LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Sixteenth Legislature
47th Day

Wednesday, April 24, 1968.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw the attention of the Assembly to 26 girls in the west gallery this morning accompanied by their teacher, Sister Edna. These girls are from grade nine at the St. Chad's school here in Regina. I'm sure every Member joins with me in extending a welcome to them and we certainly hope that their stay will be most enjoyable and educational.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS HONORARIUM INCREASE

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, we had thought we had not missed anyone in looking after the various people who serve this Legislature, but we found we missed the most important individual of all and that's the Sergeant-at-Arms. We wish to increase his honorarium $200 for this year and $200 for next year and so 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 twelve months ending March 31st, 1969, and recommends the shame to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General):

That His Honour's message, that further Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. McIsaac (Minister of Education) that Bill No. 65 — **An Act respecting Teachers' Salary Agreements** be now read a second time.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I had spoken last night on this matter and I had made some comments on the remarks of the other Hon. Members who had taken part in this debate. I had intended perhaps to make some further comments on their remarks but I think I will confine myself to a summing up of my views on this Bill without attempting to test the validity of the arguments advanced by Members on the other side of the House or on this side of the House. I want simply to record my reservations about the Bill under two headings. Firstly, what will the Bill do to the process or what has it done, perhaps, is the better way to phrase it, to the process of teacher-trustee relations and to Government-teacher relations? Now, Mr. Speaker, when asking these comments, I make them not because I believe that the Bill is bad, because it does what the teachers don't want done. I don't think the teachers have any more right to have their views legislated into law than any other groups in the Province. I happen in this regard to agree with the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) when he says that the Government must act as arbiter between any groups in the Province where friction may have developed. I do not object to the Bill on the grounds or solely on the grounds that it is departure from the recommendations of the Moore Commission Report, not solely on that ground, because once again, Royal Commissions are appointed by governments to give them recommendations. By and large, recommendations by Royal Commissions are sound and ought to form a basis for government policy, but no government can pass off the responsibility for its policies on to a Royal Commission and therefore every government must be free to change or vary the recommendations of a Royal Commission if it seeks to translate them into legislation. However, I do quarrel with the Bill on essentially two or three grounds under this heading of what the Bill will do to existing relations between teachers and trustees and teachers and the relations between teachers and trustees and teachers and the Government in the province. I say the Bill is unfortunate because it departs from the Moore Committee Reports, without any really adequate explanation or why the Government is so departing and without sufficient consultation with the teachers after the tabling of the Moore Commission Report. I think all of us agree that there were lots of consultation up to the time that the Moore Commission rendered its Report. But I think that at that time each of the contending groups, the teachers and the trustees, were entitled to believe that the Moore Commission Report would be the basis for Government policy and Government action, until they were otherwise advised by the Government. I emphasize again that I'm not suggesting

that anyone has the right to believe that a Royal Commission Report will necessarily be adhered to by a government. Not so. But I suggest that in the case of one of these types of reports, which was a quasi-arbitration in a sense, if the Government is going to depart from the recommendations of the Moore Commission Report, it was incumbent upon the Government to explain the reasons for its departure rather more fully than it has. It was incumbent upon the Government to consult with each of the groups, and in this case more fully with the teachers whose views were being done a little more violence to than the trustees', rather more adequately than it did. The other real basis of objection under this head is that the STF has alleged in effect a breach of faith by the Government. They have alleged, and I haven't heard it refuted by the Government, that the STF was given certain undertakings in November of 1967 that legislation was not going to be introduced and that in January the legislation came forward. Whether or not their allegation, which is essentially an allegation of bad faith, is true, it is exceedingly widely believed. Members opposite can dispute that proposition at their peril because it is and it did in fact, as the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) mentioned last night, spread alarm among hundreds of teachers. The action of the Government in January following as it did, at least in the view of the teachers, assurances which they received as late as November did cause alarm. It did lead to emergency action on the part of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, which action the Member for Maple Creek was pleased to call tactics which he deplored. Now I ask the Government: is this the background, is this the appropriate background for introducing a Bill when Members of the Government call upon both parties, as the Member for Maple Creek did last night, to enter into the spirit of the Bill? The teachers, in effect, say that the entering into the spirit should have taken place a little sooner than it did. I suggest that, when the Government has contrived to raise all of these fears among all of these teachers, and I believe that these fears are sincerely held by the officers of the STF, there is mismanagement. Whether the STF have good grounds for their concern, I cannot know, I did not attend the meetings. But that these people believe that there has been a lack of utmost good faith by the Government is undoubtedly the case. When this situation arises it is clear evidence of mismanagement by the Minister. If it is not mismanagement, then, the only alternative is that it is another piece of the type of brinksmanship which we have seen practised by the Government opposite on a number of occasions. We have seen them use the tactic of threatening to cut off my arm, then only cutting off my finger and asking me to be grateful for it. I don't know whether this is another use of that particular pressure tactic. I rather think it isn't. I rather think it's a case of mismanagement but in either case it is worthy of censure by this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — You will note that my first objection to the Bill is essentially one of objecting to the Government's handling of the

introduction of the Bill. In dealing with my second objection I now turn my remarks to the Bill itself. I ask the question: what will the Bill do to negotiations? First I want to admit that it is not all one-sided. I think that this Bill isn't all bad. To reduce the number of negotiations is in my view a good idea. There are, unfortunately, aspects of the Bill which I think over-balance the benefits which would come from reducing the number of negotiations in the way conceived by the Government. I would have thought that there would be other ways of reducing the number of negotiations and we've discussed them. I don't intend to review them but they include voluntary area bargaining. They include the amalgamation of school jurisdictions so that there would be a reduced number of bargaining sessions but that each group of teachers would be in fact bargaining with their employers. That's two ways to reduce the numbering of bargaining sessions without introducing this principle of multi-employer bargaining, which I think is causing all the difficulty. But there are other effects of the Bill which I think over-balance the benefits which will accrue, if in fact they do accrue, from a smaller number of bargaining sessions. The first one is certainly separating the bargaining process from the employer-employee relationship. I think that bargaining at second hand and third hand will be a source of frustration and eventually resentment by both teachers and board members, who because of this process will find themselves unable to participate effectively in the bargaining process which is such an important part of the administration of the educational system. I think that citizens will have a right to complain. I have wondered and not only wondered but wondered in print to my school board about this: to whom I will complain if I don't like the salary agreement which is negotiated by the area of which the Regina Board of Education will be a part? If I think that they are paying too much and my taxes are too high, to whom do I complain effectively? If I think they are paying too little so that good teachers are leaving, to whom do I complain effectively? If I complain to a trustee he will say, "Well, I did my best, I chose someone and sent him to the area committee and that's the last I saw of it. Then we took what was dished up." And I'm not sure that's entirely satisfactory, either for the taxpayers or for the trustees or for the teachers. Neither the trustees nor the teachers will be effectively on the firing line. And I think that this is an unfortunate development.

A further objection is that the Bill will separate salary bargaining from fringe benefit bargaining. Now we all know that the basis of fringe benefit bargaining now is purely custom which has developed. There is no legislation which builds in the processes of fringe benefit bargaining. It's an informal process but it's none the worse for that. Looking over the world, I think we will say that some of the best collective bargaining done in the world is done on an informal basis where the employers and employees have got together without legal certifications and they have bargained. This fringe benefit bargaining has been possible in the past because both the trustees and the teachers had the leverage of statutory salary bargaining in order to impress upon the other their views

with respect to fringe benefits. The teachers might be arguing for sabbatical leave, the trustees might be arguing for some playground supervision, and all of these items went into the overall settlement. This I think is sound. I think as a practical matter, and I have some experience with collective bargaining, the bones of contention have often been the little items, frequently the non-cash items which have irritated one side or the other. When a negotiator is trying to work out a settlement, frequently the most difficult problems surround a non-cash item or an item which has a small amount of cash involved but yet upon which both sides feel strongly. Now these things simply have to be sorted out and by and large they had to be sorted out at the local level. I agree that this Bill does not make fringe benefit bargaining impossible. I concede that it is possible for fringe benefit bargaining to continue. The Bill will make it more difficult. If the Government wished to include the idea of area salary bargaining or multi-employer salary bargaining, I wish it would have put into the Bill some provisions with respect to fringe benefit bargaining and had paralleled the provisions of the old Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act with respect to fringe benefit bargaining. I think this would have eased a good number of the apprehensions that are felt by the teachers.

Now there is another aspect of this which I view with some concern, I don't think many others do, I haven't been able to convince many people of this. But when I look at the area of teacher-trustee relations and I wonder what are going to be the bones of contention in the future, I see this problem of merit rating becoming more and more a problem, not only in Saskatchewan but right across Canada. Trustees are asking for merit rating of teachers, teachers are saying in effect, "Well, you have some grounds for asking for merit rating, but it will not be merit rating by employees or trustees. Over our dead body will we have that kind of merit rating." This is in essence the position of the two parties. Now, with a large number of school districts and with the fact that these trustees can employ teachers, we have an informal system of merit rating going on. We have boards which pay more money, getting a large number of applications for their jobs and their being able to select the teachers who they think are best qualified. I admit it's an informal process, and it is not a purely scientific process; but we see a shuffling going on where by and large the teachers who are better qualified find themselves in the boards which pay more money. Now this is by no means uniformly true, but the number of bargaining units allows this process to go on, and it battens down this incipient dispute over merit rating. I suggest that, if we have more uniformity and more rigidity in our salary pattern, so that this informal merit rating will not be able to operate nearly as freely, then we will see more pressure on the potential battle-ground of merit rating. I don't have any answer to the question of merit rating and I don't know anyone who does. Therefore it seems to me that anything which can avoid that problem coming to a head is something to be pursued. And it seems to me that this Bill far from

avoiding it will bring that problem to a head more quickly. I think that the Bill in effect will exacerbate that particular problem.

I suggest also, and here my arguments are certainly not going to commend themselves to the teachers, that the Bill will in fact increase costs. In Regina on the public, as opposed the separate school side, we had two school boards, one an elementary school board and one a collegiate board. These united a couple of years ago and they therefore meshed their salary schedules. There had been two different salary schedules with the collegiate board generally having a policy of high pay and the elementary board having a policy of average pay. I'm over simplifying but that was roughly the situation. What has happened, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, is that as the two grids meshed, they in fact approached the old collegiate board grid. The Elementary school teachers are now being paid at a substantially higher rate than they were before. This obviously has its merits if you are an elementary school teacher and if you are now on a lower pay grid. But we must in fact ask ourselves whether we as a Province can afford this particular development. Our problem is that we are facing competition for our best teaches by the school systems of Calgary and Edmonton and Winnipeg and Vancouver and the rest. The pull has been from Calgary and Edmonton and Vancouver, and now Winnipeg is moving into the picture. Our city systems have tended to keep pace with Calgary and Edmonton. I don't know if out of pure self-defence or for other reasons. I fancy that to a considerable extent it was a desire to retain top-grade teachers. We are going to have to continue to keep pace or we are going to lose our top-grade teachers. Now the short question I have to ask the Government is: will this Bill tend to make salary levels more equal than they are now across the Province? I suggest the answer is, Yes. Can they be made more equal at any level less than Calgary's and Edmonton's, if we are going to include the cities in larger bargaining area and if we are going to retain our quality teachers in the larger cities. I suggest that over any long period of time the answer is, No. Then I ask the next question which follows as the night the day: can we afford to have the Calgary and Edmonton salary grid uniformly across Saskatchewan? I direct that one to the Provincial Treasurer. If the answer is, Yes, then I will be exceedingly happy because this will mean we will be retaining a great number of good teachers. But if the answer is not Yes, then I wonder whether the program embarked upon by the Government is a sound one, at this time. Obviously there has got to be a move towards equality. I admit with the Minister that compulsory area bargaining will not necessarily immediately make salary grids uniform over the particular area bargained for. But I don't think any of us are kidding ourselves. It just will not be possible to maintain over any substantial period of time separate salary grids with any large discrepancy between them in one bargaining area. This is the way that collective bargaining works. Rural trustees will see no particular reason why this should be so. The STF and the teacher groups, while they tolerate the present situation of differentials, won't be

able to do it when it's all done at one table in one bargaining session. They simply won't be able to tolerate separate grids in one area. And that's a bargaining fact of life I suggest. Now, Mr. Speaker, it will follow from what I have said that I believe the Bill is an unfortunate Bill which has been badly mishandled by the Government and I will find myself unable to support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to comment on some of the remarks made by the Opposition in their debate on second reading of Bill 65 which is before us. Time this morning will not permit going into all of the questions raised by Hon. Members opposite and I think, also, that many of the points raised can be perhaps dealt with when we get into Committee.

I would like to comment first on the remarks of the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica). He covered a good deal of ground that has been gone over many times. Basically he had written the speech quite some time ago from what I could gather. He paid very little attention to some of the comments that I made in introducing the Bill. He pointed out that the Bill that is before us bears very little resemblance to the Moore Committee Report. I suggest here again, Mr. Speaker, as I did when I introduced the Bill, that the Bill does follow the great majority of the recommendations of the Moore Committee Report.

I want to point out again, as the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned in his remarks that the value of these reports lies not entirely in their exact recommendations but the study, the effort and the thought that is put into their recommendations as they come out, and they are there for Government guidance. I think, certainly, this is a point that everybody well recognizes. No Government is bound to accept either the Moore Committee Report, the Carter Tax Report or any other report. In this regard I don't think that we have deviated that much from the Moore Committee Report.

The Member for Cutknife also mentioned that he and his colleagues opposite were not opposed to area bargaining as such, provided it was on a voluntary basis. I would point out to him and to Members on both sides of the House that there has been nothing in the present legislation to prevent the development of voluntary area bargaining. There has been nothing to prevent it. He mentioned also that the SSTA backing of this question of area bargaining was not universal as a result of a survey or two that he made in his own general area. I would appreciate that this is probably true. It may not be universal but it is almost universal. I think that I can say that I have had dozens of letters and phone calls from trustees all over the province, and from trustees, Mr. Speaker, of all political faiths, belonging to the party opposite, belonging to the Tory part and to our party, that wholeheartedly endorsed and support the idea of a

reduction in the number of bargaining sessions that are now going on in the province. And if there was one thing that convinced me that this was the right move and a good move, it was the universal support from all of the trustees of the province regardless of their political faith in this question.

Now the remarks from the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies). I suggest that he overstates the case when he pointed out in his remarks as he did that there never was such a furore in the field of education as there has been in the hassle over the introduction and the development of this legislation. He goes on to rather blithely suggest, and I am sure that he knows better having been involved in labor and negotiations for most of his working life, that the Government get the two parties together to work out the difficulties, then to come to the Government with a satisfactory mutual solution. Mr. Speaker, we all know very well on both sides of this House that this has not taken place and it's got plenty of time to take place. This was the reason that we set up the Moore Committee in the first instance. And there was no evidence, to me at least, that it was going to take place. The Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) in his remarks complained about not having a copy of the Moore Committee Report to study so that he would better understand and appreciate the legislation. Then he went on to indicate that after I had given him a copy, he had obviously not read it.

Now how much local autonomy I ask Members on both sides of the House in all sincerity, how much local autonomy is left today under the existing conditions in this question of determining the level of teachers' salaries, the actual level as such? Not very much. They have some control over the total salary bill, yes, more so by way of the numbers or the classifications of teachers that they hire, rather than the level of salary as such. They have to pay close to the Provincial average and this follows. Most boards as a matter of fact have to and do follow the first few settlements that are made in the province at one level or another. And more and more these bargaining sessions are centrally directed by both organizations. I think that this is a fact that almost all Members should recognize. This Bill, I suggest, gives recognition to this fact and to the trend that has developed in these bargaining sessions throughout the province.

Now the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) in his remarks suggested that the Government ignored the Moore Committee Report. Here again I suggest he didn't either read the Bill or read the Moore Committee Report. But then he didn't go on to point out where the discrepancies were. He went on to express platitudes to both teachers and trustees and never did really get around to debating the principle of the Bill that is before us.

The Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) again covered a great deal of platitudes in his ground in his remarks on dozens of topics, and again didn't really criticize many aspects of Bill 65. He criticized my methods and it was me that was

handling this Bill. That of course is his prerogative. I may have made errors and it probably won't be the last ones that I will make. But I certainly take full responsibility for the development of this legislation that is before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He said in reference to this Bill, iniquitous Bill 65, that it was discriminatory and that it was regressive. And I say: what is discriminatory about it, Mr. Speaker? And what is regressive about it? Certainly he didn't go on to say so in the course of his remarks. "Teachers will leave." he says and went on to quote figures. I have a few remarks that I will make later on here to point out that this is not the first instance that teachers have raised a furore in cases of this kind. And it won't be the first year that a number of teachers will probably leave the province.

My Hon. Friend opposite from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) by and large as rather forthright in his remarks. He made a speech on grants for the third time in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he agreed that the Bill wasn't too bad, and again really didn't say too much about the Bill or the question on hand.

Mr. Steuart: — Was he on the right Bill?

Mr. McIsaac: — He was on the right Bill, yes. The Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) last night in his remarks in second reading of this Bill demonstrated his long association with education and with both teachers and trustees in his remarks, but I must say that it was a rather pussyfoot type of speech that he gave here last night. Larger areas were alright for trustees in 1945! Larger areas were alright then for ratepayers and it was alright for teachers at that time. Why isn't it alright today in 1968 especially when even as the Moore Committee points out that actual local conditions play such a small part in the determination of the actual level of salaries paid. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I would remind Members again, that compulsory area bargaining is a phrase that has been booted around for quite some time. We have had compulsory bargaining in this province for many years. All that we are changing in this Bill is the ground rules of that factor.

I would just like to make reference to the remarks by my Hon. Colleague on this side, the Minister for Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). I only want to point out here that there were two points of principle that were put to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation by myself. I forget whether the meeting was January 6 or 9th. But there were two points in principle contained in that draft Bill that I did advise the Federation that did have Government caucus approval, two points and two points only, the question of area bargaining and the question of the inclusion at some level or another of the principals of the major type of school that we are getting in this province today.

And in this Mr. Speaker, I think that we were trying to give recognition to the fact that the present definition of a principal as the head teacher is a little bit out of date in keeping with the schools and the size of operation that we are seeing in some of the schools in the province today. It is out of date in keeping with the variation and the specialization of teachers themselves. There is a great variation in division of responsibilities in administrative versus teaching in the schools of this province, as we get into the larger schools that we are seeing now. So it was those two points and those two points only that the Federation was advised was firm Government policy at that particular time.

For the Federation to have gone on from there as they did, Mr. Speaker, and propagate other proposals and other incomplete drafting suggestion, as an accomplished fact, is something that certainly hasn't helped in the development of this legislation. I don't think that it has helped the image of the teaching profession in the province. Perhaps as the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said, it has done the Government harm as well. But I must say in the course of all of the mail that I received throughout this whole episode — and it was pretty heavy at times — the mail that I received from the general public was about nine to ten in favour of the Government proceeding with the original suggested legislation. Here again, these letters came from members of all parties and from a lot of teachers and from a lot of principals that said that they weren't happy with the present arrangement of every class of teacher being in a single bargaining unit.

It is a difficult line, or difficult spot for a professional organization to sit upon, I suggest, Mr. Speaker. We have a professional organization of professional people, and no one will deny that the teaching profession is one of the oldest and the noblest of them all, and yet they can wave the professional banner on the one hand and act and operate and behave in a manner that reminds me of Jimmy Hoffa and a few others. Not in keeping, I suggest, with the historical dignity of the teaching profession as such.

The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) in his remarks last night and this morning, I think perhaps made some of the most forthright comments we certainly have heard from that side of the House in this debate. He went on to talk about multi-employer bargaining. It may be new to the public sector as he expressed it. The Province of Quebec has taken over the bargaining in that particular province. British Columbia I don't think has taken over as such — not the province. The Province of New Brunswick is doing the negotiating there. The other Maritime provinces I am not sure of, but there is more and more of the negotiating being done and being conducted at the Provincial level. I suggest that the Bill before us is an effort to ensure that teachers' salary negotiations will still be continued to be conducted at the trustee-teacher level and not at the Provincial level.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The Member for Regina Centre went on to point out that the Moore Committee Report is still largely the basis for this Bill 65. He says that the teachers have alleged bad faith on the part of the Government. He suggests that they were advised that we were not considering legislation and advised that fact as early as November, 1967. I can tell him that the Teachers' Federation were advised that we were considering legislation, that we already had legislative suggestions and other suggestions from the Trustee Association, and that, secondly, we would welcome suggestions for legislation from the Teachers' Federation. The answer at that time was that the Moore Committee Report represented the views and the thinking of the teachers.

Trustees and teaches certainly will still be on the firing line of the negotiations that are going to be carried on. I don't agree with the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) when he states that we will no longer see this relationship between teachers and trustees. Certainly it will be more concentrated, but I am sure on the part of the teachers that they are going to be doing their bargaining, and I am sure from the discussions with the Trustees Association that they will be doing theirs, with the help and the aid possibly of professional negotiators.

You mention the question of fringe benefits. Certainly this is one area that is a rather difficult area to resolve. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have handled it in this Bill the best way possible at this point in time. I mentioned in second reading of the Bill when I introduced it that at one point in time we had considered listing those items as fringe benefits or conditions of employment — call them what you will — that could be negotiated at the area level. And the difficulty came from the fact that there was no uniformity among so-called fringe benefits or conditions of employment at this point in time. It varied so much from unit to unit and board to board. There was one or two factors — accumulative sick leave was one that seemed to appear throughout most agreements. I suggest that certainly this Bill will facilitate the uniformity of those fringe benefits and the moving of them to the area level. The difficulty again comes, as I am sure the Hon. Member for Regina Centre is well aware, in determining what is a fringe benefit as such, what is a condition of employment as such, what is a matter relating to salary and what is a matter relating directly to board policy as such. And I don't suppose we will ever achieve the point in time where we will be able to spell all of these factors out.

Now I would just like to make a few more comments in closing this debate, Mr. Speaker. With respect to a theme that ran through the comments of several of the Members opposite when they got up to speak on this Bill, criticizing the Government for the adverse affect that the introduction of this Bill has had on the education climate in the province, I suggest that we have certainly done our best to indicate in every way possible

that we do place a high priority on education and on a good educational climate in the province and that is why we have brought this Bill in. I accept and I will acknowledge that there are issues in education in the province today and always have been over which teachers are genuinely concerned. But I would just like to look back over a few experiences in past years in this province. I have here some copies of clippings — the clippings are not with me as they are down in the Legislative library. The Star Phoenix June 28, 1956:

> A survey just completed by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation shows that there are 900 teaching positions in the province which have not been filled. And it was imperative that an immediate conference of trustees and teachers with the department be called to review the serious shortage and the increasing emigration of teachers from the province.

In 1962 the Leader-Post again:

> Teachers seek a better deal in submission to the Cabinet.

And this article dealt with STF submissions to the Cabinet.

> Seven major revisions to the Superannuation Act were given an extremely urgent priority in this brief, and the growing impatience of teachers makes this matter a most immediate one, claiming that the Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act denied certain teachers the certain right of collective bargaining and is extremely restrictive, and the STF at that time asked for changes in the Act.

Saskatoon Star Phoenix 1961:

> Saskatchewan, this year, will likely lose a large number of graduates in education, many of whom will be leaving for Alberta, the members of the education faculty at the University told the Star Phoenix today.

November 14, 1958:

> Teacher employment inquiry asked. Deterioration in relationships.

Saskatoon Star Phoenix, 1956:

> About 700 teachers graduated last year but 471 leave the province this year.

And I think my Hon. Friend from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) mentioned that 400 and some teachers left the province last year. Yes, this is probably true. But 471 left in 1956. Certainly this is not a new phenomenon to this province as I am sure that all Hon. Members will agree. What the Member for Redberry didn't point out yesterday in the course of his remarks was the number of teachers that came to this province last year.

Leader-Post, March 9, 1957, under the heading: “Pension plan need for teacher loss.”

> Education Minister W.S. Lloyd maintained teachers asking for a superannuation plan better than the one now exiting in the province are selfish.

Saskatoon Star Phoenix May 29, 1961:

> Teachers of the four western provinces backing the STF in their dispute with trustees.

Leader-Post, 1961:

> Mass resignations of teachers in the Gull Lake and Shaunavon school units were reported Tuesday.

October 5, 1961:

> In a last ditch effort to avert a threatened strike in a Rosetown larger unit, the board announced today an immediate court action would be taken.

Certainly other provinces have not been without their difficulties with, as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said, the very strong, the very well-led teacher organizations not only in this province but across the country and in North America and in the United States. British Columbia — out there each year a number of negotiations wind up in compulsory arbitration which this Bill does not provide for. In Alberta in the April 15th issue of the Calgary Herald this year has a headline “Teachers unrest gains impetus.”

> Signs of growing dissatisfaction with career opportunities and working conditions has prompted a research team to do . . .

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these headlines that we have seen and these comments and these press releases from the STF Bulletin and other sources, and I’ll give you a few quotations:

> “Legislation attacks teachers’ rights.” “Moore Committee scuttled by SSTA.” “Teachers made whipping boys.” “ Teachers’ alarm erupts in the province. ”Education is real.” “Mass resignations proposed.” “Regina Teachers talk work to rule.” “STF president warns of teacher exodus.” “Forces working to destroy STF.”

I suggest that these are not new to this province and they are not new to any other province for that matter. And I don’t take any of the discredit for having brought about any of these rash headlines.

Here we have an example again, I think, but I don’t consider it to be the best type of leadership by the STF, in one of their issues in their Bulletins at the time that this discussion,

disagreement or argument was going on with the Government, myself and the Federation. They say,

> Because of legislation long requested by the Trustees Association and etc. a number of people are seeking employment in other provinces.

So they list the addresses where teachers may apply to other provinces to get their certificates and get out of the province. I wonder did they tell the teachers, tell their membership, that in British Columbia they have no right to strike. They have compulsory arbitration. They have compulsory arbitration and no right to strike in Manitoba, but if they go to Alberta, the teachers are not happy over there with the conditions of work. If they go to Ontario they have the principals out of scope down there. Certainly this factor has an effect on the development of good education in that province. If they go to Quebec they are going to be bargaining with the Provincial Government. If they go to News Brunswick they are going to be bargaining with the Provincial Government. They got a 2 per cent increase this year. The teachers themselves agreed that due to conditions in that province they wouldn't ask for an increase.

Mind you I don't blame the Federation as such for trying to justify their existence to their membership. That's their duty and that's their job. But I do criticize them for crying 'wolf' as loud and as often as they do, for each and every change that is proposed by someone in the general field or the general spirit of education that differs from their views.

Mr. Speaker, let it be clearly understood that this Government wants good teachers and we want them to be well paid. Let me repeat that we want good teachers in our province and we want them to be well paid. I am not sure if the present walk-step, summer school course type of automatic increment structure and schedule that we have all continue to do that for very long. Here I agree with the Member for Regina Centre. I don't have any answer and this question is not under debate in this Bill in any event. That is quite another story. But, as I say, I suggest that this Bill before us will help to create greater uniformity, yes, in teachers' salaries of the province. I don't suggest that, Mr. Speaker. As the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) pointed out last night, somehow or another this is a thought that has got abroad. It certainly didn't come from me and it didn't come from the Government as such.

I don't agree with the Member for Biggar when he pointed out that he felt bargaining agents or the use of bargaining agents was going to be harmful.

Hon. W.W. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): —

Mr. McIsaac: — Outside of professionals. I still don't believe that this is being realistic when he suggests that this is going to

further divide teachers and trustees and that it is going to further remove actual bargaining and negotiating from the teacher and the trustee level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that there are going to be some difficulties to iron out in initiating a bargaining process at an area level. I am sorry that the Hon. Member for Biggar wasn't in his seat when I introduced the Bill because I did at that time go over a number of the points and factors and criteria that we are going to use in considering the size and the number of the areas in the province. I will give him my second reading remarks later and he can look at them and we can talk about them in Committee.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that most of the rest of the points raised can be best dealt with in Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33
Messieurs

Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Larochelle
Steuart	Estey	Gardner
Heald	Hooker	Coupland
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser

NAYS — 22
Messieurs

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. L.P. Coderre that Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act** be now read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I almost completed my remarks the other day on this Act, but I did want to make one or two

observations as a result of the speeches made by the Hon. Members opposite particularly the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). He chose the occasion in this debate again, the second time in this sitting of the Legislature, in launching a vicious attack on the present membership of the Labour Relations Board in Saskatchewan. As I listened to him I wondered whether particularly the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) — and I don't know whether he was in his seat — and the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would associate themselves with the remarks of the Member for Regina North East, because when he attacks the Board of course in the manner that he did, he is attacking the integrity, the honesty of the Chairman of that Board, Judge R. H. King of the Magistrate Court, one of our most respected, most competent judges of the Magistrate Court. Judge King was not appointed by this Government to the Magistrate Court. He was appointed by the gentlemen who sit to your left, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they were the Government of the day. He has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding judges of the Magistrate Court in this Province. To imply as the Member for Regina North East did, to infer that this man who is the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board would become a part of decisions — after all the Chairman of the Board has to by necessity be a very important part of any decision, he is the legal man on the Board — to imply and infer that this man, this distinguished member of the judiciary of Saskatchewan would be a part to unfair decisions, (this is the way in which it was dealt with by the Member for Regina North East), I think it was a pretty shabby attack on one of the outstanding members of the courts of this Province. I wonder if the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale — I understand he is going to speak in this debate — and I wonder whether he is going to associate himself or disassociate himself with the remarks of the Member for Regina North East. The same applies to the Member for Regina Centre.

You know, people have long memories, Mr. Speaker, and it is very hard to sit in one's place to hear an attack like the Member for Regina North East made the other day about the Labour Relations Board, when you have been in the position of appearing before the old Labour Relations Board with the complexion of that Board in those days. Let no one forget the many allegations of bias against that old Board. As a matter of fact that old Board was taken in front of the courts of this province on innumerable occasions and the courts quashed their decisions because of bias. Let no one talk about the bias of the Labour Relations Board. I think the problem that the Member for Regina North East has was that he was so used to a Board, which was biased in favour of labor, that he finds it difficult to adjust himself to an impartial and objective Board. I think that's his real problem.

I can cite cases that I had when I was a practising lawyer. I give you one example of a union that had been certified in the city of Regina for a period of about 10 years. They had been taking union fees from the employees, from the members of the union, and they hadn't even in a period of 8 or 10 years,

they hadn't even negotiated one collective bargaining agreement on behalf of the employees. They hadn't done anything for the money they had received over a period of 8 or 10 years. It took months and months for that old Board to have this union deterrent-certified; they hadn't done anything for the employees whatsoever. Yet it took many, many months.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Heald: — When I'm finished. Then I can remember another case. It was like pulling teeth. It was like entering the Kingdom of Heaven to ever get a deterrent-certification from that old Board. I remember acting for some employees in the city of Regina who wanted to get deterrent-certified from one of the international unions. That old Board did everything it could to make it difficult for those people to appear before the Board. I remember that the employer was in Regina, I remember that all the employees lived in the city of Regina and yet where do you suppose the old Board ordered the hearing to be held? The hearing was to be held in Saskatoon. Everybody had to go from Regina including their lawyer who was myself. They made it as difficult as possible for these people to appear before the Board and to obtain deterrent-certification. Finally, after many hearings and moving back and forth, deterrent-certification was ordered. So let's have no talk, Mr. Speaker, about an impartial Labour Relations Board. This Board is a good Board and it has a good Chairman. The attitude of the Member for Regina North East is so typical of the attitude of some of the Members opposite, not all of them. It makes me become more convinced the longer that I am in this Legislature of a number of things about the gentlemen who now sit to your left, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

First of all it becomes so clear that the NDP, the New Democratic party, the only thing about them new is their name. Really this is a reactionary party, Mr. Speaker, this is a doctrinaire party. This is a party who wants to stay with the status-quo. They have their sacred cows; one of their sacred cows is The Trade Union Act. No Government must ever try to change or improve The Trade Union Act. Another one of their sacred cows is The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act. We heard their performance on that Act, in the debate just completed. Another one of their sacred cows, you mustn't ever try to improve or look at or change The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act. The same is true of SGIO, the same is true of the Hospitalization Act and the Medicare Act. This Act was brought in by them 20 years ago; you mustn't ever try to change it or improve it. I say that these are the Tories of Saskatchewan, these are the Tories of Canada. This is the reactionary party. Now another thing about the gentlemen who sit to your left, I think they have become so arrogant and you know they haven't really yet realized that they were defeated in 1964, and why they were defeated. They haven't yet learned the lessons of history, Mr. Speaker. They were defeated in 1964 and they were defeated in 1967, because they gave the back of their hand to

employers, to little employees, the rank and file employees, because they gave the back of their hand to local government and to rural people in this province. They haven't yet learned that lesson. So I say they are the arrogant party in our political spectrum in this country and this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party is the party of progress, the party of change in this province, not the NDP. I say to my Hon. Friends opposite, quit playing politics with the problems of our Province. Sit down with us in an atmosphere of good will and constructive co-operation and help us solve the problems of the day. Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I would support the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if the Member before he sits down, will tell the House the name of the organization that he says for 10 years had received dues without negotiating a union agreement.

Mr. Heald: — I don't have the name, I can get it for you. It's in one of my old files when I practised law downtown. Some of your colleagues know, I think the Member for Regina North East knows. It had to do with the elevator employees in the McCallum Hill Building and I don't remember what union it was. It might have been the Building Service Employees Union. They took the dues for about 7, 8 or 9 years, they were certified. They didn't even both to get one collective bargaining agreement for the employees over a period of 7, 8 or 9 years.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one brief comment with respect to the remarks made by the Hon. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald). I think one will have to agree that the test of whether or not a political party is progressive is really by the legislation that it introduces, and not merely by some member of the Crown getting up and saying that it's progressive. I found it rather, although I didn't catch the major part of the Attorney General's remarks the other day, that today's display certainly does not enhance any of the images that he would hope the rest of the people of Saskatchewan would accept.

I am going to direct my attention, unlike the Hon. Attorney General's to the pertinent matters of this Bill. Mr. Speaker, to my mind, the amendments of The Trade Union Act, and the comments of the Attorney General whom I have a personal high regard for, reflect this Government's basic ignorance of labor management principles. The ignorance is reflected in two primary areas. Firstly, the Government has displaying a lack of knowledge of the essential concepts of free collective

bargaining. This is shown by the proposed Section 30, subsection (6). Where a notice to negotiate a revision is served, the contract between the employee and employer remains in effect, but only until such time as the workers call a stroke vote, successfully, wherein that collective bargaining agreement would go out of effect according to this proposed section. At that time, according to this proposed amendment, no contract is in effect. Each side, the employer and the employees, can then take such unilateral action with respect to working conditions and employment and the like as each may see fit. Now the effect of this proposed Section 36 is that employees will be hindered and inhibited in what should be an unfettered basic democratic freedom, namely the right to stroke, when they alone by democratic decision decided in their best interests to do so. In labor management disputes, negotiators far more experienced than myself will tell you that the prime objective always is to try to keep the parties together even in the most difficult circumstances. I cannot see the rationale behind the breakage or the cleavage of a contract between an employer and employees, once a stroke vote in the wisdom of the employees has been held for the determination of a strike. The only reasoning behind this would be to discourage, Mr. Speaker, the worker's basic right to withdraw the only commodity that he has to sell on the labor force and the market place and that is his labor. This proposed section, Mr. Speaker, is, no matter how you cut it, a weapon against strikes. It's a rather subtle weapon. It encourages the workers not to exercise their right to strike, even when negotiations between the employer and the employees are proceeding so unfavourable that it is deemed necessary by the workers to walk out or to withdraw their labor. If my statement and assumption are correct, then this Government, as I said at the beginning, either has no knowledge of the basic principles of free collective bargaining or, if it does, Mr. Speaker, then this Government does not subscribe to the basic principles of free collective bargaining.

Very briefly these basic principles are three-fold. They are sometimes akin to the three-footed stool. If you weaken one of them or take one of them away, the stool is apt to collapse, and so are the principles of free collective bargaining. The principles may be described as follows: Firstly, workers should be free to associate in such groupings and associations and trade unions of their own choosing as they may see fit. Secondly, they should have the right to negotiate the working conditions, pay and the like to these associations and unions. Thirdly, they should have the right to withdraw the only commodity that they have to sell, namely their labor. This is interpreted if you will as the right to strike. Mr. Speaker, all three of these equal free collective bargaining. Anything that diminishes or tarnishes, in any manner whatsoever, any one of these three basic rights diminishes the principle of free collective bargaining and is bad. Let it not be stated by anyone that free collective bargaining exists when all or one of these concepts has been eroded or been removed. I assume that all democratic governments subscribe to the principles of free collective bargaining as I have outlined.

Accordingly, legislation should be geared to making it easier for working men to associate, to negotiate and to strike when the conditions warrant. If those are the principles, why then Section 30, subsection (6)? Why then do the privileges that a working man has under an existing contract cease to exist, once he has exercised the third basic principle or one of the basic principles of free collective bargaining, namely his right to strike. Arguments have already been advanced in this debate that I don't wish to repeat, about the unilateral action that could be taken by an employer. The possibility of hiring non-union labor, the possibility of paying bonuses and the like to try and discourage and disrupt further those circumstances which will be already a very difficult situation exist, Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that, in the light of this Government's proven anti-labor approach and attitude, I can share the alarmed view by the average citizen and the average working man of Saskatchewan with respect to this legislation, as with respect to every other piece of legislation brought in concerning labor in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now the second basic misconception is this Government's approach and appreciation or sensitivity to the basic principles in The Trade Union Act and the amendments that we are debating here this morning, Mr. Speaker. This Government views The Trade Union Act as a judicial act — I am now using my words very carefully — and I would specifically draw this remark to the attention of the Minister of Labour when he presumably enters this debate to rebut. Now I means by judicial act that this Government says that the Labour Relations Board should be some how an arbiter between employees and employers. Although it is correct to state that this is one aspect of The Trade Union Act, this is not the intention of The Trade Union Act, which is to facilitate the freedom of collective bargaining mainly, association, negotiation and the right to strike together. It is not a judicial act, Mr. Speaker, as much as it is a social policy statute made by a democratic government and hopefully subscribed to by even this Government, which endeavours to say that, given a certain set of cur, the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan have come down in favour of these basic rights of the working man. Although there is a duty on the Labour Relations Board to be judicious as opposed to judicial, there is no duty on this Board other than to take into account those conditions that are going to make it easier for the working man to be certified and exercise his principles of free collective bargaining. It is a matter of public policy that Government seek to reinforce the adherence of the principles of free collective bargaining through such statutes as The Trade Union Act. May I say in this regard, Saskatchewan has been the leader and has been progressive all throughout Canada, not unlike the suggestions made by the Hon. Attorney General. To state it another way, Mr. Speaker, The Trade Union Act seeks to make it easier for workers to bargain collectively, simply, period. That's the essence of the Act.

Now if my interpretation is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I am now directing my attention to the second part of the

proposed amendments, does proposed Section 35 dealing with mergers of trade unions fulfil this aim and this interpretation of the Act.? Is Section 35 in concert with the general purpose and powers of The Trade Union Act? Section 35 gives the power to the Labour Relations Board to determine the validity of mergers, associations and the like of various trade unions. All members know that trade unions are association of working men formed by the working men themselves and themselves only. Trade unions should only be the concern of the employees and the employees only. That does not mean a Labour Relations Board nor does it mean employers who are interested. Nor does it mean any possible third part who has no interest whatsoever, as this proposed section now would allow, the right to interfere with working men coming to a decision of a merger. As I said in the past, The Trade Union Act was viewed as guaranteeing that right of self-determination on how they were going to organize to the working people themselves. Accordingly, the working man decides himself what union to join and decides later, if the question should crop up, whether that union should merge with another trade union. It's an internal decision made by individual trade unionists in a free vote democratically taken after democratic debate in their trade union. Why then is there an unwarranted intrusion by government introducing this legislation and now, by the Labour Relations Board, into the democratic decisions made by the working men themselves. Is there any evidence that mergers for example have already worked an undue hardship or have caused some injustice of the working people who have been affected by them? As I have stated and I want to re-emphasize, mergers are internal matters for trade unions and the workers who compose the trade unions and no one else. It's one of the basic intentions and interpretations of this Act. Some may argue that individual rights within any association are important. With this, I wholeheartedly agree. However, I wish to emphasize that unionist or worker has the full right to have his views aired and heard at the trade union meeting where the merger is discussed. If he carries the day through his arguments, the merger is not fulfilled. If he loses, the will of the majority, as in every democratic institution from this Parliament right down, then comes into play. Why should it work any other way?

Daily, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature, the will of the majority is imposed upon the minority. In other words, in other society, professional or non-professional, groups, I can also ask similarly what rights are enshrined statutorily for individual persons once a group decision has been democratically so arrived? To me, the argument of individual rights in this case smacks of the converse proposition, Mr. Speaker, that trade unions are undemocratic and trample on individual rights. With that view, I do not subscribe. The Hon. Attorney General and the whole Government is responsible for the introduction of this Bill. I feel in doing so it has implied that that is in fact the case with democratic trade unions in the Province of Saskatchewan. I hope that this Government does not subscribe to such a proposition, but there is no other alternative for me to infer or to interpret the amendment just proposed here. May

I also add further, Mr. Speaker, that there are no guide-lines set out in the statute as to what the Board may regard as a proper merger procedure. We have no indication under what circumstances the merger will be approved by the Board. If we are going to have this unnecessary step, at least, the very least we should expect, would be a right to have set out a clear procedure, clear guide-lines of the terms and conditions which mergers could likely be approved or disapproved. I can see a number of difficulties of mergers having been made, and some time later, after the successful operations between employees and employer affected, a person — and I want to re-emphasize this, Mr. Speaker — a person who may not be affected by the decision of the merger, coming along and challenging the effect of the said merger before the Labour Relations Board and some time later invalidating this.

I want to re-emphasize that the proposed Section 35 has in its language any person, not modified, Mr. Speaker. It says any person, and even it were so modified by the words, any person concerned with the particular application of the merger. That too would be such a wide and liberal avenue as to make any one who has any remotest possible interest in the internal workings of trade unions, coming forward and invalidating a merger. That's against basic free collective-bargaining principles. It creates disharmony on industrial relations. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, disharmony that has been growing since 1964, and ever since this Liberal Government gained office. It is the type of disharmony that we can do without in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is bad. As one who represents essentially a working man's riding, I cannot in conscience support what I consider now to be old, regressive Trade Union Act amendments and the attitude of this Government which, to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is either unwilling or unable to recognize the basic fundamental freedoms of free collective bargaining. For that reason, this Bill must be defeated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I would like to draw the attention to the young Member, juvenile Member for Saskatoon, that he having studied law should know that The Trade Union Act is recognized by all labor authorities, courts of the land, both in the United States and Canada that it is not social legislation, it is not moral legislation, but it is economic legislation. It matters not what anyone says, the facts are and it has been recognized by all labor authorities that The Trade Union Act is economic legislation.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) said that "changes to The Trade Union Act have not been recommended by either management of labor." That's quite so. The Hon. Member should know that there are times when the Government must

exercise its prerogative as it has the responsibility of administering the Act, and also looking after the welfare of the worker and the working man. Personally as Minister of Labour I will not stand idly by and leave the working man to be a pawn between labor and management, between management and management of labor and labor.

Mr. Romanow: — What about . . .

Mr. Coderre: — You've had your say, keep your trap shut. We've waited two days to put this Bill on the Order Paper or to continue the debate, just to give you a chance to speak. You got up and you babbled for 20 minutes and then you sat down and you're read to say something again.

However, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will not stand idly by and leave any member of the working force to be a pawn in this game between labor management, labor and labor or management and labor. During the course of my stay as Minister of Labour I've had many working men who come in to see me and explain their problem, but I'll not be pressured by pressure groups. I believe that this is a duty of the Department of Labour to look after the individual. Then the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw said that these amendments would undermine trade unionism. If allowing a working man his freedom and his self-determination, if this is undermining The Trade Union Act or the trade union movement, that's fine. But the individual must have his freedom; he himself should determine what he wants. I know that these amendments will not do what the Hon. Member claims and he knows better as well. He said that the amendment brought in would be an obstacle in forming unions. You know the Hon. Member got up on previous legislation, Mr. Speaker, and said the same thing. I find and see in this legislation no such obstacles and the bogey that the Hon. Member is trying to raise at this time he has raised in the past. It has been disproven by the Department of Labour, as has been indicated in Chart 14, page 98 of the Department of Labour Report, which indicates the increase in membership. If you look at that chart it shows a greater rate of increase than most years past since the trade union movement has been in this province. The greatest rate increase. On top of that, since this bogey has been raised, I think it should be answered, that last year alone 155 new unions were certified. Does that mean that this anti-union legislation that has been brought in in the past? He raised this bogey in the past and now he is trying to raise it again. One-third increase in union membership in three years after over 40 years of existence in this province. That's wonderful.

Then he mentioned something about labor courts and he made reference to Sweden and other areas of endeavour. He knows and he knows full well the problems of labor, the problems of management, the problems of government. We're all concerned with this. We are all concerned with the loss of wages to the working man. We are all concerned with loss of production to the nation. All of them, labor, management, government, are

attempting to find ways and means to minimize these losses. By gosh, if I had the answer I wouldn't be sitting in this House, I'd probably be the wealthiest man in the world. These problems, the Hon. Member has never suggested that these losses could be minimized or in what ways they could be minimized. We still believe and advocate and encourage free collective bargaining, free from government interference, and we practise this philosophy. There is no compulsion in it and no interference, as the Hon. Member from Saskatoon says. Section 30, as it was, did interfere, did say that this collective bargaining is in force. At present, Section 30 will determine the conditions. All one part would have to do then would be to give notice that all sections of the agreement are open, rather than by law determining that only certain sections can be opened. Is this interference? This is opening the door for the people themselves to determine. And I was happy to see on this particular point that the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) somewhat agreed with the terms of the agreement as it is here, based it on arguments in another debate. Often labor-management asked the Administration or the Government for conciliation officers. Because of this we have the lowest man-days loss average due to strikes, because of the ability of these people. This will in no way interfere with it.

Mr. Romanow: — Zero . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, all these Members have had an opportunity to speak on this very same debate. I was listening attentively trying to be constructive, and they were trying to be destructive and they are still trying to be the amendment. They were somewhat critical of previous labor legislation, Bill 79. They found against the amendments that were suggested by a joint labor government and management review committee, and they fought tooth and nail against these amendments then with no dissenting vote. Now they say, "You didn't ask a labor-management committee to review The Trade Union Act," which they fought tooth and nail, and now they ask to go back to this committee again. What do you want? You had the committee and you beefed about it. You haven't got it, you beef about it. If we go back to the committee you'll be beefing again. Just raising Cain all the time.

Then the pay off, the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) came in, and in his usual, vocal, loud, vociferous manner accused, disagreed. I don't think I need to answer these usual accusations in the usual way. But he, more than any of the other union business agents in this province, has had deterrent-certified from his jurisdiction more unions than all the others put together because he didn't service them. Nothing in this Bill will prevent mergers of membership if the membership want it. Nothing in this Bill prevents the individuals to determine for themselves. The Labour Relations Board, when a group of employees have applied for certification, determine to form a union within an establishment. They, the members, apply

to the Labour Relations Board for certification. If the membership wish to deterrent-certify they apply to the Labour Relations Board for de-certification. Any change that they wish to do it's the membership that makes this decision through Labour Relations Board. Surely, if there is a merger of Union A and Union B, members of Union Bill may not want to merge with Union A. Member of Union A may not want to merge with members of Union B, but they would agree to form a Union by Union C. Should you deny the membership this right to determine for themselves if they go through the normal process of the Labour Relations Board and say that they don't agree with the merger. And there you are beefing about Section 35. This is the right way of doing it, this is the way it should be done, and this is exactly what the Act spells out. But the most despicable thing of all, Mr. Speaker, is this constant attack on the Labour Relations Board. The people of this province should know, the people of this province should know, Mr. Speaker, that some Members opposite are constantly attempting to undermine judicial bodies, the quasi-judicial bodies, undermine the authority of the province. I think it is despicable to allow this type of thing.

Mr. Davies: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Coderre: — In a few minutes I'll be finished, I will give you the opportunity to ask it.

Mr. Davies: — I was just going to ask the Hon. Member if he can remember as many attacks on the previous Labour Relations Board when he was a Member in Opposition?

Mr. Coderre: — I have argued on occasions on the determination of the Board which is quite in order, but I have not attacked the Board as such. I have never attacked their authority. I have the most profound respect for the judicial body and the very stability of our democracy and I will defend it forever at all times.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is a democratic Bill. It gives to the individual worker the right to determine for himself. As long as I have the honour of being the Minister of Labour, I will do everything I can to give the authority to the individual working man that he not be a pawn, that he not be something of a collateral to be exchanged by union leaders in Washington, union leaders in Toronto or elsewhere. Let the individual decide in his own local union who will be their bargaining agent.

The Trade Union Act, the amendment that we are presenting at the moment, and particularly Section 35, is only there to establish the guide-lines whereby the Labour Relations Board will have to work. Oftentimes they have been presented with a certain situation that they had not the authority to investigate.

This will give them the authority to investigate such a thing as a merger. And as I have indicated before, there will be an amendment brought in that will put a time limit when a merge has taken place that it can be appealed. After that the Labour Relations Board could not disallow a merger.

I said and I'll say again and again, the Labour Relations Board grants a certification to a group of workers within an establishment because the employees have asked for certification.

Over the years it has evolved that the Labour Relations Board will grant deterrent-certification after proper authority or proper representation and the majority of the member so wish. I think, if they granted this, they should also have the right to disallow any changes if the membership so wish. I have complete confidence in the Board, complete confidence in the judicial ability of the Chairman of the Board and the members of the Board, both labor and management, who all of us know are very respectable people whose integrity cannot be challenged anywhere. I have the utmost respect for them and I know that they will judiciously approach any application regardless of whether it be a merger, certifications or otherwise. The guide-lines where mergers are approved or disapproved to go this quasi-judicial body, just as mergers in major corporations have to go to the courts. This is as it should be. Do you deny that when a corporation does merger it has to go to court to get an agreement of this merger, that this should not be allowed to the individual who has nothing to offer to anyone but his hand, his labor, the seat of his brow? Surely not, no person would disallow him this privilege.

And with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions that have been raised, I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33

Messieurs

Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Larochelle
Steuart	Estey	Gardner
Heald	Hooker	Coupland
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser

NAYS — 23

Messieurs

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Heald that Bill No. 76 — **An Act to amend The Vehicles Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, at this time, I want to extend my thanks to the Minister and to the Government for extending me the courtesy to say a few words on this Bill. It's a matter that I think all Members will agree, in the introduction of the legislation., I and others feel quite strongly about.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to express my regret at the presentation to this House of the proposed amendments to The Vehicles Act in the present form. I direct my regret to the section which relates to the 24-hour suspension of driving privileges when a person has been suspected of having a blood alcohol reading of .08 per cent. Now I mean this sincerely. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has introduced into this Legislature some, many worthwhile statutes which protect the public and I have indicated that in the past. I would have hoped, however, that in this vital area of driving and drinking, he would have seen fit to have taken a stronger and more positive approach toward the hazard off drinking drivers in Saskatchewan. Regretfully, this Bill is watered down. It is some small recognition of the problem and for that reason we will have to support it. However, I can only repeat that the people of Saskatchewan will be disappointed in the Hon. Attorney General and his Government with respect to the provisions relating to driving and drinking.

Mr. Speaker, may I reiterate briefly the arguments that show that there is a direct correlation of alcohol and road accidents. Some of these arguments I referred to in my Resolution on the .08 Resolution that was ruled out of order, properly so, Mr. Speaker, by yourself. I am not going to belabor them at great length. However, may I say that several studies have been carried out to evaluate the role played by alcohol in road accidents. Some of these are best summarized in chapter five of the Road Research Laboratories Book called "Research on Road Safety." It is an English text-book. This book tells of an English laboratory which analysed the records of fatal road accidents in three police districts throughout London to discover the proportion of cases in which someone

was involved that was known to have been drinking beforehand and, where the information was available, the amount drunk. It was discovered that out of 376 people killed, about 18 per cent, Mr. Speaker, died as a result of accidents in which at least one of the people involved had been drinking. The driver or the rider had been drinking in 14 per cent additionally in these accidents. At night, the proportion was much higher. Between 10 p.m. and 4 a.m., 62 per cent of the accidents involved drinking. Sixty-two per cent, Mr. Speaker. It was also found that the driver, who had been drinking, tends to be involved relatively more frequently in accidents in which no pedestrian and no other vehicles were involved. In other words, he was the author of his own misfortune. In England, the records of fatal road accidents at Christmas time, and I think they are also relevant, 1959 and 1963 specifically were examined to discover the reason for a higher accident rate at Christmas compared, for example, to other times of the year. There it was found that some one person had been drinking in 56 per cent of the accidents in 1959 and 48 per cent in 1963. Other pieces of research have shown that the road accident rate is higher than the average in the hour right after closing of the Public Accounts in England. And I cite this because I am sure that the facts would also hold true here in Saskatchewan.

Now I have cited the English studies, because they are the most comprehensive, and because in England present legislation is geared to the protection of the public more adequately, in my view. The person who has not been driving and drinking is more adequately protected from the menace of the person, who has chosen to drink and then go behind a car, driving a very lethal weapon. I am sure, however, as I have said, that the statistics that I have quoted will bear me out here in Saskatchewan and in Canada. All of these pieces of evidence point in the same direction. All show that greatly increased accident risks are produced with increasing concentration of alcohol in the blood of drivers.

May I briefly just discuss one other one. In the United States, the Grand Rapids survey at Indiana University was carried out under the direction of Professor Borkenstein. Professor Borkenstein was the inventor and the person who is most versed in the use of the breathalyser, the machine that we have been talking about. Blood samples were taken from over 7,000 drivers not involved in accidents. The results showed that a blood alcohol level approaching and exceeding not .08 but .05 per cent produced a definite risk of an accident. Mr. Speaker, the survey showed that, while there were some differences in the effect of alcohol on the accident rate between different classes of drivers, above a certain level of alcohol in the blood, namely. 05 per cent, all drivers no matter what their tolerance, no matter what their capacity or their experience with alcohol, all drivers were more likely to have accidents, irrespective of age, experience, or drinking habits. Mr. Speaker, what then can we draw from the facts with respect to alcohol and road accidents? I would submit the following conclusions can be made. Firstly, all the evidence shows quite

clearly that, above a certain level in the blood, alcohol impairs driving ability and increases accident risks. Secondly, the level at which impairment beings is relatively low. Thirdly, .05 or .08 is the level of impairment. For my purposes, I have no quarrel with the proposed rate of .08 per cent. Fourthly, people may argue that they can tell whether or not that they are fit to drive. But, at these relatively low levels, the driver will probably shown no outward signs of intoxication and he may not feel at all intoxicated, but in medical and other factors, he is so intoxicated. Fifthly, a driver who has had alcohol to a difficult situation, because he will be readier to take risks and at the same time he will be less aware of how to get away or to challenge or to overcome the risk, as it may present itself, because of his state of impairment. Sixthly, the only completely safe rule is not to drink at all before driving or, if you are going to drink, to not get behind the wheel.

Mr. Speaker, regretfully and to my mind, the 24-hour suspension of driving privileges with respect to drinking drivers, keeping in mind these six points and the statistics that I have related to the House, is simply insufficient and inadequate. I am afraid that it will give the driving person who has also been drinking a false sense of security that, if he is picked up by a police officer, the worst that can happen to him is a 24-hour suspension. Or, if you will, Mr. Speaker, it will create that point that I discussed in my argument No. 5, that he runs a double risk. He will feel that he will be able to overcome any risk, if he should get into it and if he can't overcome it, he may be apprehended by a police officer and saved by the bell, as it were, for a period of 24 hours. If a personal has been so intoxicated by alcohol as to make him unsafe of getting home in the false assumption that all that will be happening to him is a 24-hour suspension. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a person will take a risk in getting home. In the process of taking the risk, he may kill or permanently maim or cause irreparable damage or harm to an innocent person of society.

I say the public will no longer stand for indifference of government or for, what I would submit, respectfully, a waffling on the part of government with arguments that the people are not yet prepared to accept stringent legislation on drinking driving. I am going to refer to the most recent article with respect to the opinion of the public on drinking driving. The Saskatchewan Safety Council had an annual meeting just Saturday last. One of the things discussed there was the .08 blood alcohol level and there the impairment resolution passed by the Safety Council, I direct Members' attention to the April 22nd Leader-Post. On page 3, there is a resolution urging Government to adopt the strong legislation of the United Kingdom which provides for suspension of one year when a person has a certain breathalyzer reading, or if he refuses to use the breathalyser, after he has been so requested by a police officer, then also he is suspended. The purpose of that resolution, the

purpose of the English legislation, is very simple, If you have been driving and drinking and it has been so proven, compulsorily, he should be taken off the roads and removed as a social menace. If he refuses to blow into the machine then I think that the public and the police can properly come to the conclusion that he has something to hide and he is as equal a menace as the person who has been determined to be .08 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted to Members before in the Resolution on .08 and briefly allude again to the many petitions of church groups and other organizations in my city of Saskatoon and in the Province of Saskatchewan, the petition of some 4,500 names, that the Hon. Attorney General has on his desk, which realizes the need for this Legislature to come down in favour of strong, touch safety standards that protect the public with respect to the drinking driver.

Now may I just make a brief comment on the legal aspect of it. That is the power of the court to suspend. It may very well be argued by the learned Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that the matter of suspension is something that is ruled by the courts to be unconstitutional. It is not my purpose here to get into any legal argument on the constitution now. Briefly, my view is that licensing is a matter which is strictly in the domain of the Saskatchewan Legislature and is intra vires. In other words, if we make it a condition of licensing that a person, who is at a .08 reading or a person who refuses to blow into the breathalyser, when he has been so requested, cannot have the privilege of a driver's licence, we will overcome any argument that may be presented on the question of ultra vires versus intra vires. At any rate, I think it is important to show the people of Saskatchewan, forgetting about the legal arguments that may or may not be taken into account that the Legislature, as I have said again and I am going to repeat, decided once and for all that this menace is going to be curbed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Members will know that we on this side have been advocating suspension for up to one year on .08 or the refusal. And may I say this. I feel that in addition to the protest of the public that we may on this side, take some small measure of credit for what I described as inadequate legislation, but even that being introduced in this session of the Legislature. It is the repeated bringing to the attention of the Government the needs of the public that I think bears some fruit, and it does in this case. We urge the increased suspension of one year, or if you will follow the British legislation, on the encouraging statistics that England has produced showing that harsh and drastic Government legislation is needed. If deaths and casualties are to be prevented or curbed. For example, Mr. Speaker, in Greater London, the injury and fatal accident rate dropped 42 per cent since the introduction of the new legislation. Those killed dropped by 34 per cent. If you applied those figures to Canada, Mr. Speaker, 34 per cent of the total traffic fatalities in Canada in 1966 would have meant a saving of 1,787 lives, lives that have been gone now as a result of the menace of driving and drinking. To dally any further is

absolutely unforgivable. Mr. Speaker, I will support this Bill. As I have already stated, it is at least a slight recognition of the problem and any step to the eradication of the problem must be supported. However, I say to the Government that we on this side will continue to fight for more stringent and harsh rules governing drinking drivers. We say this legislation, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and Mr. Speaker, doesn't go far enough. We say the people are looking for action from this body of Legislators now. We say this legislation will require more examination at future sessions of this Legislature.

As I say, I will be supporting the Bill on second reading. The other provisions of the Act are meritorious generally speaking, and I am not going to dwell on them. Those who were looking to some positive and progressive legislation on the matter of drinking driving will, unfortunately, I must say, be disappointed by this particular Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any great length in closing debate on this Bill, but I would like to make a few observations particularly as a result of the remarks of the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow).

After listening to him I being to wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether he's read the Bill because he seemed to confine his remarks to the 24-hour suspension. Now it's true, that is an important pat of the Bill, Section 104(a) but I would commend, to the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale and to all Hon. Members, the other provisions of the Bill with respect to licence suspensions because they do relate of course very directly to drinking driving. I'm going to review for the House — I covered this when I introduced second reading — but I'm going to cover it again because this is the toughest, most restrictive legislation against drinking drivers in Canada and in any province in Canada, and I want to review it. You've skated over it. Some of the Members who have spoken on the other side talked only about the 24-hour suspension. But let's go back to the mandatory suspensions which are contained in Section 87 of the Act, the new Section 87; for convictions under Section 222 which is drunken driving; for convictions under Section 192 which is death by criminal negligence, in many cases as a result of a drinking driver; Section 193, injury by criminal negligence, in many cases a drinking driver; Section 207, manslaughter by motor vehicle, for the minimum suspension under the new Bill, Mr. Speaker, is six months and it can go from six months to two years. So that's a very heavy suspension, and I think it is necessary. I think it's going to cut down on these kind of people driving cars on our highways. Then there's the other group; convictions under Section 221, subsection (4) of the Criminal Code, which is dangerous driving. In many cases this is somebody who has been drinking. Or Section 223 which is the most common one, of course, impaired driving. The minimum

mandatory suspension under this Bill for any impaired driver or any dangerous driver is three months. Under certain circumstances where there's been injury or property damage, it is increased to six months, and of course where it is a second offence it is increased to a year. So under this class of penalties, this class of infractions, the minimum mandatory suspension under this Bill is three months and it can go up to one year. Then the hit-and-run section. The minimum suspension under the hit-and-run Section 221(2) is three months, and here again it can go up to one year. Mr. Speaker, the proposal in this Bill is combining these mandatory suspensions with the 24-hour suspension rule. We feel that these sanctions if you like are very important sanctions. They are very necessary sanctions, and we feel that we will by this total approach, not by a piecemeal approach, but by this total approach, we will effectively reduce accidents in the Province of Saskatchewan, particularly so far as drinking drivers are concerned. So I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not watered down legislation. This is not weak legislation. It's a total approach. It's not waffling on the part of the Government. The Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) mentioned the petition from Saskatoon. It's true I received the petition. I also had a very useful and meaningful discussion for about an hour or an hour and one-half with some representatives of this group from Saskatoon a couple of weeks ago. We discussed this matter, and I indicated to the group the nature of the legislation which hadn't been introduced into the Legislature at that time. Yesterday I received a letter delivered personally by one of the representatives of this group, Pastor Lenz and I'd like to refer to his letter. He thanks myself and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who met the Committee for our time and thorough discussion granted to further our mutual efforts to reduce the incidence of highway fatalities, injuries, and property loss.

> We are proud that Saskatchewan through its Government is making definite progress in realistic laws to further the cause of safety on our highways. We are particularly pleased that you have refused to raise the alcoholic impairment level beyond the point of .08 per cent blood content. Saskatchewan in a sense is taking a courageous and realistic course, and we are sue you will continue to study this problem and dare to act according to your findings. On behalf of our Committee for better laws and practice to prevent highway accidents.
>
> Signed by Pastor Lenz,
> Lutheran Church, Saskatoon.

So I think that, while this Committee would have perhaps been happier if we had gone for an automatic suspension of 12 months, I think they are convinced, as I am convinced, that this is a realistic approach by virtue of these two different approaches, the mandatory suspensions and the 24-hour suspension law. I think we are effectively going to reduce accidents in the Province of Saskatchewan. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and all Members of the Legislature this, that, if this doesn't work,

if I'm still Attorney General of this Province at this time next year, as far as I'm concerned I'll be in for tougher laws, but I think this law will work. I think it is tough, I think it's real tough, it is the toughest in Canada at the present time or will be. But if it doesn't do the job, if we still have slaughter on our highways which is directly related to drinking driving, then we may have to look at something tougher in another year. Now my Hon. Friend says, "Why don't we pass the British law?" Well we can't pass the British law, because the British law creates an offence, and constitutionally we can't pass it, because the Federal Government has entered this field, as I tried to explain in second reading so that we can't pass the British law. I hope the Government of Canada, whoever it may be after the 25th of June, will pass the British law and will certainly not get any higher than .08 per cent, but we don't have very much control of that at the present time.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that's all I want to say. The Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says that the Opposition are going to take some credit for this legislation. Well, that's all right with me, if you want to take credit for the legislation. We're passing the legislation. I think it is good legislation and I think that everybody who votes for it in the Legislature is perhaps entitled to take some credit. I wouldn't want to disillusion the Hon. Member for Riversdale, but we were doing work and research and study on this legislation and getting it ready for this session long before the Member for Riversdale was ever elected. But that's all right if he wants to take some of the credit for it, I don't mind.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to the Legislature. I hope that everybody votes for it and I hope everybody gets out and co-operates and makes it work. When we all come back here next year we'll have a better set of statistics with regard to highway fatalities.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — May I ask the Minister a question, Mr. Speaker. How does he intend to get a conviction for drunken driving, if the person has 24 hours to sober up? How do you overcome this situation?

Mr. Heald: — No, the judgment is made in the first instance by the police officer. If he uses the 24-hour suspension then he doesn't proceed under the Criminal Code. But the police officer in the first instance, if the man is drunk or is impaired, doesn't use the 24-hour suspension, he uses the Criminal Code. That is the way it works at the Coast as a matter of fact. You see if this 24-hour suspension was used in substitution for the impaired driving or the drunken driving, it would be no good at all. It's used to catch the people that they can't get a conviction for impaired driving or drunken driving. But you've still got impaired driving and you've still get the drunken driving. Instructions to the police will be of course that where somebody is, in their judgment, impaired, or

drunk on the highways, then they use the Criminal Code and they don't wait any 24 hours. The 24 hours, that judgment is made by the police officer right at the time he apprehends the individual.

Mr. Thibault: — Yes, well I hope you permit me to proceed just a little further with this. I'm not going to be too long. How does the judge make his judgment when it's on the word of the policeman? This I think would be quite difficult.

Mr. Heald: — That's not changed, that law has not changed. It is the same as it has always been. If the breathalyzer is there, he uses the breathalyzer as corroborative evidence to the clinical symptoms. Usually convictions are based on two things, clinical symptoms, the policeman gives evidence as to the way in which he walked and talked and possibly how he drove. Then if a breathalyzer was taken, that evidence is admissible. But this 24-hour suspension law doesn't change in any way the procedure or the law as far as the Criminal Code and drunken driving and impaired driving are concerned.

Mr. Thibault: — Well, you see the old law did not . . . oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Speaker: — These are questions that can be very well asked and answered in Committee in an orderly manner.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to a fine group of students seated in the Speaker's gallery. These are boys and girls from St. Paul's school, north of Saskatoon and they are here under the direction of their teacher. I am sure that all Members will wish to join me in extending to them a very warm welcome to the Legislature of our Province and to wish them a very safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce in the Speaker's gallery tonight 12 high school students from our neighbouring state of Montana. This is a part of a Kiwanis International Student Exchange. Regina and Wascana Kiwanis clubs in co-operation with the Public and Separate School Boards of Regina are sponsoring an international student exchange during this week. Twelve Regina high school students are spending this week in Montana and 10 Sidney plus 2 Glendive students are attending Balfour, Scott, Sheldon Williams,

Campbell, Marion and Campion high schools in Regina. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this student-exchange project commemorates the signing of the Rush-Bagot Agreement on April 28, 1817, which virtually demilitarised the border between our two countries. Observance of Canada-United States Goodwill Week was initiated by Kiwanis International in 1923. I'm sure that we would all wish to extend to these students from across the border, the 49th parallel, our very best wishes for a happy stay in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the city of Regina. I know we are all honoured by their visit to this Legislative Chamber this evening, and I hope they'll find the discussions this evening very useful, very informative and perhaps they can take back to their legislative processes in the United States some of the ideas which they may pick up here this evening. So I'd like you all to join with me in wishing them welcome.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): —Mr. Speaker, may I also join with the Attorney General in associating our side of the House with what he has said. I think it is a wonderful example that the students have given us in this exchange program. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should follow their example and exchange representatives as between the State Legislature and our own Legislature here. I would like to say that we welcome the students. We hope that this will do more to cement the bonds of friendships between the two countries and in particular of our young people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 10:12 o'clock p.m.