for the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) and the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Laroche), the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane), the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), who I am sure would be up in this House and echo the words of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that they are very pleased that the Minister of Health has changed his mind about closing hospitals with three-months' notice, that he has gotten around to visiting their hospitals, that he has gotten around to consulting with the hospital boards. I want to make way for these people to get up in their places and commend the Government for what they are doing in health here in the province. I could have also added another, section (j) could have commended the Government for the action that it took in furthering our mental health program in Saskatchewan. And (k) probably commend the Government for bringing in Dr. Frazier during the election campaign so that this whole sorry state of our mental program would have been withdrawn from the political arena prior to election time.

I want to finish now, Mr. Speaker, by moving a subamendment to the amendment which has been brought in by the Minister of Public Health, seconded by the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff). that the following words be added to the amendment:

But regrets the public statement the Minister of Health made on December 30, 1967, with respect to hospital closing.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER ON RESCISSION OF A MOTION

Mr. Speaker: — Just before I look at the clock. I have now found what I am looking for when we were talking about the rescission of a motion. I draw your attention to Citation 162 of Beauchesne's

Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

Technically indeed, the rescinding of a vote is a matter of a new question; the form being to read the resolution of the house and to move that it be rescinded.

That is what Beauchesne says, but Bourinot says the same thing much better, on page 329:

Circumstances, however, may arise to render it necessary that the house should reconsider its previous judgment on a question, and in that case there are means afforded by the practice of parliament of again considering the matter. Orders of the house are frequently discharged and resolutions rescinded.

I want the House to remember this passage particularly.

But when a question has once been negatived, it is not allowable to propose it again.

Now you can move for the rescission of a motion and decide that the House shall not do what it previously had decided to do; but if a motion is negatived you can't move for the rescission of negative vote. That is the position that they found themselves in Ottawa a little while

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat reluctant to rise in this Legislature to speak on the motion that was moved respecting hospital closing, but I was prompted to change my decision after the Hon. Minister for Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) rose prior to adjournment and to speak on the sub-amendment that was moved by the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale.

The sub-amendment before us is very brief, Mr. Speaker. It condemns the Minister of Public Health and the Government for the announcement that was made by the Department through the Minister on December 30th in respect to the closing of some eight hospitals in small communities in the province. I have a clipping, Mr. Speaker, dated January 2, 1968, probably a press release shortly after the Minister had made his press release in respect to the closing of eight hospitals. It is titled, "Eight hospitals to close in the spring." This is from the Star Phoenix, Mr. Speaker, dated January 2nd, 1968. The article in the press release says this:

The hospitals are, Frontier, Hodgeville, Maryfield, Willowbunch, Prelate, Leroy, Neudorf and Qu'Appelle.

These are the eight hospitals mentioned. Hon. Members are aware that the Hospital Survey Committee that brought in a report to the CCF Government had a longer list slated for closure or alternate use, than the eight mentioned. Some hospitals were slated for closure, others were slated for conversion or alternate use. Many hospitals were in this same category. One of the hospitals so slated was in my constituency, namely the Lady Minto hospital in the village of Edam. The Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned that the Turtleford hospital is only 16 miles away, the hospital at North Battleford, now the Union Hospital of North Battleford, is over 30 miles away. Here was a hospital that was slated for closing and has been rebuilt by the Government. Hon. Members will remember that during one of the debates the Minister of Public Health mentioned that it rebuilt the Edam hospital that was slated for

April 23, 1968

closure. I suspect that the only reason for the rebuilding of this hospital was not because the Government and the Minister of Public Health wanted a hospital in Edam, but it was rebuilt because the Government did not want me to be back in this Legislature. On August 5, 1967, appeared in the Leader-Post, this article, Edam's happy story. I know the story behind the concern of the residents and the people of my community and the municipality of Turtle River in respect to the closing of the hospital, I know the people were concerned. When the Hospital Survey Report was presented to the Government, the people of the Edam area approached me as a Member with a committee from Edam. I met the then Minister of Public Health, the Hon. Member for Regina Centre with a delegation representing this community, headed by the now doctor of the new hospital. The then Minister assured the delegation that as long as Lady Minto hospital and the community were able to retain the service of a qualified doctor, there was no threat by the CCF Government of closing this hospital.

I want to turn to this press release here, Edam's happy story, and of course I must give credit to the people of Edam and community for raising a substantial amount of ready cash. I want to congratulate the Minister for rebuilding the hospital at Edam as a Centennial project. I had also mentioned in the course of one of my previous remarks that my regret is over the fact that the hospital at Edam was not rebuilt to the standards to which a hospital of similar bed rating at Rabbit Lake was rebuilt under the CCF Government. I stated that at the time the announcement was made on January 2nd, and immediately two or three days later, the echo for the present Government, the Saskatoon Star Phoenix in its editorial of January 5th, some three days later, tried to justify the action of the present Government for the closing of the eight hospitals I mentioned. I want to read part of this editorial from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, of January 5th, 1968.

While the closing of eight small hospitals in this province will be regretted, especially by the local citizenry most concerned, health programs must march with the times.

The editorial further down which I want to equate to the situation at Edam refers in terms of distances to other similar facilities or facilities with more adequate provision for care.

Distances, even the 28 miles referred to by J.H. Reed, Chairman of the Maryfield hospital is no longer a limited factor, that is if there is another hospital within a distance of 28 miles. This is no factor. Edam Lady Minto hospital is only 16 miles from a hospital at Turtleford.

There is the Star Phoenix that re-echoes the thinking of the Government and of the Health Department. However this is not the way these communities took the announcement released by the Minister and the Department of Public Health.

Mr. MacDougall: — Question ?

Mr. Michayluk: — Not yet, I'm not quite ready, Mr. Speaker. On January 13th, 1968, this appeared. "Little hope offered to rural hospitals at Regina meeting." In other words when the communities and the people of the communities became incensed by the

releases and when they were informed that their hospitals were to be closed, they converged on the Minister and the Department of Public Health. The sub-amendment to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is condemning the Government for making that announcement, I'm on this matter of condemning, I think. I hope I am in order. "Little hope offered to rural hospitals at Regina meeting." This was January 13th. Then, January 29th, "Hospitals to join forces to fight against closure."

The Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources got up in his place just before noon hour adjournment and he asked us to name the hospitals which were closed. Well here are the hospitals that were slated for closing. Why was all this concern? Why were all these communities and people concerned? Because of your announcement Mr. Minister, the closing of those eight hospitals. Then, "Hospitals join forces to fight against closure." Let's go on a little further. February 12th, this is about over a month and a half from the initial announcement by the Minister of Public Health, another press release, same paper, Star Phoenix, this is the paper that I have access to in my part of the province. "Hospital closing approach studied." Ah, the Minister is beginning to waiver. He's beginning to change his stand, he's not as definite as he was initially. "Little hope offered to rural hospitals", on January 2nd; on February 12th, "Hospital closing approach studied." Then, the next day there is a total conversion on the part of the Department, the Government and the Minister. "Government to delay hospital closure." Deathbed repentance. Mr. Speaker, I have other clippings that I can refer to but I don't want to take up too much valuable time of this House as I know that some Members on the Government side are eager to get this over with. But the press releases, the steps taken followed by the Government in respect of the announcements of the closure of these hospitals in small communities should be condemned. I am here, Mr. Speaker, offering some of the condemning on behalf of those communities whose hospitals were slated for closing and now have been given a release of life.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I was precluded from speaking earlier but I gather I am in order to speak on the sub-amendment, under certain conditions.

First of all I must say that I have heard a lot of irresponsible statements in this House, but I think the last few minutes we heard more sanctimonious bunkum and more political pay by the Members opposite than in most cases. I honestly feel that they are continuing to bury their heads in the same and will not face responsibility. They are suggesting that I be reprimanded, or what are the words, censured on regrets expressed for my public statement on this subject. In other words they are going to ask this House to support a motion that would criticize a Minister who endeavoured to demonstrate responsibility in the distribution of hospital beds in this province, endeavoured to do something that they didn't have the intestinal fortitude to do, criticize me for my initial action, criticize me for modifying it somewhat. No matter what you do, they are prepared to criticize you, but they were not prepared to take any action themselves.

I say it is high time that this House demonstrated the necessity of doing something about the unrealistic distribution of hospital beds in Saskatchewan. They know just as well as I

April 23, 1968

do, particularly the Member from Regina Centre- he knows better than anyone over there- the situation that exists and he admits that something must be done. The Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) made a great play that it was only after my December statement that I visited these hospitals. I'll stand up and say that while I've only been in the Department of Health about a year and a half, I have visited more hospitals than any preceding Minister of Health. I have also visited every mental institution in this province, one of which had not had a visitor since the Hon. Mr. Darling was Minister of Health. So don't criticize me for visiting hospitals. The Hon. Member also said that in his opinion none of these hospitals should be closed, that they were serving a good purpose. Now he has not visited these hospitals or he would not make such a statement . . .

Mr. Willis: — Point of order. I want to inform the Minister that Mr. Darling was never the Minister of Health, I don't know where he got that statement.

Mr. Grant: — I'll stand corrected as I was not here back in his regime. It was a long way back. The fellow who informed me apparently was mistaken in his Minister — probably Public Works.

An Hon. Member: — Good old democratic . . .

Mr. Grant: — I would like to ask the Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale if he has visited some of these hospitals and will he stand up in this House and say they should not be closed. I doubt very much whether he has visited the Qu'Appelle hospital if he makes such a ridiculous statement. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this amendment because I feel that my action in starting this was responsible and necessary. Whether the course must be changed, is another thing. I think even the Members of the Opposition have admitted that something has to be done on the allocation of hospital beds in this province. To criticize the Minister for endeavouring to take action in this regard I think would be regrettable and I would urge the House to vote against the subamendment.

The subamendment was negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd	Meakes	Brockelbank
Wooff	Berezowsky	Baker
Kramer	Romanow	Pepper
Willis	Smishek	Bowerman
Wood	Thibault	Matsalla
Blakeney	Whelan	Messer
Davies	Snyder	Kwasnica
Dewhurst	Michayluk	Kowalchuk

NAYS — 31
Messieurs

Howes	Bjarnason	Mitchell
McFarlane	MacDonald	Larochelle
Cameron	Estey	Gardner

Heald	Hooker	Coupland
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser
Grant	Radloff	
Coderre	Weatherald	

Hon. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate on hospital closure motion, I want to inform you, Sir, that, although I had anticipated dealing extensively with many of the questions raised; but the six Members have during this morning's discourse made a very good complete summation and offered concrete proposals, therefore I simply will not take up the time of this House to review them once again.

I want to deal with one of the Members who I thought threw discretion to the winds and jumped into the fray. The Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), I admit, does speak from his feet and not in a reclining position as do some of his colleagues. The bombast and the fishwife shouting of the Member created a lot of din and noise and not much else, Mr. Speaker. He really doesn't warrant an answer. Most of the questions he posed had been answered on numerous occasions by the Members to your left, Mr. Speaker. I want to reply to two of the questions only.

One is this, in reply to the Hon. Member for Maple Creek's statements, that the present Minister of Health was in comparison to the immediate Minister of Health prior to 1964, and this Minister of course being a benevolent and self righteous Minister of Health was ahead in consultation, alternate service and so on. All I have to say is this, that this is absolutely incorrect. He may have consulted with some boards, so they say. I haven't heard from anyone about this, although it has been asked again and again. But he did not consult Neudorf; he did not consult with Maryfield; he did not consult with Leroy, Hodgeville and four others. No, he didn't consult with Neudorf, he had never seen the hospital in spite of what he said a few moments ago and didn't even know that it was a newly built structure, built some 18 years ago, with extensive renovation in the past number of years, and not an old converted army hut as he had stated. The Hon. Provincial Treasurer was jumping up and down and shouting all morning, name the hospitals closed, name them. Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, a press report in the Regina Leader-Post of April 18th last. It says here and I quote:

Hospitals at Frontier, Prelate, Willowbunch and Hodgeville are closed because they have no doctor, Provincial Department spokesman said Thursday. (The hospitals are among the eight small hospitals originally slated for closure this spring.) Health Department spokesman said the four hospitals closed because of the lack of doctors, but grants will be resumed if the community can obtain doctors.

Mr. Speaker, isn't that a clever move, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this "horns and tail episode" brought on by the Minister himself yesterday in the debate, applies to him, Mr. Speaker. But by actions such as these, it does not necessarily imply that the Hon. Minister is beginning to sprout wings either!

April 23, 1968

Referring to this article I don't know who the Health Department spokesman was, but it does state that the hospitals are closed. I want to remind the Assembly that this is what the Government intended and wanted to do right along, and it's continuing to close them. Oh yes, it made a lot of noise of apologetic noises, that's strictly political window dressing, Mr. Speaker. The action of this Government prior to December 30th and a little later on was deliberate to create an atmosphere of uncertainty for the doctors, an act to create uncertainty for these communities. It is as I have indicated before a deliberate act to scare away the doctors. Those who had thought of settling in such a small hospital community naturally had second thoughts and will have second thoughts on the matter, before proceeding to move in, to start a practice, to buy a house. With no firm commitment of any kind from the Government that these hospitals would stay open, I can't see any doctor moving back to these little hospital areas and starting a practice and making a living there. Mr. Speaker, this statement that these hospitals will resume operations, if communities obtain doctors, is indeed a long shot that not even a gambler would take chances on, let alone a doctor. They, to your right, Mr. Speaker, know that it will be next to impossible to get a doctor to move into such a situation. This Government has proceeded on this course deliberately and to them their big move was in December, not in February. That was window-dressing in February, Mr. Speaker. They, the Liberals want these hospitals closed and I say, some probably should be closed, I am not in a position to say, they shouldn't, but others that should stay open will get the axe along with these. Under the Liberals, the opening of these hospitals again would be comparable to telling a corpse, "Look! When you start showing signs of life, we'll come to your aid." These communities of course deserve a better deal, Mr. Speaker. These doctors who so wanted to remain in these small communities also deserve a far better treatment, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House and the people of Saskatchewan want and demand answers as to the criteria that are being applied in either closing of these hospitals or extending these hospitals or rebuilding them. We want to know why these hospitals are being built in one place and denied in others. We'll continue asking these questions, Mr. Speaker, this year, next year and the year after. The people of Saskatchewan will also be asking those same questions, Mr. Speaker, and the answers had better be forthcoming, because on the election day three years from now the answers will be given at the polls and the noise of the falling ballots will be awful deafening to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, I assure you.

I have to say that I was disappointed the other day with the performance put on by the Minister of Public Health, in his speech on the hospital closure. It was indeed a performance! He didn't fool anybody. He and his Government have blundered as they have done so many times in the past few years. They blundered and they want the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan to quickly forget about it. He said that the Member for Melville must have been asleep or something to that effect that they, the Liberals, had given their word that certain conditions would be met, in the matter of hospital closing, that consultation would take place, that no hospital would be closed before April 1st and so on. This of course happened in February, after great pressure from every community affected in Saskatchewan, from all people, regardless of their political beliefs they reflected. What the Hon. Minister would like us and everybody else to forget is the month of December and January when the Government so arrogantly and in an official

display of power proclaimed that on April 1st these eight hospitals would be closed. Now, the people don't trust this Government, Mr. Speaker, not after October 11th.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — And not after the hospital closure episode of December and January. Now the Hon. Minister would like us to forget these days, Mr. Speaker. Where was he during these days, Mr. Speaker? He seems to have forgotten all about that. It's because of these events occurring on hospital closure in December and January that led to the events occurring in February, where the Hon. Minister wept crocodile tears and consented to consultation and so on and so on. There is one slight difference, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the introduction of this Resolution. The people of Saskatchewan, who will be affected by the Government's action on hospital closure, look at the Hon. Minister's promise with a jaundiced eye. They might be inclined to give some credence to the Hon. Minister's words, but neither they, the people, nor we on this side of the House have very much confidence in the Hon. Premier's words, nor in the word of his Government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was only after continuous pressure from many sections of Saskatchewan that the Hon. Minister found that he had to withdraw and make concession. But let him not sound so self-righteous as his statement yesterday on mental health, "That here was another source of extra revenue," points out that this Government and the Health Minister consider money first and people last. Now the people of Saskatchewan, particularly those who have anything to do with hospital closure, won't believe him in spite of the amendment, that he and his colleagues have drafted whereby they attempt to give themselves a little bit of credit.

I also want to make some reference to what the Hon. Minister said in speaking to the hospital closure Resolution. The Hon. Minister questioned the validity of some of the answers he had made when he was visited by the Neudorf Hospital Board. Well, Mr. Speaker, I repeated as nearly word for word what was said at the public meeting at Neudorf where these questions and answers were brought out in point order. But if the Minister wants confirmation of this, we'll call those Board members here any place, any time. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that all these answers would be verified and I am also only afraid that the Minister would be subjected to some quite unprintable criticism. The Minister said that he thought they were doing what was right. We on this side of the House don't disagree for a moment that there are occasions and need to close certain hospitals as well as certain schools. What we question is the method they use, the way the Liberals went about it. He said that by the announcement he made in February they have complied in nearly every respect with what was being said in the Resolution. He went through the Resolution point by point, saying just where and what they had done, and it was nearly identical with the wishes and what was said in this Resolution. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they on that side of the House should have no difficulty in voting for this Resolution. I say to the Members including the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) that you will be asked as to what each of you had suggested for these hospitals back home. I think I've made it quite clear that the Resolution says what we on this side of the House want. One hospital I have in mind that was slated for closure, that is Neudorf, should remain open; and if and when after full consultation and proper diagnosis, after a couple of years' time when alternate facilities are

April 23, 1968

definitely available, doctors included, Mr. Speaker, then and only then should plans be made to make the Neudorf hospital into a nursing home, if and I repeat this, Mr. Speaker, if everything has been done to keep it as a hospital first. Now many fine comments have been made by my colleagues on this side of the House and I will refrain from repeating more statistics, I was going to say a lot more about some comments made by the Members from the opposite side, but the time is precious and running on and I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we will be meeting again next February or March when no doubt we will continue this verbal battle once again. I think that the case is clear, Mr. Speaker. People should be considered first; every avenue of consultation must be explored before any procedure or closure is applied. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all Members of this Assembly support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 49

Messieurs

Howes	Breker	Meakes
McFarlane	Leith	Berezowsky
Cameron	Radloff	Romanow
Heald	Weatherald	Smishek
McIsaac	Mitchell	Thibault
Guy	Larochelle	Snyder
Barrie	Gardner	Michayluk
Loken	Coupland	Brockelbank
MacDougall	McPherson	Baker
Grant	Charlebois	Pepper
Coderre	Forsyth	Bowerman
Bjarnason	McIvor	Matsalla
MacDonald	Schmeiser	Messer
Estey	Lloyd	Kwasnica
Hooker	Wood	Kowalchuk
Gallagher	Blakeney	
Heggie	Davies	

NAYS — 5

Messieurs

Wooff	Willis	Whelan
Kramer	Dewhurst	

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 157

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw North) for Return No. 157.

The number of persons formerly patients in the Saskatchewan Hospital, Weyburn, who are being cared for in each of the nursing homes licensed by the Department of Welfare.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — The wording of the motion is such that it would be most difficult and likely impossible to supply the information desired.

The responsibility for admission and discharges rests with the respective nursing homes. Only a detailed survey of nursing homes would disclose former residency for residencies of patients and would not, in my opinion, necessarily disclose whether such residencies included the Weyburn Mental Hospital.

(Part of this not recorded)

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) proposed the following amendment:

That all the words after the word "Weyburn" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

who have been discharged to nursing homes since January 1, 1966.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — The wording of this question, Mr. Speaker, is substantially the same as the wording of a question I submitted a year ago on this same matter. There appeared to be no difficulty in answering the question at that time. For that reason I had every reason to believe that the question could be answered without difficulty.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — that which is provided in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, would mean that a list of patients that had been discharged since 1966 to nursing homes would be supplied and no doubt that would be a very, very big list. That wasn't my understanding of the wording, Mr. Minister, but certainly it does say since 1966. What the Member from Moose Jaw North wants to know is the numbers that are in the nursing homes, licensed by the Department of Welfare as of this point in time. I think that he is entitled to this information, I think the Department should have that information and I think it should be provided.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 160

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Snyder (Moose Jaw North) for Return No. 160:

The number of persons formerly patients in the Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford, who are being cared for in each of the nursing homes licensed by the Department of Welfare.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be a little more explicit on this one than I was in the previous one and probably answer the questions. The way the motion is currently worded would necessitate an examination of the present patients in each of these nursing homes which in itself would not really give the exact information the Hon. Member wants because some of these patients we originally discharged have since moved to other locations or died. There are some former patients who had previously been discharged by the North Battleford Hospital who may now be in these homes through no knowledge of ours. On the point raised by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North pertaining to last year's

April 23, 1968

questions, there was an endeavour made last year to answer this question. It was based on a quick survey of some of the nursing homes and a closer examination indicates that the information supplied was not accurate and the extension of it to cover all the nursing homes that might be licensed was not as accurate as it might have been. There is no point in continuing this inaccuracy. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I would move the following amendment:

That all the words after the words "North Battleford" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

who have been discharged to nursing homes since January 1, 1966.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I think the comments that I made in the previous motion apply with equal force with respect to this amendment in spite of the explanation the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has now given. It would appear subject to his correction and I don't think he has said anything to dispel this idea that once the patients are discharged to nursing homes that are licensed by the Department of Welfare there is actually no record of what takes place after this discharge and after they have initially entered one of the nursing homes. These patients may have entered a nursing home, been there for a month or two and departed for any one of a dozen or more communities or some other home that isn't licensed so that there is no accurate picture for anyone that wants to trace the course of progress of patients that have gone from the mental hospitals, (the mental hospital in North Battleford in this instance) to a nursing home and to some other location. All we have is a big list of people who may not be in any of these institutions as of the present date. I think that this information is deficient in terms of what the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) wanted . . . Now I may have misunderstood the Minister of Health but that is what his amendment says . . .

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Except, Mr. Speaker, just on the point, first of all the Department of Welfare has no responsibility or control over the admittance or discharge policies of any nursing homes. These are private institutions and the Government of Saskatchewan has no control other than licensing according to the facilities to staff and so forth. Therefore we have not the responsibility to answer this question as it is so worded.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current) moved, seconded by Mr. W.S. Howes (Kerrobert-Kindersley), That the Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I take a good deal of pleasure in rising to speak on the adoption of the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing. The

Legislature is aware the Committee on Public Accounts and Printing as presently constituted is a relatively new approach to the examination of the accounts of the Saskatchewan Government. Last year in speaking to the adoption of the report, Mr. Brockelbank reviewed the history of the Committee. I do not propose to do this at this time, only to say that as our first report this year indicated, this Committee sits in camera. It is quite non-partisan in nature and endeavours to make a study in depth of the financial procedures and practices of the Saskatchewan Government. In this, we were ably guided and assisted by Mr. Hodsmen, Provincial auditor and senior members of his staff.

The Report shows that we held 20 meetings as compared to 14 last year. Owing to getting off to a rather late start because of the later than usual tabling of the Public Accounts, we were not through with our work when the House began morning sittings. As a result, our last eight meetings were held between 9 o'clock and 9:55 in the morning so that actually we held only about one or a portion of one meeting more than what we did last year.

This year as our Report indicates, we had five Deputy Ministers and senior staff from their departments before us who answered our questions in regard to financial transactions and also in regard to policy in effect without going into the reasons for the policy, which would be unsuitable questions to pose to senior civil servants. We reviewed last year's Report with the view to following up what had been done about our recommendations. The Treasury Department submitted a minute giving reasons why they were unable to carry out some of our recommendations, which was accepted by your Committee.

In the set-up under which we operate, the work and guidance of the Provincial Auditor are very necessary. His Department conducts a post-audit of the accounts of the Government and upon his findings he passes his report to the Legislature and his advice to our Committee.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to say some things about the staff of the Department of the Provincial Auditor (and I think possibly it has no part to do with my argument) but I would like to bring to the attention of the House that Mr. F.J. Sinnett, the Deputy Provincial Auditor of Utilities passed away last Saturday. He'll be much missed by his family and friends and also in the Department of the Provincial Auditor.

The Hon. Members will note that the Estimates for the 1967-68 fiscal year made provision for a staff of 43 for the Provincial Auditor. Most of these are involved in such work as providing audit services to Crown corporations, the Liquor Board, other boards, commissions and various agencies, such as the University of Saskatchewan, the Medical Care Insurance Commission and the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, as well as doing a revenue audit of all the departments of Government. In regard to the above work, the Provincial Auditor's Department consider that they do have sufficient staff.

However, in setting up the post-audit of Expenditures Branch made necessary by the new approach to handling our Public Accounts, there had to be a division of staff between the new Branch and that of the Comptroller's Office of the Treasury which does a pre-audit for all Government department. The Comptroller's Office retained most of the staff and quite

April 23, 1968

necessarily so. This has left Mr. Jud Smith in charge of post-audit expenditures of all Government departments with a staff of only some six persons. When, Mr. Speaker, you consider the many millions of dollars that are being handled by the Government of these times it seems rather inappropriate that only six persons should be expected to do all the work of a post-audit of these branches of Government. In its Report last year, your Committee recommended that favourable consideration be given to any request by the Provincial Auditor for two or three additional competent and experienced employees. As you will note in our Report, the Treasury Board has approved the addition of one auditor IV to the staff working on the expenditure audit. Your Committee is not unappreciative of this and we fully realize the natural tendency of any government to look apprehensively at any increases in staff. But your Committee contends that this is an extremely important function and reiterates the request of last year for further additions to the staff working on the expenditure audit.

The Provincial Auditor also finds from time to time, when he is in need of legal advice, that the Attorney General's Department to which he would normally turn has also given advice to the department in question or the Comptroller's Office in charge of pre-audit. The question arises as to the position of the Attorney General's Department in giving advice to both of these and the department which is making a post-audit of their accounts. Your Committee reiterates the recommendations of last year's Committee that under these circumstances the Provincial Auditor be authorized to see outside legal advice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not my intention to take up the time of the House to deal with all the items contained in the Report, but there are some that I feel should be emphasized or explained at this time.

One is in regard to the form of Public Accounts. Last year the Committee recommended that some changes should be made which they felt would simplify the Public Accounts, without deleting any of the information that Members of the Legislature and others would find useful. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of that section of our Report which deals with this. It possibly might be valuable to the Assembly if I read it at this time. It is not too long: Item 5 of our Report last year said:

With respect to the form and content of the Public Accounts your Committee recommends the following changes insofar as the Treasury Department finds practical: (1) That expenditures broken down in the objective code by sub-vote be set out in the Estimates and that, subject to item (2) below, all other detailed reporting by sub-vote be eliminated.

(2) That where accounts are maintained in the Treasury by sub-vote for management purposes, and wherein the judgment of the Treasury such information would be meaningful and informative to the Legislature, the total expenditure under each sub-vote be reported in a separate analysis.

(3) That a single listing of payees and amounts, except grants be provided for each Department, rather than the present practice of reporting payees by sub-vote, and in those cases where a Department has two main appropriations that two listings of payees be provided.

(4) That in preparing listings of payees and amounts by Departments, payments be grouped in two categories; (a) salaries, services, gratuities and travelling expenses, with salary and travelling expenses to be shown as separate amounts; and (b) other payments.

(5) That in preparing listings of payees and amounts, the following limits be observed: (a) in respect of payments for salaries, services, and gratuities, only payments to individuals receiving \$4,000 or more (excluding day labor which will be reported in a group total) be reported; (b) in respect to those reported under (a) above only travelling expenses of \$300 or more be reported; (c) in respect of reports under "other payments", only those aggregating a \$1,000 or more be reported; (d) all payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly, including Ministers, be shown in full without any limitation; (e) all payees and amounts of all expenditures under the Department of Education sub-vote "Grants to Schools" be shown.

(6) That "Grants" be reported in alphabetical lists under each sub-vote as is presently done, except that (a) grants under The Family Farm Improvement Act shall be reported individually only when the grant exceeds \$300 and (b) other grants will be reported individually only when they are in the amount of \$100 or more.

(7) That the amount voted in the Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates, together with the actual expenditures, be shown at the head of each sub-vote.

This was our recommendation from last year, Mr. Speaker, and at that time I remember Mr. Brockelbank saying that he thought that this would likely cut down the size of our Accounts by one-third or possibly a half. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that they actually have been reduced from some 970 pages in the 1966 Public Accounts to 592 in the last year's 1967 Public Accounts, from 970 to 592. There has been a reduction of more than one-third very close to a half. I think Mr. Brockelbank was very accurate, I think it was an educated guess given to him by the Department but I think it was a very accurate one, and I think what was done last year has resulted in bringing down the size of our Public Accounts a great deal and making them more in line with what is done in other jurisdictions, other Provincial jurisdictions and in the Federal Government.

There have, however, been some complaints. There being only now one list of employees for the whole department, one cannot ascertain by perusal of the Public Accounts those persons who are working in any one branch of the department. Upon enquiry, your Committee found that the listing of travel expenses was quite meaningless as an employee driving his own car might be shown as having quite a high travel expense, whereas an employee driving a CVA care, Central Vehicle Agency car and doing an equal amount of travelling will not have this expense shown under his name. However, your Committee was not prepared at this time to recommend the rather complicated procedures which would be necessary to rectify this. Members of the Legislature may have some definite ideas about the changes in the form of Public Accounts that had been made, and I'm sure next year's Committee would be glad to have your opinions and suggestions on this.

April 23, 1968

It seems to me that one of the more important items in our Report has to do with the bringing up-to-date of Treasury Board regulations. Ever since the time of the Magna Carta, Mr. Speaker, there has been a struggle between Parliament and the Executive over the control of funds from which has evolved the accepted modern-day principle that the basic control of the nation's or the province's purse strings is held by the Parliament or Legislature, which in turn gives its powers to the Executive through legislation and the power to make regulations under such legislation. Without such adequate legislation and regulations controlled by the Legislature this is impossible, and it is indeed very difficult for Treasury or the Provincial Auditor to exercise the needed surveillance.

This problem is certainly not a new one originating with this Government. It is my understanding that Treasury Board regulations were last revised in 1948 and in many instances they have been out of date for some time. Upon several occasions this year, we pointed out to departments which were before us gaps in the legislation and regulations governing the handling of funds by their organization.

Your committee recognizes that the careful review of such legislation and regulations is no small task, and that it is extremely difficult to obtain the qualified personnel necessary to do the work. However, we consider it to be an important matter and again bring to the attention of the Legislature the recommendation of last year's Committee in this regard.

Governments for some years in the past have found a useful financial tool in using Supplementary Estimates for the purposes of taking part of the surplus of one fiscal year to make payments or grants for work that might not be performed until a later year. Last year's Committee recommended only that the test of the appropriation make clear in all cases what authority is being asked of the Legislature. In reporting back to this year's Committee, Treasury pointed out that there were so many ways in which this could be done, other than through Supplementary Estimates, such as using unexpended balances in departmental estimates, that the meaning of the recommendation became unclear and suggested further study by the Committee.

In going through this year's auditor's report and in questioning some of the departments before us, we found that there were instances where the Supplementary Estimates were used in the year under review for the above-mentioned purpose, but that the Legislature was not informed. For instance there is an item in the Supplementary Estimates for the 12 months ending March 31, 1967 for the Saskatchewan Research Council, further amount required a grant, \$253,015 with no further explanation. The Provincial Auditor pointed out to us that in fact \$123,140 of this was actually designated as pre-payment for the 1967-68 program. Your Committee is not prepared to find any fault with such payments but it does feel that the Legislature should be informed of what is being asked of it when such items are being voted.

Another item brought to our attention by the Provincial Auditor was that concerning Treasury advances. Treasury Board regulations provide for advances being made to officials and employees of the Government in cheque of \$50 aggregating the amount required. These cheques are to be cashed from time to time as the exigencies of the business in which the employees are engaged may demand. All advances are to be accounted for by

the end of each month or anytime prior thereto. The Provincial Auditor pointed out to us that many departments are using the imprest system, for which there is not authority. Under this system advances are made to employees in an amount ranging to \$600 at the beginning of each fiscal year. The employee submits an expense account and is reimbursed for the expenditures made, thereby re-establishing the advance to the original amount.

The Provincial Auditor has told us that there are instances where money was used for taking a holiday trip, although it was repaid, and other instances where the new cheque issued at the beginning of the year was simply endorsed back again to the Treasury without the employee repaying the original amount in cash. The Committee is not saying that the imprest system should not be used, but, if it is, there should be Treasury Board regulations covering the practice and the department should tighten up their control.

The Provincial Auditor has pointed out to us that it has been the practice for some years in several departments to pay for goods and services in advance particularly in the last month of the fiscal year. He has indicated instances where declarations have been signed, that certain goods had been received, while in fact they were not received for several months later. We are not talking here of carefully controlled use of Supplementary Estimates, the carry-over of surpluses into the following year. The practice to which we refer is a dangerous one as the Government funds could be lost if the company did not eventually supply the goods. Besides this it is a very poor accounting practice and against Treasury Board regulations. The officials of the Treasury join us in endorsing the Provincial Auditor's recommendation that this practice be discontinued or allowed only in very exceptional circumstances.

I would like to draw to the attention of the Legislature Item 13 of our report which reads as follows:

Your Committee wishes to renew a recommendation of the 1967 Public Accounts Committee that consideration be given to authorizing the Committee to hold meetings when the Legislature is not in Session to enable your Committee to consider the Public Accounts and the Provincial Auditor's Report when and if these documents are available prior to the opening of a regular Session.

There may have been different reasons for it, Mr. Speaker, but your Committee, both this year and last year, found themselves pressed for time. This did not lend itself to the proper study of the accounts and accounting procedures and practise, which I am sure could be beneficial to the Government, the Legislature and the people of this province. I would like to commend this action of our Report that I have just read to the Government for their sincere consideration.

You will note that your Committee recommended that 100 copies of the minutes and the verbatim report of the Public Account's Committee be multilithed. Last year our verbatim report was simply typewritten and duplicated which made a huge volume. I have a copy of it here, Mr. Speaker. It is rather a large one and there weren't too many of these made. It is a terribly bulky document and there were only a few made for the Members of the Committee itself and one or two in the Clerk's office. This year for very little more expense, we are able to have the documents multilithed and if it is approved by the Legislature,

April 23, 1968

it is our intention that these will be distributed to the House in a volume this year. We are asking that 100 copies of this be printed.

In closing I would like to take this opportunity to thank Members of the Committee for their co-operation. Serving as chairman of a Committee of this nature, was a new and a large undertaking for me. I admit that I made mistakes, and without the co-operation of the Committee it could have been much worse. I would also like to thank Mr. Hodsmen, the Provincial Auditor, for all his help and advice as well as Mr. Jud Smith, who is Deputy Provincial Auditor in charge of the post-audit of expenditures, and Mr. Jacoby, the Deputy Provincial Auditor in charge of the post-audit of revenue. It is these men and their staff who made this Committee possible. I would also like to thank Mr. Wakabayashi, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer and Mr. Allan Kerr, the Comptroller for their attendance at the Committee and their valued advice and information they were able to give us from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Howes, that the second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing be now concurred in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to the find report which the chairman of Public Accounts has given to the House. I want to say first of all that this is a different approach to the Public Accounts idea and I for one want to say that I am very pleased at what has happened here in the last two years. I have been a Member of this Committee over the last two years. We have looked at the form of the accounts as the chairman has said. We have recommended some changes. We looked at regulations regarding expenditures. We have recommendations regarding this. We have made recommendations legalizing expenditures. I think that the new form of the Committee has proven its worth regarding all of these actions which we have taken.

In this session we have been in meetings for 20 days. We have considered the Provincial Auditor's Report as the chairman has said and we have had before us five different departments, that is the Deputy Minister and the senior officials of five departments. But I want to point out that about half of these meetings were for less than one hour. And I too want to support the chairman in his remarks about an inter-sessional meeting of this Committee. I think that this work is important enough that we should have much more time to spend considering the Provincial Auditor's Report, considering the various department expenditures. This Committee should meet inter-sessionally where we could work without the tremendous pressure which develops in this House. You know yourself, Mr. Speaker, we come here in the mornings. In the last three or four weeks we have been meeting at 9:00 o'clock in the morning and going until 5:30 sometimes and sometimes 10:00 o'clock at night. This makes for a tremendous day and every person in the House especially those who are on the Committee have been carrying a tremendous load. I certainly want to add my voice to the chairman's remarks that this Committee should be meeting inter-sessionally where we could work at a slower pace and probably get a tremendous amount more from the work which we do. I see the advantages of this type of Committee which we have set up. As I mentioned earlier this is my second

year on the Committee and I think that we have made much better use of public officials, of deputy ministers and their staff, in considering the Public Accounts and I think that we have come up with a lot of suggestions which tend to improve the form of the Public Accounts. I for one have objected to the change that was brought about regarding the form of the Public Accounts where all of the payees from one department are listed in one group. My objection to this is the same as the chairman has mentioned, that we are unable to identify the branch staff for the various departments. If you want to look at the people employed by these various department, you have to look at the back of the report and here we find an alphabetical list with nothing to identify which branch of the department they work for. I think that this is a disadvantage. I for one would like to know who are employed in the various branches. While we have cut down in size, I think that we have lost something by not being able to identify the people who work in the various branches.

I would point out to this House that the Provincial Auditor has assumed a different relation to the House itself. Previously the Provincial Auditor had been employed by the Government. Now he is a creature of the Legislature and this, I think, is the way it should be. The appointing and the dismissing of the Provincial Auditor have to come in the House. We are responsible for action taken in that regard. In this regard, too, I think that the Provincial Auditor in his concern of auditing, I think that he should not be handicapped in staff. The chairman has pointed out that last year's committee recommended an increase in the Provincial Auditor's staff. The Treasury Board in its wisdom saw fit to see to it that only one of the staff members was agreed to. I think that this is a mistake, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the chairman when he says that we now have a tremendous amount of money which has to be audited by the Provincial Auditor and his staff and, if the Provincial Auditor feels that he can't audit this \$400 million satisfactorily with the staff he has, there should be no restrictions on his request for more bodies. If he requests another staff member, then that staff member should be forthcoming. It is only fair to him that he have an adequate staff to carry out the work which is his responsibility.

With these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I feel that we are on the right track, that we have adjusted ourselves now to the new method which we have adopted in the last three years, and I think that we will find the benefit of this type of Provincial Auditor Committee in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words. I wasn't a member of this Committee but I would like to congratulate the chairman of the Committee, the Hon. Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and the entire Committee and the auditing staff for the fine job they have done. As has been said, they were breaking new ground and they moved in what could be sensitive areas. I think they did this in a very understanding way. Now the responsibility is on the Government to look at this Report and take whatever steps are necessary to correct some of the things that they pointed out. I don't take this at this stage as criticism of the Government, but certainly it is up to us now to take action. They pointed up some weaknesses and some practices that need tightening up and need changing. This was, as I understand

April 23, 1968

it, the very idea of changing Provincial Auditor so that they could report in this manner, as the Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) said, and be in fact representative of the Legislature rather than of the Government. Just allow me on behalf of the Government to congratulate again the chairman of the Committee and all those connected with this Report. You may be sure that we will look very seriously at the recommendations and consider them most closely.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND REASON

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. J.C. McIsaac that Bill No. 65 — An Act respecting Teachers' Salary Agreements be now read a second time.

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, when I rose to take part in this debate last Friday I had written a few paragraphs in which I attempted to emphasize my beliefs that the proper role of government is to act as a catalyst in the educational ferment. I pointed out that we have delegated the day-to-day business of education to teachers and to trustees. Our job is to strengthen the work of each of these groups and to help them form an effective team, a team that will provide the best possible educational opportunities for our young people.

Frankly, I had intended to speak my prepared piece and retire from the fray, but the words of the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) bothered me a little bit and I adjourned the debate in order that we could have another chance at setting the tone of the discussions at a non-political level. I am quite sure that the Hon. Member for Cutknife spoke in all sincerity. But I must take exception to some of the interpretations of the facts which he put before this House. If I take strong exception the fat will be in the fire. I do not want to have a controversial discussion, but I would like to point out that re-hashing some of the things that were said and the things that went on at an earlier stage of this debate, would really serve no useful purpose.

For instance he spoke about a draft Bill which caused a great deal of controversy. I don't think there was any breach of faith on anyone's part in releasing this draft bill to the public. There was certainly a good deal of furore stirred up at that time and I don't believe that there was any breach of faith on the part of any organization. I think that it was a matter of misunderstanding. The Member for Cutknife did say and speak of a number of people who had taken strong exception. I was rather surprised that he hadn't read from a press release of an appearance that I made before some 700 or 800 teachers in Saskatoon at which time I said that the draft Bill was an abominably worded Bill and it certainly was. The measure of our thinking on this has certainly proven that we are not interested in presenting that Bill as it was drafted and as it was presented purely for purposes of discussion at that time. I don't want to go into this any further. I feel that the number of teachers who have spoken out have certainly spoken very clearly of their

exception to a theoretical situation, a situation that really never did exist since there was no proposal to bring that legislation before this House. There was a mention made that the proposed area bargaining would cause teachers to lose their rights to bargain. This is really not a fact. If you wanted to pursue another theoretical argument, you could say that when larger school units were formed, a great many teachers who had formerly the right to bargain as a single teacher in a one-room school run by a school board in effect lost their right to bargain. I don't think there is anything to be gained by this type of argument.

Concerning the question about the exodus of teachers, the scare tactics that were presented at one time, and have been presented fairly recently, have no basis. If you consider the exodus of trained people in this province it is true that Saskatchewan is an exporter of trained personnel. The Dean of Medicine speaking before the Law Amendments Committee the other day made this very clear when he was asked why so many of the graduates of our medical school leave this province. He said, and I think quite wisely, that once you put a diploma in a person's hand, a young person who has never been outside the Province of Saskatchewan, you practically offer him a passport to go to broader fields, and to see the world. The same problem exists as far as dental personnel. It was pointed out in the Health Estimates that we have great difficulty in attracting dentists to smaller communities, not because their incentives are not financially good, but because professional personnel sometimes prefer to live in larger centres.

If I can speak of the Saskatoon situation again, the exodus of teachers is not proven by the figures from the Saskatoon public school system from both 1966 and 1967. In 1966 there were more teachers coming to the Saskatoon public school system from outside of the province than left the Saskatoon system for other provinces. In the figures for 1966, 11 left the province and 19 came onto the staff from outside the province. In 1967 the figures were 15 who left the province from Saskatoon and 17 who came from outside the province. Now this is an urban situation and I think it points out that the whole question of teachers leaving this province is tied up with the problems of urbanization and not with any legislation which is proposed.

I don't want to go further into the situation with regard to school boards who have indicated that they are not in favour of area bargaining. As a matter of fact it could be pointed out that two of the boards which were quoted by the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) are not unit boards. In other words they are not boards who have the responsibility for the expenditure of funds. They are boards which report to the unit boards and they did certainly report their feelings. But these are not what one might call financially responsible boards.

In closing I would like to ask every speaker in this debate to ask himself just one question and that is the question: will the statements that I am making help the cause of education in Saskatchewan? If the answer to this is yes, then I feel that we are fulfilling our duties as Legislators.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't extensive remarks to make in this debate but I think that I should begin by saying something

April 23, 1968

about the remarks of the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) who has just taken his seat. I think that I would begin by agreeing with him that it is the place of government to strengthen relations between the bargaining parties as I understood him to say in the beginning. I would also agree that controversial discussions in this whole regard should be avoided wherever possible. But I think that the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South will have to see that the situation that has caused the controversy has been brought about by the actions of his own Government. He has spoken about the whole affair that has taken place in recent months between government, trustees and teachers as a misunderstanding and that no breach of faith was involved. He has also said, and I agree with him, that the draft Bill that had been presented to the parties, was either an abomination or abominably worded — I just forget his precise wording — but I think that I would agree either way. The point is of course there was far more than an misunderstanding by the very fact of the Bill, which would have disrupted relations which the teachers had considered to be pretty well static over a period of almost 25 years.

May I say too with respect to his remarks about the exodus of trained people, in this regard he said something about there being scare tactics used. I don't think that anyone wants to scare any teachers from leaving the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that we have had quite a bad enough exodus as it has been. But I think that the recent happenings cannot help but have contributed to the sense of alarm that will cause an inevitable further exodus of teachers in Saskatchewan unless the Government acts much more positively than has been the case up to this time.

He has used Saskatoon as an example to show that teachers are not leaving the province in any way or any large scale. I would think that Saskatoon is hardly the area to seek as an example. I think that we have to take the province-wide figures. I don't think there is much doubt and I believe that he left-handedly admitted this, that professional people have left Saskatchewan; that there is a temptation for various reasons, to leave the province and that a lack of sensitivity in the handling of relationships that have to do with professional people, as well as a lack of knowledge and foresight in the handling of the relationship so far as the local trustees, the elected representatives are concerned, will cause difficulties that will hurt not only the teachers and the trustees but the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone can discuss the Bill without saying something about the events that led up to the Bill and surrounding it in the previous months. The Bill we now have before us has caused discord in trustee-teacher relationships which has probably never been equalled in the history of Saskatchewan. For the past six months or more, the two parties have not been brought together so much as they have been driven apart. I think that everyone knows the trustees and the teachers have disagreements from time to time. But, Mr. Speaker, did the Government act so as to soften and to erase misunderstandings? I would say on the record, hardly.

What happened, of course, was that the Government announced the Bill which was not the result of a trustee-teacher consensus but the reflection of the Government's own narrow approach in thinking. The result as everyone knows was a great disturbance among both educationalist and local authorities. And I say that this exercise did nothing whatsoever to help either relations

or the process of education in the province. In the final analysis the Government's policies on teacher-trustee relationships have done harm to the educational system and to the Saskatchewan sons and daughters who must depend on our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, the Government rather than proceeding with draft legislation several months ago should, I submit, have acted rather to encourage trustee-teacher harmony on the issues that were at stake. They should have lent the two parties every possible skilled assistance towards this desirable end. If the bargaining process needs overhauling, it should be revamped at the instance of the teachers and the trustees. I frankly admit that this may pose problems but it is the only constructive way to assure firm, lasting, stable and peaceful conditions between these two parties. The announcement that the draft Bill contained measures to summarily remove over 1,000 teachers from the benefits of their organization was scarcely likely to arouse a feeling of security and good fellowship among the teachers. The resultant furore in the province should have been quite unnecessary, but its effect, the enormous protest in the province, was to alarm the Government sufficiently to cause some changes in the Bill to be made, changes which we now have before us.

Now I understand that there is no unanimity on the Bill yet and I ask why does not the Government relax its obdurate and unyielding attitude? Why not ask the trustees and the teachers to jointly select a committee with the further request that this committee bring in common proposals which could form the basis for any necessary legislation next year. Mr. Speaker, the Government is repeating in this legislation the mistakes it made in the Trade Union Act amendments several years ago. They have inflamed, not solved, the area of dispute in management-labor relationships in our province. The Government has not realized the principal thing in any bargaining relationship is mutual agreement between parties. Mr. Speaker, in the Bill before us the Government intends to define so-called negotiation areas which have not been agreed upon by the parties beforehand. Now true, the Bill would require consultation before these areas are set up, but if the consultation is of the scant and cavalier variety that we have heard about up to this time it will be but a bare and a minimal formality. The heart of the subject as I see it is that these areas should not be created without a very great deal of intensive study if they are to succeed at all. They should not be mechanically and bureaucratically moulded on the lines that have not been expressly laid down by the elected representatives of the ratepayers and the teachers themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if this is not done, incalculable harm could be inflicted on the rights of local school boards and the rights of school units. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is every reason to hope that it would be possible to evolve improved means of communication and bargaining between the trustees and between the teachers. What the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and his colleagues don't seem to understand is that these means have to be evolved, not pressed out harshly from a preconceived mould. I say that the task of Government is to help, to facilitate, to advise and to smooth the ways in this complex undertaking; not to take the rash headlong action it is taking in disregarding the needs and the feelings of both the parties. The Government, it may be argued, did investigate by the Moore Committee, and I give it credit for having set up this body. I do not credit it for ignoring many of the basic considerations of the Moose inquiry. Now I

April 23, 1968

understand that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation said that it would accept all of the Moore Report. It seems to me there must, therefore, be something very adverse indeed in the nature of this Bill in the reaction that it excited among the teachers.

Mr. Speaker, local ratepayers in Saskatchewan have traditionally handled their own business through their own elected representatives, in all cases either by direct means or through channels that they have themselves authorized. Now in the instance of this Bill, there is a real danger that the interference of the Government will take away the rights that were formerly enjoyed by the local ratepayers. I think this is a real and an ominous possibility. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of this Legislature and the Government must be devoted not to circumscribed, confining and compulsory procedures but to widening, extending, facilitating the agreement between the teachers and the trustees of Saskatchewan. This Bill runs counter to this necessary objective. How has the Government given any real indication that it is interested in any intensive activity along these lines?

Mr. Speaker, from all that has taken place, the obvious course for the Government is to arrest the headlong course that is illustrated by this Bill. The next step should be for the Government to withdraw this Bill. The third step is to ask the respective associations of the teachers and the trustees to bring to this Legislature the terms on which they have agreed upon and I suggest that this could be done by consultation. I say, Mr. Speaker, this is the procedure that will bring about that which will benefit both the people of Saskatchewan and the educational system that they want in the interest of the children of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words on the second reading of this Bill. When the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) the other day moved second reading of Bill 65 he mentioned that there had been 10 or 12 drafts before the one brought into the Legislature. Well I wonder who these drafts were discussed with because as my colleague from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) pointed out they weren't discussed with the teachers' organization all during the summer of 1967. He mentioned that there should be less bargaining sessions in number. Well, Mr. Speaker, that in itself, the principle, sounds to be good. Maybe there should be less but I think if there are going to be less groups bargaining for teachers' salaries, this should be done on a trial basis, on a voluntary basis. I noticed the Minister's own colleagues were so interested the other day that, while he was moving this Bill, for the biggest portion of his speech, there were only 15 of them in the House. Now this has been a contentious issue; it has been very contentious ever since the Minister first announced his intentions at the end of last year in December. As the Member for Cutknife pointed out that all during 1967 there were no discussions with the school trustees association, but just with the executive. A good many of the school unit trustees in my constituency tell me that they have no knowledge of it; these trustees are not in favour of the proposed legislation. Had this legislation been prepared along the lines of the recommendations of the Moore Committee I don't think any of us would have objected to it. But the Moore Committee Report was brought

down over a year ago and yet it was not until after this session convened that most of us were able to get a copy of that Report. Before we as Members of this Legislature had a copy of the Moore Committee Report, that is for each one of us to have a copy, the Minister had announced his intentions of bringing in this legislation, and he tried to give the impression to the public of this province that it was based on the report of the Moore Committee. I cannot see how this legislation compares with the Moore Committee Report. Wherever it does, it is just by accident and not by design. I think when we look at the Moore Committee and the number of recommendations which have been adopted by each party which is included in this Bill, we see there are some recommendations by the Trustees' Association but none by the Teachers' Association or the STF. It is much like preparing horseradish, one horse, one radish. That's about the mixture we have of the recommendations. Now some of the units have already signed with the teachers, part of my area is included in the Govan unit. Other units have signed too which have already been mentioned in this debate. But the biggest thing I see wrong with this legislation, it will take away the authority of the school unit.

Already the authority has been taken away from the school units for putting up structures and buildings and financing their buildings. The Local Government Board tells them whether they can or they can't put up a building. They are just the Joe boys now for the Local Government Board. Regardless of the need for school buildings they are told they must hold off. I know of schools buildings they are told they must hold off. I know of schools which have been badly needed for the last three or four years which as yet haven't had the go-ahead to build. In the meantime the local authorities have had to make do with temporary buildings, and it has cost them more than it would have to build a proper school in the first place. At the same time the cost of construction, interest rates and other costs have been climbing so whenever these buildings are okayed it is going to cost them more now than it would have done three or four years ago. Yet they have been deprived in the meantime of the use of those facilities. I think steps should have been taken by the Government to set up a fund. If it feels that there are cases where a debenture shouldn't be issued, the Government should be setting up a fund, as was advocated by the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), a loaning fund to local governments for school purposes or other purposes whereby the money could have been made available. This wouldn't have interfered with the borrowing power of the unit for other purposes. But we have seen their power eroded there.

Now this will take away the power from the unit trustees for bargaining for teachers. After all if the unit trustees are not going to be involved in the bargaining and the collective bargaining of their teachers neither are they going to have the control over teachers nor are they going to have anything left, only the Job jobs. They'll just be responsible for janitors and conveyance of buses. But if we adopt the principle that there are so many teachers to bargain with and therefore it should be put on compulsory area bargaining, then equally it is right to assume that the hiring of janitors or the hiring of bus drivers should be on a compulsory area bargaining program. Therefore, where do you stop, Mr. Speaker? The thing is, the unit trustees will just be a body that is told by the central board or an area board, or an area authority, whatever is going to be designed, what salaries they have to pay. They in turn will have to make a requisition to the local municipal authorities for

April 23, 1968

school taxes. That would be about the extent of their authority, to pass on to the local municipal authorities the necessary mill rate and taxes in order to carry out the obligations of the Department of Education as laid down by this area bargaining program.

Now the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) mentioned that he had carried on a survey in his constituency by contacting all of the trustees and all of the teachers independently, not at meetings but on an independent basis. His survey showed that 63 per cent of the trustees contacted and 98 per cent of the teachers contacted were in favour of the Moore Committee. Now the Attorney General said this was nonsense and he said the survey didn't mean a thing, but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Cutknife carried out a survey in the area he had access to, he has made the results of that survey available to this House. On the other hand regarding another Bill that was before this House, the Government carried out surveys in certain areas of the province where it had more facilities to carry out a thorough survey but it did not make available to this House the result of its surveys. Where it has the machinery and the Department to do the work, it says it is private, confidential information, but when the Member for Cutknife makes the results of his survey available then the Government calls it nonsense. I imagine if this Bill goes through the House, it will be another one of those Bills which the Premier described the other day after the third reading of a previous Bill as one more Socialist mess cleaned up. Maybe that is what it is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, because the former Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act which was brought down in 1949 by and large has worked reasonably satisfactorily for the past 20 years. There is no doubt, due to the progressive trend in education and the needs of education, that Act needed updating but it didn't need scrapping and it didn't need dictatorship methods in order to amend that legislation. So therefore this will be one more Socialist mess cleaned up according to the Government. The previous Bill believed in local autonomy and believed in democratic principles. This Bill believes in neither. Therefore I would say that this Bill is a vicious Bill and should be withdrawn.

Now the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) said that under this Act we could do a better job for the public, the trustees and the teachers. Well under this Act I cannot see how this Act can do a better job for the public, the trustees and the teachers. At the present time it is saying that the teachers and the trustees cannot get along and that the public is the victim and that under this Act it is going to do better for all three. Well I fail to see it, I have read the Bill through and I cannot see how either the public, the trustees or teachers are being considered. It is a matter in my opinion of putting the trustees against the teachers, the teachers against the trustees. The old method of divide and rule. Therefore you can say to the public if you are talking to the public it is either the trustee or the teacher that is at fault, it has always got somebody to have as a scapegoat to lay the blame on. I think it is one of the old tactics of divide and rule and I think this is a bad Bill. This Bill is not only centralization but it is compulsion. This Bill doesn't define what rules or criteria will be used in laying out area, whether the province will be carved out into four areas, five areas, fifteen areas or twenty. It doesn't say whether the cities will be an area, the larger towns an area, or how it will be divided. It's a blank cheque given to the Minister of Education. And incidentally I don't know how he is going to make it work but I

understand he is going to be absent for the next month or so.

I think that education today is a thing which we must give great attention to. Education is a tool for giving our young folk some security for the future. I believe that education should be set up as a means to an end. I think that a lot of amendments are needed in our educational set up, in our curriculum and so forth. I believe that more attention should be given on guidance counselling to our boys and girls in school. Too many of our boys and girls go through school and have no idea what their goal is or what they are going to head for. Therefore, education doesn't mean much to them. I would like to demonstrate that by saying that some years ago there was a young lad at McKague which is north of my constituency in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. Yes, it's still in Melfort-Tisdale. It was in Kelsey but it was put in Melfort Tisdale. There was a lad there that when he used to go school believed in playing truant. He would go into the bush and pick up bugs and leaves, anything rather than go to school. He just loved to study the small wild life that way, butterflies, etc. Eventually he realized in order to know more about entomology that he must go to school and learn how to read and write. Consequently once he saw his goal, what he would like to do, schooling became a pleasure for him. The last I heard of that fellow he was Professor of entomology at one of the Universities of California, because he had decided what he had wanted to. But until he knew what he wanted to do education to him was something that wasn't interesting, therefore he shouldn't stay in school; I think that is one of the problems today. Our education does not give our boys and girls the goals which they should be looking for. School is more or less a place to send them to keep them off the street and to keep them out of the parent's way, and the pupils don't understand why they are there in a good many cases. You take a boy or girl that is in public school and says, "I want to go through for a doctor or a lawyer or a nurse," if they have an idea what they want, these boys or girls usually are good pupils because they know what they are headed for. But the boy or girl with equally as high an I.Q. But doesn't realize what the goal is finds it very difficult. I think this is one place we need to give emphasis to our education which would help a lot.

Putting in a Bill like this which is just going to upset the foundation behind the education is not going to help. To have 126 teacher negotiation units in itself may be good or it may be bad. It is not a yardstick of measure. Just to say there are 126 different municipal secretaries or town secretaries or unit secretaries and so forth, and this Bill is not saying that there should be an area of bargaining for municipal secretaries, unit secretaries or other like employees. But whether there is one in a bargaining group or whether there is a number it is still a bargaining agreement, therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that 126 in itself doesn't mean anything.

There is one thing I noticed the other night when this Bill was up for debate. The Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) spoke on second reading of this Bill and in my opinion made a very logical speech. He dealt in much greater depth than I am going to do. The galleries on that occasion being the Easter holidays had a lot of teachers. A lot of teachers were interested to hear what the Legislature had to say about this Bill, but the Member for Nutana south (Mr. Forsyth) after the Member for Cutknife had spoken got up to speak, spoke for less than 10

April 23, 1968

minutes and adjourned the debate. The teachers were back in the gallery on Saturday but this Bill wasn't called. I knew it would be called when the teachers couldn't be present, because the people who sit opposite to us are not prepared or don't want to have the teachers hear the debate on this Bill. They only want them to hear their side of the story and, therefore, that is why this Bill was adjourned. It wasn't because there wasn't time, we could have gone on that evening but it was because they didn't want the teachers to hear. Arrangements had been made ahead of time, Mr. Minister, for two more speakers and then the Bill to be adjourned, but it was adjourned in less than 10 minutes.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Will the Hon. gentleman permit a question.

Mr. Dewhurst: — No, you can speak on the Bill!

Mr. Coderre: — No, I would just like to ask you one question.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Go ahead, ask it.

Mr. Coderre: — I am wondering whether you are debating in the House to the Legislature or are you doing so for the gallery. It indicates from what you have just said that whatever is said in this House is said for the gallery, not for the Legislature itself.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I don't know what he rose on, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a point of privilege or a point of order and it wasn't related to the Bill. But when it comes to talking to the galleries, if that's all they make speeches for, everyone of us could take lessons from the Minister of Labour because that is all he does. He speaks to the galleries. He never speaks to his Bills or his legislation, he just speaks for publicity. But I am talking to this Bill and I am criticizing the actions of the Government for all during 1967 they didn't give the teachers the opportunity to present their case for this Bill and they weren't prepared to let the teachers hear their arguments on behalf of the Bill, on second reading of this Bill. Their actions speak louder than their words. They stand to be condemned. This Legislature should reject this Bill, tell the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) to take it back, have a further study on it and bring it back at a later session.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) for putting the case so well for the group on this side of the House. The Government introduced what I think is ill-advised and controversial legislation. Then the Hon. Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) pleased with the House, "Let's not be critical; let there be sweetness and harmony." Well, Mr. Speaker, this sanctimonious and hypocritical attitude reminds me of a fellow who set his own home on fire, then criticized his neighbour for not helping to put out the fire. If he

wants no division between the teachers and the trustees, I suggest he use his influence on the Minister to have the legislation withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, in its wisdom the Government of this province asked Judge Ben Moore and his Committee to examine the bargaining relationship between the teachers and the trustees and to make recommendations in this regard. This Judge is well known to many of us and he has earned our respect by his patient approach and his many sound decisions based on reason. His Committee wrote a report setting our recommendations after they heard many briefs from all the parties concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment more specifically regarding Judge Moore and his Committee's recommendations concerning area bargaining. Without quoting the Judge at great length, it seems evident that he felt that area bargaining should be tried first on a voluntary basis, and practised on a compulsory basis only if it met with the approval, that is, compulsory area bargaining should be practised only if it met with the approval of both the teachers and the trustees. Mr. Speaker, I think there are precedents, precedents have been established for this. Compulsory area bargaining by legislation operates in some jurisdictions with the sanction of both parties concerned.

Introduction of this Bill ignores the Moore Committee Report. It fails to accept the basic facts since both parties concerned must live with it that, if it is compulsory, they should both endorse the method of operation. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, after having listened to both the trustees and the teachers, that the teachers are most unhappy with compulsory area bargaining. It seems to me that by passing this legislation without giving it a trial on a voluntary basis, without having the trustees and the teachers work out a procedure that is satisfactory to them prior to drafting the legislation, we are setting the stage for some very bad clashes between these two necessary groups in our society.

Mr. Speaker, trustees work for the community, for the parents of Saskatchewan and for their children at little or no remuneration. They are dedicated to education; their objective, and no one would quarrel with this, is to provide a good educational system for present and future generations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — We have some of these people sitting as representatives in our group. Teachers in the past 20 years have raised the status of their profession. They have worked diligently to improve methods, facilities and the standard of education. No one can deny that their contribution, to our province a contribution like that of the trustees is necessary, is appreciated, and is part of the very structure of Saskatchewan society.

Mr. Speaker, our task is not to decide who is right or who is wrong. Our job is to provide machinery that will give the trustees and the teachers an opportunity to work out their own solutions, solutions for bargaining, regarding area, fringe benefits, the entire scope of an agreement. Judge Moore and his Committee in their wisdom were searching for a solution to this problem. At the end of their search, they came up with an answer to area bargaining. They said it should be on a voluntary basis, and if on a compulsory basis, only in a form

April 23, 1968

that is acceptable to both parties.

Mr. Speaker, an enunciation by the Minister that this Bill is an improvement in salary negotiations when one party was hardly consulted just before the first Bill was drafted, I think is a pretty brave statement. When areas are not outlined in the Bill, we are reluctant to trust his judgment and inclined to question his objectives. Negotiations on fringe items, other than salaries, add up to a tedious duplication and I suggest offer opportunities for more and not fewer disputes. The legislation has been drafted without full and proper consultation. This is regrettable for we had hoped that it would be practical and acceptable to all parties. Frankly we have some serious doubts and I think these doubts are justified.

Mr. Speaker, the Government by acting in haste, by acting without following Judge Moore's carefully weighed recommendation, without taking the recommendations of this Committee into consideration, the Government may have set the stage for prolonged difficulty between the teachers and the trustees. This is regrettable for the students, for everyone concerned. It is unfortunate. It is another case I contend of bad judgment being exercised by the Government opposite. This bad judgment, Mr. Speaker, prevents those of us who are interested in seeing harmony between the teachers and the trustees from supporting this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill 65, an Act respecting Teachers' Salaries Agreements, I do so as a Member of the Legislature and as a member of the profession which this Bill so directly affects. At the outset, I do not wish to indulge in repetitious arguments or to look for a hanger or a nest where I could lay the blame. This, Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from doing, as I feel that this will not heal the breach and the gap which is currently widening between the parties whose main concern is the welfare of the educational system and, what is more, Sir, the welfare of the taxpayers and the teachers in the community and the welfare of the taxpayers and the teachers in the community and the welfare of the education of the boys and girls. It is somewhat regrettable that the Government and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) together with the members of the Executive Council and the Premier did not or were not able to surmise that the teaching profession will not voluntarily submit to arbitrary decisions in respect of the welfare of the profession without full consultation and participation of the members of the profession and its organization, namely, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. Mr. Speaker, and will the Hon. Minister of Education take note, it is my opinion and I feel that it should be of most Hon. Member of this Legislature, that education is a two-way street. On the one hand, are those who pay for the services, be they taxpayers or the Provincial Government on behalf of the taxpayers and those providing the services. These two groups, Mr. Speaker, should be equal participants in joint, mutual discussions concerning the welfare of education and the welfare of the teaching profession and where they concern the taxpayers' ability to pay and carry the cost of education.

Having established, Sir, the fact that both parties have common and indeed necessary mutual interests, it is in this atmosphere, an understanding, that the problems concerning all areas of education be mutually and jointly discussed and agreed

upon for the benefit of all parties concerned. Needless to repeat at this point, what has already been so ably stated by other Hon. Members that to disregard the basic concept of good faith, trust and mutual understanding in the exchange of ideas will not bring about an established mutual respect which is so evidentially needed in this instance.

To these Hon. Gentlemen to your right, Mr. Speaker, all legislation concerning employer-employee relations implemented by a CCF Government in the 20-year period always places some one group in a preferred position. Therefore upon its election to office this free enterprise Government, Mr. Speaker, together with the opinion and thinking of the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) of the independent sector will rectify the problems and bring amendments by which the lambs will live together in peace with the wolves forever. The Essential Services Act, Bill 79 and Bill 2 were introduced to stabilize the trade unions and labor, Bill 39 to take care of those in need of medical care and hospital services, Bill 65, to take care of the teaching profession. May I remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that the one-time leader who was sitting on this side of the House, Mr. Walter Tucker or Justice Tucker, coined a 1948 election phrase that went something like this: "He who sows the wind will reap the whirlwind." Well this Government hasn't either the wind or the steam to propagate its own well-being by introducing legislation of this type. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has gone broke. This Government has mismanaged the affairs of the Province, this Government has through its high-handed methods placed efficient servants into intolerable positions and many who left because of the action of this Government are lost to the Province and its best interests. As a result, this Thatcher Government is floundering in the sea of inefficiency, in the sea of floundering mistakes, in the sea of political indecision based on interests other than those whose concern is the welfare of our people. To top it all, the blame for the Government's fumbling and inefficiency must be placed on someone else other than itself so that our doctors, our nurses, our teachers, the mentally ill and the sick must be to blame. This all reminds me of a robber who was running away from the scene where he had committed robbery. He kept yelling back in loud outbursts, "Catch that thief."

Mr. Speaker, this Government fails and has failed to realize that costs of education are rising each year and in order to ease the burden on the local taxpayers, the Government should be providing larger operational grants. This would ease the burden of increased taxes borne by the property owner. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the Blaine Lake school unit where I teach, No. 57, where expenditures for the fiscal year have increased by \$73,000 will receive \$16,475 less grants from the Department of Education for 1968 than they did a year ago. To keep the records straight, Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the total amount received in grants amounted to \$428,075 and the information I have from the secretary of the school unit is that for 1968 the grant will only be \$421,600 or exactly \$16,475.09 less. What has happened to the school taxes in the Blaine Lake school unit because of this? Up to 40 mills went the rates for both urban and rural property taxpayers. It will be difficult for the Minister and the Government to explain to the taxpayers of my school unit that the mill rate has increased because the Government is providing \$2.7 million more for school grants. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, seems to have a miracle drug or a panacea for all ailments. Reported in the Saskatchewan Bulletin of December 19, 1967 under title "Teachers to Blame", note,

April 23, 1968

Mr. Speaker, not the Government or the Department, it is the teachers who are to blame. May I quote in part the article, Mr. Speaker:

Premier Ross Thatcher says increased Provincial grants to local school boards have been soaked up each year by equivalent teachers' salary demands and this Government intends to cut out. These increases were intended to reduce the financial burden of local taxpayers, says the Premier in a recent interview with the STF Bulletin. "But this purpose has been continually thwarted because the teachers have converted the extra money into higher salaries for themselves", he charged. From now on the Provincial Government will set the percentage it is prepared to pay for teachers and local school boards will have to pick up the tab for the rest.

And may I quote further, Mr. Speaker:

He also made known that all school construction in the province except for emergencies has to be frozen for at least a year. No more division 3 or 4 schools will be built until the whole situation has been studied by a board appointed for that purpose. Premier Thatcher said this board will probably be made up of businessmen rather than educators.

He says his Government still gives education top priority. You see he sort of stands on the one Legislature a little, then on the other Legislature a bit; this way yes, the other way yes. He doesn't know himself where it is half of the time. To quote again:

He still gives education top priority but he is determined that education costs will increase only within the ability of the province to pay for them. He will not condone deficit financing in any form for any purpose in boom times.

Please note, Mr. Speaker, boom times, 1967, and the Premier is curtailing expenditures for more facilities for division 3 and division 4. This is a Government, Mr. Speaker, who in 1965 turned away almost 900 students because of lack of space in our technical schools. And in a Return tabled this session, an additional 500 more students, to be exact, 549 . . .

Mr. A. R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I know that the Member for Redberry likes to make a political speech on behalf of his constituents but we are discussing the Salary Negotiating Act. School grants, the number of students that are turned away or not turned away from any given institution during any given year has absolutely nothing to do with the principle of this Bill and I would ask that you rule that he stays on the principle of the Bill so that the work of the House can progress in a reasonable manner.

Mr. Speaker: — Well I couldn't agree that school grants weren't relative to a Teachers' Salary Negotiation agreement, but I do have to say that I doubt very much if reference to the technical schools of the province was within the scope of the debate.

Mr. Michayluk: — Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I want to remind the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) if he wants to make a speech on Bill 65, I would suggest that he rise later on in the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Let's get back on the Bill.

Mr. Michayluk: — May I continue, Mr. Speaker, with your permission. In all because of costs, Mr. Minister. This is the basis on which the Premier argues his case that he is not going to allow costs to go up and this is the only reason. A Government and a Department, Mr. Speaker, that had monies appropriated by this Legislature, sat on its haunches for three years until it realized that the situation was getting drastic and started expanding facilities at the technical school in Saskatoon. This, Mr. Speaker, will provide facilities, I'm given to understand, only for the nurses' training.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier thinks he is going to curtail expenditures for education by curtailing increases for teachers' salaries, and if he is of the opinion that because of Bill 65 teachers will come hat in hand to him to beg for salary increases, he has another thought coming. No legislation passed by this Legislature will bind teachers to hold their teaching positions in this province when more lucrative salaries in a more democratic atmosphere are being paid in our neighbouring provinces. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to give the Hon. Members of this Legislature comparison medium salary scales for the two provinces to the west of us compared with the salaries in Saskatchewan. Might I, Mr. Speaker, begin with British Columbia and Saskatchewan comparison for 1966-67. Let us look at teachers' salaries in class I. This is the beginning teacher. Minimum salary in British Columbia, \$4,100; minimum salary in Saskatchewan for the same qualification and the same experience, \$3,200. Mr. Speaker, the beginning teacher with the same training and qualification receives \$900 more by teaching in British Columbia than does the teacher teaching in the Province of Saskatchewan. Let us look at the maximum for this group, British Columbia and Saskatchewan. In British Columbia the maximum is \$6,350, more than the MLAs got up to this session; and in Saskatchewan, the maximum for this group is \$4,700; a difference of \$1,650 in the maximum between the Province of British Columbia and the Province of Saskatchewan. Now I'm not acquainted with the provisions of salary negotiations in British Columbia, but if Saskatchewan employers refuse to increase salaries to their teachers to somewhere within the minimums and maximums, what is there to stop a teacher from packing several of her suitcases, buying a \$25 ticket and saying, "Goodbye to the new Saskatchewan." This same group for 1967-68 has \$850 less in minimum salary and \$1,700 less in maximum salary. This is group I.

Might I, Mr. Speaker, use class II, a teacher with two years' training. For the 1967-68 academic year, the current academic year, minimum for this group in Alberta is \$5,182; for Saskatchewan, the minimum is \$4,700 or \$482 less in Saskatchewan than in Alberta. But, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the maximums, Alberta teachers in this group are paid a maximum of \$8,147, while in Saskatchewan the teachers with the same training and experience receive \$7,400 or \$747 less than the teacher receives in the Province of Alberta.

April 23, 1968

Even the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, which not in the too distant past had salaries lower than in Saskatchewan, pays \$400 more in the minimum and \$100 more in the maximum for the same qualifications. But if we compare British Columbia and Saskatchewan teachers in group III as I have just finished comparing with the Province of Alberta, the minimum is \$843 more, and \$1,310 greater in the maximum compared with the salary for the Saskatchewan teachers for the 1967-68 academic year. If the Government, Mr. Speaker, thinks that Bill 65 will create an atmosphere conducive to retaining teachers, which I doubt very much, only time will prove that what I now say is correct.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the numbers of Saskatchewan teachers seeking teaching positions outside of Saskatchewan was the greatest in a decade. Statistics show that in 1964, 309 teachers took up teaching positions outside of Saskatchewan. In 1964, almost 300, 299 to be exact, left Saskatchewan to take teaching positions in other provinces. However, last year in 1967, a total of 489 left the new Saskatchewan, the greatest migration of qualified human resources, according to the Premier's own words, since the time when Moses led the Jews out of Egypt.

Mr. Minister, might I sound a word of warning to you and to your Department and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, that if you try to impose compulsion or compulsory area bargaining on the teachers, the figure for 1969 will be the largest increase in the number of Saskatchewan teachers leaving Saskatchewan to take teaching positions in other Canadian provinces.

Is it any wonder that the Saskatchewan teachers reacted with almost total unanimity when the Minister unfolded the original proposal of a draft bill that was concocted by this Department and probably under pressure from the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. Mr. Speaker, in the Budget debate I made a brief reference to the fact that had the ex-Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) remained on the coaching staff of the present Minister, the crisis existing between the Department and the School Trustees' Association and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation need not have occurred. Mr. Trapp knew, Mr. Speaker, that the 1949 Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act was implemented in consultation with all parties interested in the welfare of education. Mr. Speaker, I too mentioned at that time that before this Act was implemented several years of joint consultation between the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Department of Education had taken place. Many of our school units and our school boards had employed the basic concept of that Act, in negotiations prior to the implementation of the Act. Mr. Speaker, when in 1949 the Act was introduced into this Legislature, all the Members supported the Bill unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Moore Commission Report on salary negotiations which discussed the salary negotiation procedures ordered by the Liberal Government, it is correct that the Government never did state its opinion of the Report and never took action based on it until this session. Why? Mr. Minister, didn't your party make your stand on the Moore Commission Report known to the teaching profession prior to the 1967 October 11 election? The Saskatchewan teachers were agreed to adopt the Moore Commission Report in its entirety. Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, why did you not make your consultation with both groups so vitally concerned with the best interests of education? Why did you not invite the teachers' representatives and the Saskatchewan school trustees' representatives to sit

around the same table and mutually discuss the revision in respect of salary negotiations, if such revisions in your candid opinion and that of the Government were necessary?

There were all kinds of headlines, Mr. Speaker, emanating from the Minister's office and appearing in the daily press when the teachers of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation took exception to the proposals of the original draft legislation. Appearing in the Star Phoenix of January 16, 1968, may I quote the headlines, "First bill draft not final — McIsaac." On January 30, 1968, in the same paper, and I quote, "McIsaac says compromise likely."

Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1968, as reported in the Star Phoenix, after the waters were already muddied and the teachers had taken a violent exception to the proposals, the Minister began to backtrack, like the Minister of Public Health in respect to the closing of the 8 hospitals, although even then it was with reluctance. Probably big Daddy No. 1, Premier Thatcher kept his finger pointed at this head as he did on the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). May I quote from a press release of January 23, 1968. Here is what the Minister was reported to have said:

McIsaac accuses Federation of gross exaggeration.

And after he backtracked this is what he stated, I quote:

He said that that was not the final draft and that he was willing and prepared to revise the original draft. Education Minister McIsaac, Monday, accused the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation of unprofessional tactics and extreme exaggeration in discussion of proposed changes in teachers' bargaining procedures.

There is no justification whatever for the wild statements by the STF leader that teachers are being made into whipping boys or about the Federation being forced to adopt survival tactics. Dr. McIsaac said many teachers had written courteous and reasonable letters to him expressing their points of view.

Well I received copies of some of them, Mr. Minister.

I feel that letters of this kind express a concern which is sincere. However, union-style tactics such as centrally directed mass telegrams and the like are not in my view the way in which a profession conducts its business.

We are supposed to lie down, come hat in hand.

One of the main concerns of the Federation leaders at this time is the fact that we would give consideration to proposals advanced by the school trustees.

And further down he states:

He took the draft procedures to the STF January 3rd and asked for their views hoping that Government, teachers and trustees would sit down calmly and work things out.

Wouldn't it have been better, Mr. Minister, if you had called upon the members of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the representatives of Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association

April 23, 1968

jointly with the members of the Department of Education and drawn up a draft where there would be unanimity, where there would be agreement. But let's go on, Mr. Speaker, the president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, Mr. Dudridge, knew what the Act implied. Reported in the Star Phoenix of January 12th — and this is only nine days after the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) presented his draft proposal to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation — the president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association was reported as saying:

The legislation would have a hundred per cent support of the school trustees, Mr. Dudridge said.

Surprising, the trustees president agrees with it, or the trustees one hundred per cent. The Saskatchewan teachers take violent reaction to these proposals.

He said that trustees wished to streamline the mechanics of salary negotiations. Unless this is done, trustees may lose some of the powers to the government as is happening in other Canadian provinces.

Well, the Saskatchewan people are sure losing a lot of their power to this Government.

He said that he thought that trustees all across Canada were waiting for a government to bring in legislation of this sort and he hoped that Saskatchewan would be the first.

This is the president of the Saskatchewan school trustees speaking. Another first for the new Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The trustees strongly supported the idea of compulsory area bargaining by dividing the province into four areas geographically with more than one salary grid in each area for city and unit teachers. Trustees also support the idea of one bargaining agent for trustees meeting one bargaining agent for the teachers.

This Act also provides that, if the teachers' representative negotiates with the trustees' representatives one day and comes back and keep on negotiating, he may find in the seat of the trustees' representative another agent, because the Act so provides.

Mr. Speaker, a one-time Liberal MLA of this Legislature and now professor at the College of Education at Saskatoon, Mr. John Egnatoff who is also a public school trustee, said, as reported in the press of January 15th and may I quote in part:

“I find it difficult to believe a Liberal Government would try to enact such reactionary legislation.”

He said that as an individual and a former school principal, he had strong feelings about the Government's proposed Bill which would force area bargaining for teachers and remove administrators from bargaining.

And then further down the same article, Mr. Speaker,:

He said that he thought the executive of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association had erred in asking the Government to enact such legislation. But said that he

wasn't sure what effective action an individual trustee could take. Mr. Egnatoff thought that compulsory area bargaining is premature. It should have been tried on a voluntary basis. He said that compulsory area bargaining would inevitably lead to bargaining on a province-wide basis and more centralization.

Mr. Speaker, the Moore Committee Report was quite specific on the subject of area bargaining. They recommended that area bargaining be started on a voluntary basis as school boards and teachers should choose without any compulsion. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education accuses the teachers of union-style tactics. Might I with your permission, Mr. Speaker, quote from the report of the meetings held by teachers after the draft proposal was made known to the representatives of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the teachers. In the teachers' Bulletin and I am quoting just sections of it:

Teachers of Saskatchewan East, West, Biggar, Blaine Lake, Lanigan, North Battleford City and unit Parkland, Rosetown, Rosthern, Wilkie units, gathered to protest Government legislation concerning teachers' welfare.

Hundreds of teachers gave up night classes to attend meetings. The feeling expressed at all meetings was that we can look after ourselves economically no matter what happens, but we will certainly fight to retain control of all our professional destiny.

From the same paper, Mr. Speaker:

In the Kerrobert unit meeting held at Luseland it was suggested from the floor that teachers agree to withdraw services for a week if the proposed legislation is not withdrawn. Teachers of the Lloydminster city and unit were also to submit mass resignations effective June 30th or a month from now or probably go on strike.

Another section from the press report:

About 424 separate school teachers in Regina gave enthusiastic support to the proposal to write or telephone their MLAs, Education Minister McIsaac and Opposition Leader Mr. Woodrow Lloyd, protesting the draft legislation on teachers' salary negotiation.

The Member speaking the other day said, "Well, there are just a few teachers who want to antagonize this type of legislation." I am quoting from meetings that were held in practically all the units of Saskatchewan and in all the cities of Saskatchewan in respect to this legislation. So for a Member of the Government to get up and say that some teachers, or very few teachers take exception this legislation, is not correct.

One more, Mr. Speaker, another quote:

More than 700 members of the Regina Public School Teachers' Association considered a work to rule motion at a mass meeting recently protesting draft legislation on teachers' salary negotiations.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if he would allow a question. Would you tell us the teacher who suggested

April 23, 1968

that resolution at that meeting?

Mr. Michayluk: — I am quoting from a press report. And the press report did not state who.

Mr. Guy: — It was Mr. Jack Kehoe who made the resolution.

Mr. Michayluk: — Immaterial. There was no Jack Kehoe in Blaine Lake and North Battleford, Unity, Kerrobert, Wilkie and all these other units. Just because Jack Kehoe moved a resolution in one area does not mean these actions were politically inspired. And if you think that this is politically inspired you have another thought coming. How about John Egnatoff? Was he politically inspired.

An Hon. Member: — He was also defeated.

Mr. Michayluk: — May I go on Mr. Speaker. You gentlemen will have the opportunity of rising and speaking on Bill 65 when I am through.

Another one concerning 500 Moose Jaw teachers, meeting at Moose Jaw.

Some 500 Moose Jaw and district teachers last week voiced opposition to proposed provincial legislation concerning teachers' salary negotiations.

In another portion Saskatoon East-West unit locals criticized proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) speaking on second reading of Bill 65 mentioned the fact that 49 teachers, 47 of whom are in the final year of a four-year program were recruited by the Edmonton Public School Board.

According to the reports of the Minister's Invitational Conference on Teachers' Supply and Demand held in December, 1966, the cost to the Province of training one teacher for one year is \$1,600. This means, Mr. Speaker, that a teacher with a Bachelor of Education degree costs the province \$6,400 to train. The very fact that 49 of these teachers have decided to go to the city of Edmonton, this province
...

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — An Hon. Member is smoking in the House.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not smoking, I am holding a pipe.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! It would look a lot more as if you weren't smoking, if you had it out of your mouth.

Mr. Michayluk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the ruling. I think the ruling is timely.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30 I was in the course of making some remarks about the necessity of the co-operation between the various parties concerned, namely the school trustees, the teachers' association and the ratepayers in the best interests of education. I was also making some comparisons in respect of salaries between the two Western provinces and those of Saskatchewan. I was also stating my opinion in respect to the fact that the Department of Education and the Minister didn't see fit to convene the various parties to mutually agree on some form of revision, if such a revision was necessary in respect to salary negotiations between the teachers and the school boards. I had also intimated, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan had over the years been losing a large number of teachers to our neighbouring provinces and that this was probably due to the fact that the salaries in our neighbouring provinces were unusually higher, both in the minimums and the maximums. I had also mentioned the fact that, if compulsory bargaining was forced upon the teachers of this province, this may too create a feeling of unwillingness on part of the teachers to forego the Saskatchewan climate of compulsion. So we may in the future see more teachers leaving Saskatchewan and taking up positions in other provinces. I was also mentioning the fact that teachers were being castigated particularly by the Members opposite, that these reactions that had come from the teachers were probably motivated politically by certain individuals, and we had a remark made by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) about one teacher who had moved a resolution in Regina and at that time I mentioned that this was not the case in all units and all cities of the Province of Saskatchewan.

In bringing to this Legislature the fact and the concern of the teachers, I was just about to say that 500 teachers at Moose Jaw had met and they voiced their opposition to the Provincial legislation concerning teachers' salary negotiations. And in another portion of the newspaper to which I referred, Saskatoon East and West locals criticized the proposed legislation also.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) speaking on second reading of Bill 65 mentioned the fact that 49 teachers of whom 47 are in the final year of a four-year program were recruited by the Edmonton Public School Board. Now this is a terrific number of teachers. 47 out of these 49 recruited were degree teachers, that had completed their four-year university training. I also mentioned before adjournment, that according to the reports of the Minister's Invitational Conference on teacher supply and demand held in December, 1966, the cost to the province of training one teacher for one year was \$1,600. This means, Mr. Speaker, that a teacher with a Bachelor of Education degree costs the province \$6,400 to train. The very fact, Sir, that 49 of these teachers have decided to go to the city of Edmonton, indicates that this province has contributed \$307,200 towards the training of some 49 teachers to meet the requirements of the Edmonton Public School Board. There is every possibility that about 200 degree teachers may leave and this province will be contributing over \$1 million dollars from the taxpayers to subsidize the schools of our neighbouring provinces.

I had intimated, Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks that there was salary differential between Canadian provinces. This is one reason why many of our teachers left Saskatchewan and will be leaving. With this iniquitous Bill 65 before us, and if it is allowed to pass through this Legislature, many more of our qualified teachers will leave the province to

April 23, 1968

seek employment elsewhere in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the loss of our trained personnel is a loss to the best interest of education and of our Saskatchewan boys and girls. Surely a Government and a Province that is always short of qualified personnel to staff the classrooms of our province should think twice before it implements a Bill or legislation as discriminatory and regressive and compulsory as this Bill 65.

Mr. Speaker, the Essential Services Bill was passed with only a mild objection on the part of the public. Next the academic freedom of our University was threatened. Again, we heard very little from the public. Now, we have the teaching profession, and indirectly the education of our young people being undermined. I hope that the public with the implementation of Bill 39 realizes that this Government is right at home and true to form.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Minister and I would urge the Government to think seriously before they make a definite stand on this iniquitous Bill which is before us. The challenge, Mr. Speaker, in education today is for men and women of good-will to make sure that they realistically face the issues shoulder to shoulder with common understanding in the best interest for all. It is for this reason that I will oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, as usual the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is in his usual form. If he isn't giggling, he is shouting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Act respecting Teachers' Salary Agreements is a very controversial Act. I know that the Liberals in their zeal for more power and being in general agreement with the Premier's lust for that kind of power and his wielding of the axe, chopping off the powers of universities, school boards, teachers' organizations and others, have been wielding this axe in conjunction with the Premier's wishes who has made it know far and wide across the whole province that school boards and universities, teachers, nurses, and hospital workers beware.

We are reaching the end of this session, Mr. Speaker. I know it and the people of Saskatchewan know it, the feeling permeates the length and the breadth of the whole province, Mr. Speaker, that the next three years of divine Liberal rule will be over.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, prior to 1964 they were out in the pasture for 20 years. The next time around they will be 40 years in the wilderness.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — And there won't be no Thatcher Moses to lead them out either, Mr. Speaker. In fact I doubt if he will be around

for the next four years. The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) on Friday last in his short abrupt manner presented his arguments. He said what he thought was necessary, but I am afraid with not too much conviction. Some of what he said, was and is, quite unacceptable to this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. He said that the Act embodies practically all the provisions of the Moore Report. Mr. Speaker, the big difference is the word practically. There are a number of areas of disagreement; in some it is within the realm of making things too rigid and some, of course, too loose. If the Government had endorsed and adopted the Moore Report in its entirety, the vote on this Bill would have been unanimous, Mr. Speaker.

Some of these areas I intend to mention right now. The big question of course is area bargaining. Another is the use of professional bargaining agents. We on this side of the House, wonder who these agents are going to be, Mr. Speaker. We have heard of some men retiring from some other job just lately — just the other night in fact — and I wonder if they are going to be in the position of being these agents. Another is the establishment of these areas under Orders in Council. Still another is the looseness of the constitution of this bargaining committee with no firm stipulations of numbers on the committee, the degree of conclusions reached by this community, the degree of conclusions reached by this community, and so on. Now many of the questions by both trustees and teachers, are these. Many trustees have voiced anxiety in these matters with the thought always in mind as to how far this Government is going to extend its fingers to erode the democratic powers of the people, and thus erode the powers of school boards. The Hon. Minister was very careful in pointing out that bargaining areas will not result in the loss of rights for teachers — a rather dubious statement, Mr. Speaker. But he carefully avoided saying anything about the loss of rights of trustees. He did, however, say that the trustees and teachers have other important educational matters to deal with which would be of more importance to education. Now I agree that in the process of education there is really one important viewpoint and that is the best education possible for each child. However, that does not mean that other factors aren't important. If this erosion of powers of the important function of the trustees continues, the result will be that they will become mere caretaker boards as I mentioned the other day, with far too great power concentrated in and wielded by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this session in the presentation of numerous Bills, it is all too evident that this Government under the Liberals is bent at all costs to cut away and erode the autonomy of the people and concentrate it in its own hands. Now my colleague from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) outlined the extent and the results of a survey the other evening, Mr. Speaker. I want to inform the House that I also conducted a survey, a similar survey, in my constituency with the results being almost identical with those of the Member for Cutknife. I agree that on one point, on area bargaining, not too many trustees are opposed to it. That is correct. But in nearly every case, Mr. Speaker, they indicated that if it would come about, this somehow would cost less money to the taxpayer.

I will have a little more to say about that later on. Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, when my colleague from Cutknife was pointing out the results of a survey, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) were heard across the House saying, "Why didn't you check on the rest of the province?" Well, Mr. Speaker, before proceeding

April 23, 1968

with this Bill, why didn't they find out more from the people of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Why didn't the Government carry out the total complete survey? They should have checked the feelings of the people. They are the Government. You on that side of the House are the Government. You are introducing the Bill. It was up to you to find out what the feelings of the people are. Mr. Speaker, it is all too evident that this Liberal Government is out to limit as much as possible the local autonomy, that the erosion of the freedoms of all people is at stake, that the statement that the Premier made after the final standing vote on the infamous Bill 39 which would affect trustees, teachers, university, schools, nurses and so on. Well what was it he said? Let me quote. "Another Socialistic mess cleaned up."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the guarantee of full security for the sick at no cost — a great goal which he through the CCF described as a Socialist mess. Mr. Speaker, what can we expect from the power-hungry Premier and his power-hungry colleagues in regard to other social legislation? Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Education had quite a number of reservations about this Bill. I am also sure that, had the Bill not been conceived in such haste, he in conjunction with trustees and teachers would have come to a far better understanding and something more acceptable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — After all, Mr. Speaker, I know he realizes, as I do and that the school trustees do too, and the teachers and the parents, that the basic reasoning behind all this is to provide the kind of education for the young people of Saskatchewan necessary in this modern and technological age. Now you can't do this in an evasion of responsibility and lack of consultation leading to mistrust and disillusionment for both trustees and teachers. I understand that the Minister had agreed to some amendments to the proposed legislation which aren't in evidence. One of these amendments was that the principals would be definitely included in all bargaining negotiations which has been included until now.

This guarantee isn't anywhere in the Bill. It has been clear for quite a number of years, Mr. Speaker, that to achieve the goals and aims of the new kind of education, centralization . . .

An Hon. Member: — Tell John Burton to number the pages.

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, all these gentlemen opposite to your right will have all the time to speak that they want. It's been clear, Mr. Speaker, for quite a number of years that to achieve the goals and aims of the new kind of education, centralization and larger areas would be of benefit. These, however, could and should have been achieved like the larger school units in consultation with all people — ratepayers, trustees, teachers, the department and other officials. Instead it must be this way because the Liberal Government wants it this way, the dictatorial way which has caused dissension and mistrust between these people.

I really hope that the results aren't tragic, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope that the breach will be healed between the teachers and the trustees, and that this coming fall, our teachers in spite of the difficulties will stay in Saskatchewan. I sincerely mean this.

A number of speakers have spoken on the loss of autonomy in so far as Bill 65 is concerned, an Act respecting teachers' salaries. Something has been said about the exclusion of certain types of administrators being out of scope and so on. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that this Government is silent on, the one thing that school trustees are thinking about back home and that this Bill might accomplish, their hope is to halt the local tax increase. I only want it known throughout Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to all people, trustees of school boards and ratepayers that this is what they are talking about, that these citizens of Saskatchewan be forewarned that area bargaining is not going to save the ratepayer any money. I would like to repeat this, Mr. Speaker, that bringing in area bargaining is not going to save the ratepayer any money. Somehow this impression has been left with the local boards across the province. I know that trustees clear across the province, school district boards and separate school boards have been very disturbed and exasperated by the yearly negotiations. This contention, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphatically point out, is the price you have to pay to retain the freedom and the power of being autonomous.

Now the teachers are just as exasperated, but they are not so sure they want to let that freedom go so easily. Mr. Speaker, these school boards believe that area bargaining is somehow going to make education costs cheaper, that somehow these cost problems are going to disappear. I want the people of Saskatchewan to know that this alone, area bargaining, is not going to make education cost less. In fact I predict that it will cost a lot more. The Government to your right, Mr. Speaker, isn't saying a word about this. Why? Because it knows that this is going to happen, that in fact if this Government isn't going to pick up a much bigger tab of the education costs, the people will be asked to raise their local tax level to unprecedented heights. If this Government will not find more money to put into education than it has for the last four years, Mr. Speaker, then local levies will continue to sky-rocket. I do not want to repeat myself, but I want to point out once more again that prior to 1964, the CCF Government of that day had made it possible for the local boards to maintain a basic minimum of the local tax levy, while adding greater and greater amounts to yearly operating grants, so that for a 10-year period prior to 1964, many school boards had either no local tax increases for education purposes or a very minimum of increase, except for some exceptional case. I'm not going to point out the increase that has come about this year in spite of the new grant formula. For the last four years, under the Liberals this increase of school expenditures was mostly placed on the shoulders of the local taxpayers. In case after case, year after year, a higher tax levy in nearly every school district had to be imposed because the level of Government grants had not kept pace with the rise of education costs. In spite of the warnings, Mr. Speaker, in spite also of the Liberal promises to help the local taxpayer, they ignored all this. For four years they have dragged their feet, Mr. Speaker. Not only have they dragged their feet, they have also been busy dragging their proverbial red herring, called the incentive grant, which I have referred to in this House before, as being the most dishonest, discriminatory and politically oriented ever produced. So it has been

April 23, 1968

ever since, Mr. Speaker. This year, Mr. Speaker, in spite of some good features of the grant formula, the hard and the fast fact is that the local taxpayer is still being heavily taxed, an average of 5 mills in every school district in the province.

Area bargaining is not going to help the local taxpayer. Area bargaining is going to cost more, a lot more. I feel that the Government in introducing this Bill has an obligation to tell these facts to the people of Saskatchewan, to tell them that in all likelihood it will cost them much more money in direct taxes, that this dragging of the red herring, as the Premier has been doing and suggesting in the new tax foundation formula proposed for the future, that this new tax foundation formula will not cure this evil, and will in reality not alleviate the local tax burden at all if, let me repeat this, Mr. Speaker, if the Government does not put more money into much larger school grants. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the expectation that area bargaining will itself solve the ever-increasing costs of education is a fallacy that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that some sections of this Bill are good, of the fact that many sections of this Bill are also bad, this Government saw some reason to bulldoze this Bill through with little or no consultation and in spite of the objections of many people who have indicated that this be held off for a year, to experiment with area bargaining on a trial basis and in spite of the findings of the Moore Commission, they still go. The fact that local boards are going to lose a great deal of autonomy through this educational Bill, as well as some of the other educational Bills passed, but mostly because this Bill will not save any money or give any money to the local taxpayer in the majority of Saskatchewan school districts, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, most of the comments that need to be made about this Bill have been made by my colleagues who have already spoken in the debate. However, it is a matter which in itself is of very considerable interest to me and at the risk of repeating some of the arguments I do want to take a brief part in the discussion.

What we are proposing in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a statutory framework by means of which teachers and trustees may jointly take part in making certain decisions. We're providing a statutory framework by means of which they will take part in making decisions about matters that are of mutual concern and interest to them and of course of great importance to the public as well. One can accept the fact that salary levels are a major part of this decision but it is also true that there are a number of other matters which are of great importance. I think of items such as; sabbatical leave, supervision allowance, the whole field, let us say, of employer-employee relationship.

These are important to trustees. They are important because trustees do have a very wide and very essential financial responsibility with respect to education. They are important to trustees because trustees also have an educational responsibility to create good conditions within the operation of our educational system. They have a responsibility to create those conditions which will recruit into the teaching profession good

students, which will retain in the teaching profession the best of our teachers, in particular of course they want to attract the well-trained and the experienced and the promising teacher to their own areas. Anything which interferes with or which detracts from the ability of trustees to so attract people into the profession or to retain people in the profession or to attract them to their area, is not good for education. I say with regret, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill does interfere and does detract from the change that trustees have to do this part of their job.

This whole matter is of interest to teachers not just for personal reasons, not just because it is the way in which their particular payroll is determined. Teachers too, Sir, have a responsibility to their profession. Teachers too have a responsibility for recruitment into the profession, retaining in the profession and retaining in our province. Again it seems to me that this Bill interferes with what teachers can do, and detracts from what teachers can do to maintain the best of the profession in the Province.

Teachers and trustees of course accept this joint responsibility on behalf of all of the rest of us. They have this responsibility to education generally; they have it more specifically to the young people in the classrooms throughout the province. I think it goes without saying that the joint determination of decisions of this kind is highly desirable, whether one is looking at it from the point of view of teacher-trustee, parent or student in the classroom. If we are going to have this joint determination and have it work effectively, then as my colleague from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) put it so very well this afternoon, there must be a large degree of acceptance by both of the parties concerned. There must be very considerable willingness on the part of all concerned to make this particular procedure work and work well. There has been a great deal of evidence presented that there is not that kind of acceptance and we cannot look forward very optimistically to smooth operating of the situation on the basis of this legislation.

Perhaps it is worthwhile in the light of this rather considerable change to look back a little bit on the history of this kind of relationship between teachers and trustees. There was a time, as all of us are aware, in which there was no legal structure to provide for joint decision-making. There was no legal structure for the determination of matters which affected teachers by way of salaries or other means. There was a straight employer-employee relationship in which teachers might talk to trustees, but in the end, the entire and complete decision was in the hands of the elected school board. Gradually there has evolved and wisely so I think a change in that relationship. Gradually there has evolved a system whereby more and more of these decisions are made jointly, rather than unilaterally. This is good and this is important. I think it is worthwhile to recall the way in which this system of joint decision making came about. Somebody earlier this afternoon, has referred to the Act not quite, but almost 20 years ago, when this joint decision-making was first given a statutory basis. If I may be pardoned some personal reference, Mr. Speaker, I can recall very well the events leading up to that. The idea was strange, it was foreign, it was new to the great majority of school trustees throughout the province and indeed to the great majority of teachers as well. In order that there might be acceptance, acceptance based on understanding, there were a number of meetings held throughout the province. In every

April 23, 1968

region of the province teachers and trustees together with officials of the Department of Education got together to discuss this whole matter of teacher-trustee relations and how it might be developed in the most productive manner. MLAs were invited to the meetings and many of them came. Following these discussions, there were further discussions between the organizations officially representing both groups. Out of this came a voluntary agreement. From this agreement we proceeded to institute on a voluntary basis in the initial stages, teacher-trustee collective bargaining throughout the province. When we had found our feet and determined our way in this method, Mr. Speaker, then legislation was brought before the Legislature. It was passed with the complete support of the Trustees' Association and the Teachers' Federation and the Legislature itself.

I think it is worthwhile noting that, because there was a need then as there is now for understanding and acceptance. It took a lot of hard work to get it, but in the end it was worthwhile because the system worked very well for quite a number of years. I can't emphasize too much how important this good relationship is, how important it is to have a clearly defined statutory basis for it. I submit that it is no stretch of fact at all to say that with The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act and this acceptance of the right to take part in making decisions, the teaching profession gained a new dignity in this province. I think there are few things that we have done, that added to the dignity of the teaching profession more and gave teachers some of the necessary rights and opportunity to have influence than did this particular procedure in this particular set up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Because this is so important I regret this legislation and more particularly the months leading up to this legislation which seemed to me to jeopardize this relationship, not only jeopardize it now, but which does not promise to improve it and to provide for a more productive, fair relationship in the future. I know that circumstances have changed since that particular first legislation was introduced, I think that there have been a number of new stresses on that legislation. There are new problems and new patterns which have developed. It was because of that the Government set up and I think wisely set up the Moore Commission to examine what had happened and what should be effected by way of change.

I need not go into any detail in the Legislature as to how that Commission proceeded, the number of meetings they had, and so on. It has already been recounted, we are all familiar with it. They produced a report which had, as I understand it, rather general acceptance from teachers and trustees and the public in general. While they have already been mentioned, I think it would be well for us just to remind ourselves of some of their main recommendations again at this particular time. I have reference, here I repeat what has already been said, I know, to the recommendation with respect to area bargaining. They note the interest that was shown throughout the province in various ways. They recommend that there be further study by a community consisting of members of the Department, the Trustees' Association, and the Teachers' Federation. They suggest that this study should be undertaken in order to determine the feasibility of a system of compulsory area bargaining under the present system of school administration. That recommendation needs looking at. This Commission after very extensive study

did not feel that it was ready to make a recommendation in favour of compulsory area bargaining. This Commission after all the study undertaken was not even convinced that area bargaining was feasible. So it recommended there be some further, some more intensive study by the representatives of the groups most intimately involved in order to determine first of all whether compulsory area bargaining was feasible.

They did have a further recommendation it is true. They suggested that there be legislation for area bargaining on a voluntary basis. This is as far as they went. I think a great deal of the difficulty that has arisen in the relationship of recent months and which we now face is because the Government in its wisdom or its lack of wisdom tried to leap-frog some of the steps proposed by the Moore Commission. They leap-frogged over the suggestion that there be a committee to study the feasibility of area bargaining. They leap-frogged over the proposal that legislation be limited to that which would make possible voluntary area bargaining. They jumped directly into a proposal which we now have before us to make area bargaining compulsory, to make it compulsory completely over the entire province, to make it compulsory in such a way that every school board and every teacher in the entire province was going to be involved and governed by this one particular step.

The second proposal which they made which is of quite considerable importance and again is pointed to in some of this legislation, has to do with bargaining agents to represent teachers and to represent trustees. I think the recommendation of the Committee merits emphasis again. "Your Committee would therefore recommend that the legislation provide that the committee selected by the board or the group of teachers include a majority of members who are members of the board or of the group of teachers as the case may be." Again I think the Government has not been most wise in not following that particular advice. As I understand the legislation, Mr. Speaker, it would be possible for those who will represent teachers or those who will represent trustees, to be from outside of the area, to be from the outside of persons who are active as teachers or active as trustees of the province. They could be outside of the organizations of either of these two groups. They could be outside of the province entirely. If one wants to take an extreme example, it would be possible for the trustees to choose somebody from Winnipeg and the teachers to choose somebody from Montreal, and for these two people to meet at the Lakehead and negotiate an agreement. I grant you I am being particularly extreme when I use that possibility, but the Act does allow it. I think that there is something here which tends to remove a proper degree of responsibility from those who are going to be taking the prominent part in making these decisions. I hope that the Minister if he persists with the legislation entirely will take a very hard look at that particular aspect of the legislation.

I submit, Sir, that if one looks at the history of employer-employee relationships an inescapable conclusion can be drawn about the use of outside so-called experts. I think a great deal of damage has been done to the relationship between employer-employee groups, by this emphasis on using somebody from outside simply because he is what is known as a professional negotiator. I hate to see this even made possible with respect to what I think is the most important of all employee-employer relationships, namely that which exists between our school trustees and the teachers of the Province of Saskatchewan.

April 23, 1968

So I urge the Minister to take, at least at that particular part, a better look than has been done at the moment.

The third item with respect to the Moore Commission which needs noting was that with respect to the position of principals as part of the group who would be bargaining or who would be bargained for. I am pleased that the Minister has backed away from the earlier proposal in this regard. This earlier proposal it will be remembered would have removed them, put them outside of scope. I think this would have been bad because it created two groups of teachers. It took one group; it would have set them aside and apart from the rest of the group. I think it would have tended to develop divisive forces within the profession and interfered with the proper relationship within the profession. This would have been very bad.

I wouldn't be mentioning it now since it is not in the Bill, except that I recall reading a statement of the Minister not long ago in which, as I understood, he said he still wasn't convinced that he shouldn't have left this in the Bill, or words to that effect. There is some statement about the person who is convinced against his will or her will remaining unconvinced still. I wanted to make an attempt to convince the Minister that his decision to leave it out was right and that he should leave that right decision where it stands and not move further along that line at any later date.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned some of the main recommendations of the Moore Commission which it seems to me have been ignored in this particular legislation. I would like to go back and just look more specifically at the legislation, what it proposes and what seems to me to be the problems it presents. I have already mentioned that the recommendation of the Commission was that there should be first of all discussions as to the feasibility of area bargaining, and secondly there should be legislation making it possible on a voluntary basis. I regret that the Government has moved, leap-frogging these proposals, into a situation of compulsory area bargaining for the whole province. I regret that because I think that without more agreement it is good and that it is feasible, then we defeat the very thing that the Minister has said. I am prepared to accept the fact that he says he conscientiously wants to avoid it. I am afraid we lead not into less dissension between teachers and trustees but into more dissension between teachers and trustees.

Secondly I think we must note that there is no definition as to what an area is in the Bill. Indeed I don't think the Minister has made any comment which helps us define an area. Perhaps I am wrong. If so he will correct me when he speaks in closing the debate. But I have not heard from anybody as yet any definition of an area, nor have I heard any definition of how an area is to be defined. Nobody it seems to me has said anything about the principles which ought to guide a decision as to what an area will be. I for one at the moment don't know whether we are talking about four areas or forty areas in the province. I don't know whether each city is to be an area in itself or all the cities are to be put together or the large cities together and the small cities together. I don't know whether it is to be a city plus an area of four or five units around it, I don't know what it is. I have not heard any suggestion from the Minister that would help me in making that kind of a definition. It seems to me that, if this Legislature is to be asked to decide on a measure as important as this, the Minister ought as a very minimum to put before us the criteria

which he is going to use in defining an area. I think we should have had it before this particular time.

It appears also from an examination of the Bill that part of the negotiations, by which these decisions are made, are going to be held at an area level whatever an area is, and part of them are going to be made at the level of the unit or the school district, as in the case of the cities or some of our larger towns. One has to question whether this fracturing or fragmenting of relationships is the best sort of thing to have. Here you know you deal with a teacher's position and how that teacher is to be remunerated for it. It ends up as one thing. Part of the decisions are being made at an area level; some I gather are to be made at the local level. In the end, you can have some unfortunate developments out of that.

I want to draw attention also to the fact that the first negotiations that are being proposed have had some added difficulties placed in their way. These negotiations are going to take place some time after the beginning of next year. In addition to all the difficulties of trying to make this new arrangement work, those who meet at that time are going to have to go back and try to make salary arrangements for months preceding. It's going to have to go back to August 1st or September 1st, I'm not sure which, in 1967. Now this is always a very tricky business it seems to me to attempt to negotiate for four or five months preceding the time of the actual negotiations. One comment on this which I think should be noted is the effect that this is going to have on next year's mill rates. This negotiation is going to have to provide rates for the 12 months of that particular year and the increases for the four months previous to that. So the mill rate is going to have to carry an increase, not only for the calendar year in which the negotiations are carried on, but in this case for four months preceding it. So you're going to have an inflated mill rate at that particular time.

I hope also that the Minister can say something about another difficulty when closing the debate, that is the fact that in some parts of the province trustees and the teachers in their areas have already agreed to what their salary arrangement should be for the period from August to December of next year. Is it going to be possible for the area negotiations to upset those arrangements or what will be the case? The Act is silent on it as it is at the moment.

May I just take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to look at the advantages and the disadvantages of this proposal. It has been said that this is going to save the trustees a great deal of time. I know that the trustees are hoping that this will be the case. I think all of us can appreciate that which the school trustees hope to achieve when they support as they do I know in the main this particular proposal. We ask a lot of our school trustees and I know that it takes a lot of time. I know that it is frequently not the most pleasant job in the world to have to carry on negotiations of this kind. Sometimes there is unpleasantness associated with it. But I just wonder if they have as much reason to be optimistic about the time they are going to save as they appear to be. I have, Mr. Speaker, said this to the school trustees. They're going to do some negotiating among themselves, hopefully at least, in order to determine what their area representatives are going to be able to offer on the basis of these arrangements. I am afraid that they are going to be disappointed in terms of their expectations

April 23, 1968

as to all the time and all the difficulty that this is going to save them.

Even if it does result in this, I must agree with a number of my colleagues who have already spoken in saying this does represent some loss. There has been talk of loss of local authority. I think it represents another kind of loss, Mr. Speaker. I have always held to the point of view that when the teachers and the trustees sit down around the table or across the table from each other in discussing these matters, they come out with something more than just an agreement about salaries. I think they come out of it with an understanding about the problems of the persons on the other side of the table. I think that teachers in this face-to-face kind of talk know better, when they are finished, what the real problems of the trustees are in respect to financing and managing the affairs of the schools. I think that trustees, when they come out of these kind of discussions, come out of it knowing something better than they did before of the problems and of the hopes and the expectations of the teachers and of the profession which they represent. This to me is one of the losses in this proposal. I know there are other ways in which hopefully this will be done. There will be some continuation of meetings. But I think really when they get down to examining these very basic and very large problems on this face-to-face basis that they do get to understand each other.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a great deal of the eventual success of our educational system depends on how well there is this mutual understanding of the problems of the people on the other side of the table. I am afraid that we are going to lose some of this which I have always held to be possible and to be one of the beneficial results of bargaining in this particular fashion. I know they say there is some unpleasantness; there are some difficulties about all of this. I hope we don't fall into the trap of sort of welcoming handcuffs in order to keep our hands from shaking.

There are some other disadvantages. Some of them have already been referred to. I think that the promises have been more than are going to be obtained. The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who just took his seat emphasized a point which I think needs emphasizing, because this idea has in part to some extent been sold to people on the basis that it is going to save them money. I don't know where the idea got started, I don't know who has been advancing it. I haven't heard the Minister say it.

Mr. Guy: — You haven't heard any of us say it!

Mr. Lloyd: — No, I haven't heard any of you say it, but the fact remains that throughout the province people have been saying it. I've see it written and I have heard it said and I suggest that we need to dispel this idea. There's the mouth of the north, and mostly mouth and nothing more than mouth generally speaking from northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Guy: — I knew we'd get him!

Mr. Lloyd: — You knew nothing about getting anybody . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If you'd stop sniping at him he wouldn't resort to personalities. I wish to goodness the whole lot of you would stop resorting to personalities.

Mr. Lloyd: — This idea that this is good or going to be good has been accepted by some people throughout the province in the expectation that it is going to save money. This as the Member for Melville has said is simply not the case. It is not going to save a dollar or a dime to anybody whatsoever.

I have already noted that there is a disadvantage because some of the decisions about teacher-trustee relations are going to be made by one group at the area level and by another group at the local board level. I doubt very much the wisdom and the value of splitting this kind of decision-making process.

There is one other disadvantage which I think we need to note. That is that this move, in a sense, brings us closer to a situation of total confrontation of teachers on one side and trustees on the other. I think it increases the possibility of this, a sort of total clash as between teachers and trustees. I think it does something else. I think it makes it difficult for the provincial organization of teachers and the provincial organization of trustees to operate in a way they frequently have operated in the past. There are many here who will know of instances in which there have been local difficulties between teachers and trustees in an area. Very frequently it has been possible to go to the parent provincial organization and say, "Look, can you help out." Very frequently the Provincial Teachers' Federation and the Provincial Trustees' Association have been able to move in and do the mediating and the conciliating. This is a very healthy and a very productive thing. I think the more we move to a pattern there is more danger of a more total confrontation and less possibility of using the conciliatory services of the provincial organizations in that particular way.

Finally I want to look just for a moment at some of the tests which I think out to be employed as we weigh this particular legislation. An obvious first question is this one. Will it improve teacher-trustee relationship? Is it going to remove the causes of and reduce the areas of tension, remove the cases of dissension between the two groups? I say it is doubtful that it will do so. In my opinion, it won't do so, because after all — this has already been said before this afternoon and this evening — we must recognize and I know that the Minister does, one of the big reasons for these is frequently the financial reason and this is not going to be improved or affected by this particular arrangement. Is it going to save the time of the school trustees and their time warrant saving if it is possible to do so? I have some very real doubts as to whether their hopes in this regard are really going to come about. I've often heard the phrase used by Members opposite that it is necessary to streamline the procedures. I am not particularly impressed by an argument that something is going to be streamlined and personally I don't see that much streamlining in it. I don't think that this is particularly an educational objective. Is it going to help recruit new people to the profession? Is it going to help retain people in the profession? Is it going to help retain valuable members of the profession in the Province of Saskatchewan? Like it or not, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to admit that the answer to these questions is

April 23, 1968

really no. All of the evidence at the moment seems to be that this is more likely to discourage people from entering the profession; it is more likely to encourage people leaving the profession and leaving the province. It is a regrettable answer, but that seems to be what the evidence is. Then there is of course the final question; is this going to provide us in any way with better educational results? I have as yet had no particular arguments presented which make it possible for me to say that this is going to provide better educational results.

The tests of the proposals after all must be whether or not they will improve opportunities for Saskatchewan children. Will they help us to get and keep better teachers in our classrooms? In my opinion regrettably they won't help. On the contrary I am afraid that they will hurt and they will hinder. It seems to me that the legislation runs counter to some of the best experience governing relationship between employers and employees. It's going to widen the differences; it is going to narrow the opportunities for meeting on common ground to make decisions about matters which are of joint concern. Because of all of this, Mr. Speaker, I find that I can't support the legislation in the form in which it is being presented.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate. However as a school teacher and a Member of the Legislature who has sat back and listened to this debate for the past two occasions, I cannot refuse to participate.

First of all, I cannot help but recall one phrase that the Leader of the Opposition started his address with. Let's look back on history. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that some of the younger Members would disagree with that. But I would agree with the Member for Biggar that the legislation of the past provides the causes for the changes of today and the changes of today provide the format for the future. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the Members of the Opposition, teachers and educators, stand on their feet and point and criticize the principle of area bargaining. Bill 65 does not introduce compulsory area bargaining to the Province of Saskatchewan. Compulsory area bargaining was introduced in 1944 and it was introduced by the Member for Biggar at that time and on that occasion. Let us be clear and concise. All that this Bill does is provide changes in the boundaries of area bargaining; it does not establish that principle. That principle was established with The Larger School Unit Act, when with one stroke of the pen that particular party opposite removed forever from the local school district the responsibility for negotiating with teachers. All that Bill 65 does is provide for the means of changing the boundaries of a larger compulsory area bargaining and it does not in any way shape or form introduce it. Mr. Speaker, if any Member of the Opposition had stood on his feet and criticized compulsory area bargaining other than the Member for Biggar I would have sat back and listened with respect.

I want to for example read you a couple of clippings. This goes back to those times in history, when the Member for Biggar was responsible for introducing area bargaining in this Province. It had such a revulsion in the Province., it had a reaction even

among its own Members to such an extent on March 27, 1945; there is a title in the Leader-Post, CCF Member wants compulsory school vote. I would like to read a couple of those clippings:

Independent-minded Jacob Benson, CCF Member for Last Mountain,

I've come to have a great deal of respect for Mr. Benson.

late Saturday afternoon sprang a surprise on his part in the Legislature when he moved an amendment to The Larger School Unit Act to make it mandatory for a vote to be taken before the establishment of a larger school unit. A similar amendment to Mr. Benson's was moved to The Larger School Unit Act during the 1944 Special Session when it was downed by a large majority.

Under the Act as it now stands that the Education Minister has the power to set up larger school units with the approval of the Cabinet, not with a vote, not with approval of the ratepayers, not with the approval of the trustees, not with approval of the teachers, but with the approval of the Cabinet. But there is a provision under which the Minister may submit the question of the unit's establishment to a ratepayers' vote

I want to comment on that later, Mr. Speaker.

15 larger school units have already been established. Mr. Benson said it was a mistake to deprive the people of the democratic right to vote, he had voted against Mr. Patterson's amendment last session to help give the Government a chance to set up experimental units. I made a mistake on that occasion, Mr. Benson said. He told the House that ratepayers of various school districts in his riding had passed resolutions asking for a vote. When he had found the people's attitude he had communicated with the Minister who said that Government did not think a vote was advisable. I believe we have done something wrong in passing an Act that fails to provide for a vote and an Act that should not have been passed, Mr. Benson said.

Then, Mr. Speaker, what about voluntary area bargaining? What did the Member for Biggar say about voluntary establishment of larger school units which introduced compulsory area bargaining to the Province of Saskatchewan? Prior to the vote, Mr. Lloyd said, and this comes from March 29, 1945.

He was intrigued by the attitude of some Members of the House who sat in the Legislature in the past, when permissive legislation for setting up larger school units was on the Statute Books. They had taken no action to have larger units formed under the permissive legislation. It was a case of faith without works. Mr. Speaker, we haven't seen the establishment of voluntary area bargaining.

Let me quote a few of the words of the Leader of the Opposition in describing this Bill.

First of all it must have a large degree of acceptance, it must have a spirit of willingness. When we have found our feet, he said, we had the complete acceptance of teachers and trustees. How important is good relationship?

April 23, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why he couldn't convince the four Members of his own Government in 1945.

The Opposition has debated this particular Bill on the principle of the method by which it was implemented. They have not suggested that this was not good legislation, because I am convinced that the Member for Biggar as a former Minister of Education knows concisely and precisely that this is good for education, it is good for the teachers, it is good for the trustees and is good for education in the Province of Saskatchewan.

But let's go back on history, as the Member for Biggar has suggested. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) got up in his seat and said they didn't tell us anything about this before the election. Well I wonder what they said in 1944 before they implemented The Larger School Unit Act. Mr. Speaker, let me quote an excerpt from the CCF propaganda machine from their election platform of 1944.

Implementation of permissive legislation on the larger school unit administration by active encouragement and leadership in setting up at once some experimental units. The legislation providing for the establishment of the larger school unit of school administration is now on our Statute Books. Let us then proceed at once to test the larger school unit and find out at first hand whether it will bring to Saskatchewan the education advantages it brought to other places.

No sooner were they elected than they changed The Larger School Unit Act and made it dictatorial, compulsory and without any vote, without any choice. Mr. Speaker, this is only one of the things. I cannot help but comment for a few minutes on some of the other things. Mr. Speaker, he said every teacher, every school board was going to be affected. Yes, but I cannot think of a single step or a single mood or a single action that was ever taken in this Legislature that did not affect every school and every trustee and every child like The Larger School Unit Act. I am not at this time speaking against The Larger School Unit Act, I am speaking against the principle of implementation on which the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) is so adamant. Mr. Speaker, then he talked about negotiations from outside; outside the area, outside the province, he said, perhaps from Winnipeg or Montreal. I have never heard of anything so absolutely ridiculous, coming from a political party that has climbed on the backs of organized labor, that became married to them in 1963 or 1964, because they were unable to obtain the support of the electorate of Canada, a particular organization and international trade unions, that believes in the equal work, equal pay principle on not only a provincial level but on a national and an international level. Mr. Speaker, he also talked about principles.

I would just like to comment on principles and I want to deviate briefly from the debate. I happen to be a school teacher, but I also happen to be one of those school teachers that object very strenuously to the principle of the best teacher in the school becoming an administrator. I happen to believe that the best school teacher should stay a teacher, that he shouldn't all of a sudden be taken out of the classroom, taken out of contact with his young people, the students on which he has an influence, and a responsibility and becoming an accountant or an administrator. I am one of those that believe that the best teacher

should become a departmental head, he should become the head teacher, but not the principal or the administrative head of a school. I am also one of those that believe in the administrator as long as he is not a teacher, being outside of the bargaining unit.

I have a few other comments. I could not help but be reminded by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) of an expert, not my definition of an expert, but my daughter's. She is very young, about 8 or 9 years old and so she divided it up into two parts. She said I can't tell you what the expert means, but if you divide it up by parts, 'ex' means a product that is undefined and a 'spert' is a drip under pressure.

Mr. Speaker, here this man stood up and became the spokesman for education in the Province of Saskatchewan on behalf of the teaching profession, Mr. Speaker, the self-styled critic on the educational advantage, progress, and needs of the Province of Saskatchewan. He said we cannot talk about the financing of education, particularly if they do not contribute more to education than they have in the last four years. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the words of the Premier.

We have jumped the provincial contribution on education in this Province from \$57 million to well over \$90 million, this in a three and a half year period.

Mr. Speaker, it matches anything that the Opposition has done.

I also want to talk about the basic principles of collective bargaining and area bargaining. The very principle of collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker, is to draw together the common interests of various professions, various groups. It is certainly a strange position for the NDP. I wonder what the Members for Moose Jaw South, Moose Jaw North, the Member for Regina North East have to say standing up for the principle of fragmentation in the collective bargaining principle. This, Mr. Speaker, is the same political party that in Ottawa, Tommy Douglas and all the rest of his cohorts are sanding up and fighting day and night against the principle of fragmenting the Province of Quebec from the Canadian Labour Congress. I cannot understand their principles.

I also want to say that when talking about the basic principle of implementation of this Bill, they have turned around and criticized the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) for the fact that he has failed to reconcile the difference of trustees and teachers. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Education has done an excellent job. He has handled a very difficult proposition, a proposition that could never be reconciled between two groups that are polarized. Education in the Province of Saskatchewan is a partnership. It is a partnership between trustees, between the teachers and the Government of Saskatchewan. Very often, the interests of the trustees and the teacher are mutual and they are directed toward the educational best interests of the children of which they have a responsibility. But very often this is not possible when it deals with the negotiation of salaries and very often they become . . . polarized.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education with all his spirit of diplomacy, with all his spirit of understanding, has attempted to negotiate and reconcile two various groups that have opposing viewpoints and I think that he has done a very satisfactory and a very commendable job.

April 23, 1968

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP has also stated that this legislation was rushed and hurried in its conception and its implementation. I find this very difficult to accept. The Moore Commission was established two years ago and since that time all of us are aware that the trustees and the school teachers have had over 80 meetings with the Moore Commission. On all of those occasions they have had the opportunity of presenting not only their viewpoint on area bargaining, but on all of the problems that are related to negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to those representations, surely it is the Government's responsibility to be the arbitrator, to decide once and for all, which is the best position for the third partner, the Government of Saskatchewan, to implement on their behalf. Mr. Speaker, if anyone suggests that this was ill-conceived or rushed, I am afraid that they only have to look back at the history of the Moore Commission. Certainly, there are viewpoints of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation of which I am a Member and consider it a privilege, but at the same time I feel that the Saskatchewan trustees presented their viewpoint in a very positive manner. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Association felt that the Moore Commission's recommendations were satisfactory. It was left to the Minister of Education and the Government of Saskatchewan to make the decision. And they have made it on behalf of what they consider the best interests of education.

The one thing that has bothered me most about this debate, and one thing that I think should be made known to the people of Saskatchewan, no one has suggested that this is bad legislation. They have talked about the method of implementation, the principle of compulsion, but they have not talked about the legislation itself. Mr. Speaker, there is a reason for it.

First of all this is good for education. This is good for teachers. And this is good for trustees and most important it is good for the children in our schools. Mr. Speaker, this legislation contains much more than area bargaining. I would like to discuss, very briefly, some of the main points of issue in this controversy. What are some of the existing problems today in the negotiation of teachers' salaries? First, we have well over 100 bargaining units in the Province of Saskatchewan. In most cases there is not individual bargaining. It is a question of accepting the settlement of the highest unit in the province and making that a model. It is neither competitive bargaining nor is it responsible bargaining. And, Mr. Speaker, you only have to look at the settlements of the past year to see all the school units of the Province of Saskatchewan regardless of class after class are within \$100 or \$200 of one another.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think another very basic problem is that the function of the trustees and in many cases the functions of the teachers, have been to spend a great deal of time in the bargaining process, bargaining with salaries, confronting teachers when they should be working for the benefit of the children of the unit, for the district or the area of the city. On many occasions, weeks and months, and on occasion a year has passed without any settlement. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for those trustees to return and carry out their responsibilities with the kind of relations that often result

between trustees and teachers in the province because of negotiations. Very often the results of the negotiations create serious strains between these two partners in the education process.

I would like to bring up a few problems of teachers. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that as a teacher this is good legislation. And I would like to indicate why. First of all, why should it be that in Ogema and Bengough there should be different fringe benefits for a teacher? Mr. Speaker, if there is any reason for collective bargaining, it is because a worker in a factory in Regina and a worker in a factory in Moose Jaw that have the same job and the same training and the same responsibilities, have the same benefits and the same salary. And, Mr. Speaker, in the units in the Province of Saskatchewan, fringe benefits are different, sabbatical leave is different, sick benefits are different and so forth. And there is only one way in which we can get a common ground for those areas of difference between teachers of the same qualifications and the same experience and that is to expand the areas of bargaining. Also, Mr. Speaker, there is another very serious problem in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is a large difference between the salaries and the benefits offered to teachers in rural Saskatchewan and those of teachers in the city. Without question, as far as I am concerned, a teacher in Milestone deserves as good a salary, as good benefits as any teacher in the city of Regina. I do not challenge the fact that there will always be a premium perhaps for those teachers who have the good fortune or have been selected to teach in the larger city schools. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you of one unit and one city in the Province of Saskatchewan where two teachers live on the same block, four or five doors from each other. They get up at the same time in the morning, they leave their hoses at the same time. One goes to the right and one goes to the left. They have exactly the same professional certificate. They have exactly the same years of training. They have approximately the same experience. And one makes \$1,000 more than the next.

Mr. Speaker, coming from a rural constituency I am convinced that the teacher in rural Saskatchewan deserves as much as the city teacher. And I think that area bargaining is the only hope of levelling-off that kind of salary discrimination.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — There is another very basic problem with teachers' salaries in the Province of Saskatchewan and that is the relation of elementary and secondary teachers. Again too teachers can be living next door to one another, Mr. Speaker. They can have gone to university the same duration of time. They can have studied and worked and trained as hard. They can have the same amount of experience. They can have the same amount of dedication. But those same two teachers, Mr. Speaker, can get up in the morning, one can go to one school and the other can go to another school and they can have a difference in salary of at least \$1,000 a year. To me, Mr. Speaker, this neither makes sense nor is it a good bargaining principle. There is only one way that these kind of discrepancies between teachers can be ironed out and that is by larger areas of collective bargaining. I am not going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Bill will eliminate those discrepancies overnight. But I am convinced that over a period of time that this will result in two things. It will result first of all in the levelling-off

April 23, 1968

of teachers' salaries within the urban areas. And second, it will remove the discrepancies between units and rural areas and the difference between a teacher in a rural portion of the Province of Saskatchewan and one in the urban part of Saskatchewan. I am convinced that one of the problems of equal opportunity in education is the right of any child, regardless of what part of the province he comes from to have the same calibre and quality of teacher whether he comes from the city of Regina or the community of Milestone.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk for a very brief moment on the problem of professional negotiations. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) commented on professional negotiations. If there is any value to collective bargaining or the whole principle of collective bargaining, it is that it be done in an competent and efficient manner. To take a unit in the Province of Saskatchewan and to elect a group of trustees that have neither had experience nor the opportunity of running a business and expect them to negotiate for salaries, is to expect the impossible. And if there is anything in the Province of Saskatchewan today that teachers and trustees are requesting, it is not that they be denied the privilege of negotiating for salaries, it is not that they are trying to revoke their responsibilities. They are requesting that when they negotiate on behalf of the ratepayers and the taxpayers that they represent, that they are capable of negotiating to the best of their ability and in an competent and efficient manner.

Surely the whole principle of trade unionism, of collective bargaining, is that we hire and have competent and efficient negotiators on our behalf whether it be on behalf of management or labor. Mr. Speaker, this is a good principle in this Bill. We can now have the kind of negotiators on behalf of both the school teachers and on behalf of the trustees, which will present the real issues at stake, where it will not be a comparison between units, or comparison between districts in the province, that will be based on the law of supply and demand, on the competition between province, that it will be based on the recognition of the training of the teachers' salary and it will be based on the economic conditions. This is the advantage of professional negotiators. I have no hesitation as a teacher in accepting this principle.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that this is no attempt on this Government's part to attempt to save dollars as implied by two or three Members opposite. Let's make no mistake, this is going to cost the people of Saskatchewan and probably the Government of Saskatchewan dollars. This is not an attempt to save money. We recognize as well as anybody in the Province of Saskatchewan that our young people are our best resource and without question, our richest resource. If we are going to train them and develop them and meet the challenges of 1968 or 1970, we are going to have to provide the kind of instructors and the kind of teachers that can provide this kind of training.

Mr. Speaker, without hesitation, I support the principle of this Bill. I support it because it is good for the teaching profession. It is good for education in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): —Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. I would like to make a few comments on this Bill. I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Members opposite.

I started out in life as a teacher. I served for a number of years in the classroom and I served a number of years as a trustee in a larger school unit. I think that I am in some position to judge both through the eyes of the teachers and the eyes of the trustees. I am happy to say that I have two of my own family who have followed in my footsteps and are today actively participating in the educating of the children of this province as teachers in a classroom.

So what I am going to say I hope will not be misconstrued as either anti-teacher or anti-trustee. But I have been rather surprised at the trend in the debate that no one has put forward on behalf of the trustees any of their plea for this type of legislation. Everything has been teacher-oriented and what it may do to the teachers of this province and what it may do to the children in the classroom. I think that we should take an opportunity to pause and reflect on how this legislation was introduced to the Government, and the results of that in the press and the news media, and in this Legislature. I think that it is interesting to recall that the trustees of this province for a number of years have been disturbed about the relationships that exists in this province between trustees and teachers. They are perturbed that periodically there breaks out in the press derogatory statements on behalf of the teachers and against the trustees, and vice versa the trustees against the teachers. This attitude or relationship between trustees and teachers in this province is not in the interest of education in this province and in the interest of our boys and girls. There are many people very much concerned about the attitude that has developed between teachers and trustee relationship in the Province of Saskatchewan. The trustees took it upon themselves to present a brief to the Cabinet, outlining their point of view and reviewing the type of legislation which they would like to see set up in this province. They fortified their brief by a Bill and that is not unusual for a delegation to present a Bill to the Cabinet for consideration. This was a Bill that was presented by the trustees to the Government and which incorporated the thinking of the trustees of this province and the measures which the trustees would like to see this Government implement. That was the basis of that legislation. I think that it is most regrettable that when the Minister, having received this Bill, considering its contents, called in the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and revealed to them the contents of this Bill, someone took it upon himself to openly declare that this was Government legislation, that this was the type of legislation which this Government is going to bring into the House, and therefore, to say that we must rise up in arms against this Government and this legislation and to take and say our quarrel is not with the trustees, our quarrel is with the Government, and this is what the Government proposes to do.

This led, Mr. Speaker, to a great deal of alarm among hundreds of teachers in this province. I had hundreds of them write to me asking me if this was true. They were rightly concerned if the Government was going to move in that direction, if they were led to believe that there was going to be compulsory arbitration, not area bargaining but compulsory arbitration;

April 23, 1968

secondly, that the wages were going to be frozen, that principals were going to be exempted from the bargaining table, that they were not going to be able to negotiate on fringe benefits, that it would lead to a mass exodus of the teachers from the Province of Saskatchewan. No wonder the teachers became alarmed when they heard this type of an approach to a Bill. I had occasion to write to many of them. I had the occasion to say to them that we have in the Government men who have a wide experience as trustees, men who are former teachers in the classroom. We have men in the Cabinet who are professional teachers. Surely a Government with this type of experience in the House would give a great deal of weight to any type of legislation which they are going to introduce dealing with the relationship between trustees and teachers. After the smoke had cleared away, what was found?

Many of these fears were found to be groundless. Principals were not excluded from the bargaining area. Teachers' salaries were not frozen. Fringe benefits were not denied them. The only thing that this legislation provides for basically is area bargaining, compulsory area bargaining. If I recall history correctly, I can look back to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation for a number of years and they have not opposed area bargaining. The trustees have not opposed area bargaining. The teachers have said that they propose it on a voluntary basis. There is disagreement as to the method of how it is instituted, but it is not a disagreement as to the principle of area bargaining.

I was in the teaching profession during the years when the hired man who took care of the livestock and fed the hogs was worthy of a greater salary than the teacher who taught the children in the classroom. Many of us got much less than the hired man who was feeding the hogs, because we were teaching the children and he was feeding the hogs. I have seen the Teachers' Federation rise above these conditions and build itself into a professional organization. I was one of them who gave my support and help in this work from the bottom up. I am a little disappointed that I should see this great profession of teachers be misled into some of the tactics that were used this fall, that are not in keeping with the dignity of a professional standard of people. I regret such occurred. As a former teacher, who has two of his family in the teaching profession, I regret to see teachers resorting to these types of tactics.

I want to say this. All professional organizations have a standard to uphold but the teaching profession has a double responsibility to uphold. Their work is of such importance in the moulding of the minds and the lives of young Saskatchewan boys and girls. What we want to see, and what I am vitally interested in, is not the quarrel between the teachers and the Government — we can expect that — but I am vitally concerned that we bring forth legislation which will advance us in the age which we are living, which will provide legislation which will permit a more harmonious relationship between the trustees and the teachers of this province. I am certain that, if the trustees and the teachers enter into the spirit of this Bill, they can sit down together and negotiate matters of salaries and fringe benefit. There is nothing in this Bill that would not permit either the trustees or the teachers to work within the scope of their duties or their professions on behalf of the students of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I have many letters from teachers that expresses disappointment that the relationships deteriorated between trustees and teachers and that they should have been carried away by an emotional appeal which was not forthcoming when the legislation was brought forth. Many teaches today now realize this legislation is designed not to divide teachers and trustees, but to give the machinery that is necessary in today's society that they can negotiate on a larger area and bring to the table the wider approach to the relationship between trustees and teachers, to give, as the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said, trustees the machinery whereby they too can bring some enlightened knowledge and some enlightened approach to negotiating teachers' salaries today and thus to participate on equal status, so that teachers and trustees around a table conference get a better appreciation of each other's work and of each other's obligations.

On one side we have the trustees of this province to whom we owe a great debt for the contribution that they have made in the field of education and the grave responsibilities they have assumed without regard and yet subject to the criticism which sometimes follows men and women in public life. We have on the other hand a great teaching profession, dedicated to the building of a great educational system in the interest of our boys and girls. Surely there is room for judgment, initiative and competence in the framework of this Bill for trustees and teachers to sit down in the interest of education in the province and to negotiate in a fair and equitable manner, conscious of the fact that anything which we do in this regard we do in the interest of that child in the classroom. Therefore, I would hope that this bogey of all the so-called evils which this Act is supposedly to introduce will be looked at in its proper light.

I wish to put myself personally should to shoulder on the side of the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) who has assumed this responsibility for this Bill, who has done his utmost in consultation with the Teachers' Federation and with the Saskatchewan Trustees' Association, in an effort to bring in a Bill which is mutually acceptable to both. Each may have reservations, but each can find support that together they could go forward in the interest of the boys and girls of the Province of Saskatchewan. I say the Minister deserves our appreciation and our commendation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the STF I feel that I must make a few comments with regard to this proposed Bill No. 65.

The first point I would like to make is one that has obviously been missed by the Members from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), and Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). I can forgive the Member from Cutknife. He's a new Member in this House and a new representative of his constituency. It's not so easy to forgive the Member for Redberry for the position that he has taken. I would like to remind Members opposite that when you are elected to the Legislature you are not here to represent any one group, you are here to represent all the people of Saskatchewan, and in this particular case you are not elected to represent the views of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association or of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. You weren't elected to represent the views of the parents and the students alone, but

April 23, 1968

you were here to represent the public at large. This is something that I think the Members Opposite have failed to recognize. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) pointed that out quite clearly a few moments ago. From the remarks of Members opposite it is quite clear that they have chosen to ignore their responsibility to the people as a whole in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have made themselves spokesmen for the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and this is particularly true of the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). Now I have just as much admiration and respect for the work of our Federation that they have done for the teachers of this province as any Member of that Federation in the Province of Saskatchewan. I can say without any hesitation that I am proud to be a member of the STF. But at the same time I am not prepared to always follow the lead of the leaders of the STF. I have views of my own as I would hope that every teacher in Saskatchewan would have views of his own. No one will deny that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation has done a great job for our profession. It has continually led the way in developing new curriculum, new techniques, new teaching methods and it is continually encouraging teachers to improve their professionalism, and improve their standards. However, as I said earlier, while I support the STF, I will not blindly follow it if I believe that its stand is wrong.

Knowing that the STF has always been in the forefront of changes, new developments, I must confess that it was difficult for me to understand why it has been so negative in its approach to changes in The Salary Negotiation Act. Surely it is not because it affects them personally. The present salary Act has been in force since 1949 and if changes in every other field of education and desirable in 1968, surely to goodness changes in the methods of arriving at teachers' salaries are also desirable in 1968. Other trends in education have been recognized, why can't we recognize the trends in the paying of teachers' salaries. I think we all agree that it should be reviewed and up-dated the same as any other type of legislation.

Now I have made no pretence of being satisfied at the approach of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation towards this problem of teachers' salary negotiations. Anything that I might say tonight, I have said to the executive director, to the president of the STF, to the executive members and anything that I might say now will come as no surprise to them. I want to commend them first of all for their concern for the members that they represent, but I must admit that I deplore some of the methods that they have used to show this concern. I am also dismayed at the attitude of Members opposite. They are trying to walk a tight rope. They know they have no case, they are afraid to stand up as a group and support the Teachers' Federation, they are afraid to stand up as a group and support the School Trustees' Association. They are trying to walk a very thin line between the two and that thin line isn't there. The MLA for Redberry supports the teachers. The rest are trying to support both. But when it comes right down to it, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to find a scapegoat and in their usual manner for political expediency they want to make the Liberal Government the scapegoat for this particular case. They are weaselling the same as they always do. One of them gets up and supports the teachers; someone else will get up and support the school trustees. They hope that when the vote comes everything is going to be weighed together and they are going to come out in a neutral position. But I want to know when the votes comes, how many are prepared to support the school teachers, how many are

prepared to support the school trustees. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was the biggest disappointment of all because after all he was the man who was primarily responsible for taking away the autonomy of the local school boards that they speak so strongly in favour of this evening. It wasn't only with the larger school unit.

I think we all remember the day when the county system was talked about in this Legislature. Never was there opposition against the county system as was mounted by the STF in those days. The opposition to the county system was many times greater than the opposition to Bill No. 65. I suggest to the teachers of this province that they should not forget what the NDP were going to do to them back in those days. They raised a hue and cry against the county system which has never been forgotten in this province. The NDP were prepared to subordinate every teacher in this province to the municipal secretary; they were prepared to subordinate the teachers' salaries to the building of bridges and the buildings of roads. They had no interest for the teaching profession in those days when they wanted to implement a county system in this province. But today they stand up and they are the great saviours of the STF. I hope that every teacher in this province will remember that. The NDP would have destroyed the teaching profession, if they had had the opportunity back in the years when the county system was an issue in this province. I want to remind you that it was only the Liberal Opposition that prevented the implementation of the county system and the subordination of the teachers to that particular philosophy. But I want to say this, the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) a babe in arms when it comes to what the NDP under Tommy Douglas, Fines, and Willis were trying to do to the people of this province in those days. He's got a great deal to learn and he will learn it in the days ahead.

Now the STF has objected to this legislation and it has put severe pressure on the Government of the day. I think that it did it in true respect for this legislation but again I cannot agree with the methods that it used. But again it was not the STF as a whole, but it was the NDP Members within the STF who tried to bring this issue to the forefront. We have only to remember the meeting that was held in Regina. Who was the man that stood up and wanted to pass a resolution in regard to work and wages? None other but Jack Kehoe the defeated CCF candidate in the last election. A meeting was held in Melfort-Tisdale. Who was the man that got up and tried to rabble-rouse the crowd? None other but the Member for Melfort-Tisdale, C.G. Willis. The same was true in every meeting that was held across the province. You would get one NDP teacher to get up and make an inflammatory speech and then the rest of them would follow. The Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was also one of those fellows who wanted to throw their weight against the Government of Saskatchewan. He got up in the meeting in Prince Albert and said, "Oh it's terrible what the Government is doing." Really he didn't know what was going on at the time. He was talking about a Bill that was only proposed legislation; it never did come into the House. I notice that now that the Bill is in the House and in front of the committee, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland hasn't got the courage to stand up and state his convictions because the things . . . sit down you'll have your chance on a point of order later on!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of

April 23, 1968

privilege, I did not speak at any meeting on this subject in Prince Albert. The Hon. Member is untruthful.

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have it here. I could go through it and probably find his remarks — it might take a few minutes — however, we know that he did. No he didn't say anything nasty about the Minister of Education. In fact he never even mentioned the Member for Athabasca which is something different. But he made his speech, I've got it here somewhere. I'll find it for him before the evening is over. But he's like everybody else. He attended the meetings and followed the recommendation of the NDP executive who said, "Get to the meetings, stir up whatever controversy you can," and of course he did his best.

Now as I mentioned earlier I think that the STF has taken the wrong attitude in this. It has been premature in its assessment of the situation. I want to refer to just one or two articles that show what I believe to be true. I have here a clipping from the Prince Albert Herald, January 25, 1968.

The President of the STF, Mr. Lozinski referring to the Provincial Government's proposed bill for compulsory area bargaining said that compulsory area bargaining would mean a loss of local autonomy and an erosion of local control of education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how naive did he think the people at that meeting were? Anyone that knew the background of the larger school unit knows full well that local autonomy was long gone under the NDP when the larger school units came into force. The local school boards have had no say in salary negotiations since that time. So to try and leave that impression was erroneous and I suggest that it was done deliberately to try and create an impression that would stir the teachers up to opposing this Bill more than they would under ordinary circumstances. Then he goes on and says:

Local school boards and their teachers would no longer have the right to establish salary scales and conditions of employment.

Well, they never did have the right to establish salary scales and conditions of employment since the larger school unit came in. He knew full well that this was the truth, and this is why I'm concerned about the attitude of some of the members of the STF in this regard. He went on and said:

Another area of the proposed legislation would abolish the collective bargaining rights of school principals and certain other supervisory personnel.

The truth is that this didn't occur. He was putting the cart ahead of the horse. He went on to say that the right for fringe benefits would be eroded. The question is that there were no rights in legislation that provided these fringe benefits. There was nothing in the old Salary Negotiating Act that provided that these fringe benefits would be negotiated. This was a principle that was determined by the boards and by the teachers' salary negotiating committees and there is no reason to believe that they won't be continued under the same level as they were before.

Then we have the MLA for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). He wanted to make a big name for himself so he gets the headlines as Saskatchewan's own de Gaulle. I think if you asked him where deterrent Gaulle was from he probably wouldn't know which country he was from, but again just the same as every NDP Member opposite trying to inflame the public against this legislation. This is what he said, as quoted from the Leader-Post January 23, 1968:

The proposals would restrict the chance of local school boards to employ and to keep in the province persons needed as teachers.

Now the Member for Wadena knows full well that the local school boards have not had anything to do with salary negotiations since the larger school units, so why did he make this statement? There is only one reason and he knows full well that again he is trying to use this legislation for political purposes and he hasn't got the courage to stand up in his seat now and deny it.

You can go on and on. "Locals threaten protest strikes." Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if the STF had decided to go out on strike in this particular case it would have been one member short. I think that the teachers of this province know full well that the talk about mass demonstrations and mass resignations and strikes and withdrawal of services was far too premature. They never even had the Bill in front of them, but they were led into believing that this Bill was proposed legislation, by a few rabble-rousers from the other side of this House. Members like Jack Kehoe, a defeated NDP candidate, and a few others who are strong in the NDP movement. Then we find the president of the STF suggesting that there would be an unprecedented teacher exodus from Saskatchewan. Members opposite have raised the question tonight. We all know that every year there is an exodus of teachers from Saskatchewan. It's unfortunate and I feel just as badly about it as anybody in this House. But also we have to recognize that Saskatchewan is not in the same economic position as British Columbia or Ontario. There has always been an exodus and there will continue to be an exodus of teachers. But at the same time there are a large number of teaches that at the same time are coming into this province. Therefore, this great exodus that they are predicting I would suggest is nothing more than to try and frighten the school teachers and to frighten the school trustees of this province. The president of the STF in all due respect did the teachers of Saskatchewan a disservice when he prints this type of garbage in the paper. He suggests that legislation which he knew full well was not the final legislation to appear in this House would have an effect upon the teachers of this province, but he did nothing to try and say that this was not the legislation that would finally be presented to the Legislature.

I am afraid that the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who should probably be sitting over on this side of the House because he is a young swinger and would like to follow a young swinger as a leader. In face we may have him before too long.

Mr. Cameron: — No, leave him where he is!

Mr. Guy: — Leave him where he is? Well, I don't know, I don't mind him that bad. I wouldn't mind having him come over here.

I want to refer for just a moment to one other of the actions

April 23, 1968

of the STF that I felt was not in keeping with its policy and with its support in the past. This is from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, January 18th:

STF won't help with teacher hiring. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation has declined to co-operate with the Government in carrying out its traditional job apparently because of the current feud over proposed changes in the Teachers' Salary Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is the attitude of the STF, and I doubt very much that it was, it is certainly a very narrow and very miserable approach to the situation. Surely to goodness the STF can have some differences of opinion with the Saskatchewan Government or with any government as far as that is concerned, without jeopardizing the position of their profession by refusing to co-operate on some matter which is entirely outside of the area of dispute. So if this is the attitude of the STF, again I say it is doing a great disservice to the pupils and the parents and the trustees and the teachers of this province.

Now I haven't too much more that I wish to say in this regard. I know that we would like to get this into Committee of the Whole this evening. I just want to say one thing about the Moore Report. Here again we have listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and we listened to the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who's afraid to stay in his seat, and the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) who has also left the Chamber. But I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is sitting there. In fact I had to count a little while ago when one of the Members said there was only 22 Members on the Government side, I counted up the others, I think it was when the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) who was speaking, there were only nine listening to him, mind you that is probably nine more than wanted to listen to him, but after all when the Whip says you've got to sit there, there isn't much alternative.

Mr. Dewhurst: — There's nine on your side right now!

Mr. Guy: — How many, nine? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve — I knew he couldn't count, Mr. Speaker.

However, I want to refer to the Moore Report for just a moment because Members opposite have said that we have not adopted any recommendations of the Moore Report. However, here are some of the things that were recommended. "Inclusion of principals and other supervisory personnel within the scope of the collective bargaining." Again this has been done. Sure I know Members opposite like to go around the country and say that it wasn't part of the proposed legislation, but they have no proof because the legislation is here in front of us. The principals are included as has been recommended by the Moore Report. So anything that they have said in this regard has been a complete falsehood. "Changing the anniversary date for teacher contracts to January 1st from July 1st." I suppose they say this isn't a recommendation of the Moore Report. Another recommendation that has been accepted in this proposed Bill. "Amending The Larger School Unit Act to allow unit boards to designate superintendents employed by the Department of Education as Chief Executive Officers." Nothing wrong with that. But they say we have never adopted anything from the Moore Report.

“Periodic review of the Negotiation Act to keep it in touch with current circumstances.” Here is the crux of the whole situation. This was a recommendation of the Moore Committee that led to the proposed Bill. This is the recommendation which they have opposed from the beginning. They are back in the 19th century and they don’t want any changes in The Salary Negotiation Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is probably enough to say in this regard. All I want to say in conclusion is as I said earlier, I am a member of the STF. I am proud of that organization. It has made a great contribution to the professionalism of the teaching profession. It will continue to do so, but I do deplore the fact that some of them have been led astray for political expedience by Members opposite. I know that the bulk of Saskatchewan teachers are prepared to look at the proposed legislation and to accept it and to give it a trial. But again the Members opposite as with the health legislation, and as with any legislation, are never prepared to accept a change. They are never prepared to try something different. They are living back in the days of 1944 and they should know after two defeats at the polls that 1944 is no longer the time that they should be living in.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Like to try it again?

Mr. Guy: — I’ll try it again any time and we’ll see when the time comes how many of you will be sitting back on that side of the House. I have no doubts whatsoever that when the time comes to have another provincial election we will be back here in our seats. Some of you will be there, some of you will be gone into the pale blue yonder. I am amazed at how often they want an election now. They had their opportunity last fall, they got their election. Some of them are deceased. I think of the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) who would have enjoyed this debate but now he is not here. The Member from Swift current (Mr. Wood) is sitting in his seat. We’ve got a few newcomers, which I am very happy to acknowledge and I think that there may be the odd one that will be coming over to this side of the House after the next Federal election. However, in closing I want to say that I support this Bill 100 per cent. I am sure that the teachers of this province when given the opportunity to see it in action, to see it work, will also support it. I am very disappointed at the attitude of our Members opposite, but again you have to recognize that political expediency is first and foremost in their philosophy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few remarks to the House in this debate, and I want to say at the outset that I am not going to be as controversial nor am I going to speak with as many dramatic flourishes as the Members for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who have preceded me. May I also say at the outset that I would like to believe that all of us in this House in debating this Bill have uppermost in our mind the interest of the students. I will not repeat that; I am prepared to concede that to Members opposite and I would respectfully ask them to concede it to us.

I compliment the Member who is just taking his seat, the Member of the STF (Mr. Guy) as he describes himself. He is indeed a teacher. He has been as we all know busy improving his

April 23, 1968

educational qualifications and we compliment him for that and for the ingenuity which he used in obtaining these extra qualifications. He appears to be preparing for a day when the political misfortune will befall him, and I would think wisely preparing, based on tonight's remarks.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Why don't you . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) who is sitting in the seat of the Member for Morse will have his opportunity to speak after I take my seat, I would ask him not to interrupt me since I have not interrupted Members opposite. I simply want to make a comment on the play on words of "the local school board" which the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) used. I felt that was a particularly unworthy debating trick of his. I think all of us knew that, when Members referred to local boards, they were not referring to old local school boards but in fact to the effective local school boards. And it is certainly true that the Board of Education of the city of Regina is a local school board. It has never been anything else but a local school board. It hires teachers notwithstanding the evident lack of knowledge of this by the Member for Athabasca. It is certainly true that in the same way that the Board of Education of the city of Regina is a local school board so is the board of let us say the Milestone School Unit a local school board when considered in the context of this Act, because what we are talking about here are boards which now negotiate with their teachers but who will hereafter not negotiate with their teachers. It seemed a shade amusing to hear the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), the Member for Athabasca, urge us to leave behind 1944, particularly after the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) had concentrated almost his entire speech on quoting comments from the years 1944 and 1945.

I was also troubled by the approach of the Minister of Public Works who said it was inappropriate for Members of this side to represent the STF; it was similarly inappropriate for us to represent the SSTA; but however, it was cowardly for us to stay in the middle. He suggested to us that we were trying to, as he said "walk a thin red line" between the STF and the SSTA. However he similarly castigated us if we fell off this line either on one side or the other. I want to tell him that we are not here representing the STF and we are not here representing the SSTA, and we are not here criticizing the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association for this Bill. The Bill is the responsibility of the Government. The Bill is put forward by the Government and the Government must take the praise or the blame which is attached to it. I think that any suggestion that, when we attack this Bill, we are somehow advocating the position of the STF or attacking the position of the SSTA, is wholly unsound.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Members opposite and particularly the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) were somewhat less than gracious in discussing the organization to which he belongs, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. In listening to him I thought that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation had changed a good deal, or must have changed a good deal since I negotiated with them. Certainly when I negotiated with them they were a pretty hard-headed, hard-hitting, well-led group of people who weren't likely to be manipulated or misled by anybody except their own members. They knew well what they were doing. It is true maybe

that some New Democrats are active in the STF. I know in Regina, as he said, Mr. Kehoe the defeated New Democratic candidate in Regina south West is a member of the STF, but I know also that a defeated Liberal candidate takes the same position. I know Mr. Eamer who is, shall we say, active in the STF, is a defeated Conservative candidate. I think it is quite ridiculous for the Member from Athabasca to suggest that this hard-hitting and well-led organization is in any way misled by any particular Member who has any particular political affiliation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — These people well know what they are standing for. They are standing for the principles of education as they see them. They may be misled. On this Bill I don't happen to think they are, but if they are voicing the views of the STF, they are indeed the opinions of the STF and not the opinions of any political party voiced through the STF.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the comments of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) deserve some comment on my part. I particularly want to deal with the essence of the problem which seems to me to have been missed by Members opposite. Part of the problem is in the use of the word "area bargaining." Now no one objects to area bargaining, if area bargaining means bargaining for all the teachers who teach in a given area, provided that they are all employed by the school board which has jurisdiction in that area. We would put our debate on a much sounder basis if we laid aside the word "area bargaining" and talked about "multi-employer bargaining", because that is the key to the problem. As I understand the teachers' objection, it is not that the area of school jurisdiction is large, not the fact that a larger group of teachers will be negotiating with trustees who have a larger geographic jurisdiction, but the fact that the teachers will not be negotiating with their effective employers. Now this is a very, very different principle. I venture to think that, if the proposal was to make all of the school districts in Saskatchewan into 25, 30 or 40 actual school districts, the STF would not be heard to complain that the areas were larger. As I understand the nub of their objection it is not that the areas are larger but that the people with whom they will negotiate will not be their effective employers. You can see that this is a very, very different principle. I am not aware of any area of employer-employee negotiation where a group of employers negotiate with employees who are employees of several employers except by consent of all parties. There are some exceptions to that, the Province of Quebec is an exception. They have what in fact amounts to province-wide area bargaining, but I hardly think that their educational record in terms of teacher-trustee relations is one that we ought to emulate. They have had the only major teacher strike that I can recall in the last 20 or 30 years in Canada. Now it is true also that we have multi-employer bargaining elsewhere, I understand that it operates in parts of British Columbia. But there it was by consent of the teachers and the trustees. By consent. I venture to think that neither the teachers nor the trustees would object to area bargaining, by which I mean multi-employer bargaining, if it was arranged by consent. It seems to me both of these groups have throughout said they agreed with voluntary area bargaining. The trustees go one step further with voluntary area bargaining. The trustees go one step further and say that they agree with compulsory area bargaining. But we

April 23, 1968

don't have any examples of that in Canada except, so far as I am aware, in the Province of Quebec.

Now I look at the field of general labor negotiations. A couple of references were made to the fracturing of negotiating units. Of course references were made to discussions at Ottawa and Bill C186. There is no suggestion in Bill C186 that any one will negotiate on behalf of three or four employers by act of law. Bill C186 and the arguments against fracturing bargaining units are arguments against having two or three bargaining units of employees who work for one employer, the units being based upon geographic divisions. It has nothing to do with multi-employer bargaining. Now there is multi-employer bargaining in industry, the railways, the packing plants and the lumber mills on the west coast, but all of this and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, all of it is done by consent. And if Members opposite know where two or more employers are created into a bargaining unit by act of law, please tell me. Please tell me because I tried to convince the Labour Relations Board in Saskatchewan only six months ago that this would be a good idea with respect to two grocery stores in Regina, each owned by a separate company, but with the same two men owing both companies and operating both stores. The Labour Relations Board of Saskatchewan said this was quite impossible. "You can't do that, you can't have two employers negotiating at the same time. They may have different interests." I said to myself, "Well surely this must have happened in Canada", and I looked for a while in the books and I was not able to find anything. I found one obscure reference to such a practice during the War. But other than that I couldn't find a place where by law, two or three or four employers were grouped together as a bargaining unit. Now if Members opposite know where this is true, I'd be delighted if they'd tell me and I'll make some notes. But I say it isn't true in industry and it isn't true in negotiations with respect to teachers. I don't want to get too far a field into packing plants and that sort of thing. You may think it is not relevant and true with respect to teachers except in the Province of Quebec and in British Columbia where it was entered into voluntarily. Nowhere else in Canada do we have multi-employer bargaining. Probably coming, say Members opposite. Well I suggest we wait and see. I think it is going to come but I think it is going to come by consent and I think that's the appropriate way for it to come.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I recall the comments made about the alleged problems of the present system and I particularly recall the comments of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) in this regard. And I really had trouble with his position. He seemed to say, and I made a list: 1) That there are 100 or bargaining units in the province, but there is no effective bargaining. They just follow the lead of the first unit that settles or perhaps the highest unit that settles and there is in fact no true bargaining. It's a straight follow-the-leader proposition. That seemed to be his proposition number one. By the time I got down to proposition number five, he was telling me that this Bill would remove the obvious and grave discrepancies which exist between unit and unit. Well I don't know how these discrepancies arise if in fact there is no true bargaining, but in fact one unit simply follows the lead of the lead unit in bargaining. Well alright . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . fringe benefits, don't . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), I invite him to look at his remarks, suggested between unit and unit as well as between urban and rural and I invite him to look at his remarks on that score, because I made a note as he was saying it. But if he now wants to abandon that position that's fine with me. If he wants to confine his alleged discrepancies between town and country that's alright.

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . urban and rural.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, alright. I may as well come to the question of fringe benefits now because somehow he suggested that this Bill was going to affect the differences in fringe benefits in — was it Ogema? What was the other one, Pangman? At least he mentioned two rural units with two different sets of fringe benefits and suggested that somehow this Bill was going to help this situation. In fact this Bill has nothing to do with fringe benefits. And in fact under this Bill one cannot negotiate fringe benefits. In fact if there are differences now in fringe benefits all those situations will remain precisely the same. That isn't even true, in fact the situation is going to be a little bit worse because of the fact that there will be a real erosion of the right to bargain for fringe benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted in view of the uneasiness of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) if you would call it 10 o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.