

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature
30th Day

Monday, March 29, 1971.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Before we proceed with the day's order of business I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Regina North West represented by Mr. Whelan, 80 students from the Rosemont Elementary School with their teacher, Mr. Reese, the Vice Principal; from the constituency of Watrous represented by Mr. Schmeiser, 39 students from the McClellan School of Young, Saskatchewan, under the direction of their Vice-Principal Mr. Kuzyk; from the constituency of Regina South represented by the Minister of Health, Mr. Grant, 31 students from Campbell Collegiate under the direction of their teacher, Miss Lieske; from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre represented by Mr. Estey, 45 students from the Grosvenor Park School under the direction of Mr. H. Welch and Mr. Bonner; from the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair represented by Mr. Brockelbank, 40 students from the Caroline Robbins School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Dyck and Mrs. Klase.

I am sure that all Hon. Members will wish to extend to the students, their teachers and their bus drivers a very warm welcome to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable and educational and wish to each of them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

NINTH ANNUAL PEE WEE HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

MR. J. A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to report to the Legislature through you, Mr. Speaker, the final result of the Ninth Annual Pee Wee Hockey Tournament which was played in the Coliseum in the city of Weyburn. Yesterday the Weyburn Young Fellows, the Provincial "A" champions added another title to their list when they won the "A" Division of the Ninth Annual Tournament by defeating Westridge, Manitoba by a score of 5 to 3 in the final game. I am sure Members all join me in extending congratulations to this fine hockey club in Weyburn and in their most recent achievement.

SHAMROCK CODERRE MIDGETS WIN HOCKEY "D" CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. L. P. CODERRE (Minister of Public Works): — I should like to ask this Legislature to join with me in congratulating the Coderre Shamrock Midgets who won the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey "D" Championship recently. Incidentally, last year this very same team won the Pee Wee

championship, this year the Midget Ds, next year who knows, the future looks very bright and they will be the Provincial Champions later on in other classes. So let's watch them grow. Their manager is Mr. Louis Gaucher and Mr. Danny Fisher of Shamrock their coach.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MEETING HELD AT OTTAWA OF ALL AGRICULTURE MINISTERS

HON. D. T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure it would be of interest to the Members of the Legislative Assembly if I reported on a meeting that was held in Ottawa Friday last, called by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Bud Olson, attended by all the Ministers of Agriculture of all the provinces except two, along with their Deputy Ministers. The main object of the meeting dealt with a proposed nation-wide farm adjustment program. The first meeting of course was a preliminary one. The Hon. Mr. Olson, the Federal Minister of Agriculture has mentioned several times in the last couple of months the concern of the Federal Government that farm adjustment has not been proceeding rapidly enough. In line with this thinking, the 1971-72 budget of the Federal Government includes a \$16 million item to be directed towards this type of program. The meeting recognized that there are farmers, who at present, have non-economic farm units but who want to stay in farming and who need some help towards developing a viable commercial unit. There are others who would like to give up farming, some through retirement and some through moving into other types of employment.

Now we were most concerned that adequate policies be devised to help this first group, that is, to develop a system that would put the smaller farmer in a better position to compete for land with the larger farmer but without putting too much pressure on land prices. Special credit terms or preferred sales opportunities were points that we mentioned. For the group who wish to leave agriculture, programs such as incentive grants with retirement pensions and better information programs on retraining and job opportunities were discussed. Some time was also spent on discussing administrative arrangements for the program so that there would be no duplication of existing services. It appears that the Farm Credit Corporation will play an important role, at least in Saskatchewan. A Committee with Dr. R. Poirier, Federal Associate Deputy Minister, will take a further look and report to a meeting in April. In the meantime the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson, will be discussing the subject with representatives of farm organizations.

QUESTIONS

PSYCHIATRIC NURSES' PROGRAM BEING PHASED OUT AT WEYBURN

MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and by way of introduction I should like to remind him of a question that was asked of him on the 27th day of March with respect to the rumor that the Psychiatric Nurses' Training Program in Weyburn was being phased out. At that time the Minister replied and I am quoting from the record, Mr. Speaker, there is no plan whatsoever for the phasing out of the program at Weyburn. I want to refer to him and ask him about a communication received by a constituent of mine on March 17.

March 29, 1971

It says: The Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn will not be enrolling students in the Training Program for psychiatric nurses this year. We have therefore forwarded your application to the Saskatchewan Training School in Moose Jaw for their consideration.

There is another paragraph, and it is signed by M. C. Schreder, Director of Psychiatric Nursing Program, Psychiatric Services Branch. I wonder if the Minister would like to make another statement concerning this matter and perhaps clarify the situation with respect to the fact that the Weyburn Institution is not accepting applications for the psychiatric nurses' course during the year.

HON. G. B. GRANT (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I shall have further comment to make in the House tomorrow on that subject.

TELEGRAM TO RAILROAD UNIONS RE SLOWDOWN IN MOVING GRAIN

HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would join with the Government - I see he has a proposed motion in here - in sending a telegram to all the railroad unions involved in this slowdown that is affecting every farmer and will in fact affect every farmer in Saskatchewan and in Western Canada, urging the railroad unions to show a sense of responsibility to Western economy and to the Western farmers, urging them - unify this House - to get back to work or to quit the slowdown until such time as we can urge the Federal Government to get the two parties together and settle whatever dispute they have. I should like to see this House join - unitedly - and send a telegram to the unions because they are the ones who are causing the slowdown - say stop the slowdown, move the grain, keep the thing rolling until such time as we can work together to get the Federal Government to take whatever action is necessary and get the two parties together. But in the meantime there is a slowdown. I don't know whether it is a legal strike or what it is but it is a slowdown that has backed grain up into every small town in Western Canada and especially in Saskatchewan and with the difficulties the farmers are already encountering, they have enough problems right now without having this added to their burden. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) if his party would join with the Government in sending such a telegram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I think it will be known that it's inappropriate for him to ask me that question. He has done it and I intend to answer it. I do so either with your indulgence or else I stand in my place under Rule 17.

MR. SPEAKER: — Under my indulgence.

MR. BLAKENEY: — All right, very well. With respect to the question asked

by the Deputy Leader (Mr. Steuart) the answer is that if he will join together with us in directing that telegram also to management, then yes. Whereas it is known the negotiations have been going on for over one year, I don't think we can characterize either the trade unions or the management to be at fault. There is nothing else a trade union can do under the circumstances except to withdraw its services if it wants to bring things to a head and we regret that action by them and we regret any action by management which may have precipitated this. But if he will join with us - and I should say yes. But let's put it in the form of a Resolution so that this House will be united in addressing both parties, the firm and united desire of this Legislature to see this dispute resolved so that the movement of grain is in no way interrupted and so that the export sales so important, not only to Prairie farmers, but to Canada as a whole continues at full speed. If he will join with us then we will see no difficulty. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the way we could do that is for me to move a resolution under Standing Order 17, of which I have given insufficient notice, and that once this matter is before the House then it is open both to me and to Members opposite to move a resolution which follows on the statement matters under debate. I would commend that procedure to him and to you, Mr. Speaker, as the most expeditious way of getting the united voice of this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I now wish to stand under Standing Order 17 if you will recognize me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well I think we've got to untangle our procedure a little here. By indulgence the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) spoke before the Orders of the Day, similarly by indulgence the Leader of the Opposition spoke. Now that's the end of that part of it.

Now we start off in a fresh line of procedure.

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, he asked me, 'Would I join with them?' He answered my question saying that if we would join with them in making the telegram be all embracing and take in management, I presume too. We should be very pleased to do that. We don't need to wait until we've debated it, if the Speaker rules we can debate this immediately or later on or whenever. We don't need to wait for that, we can send that telegram immediately. Let's not forget, it is the union that has caused the slowdown but we shall be glad to join in to urge both management and union to settle this immediately so that any slowdown in the movement of grain could be stopped right now and the trains would be moving today.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Now are you answering the answer or . . . ?

MOTION - PRIORITY OF DEBATE

MR. BLAKENEY: — I rise under Standing Order 17. Under that I desire to make a motion and ask leave to move that:

The Assembly give priority of debate to a definite matter

March 29, 1971

of urgent public importance and I state the matter of urgent public importance as follow:

My apologies to you, Mr. Speaker, for giving you only one-half hour's notice when the rules call for two hours notice.

Whereas it appears that a dispute between the management of the two major Canadian railways and their employees could result in a significant slowdown in the movement of Canadian grain to Pacific ports, and whereas it is desirable that steps be taken to assure that everything possible is done to assure that the current dispute between the two major railway companies and their employees are settle so as to maintain an uninterrupted flow of grain to Pacific Coast ports, this Assembly gives priority of debate to the following Resolution:

That this Assembly request the Government of Canada and particularly the Minister of Labour to take appropriate steps to bring about a speedy agreement between the railways and their employees in order that grain for export may continue to flow freely to the Pacific ports and further that the contents of this Resolution be conveyed immediately to the Minister of Labour of the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that is my matter. I am not to debate it until you have made a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — I thank the Member for having given me due notice of his motion, but I should draw attention to the fact that subsection 2 of Rule 17 requires that written notice be given two hours prior to the sitting of the House. Two hours prior to the sitting of the House would be 12:30. I received the notice at 2 o'clock. It was therefore a hour and one-half late in arriving at my office. However, I go on to quote further from Rule 17, subsection 2:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Mr. Speaker shall have the right to waive notice.

That was written into our rules for a very good reason. The reason being that there might be something crop up which was of a suddenly emergent nature. There has been, I think, some indication that this problem was arising prior to this. I'm not sure just how little or much, however I don't think I should take that too seriously. I take the matter which the Member states as his reason as serious. I'm not sure just now what degree of urgency there is. I contacted the press immediately after receiving the Member's notice and I came to the conclusion that there was a degree of urgency from what I gathered from them. I placed a call to Ottawa, to the correct authorities, to try and elucidate from them what the real situation in regard to grain movement is exactly now. I have listened to what the Deputy Premier, the Provincial Treasurer has to say. It seems to me if I take the sense of the House correctly that this House would like to take common action to meet this common problem which is affecting or is about to affect all Western Canadian grain producers. However, I have some further question in connection with the form of the motion that the Member handed to me. It appears that according to his motion the matter of importance is not the matter of the movement of grain but the matter of his specific Resolution. It is not the Resolution as much that is of

greatest importance. The matter that is of importance is the movement of the grain.

I draw attention to the wording of the request for priority of debate under Rule No. 17. I have to decide whether this matter is of such urgency that it should be debated at once. In doing so I have to think about the welfare of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and I have to think about the proper procedure in this Legislature. I should ask the House if, without prejudice, I could defer my decision for approximately half an hour until such time as I sum up the entire situation. I expect that I will be in contact with people in Ottawa and perhaps the Wheat Board. I will tell the House exactly what the situation is when I have done that and we can proceed from there. I realize that this might take half an hour out of the time that the matter could be discussed, clearly and simply because the debate must end at the time of normal adjournment according to the rules. There could possibly be some give and take here. Maybe an accommodation could be arranged through usual channels.

MR. W. G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I put it to you that with the unanimous consent of the House the Rule of Notice could be waived and we could proceed to debate this motion now, that is, with unanimous consent. With respect I suggest that that might be proposed to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: — It is possible to do this if the House wishes to. It would have to be the unanimous consent of the House.

MR. STEUART: — I don't think that the House should question your request for indulgence for a half an hour to study this situation and I think we should be prepared when you come back to give us your thinking on this. A half an hour certainly isn't going to make any difference.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right. Normal adjournment is 9:30 and it is not going to take us anything resembling that to get a consensus.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll ask the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair. If that's agreed.

Oh, wait a minute. Order, order! Maybe I moved along a little too speedily here.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Guy (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that Bill No. 39 - An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act be now read a second time.

MR. H. H. P. BAKER (Regina South East): — Oh, yes, I asked that that one be held over until Mr. Wood got back. I think we can let it pass, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am sure the questions he will want to ask can be done in

March 29, 1971

Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: — Before the Orders of the Day the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) asked for leave, under Rule 17, to make a motion asking for "Priority of Debate" for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance.

The Rules require that a minimum of two hours notice be given and inasmuch as the Member did not give notice until 2:00 p.m. today, this section was not complied with in full. However, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Chair to waive notice, as the Speaker is empowered to do under Rule 17 (2).

At the time the matter was raised, I asked the Assembly to allow me to defer my ruling, without prejudice, pending a correct factual assessment of the situation. I thank the Members of the Assembly for their courtesy in allowing me to do so.

Basically, the immediate question is "Shall the Chair waive the two hour notice as required by Rule 17(2)."

I have contacted authorities, who I believe to be well informed and have been told that the entire movement of grain in British Columbia is at a standstill and is almost entirely halted from Calgary west, and that the slowdown is spreading eastward. I hardly need to mention the effect on our West Coast exports.

In view of what I consider to be the seriousness of the situation and taking into consideration what I feel to be the sense of the Assembly, I believe that under these particular circumstances it would be proper, on this occasion, for the Chair to waive notice.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I first raise a procedural point. My difficulty with respect to this matter was that the nature of the problem arising in British Columbia only came to my attention really as to its seriousness at noon today when I heard some reports, particularly the statement by Mr. Ira Mumford, the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I had, of course, been aware of the sporadic nature of the problem but I saw the Western Producer on my desk this morning which indicated a problem which was sporadic in its nature. But these reports indicated something more. I, therefore, didn't have time to do the proper amount of homework under Standing Order No. 17. I believe the statement which I have presented to the House does not comply with the Standing Order. I have prepared another statement and I have given a copy to you, Mr. Speaker, which I think raises absolutely nothing new but which I think puts the matter in better order. And the statement now is that the item which should be a definite matter of urgent public importance in respect of which I am asking priority of debate, I should state as follows:

The reported interruption of the flow of grain to Pacific Coast ports by rail consequent upon the dispute between the management of the two major railways and their employees.

And I would first ask leave to substitute that for the statement which I read at the outset which I think contains precisely the same subject matter but which I think complies better with the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I drew to the attention of the Legislature before I deferred my ruling, the fact that the original motion asked that the House give "Priority of Debate" to a motion, whereas the correct procedure would be to ask the House to give "Priority of Debate" to a matter. I shall read now the statement of the matter as required under the Rules. I have in my hand the written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed, which is as follows:

That the matter of the reported interruption of the flow of grain to Pacific Coast ports by rail consequent upon a dispute between the management of the two major railways and their employees, be given "Priority of Debate" under Rule 17.

I shall read that to you again. It is supported by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) and the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). The statement is:

That the matter of the reported interruption of the flow of grain to Pacific Coast ports by rail consequent upon a dispute between the management of the two major railways and their employees, be given "Priority of Debate" under Rule 17.

The debate is on the question as to whether or not the foregoing matter shall be given Priority of Debate. I want to draw attention before anybody starts speaking that we are operating under the new rules now. This is the first time we have had a debate like this under the new Rules and the debate is on the question as to whether or not this House will give "Priority of Debate" to the matter stated.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the advice which you gave to the House is the advice which I had picked up by news reports at noon that there was in fact no longer a small and sporadic interruption of grain movements to the West Coast but that the interruption had become much more than sporadic, and in fact, was very general in British Columbia.

I think that we on the Prairies are well aware of the fact that there are likely to be small interruptions of the flow of grain to the Lakehead or to the Pacific Coast ports by reason of any number of things which interfere with the progress of grain shipments. It could be weather, it can be the misallocation of boxcars, it can be the misallocation of ships, the inadequacy of loading facilities or of storage facilities, many things can interrupt the movement of grain. I think we on the Prairies are not in a position to demand a system wherein there is 100 per cent delivery of grain every day of the year. However, whenever any major interruption of the flow of grain does appear, it behoves us in Saskatchewan, for whatever its cause, to bend every effort we can to see that the interruption is as short as possible, and, if we can, to see that it does not happen - given the circumstances which are under our control.

March 29, 1971

I think what we see now is an interruption arising out of a dispute between the management of the two major railways and their employees. I think that this is not now the time to enter into a lengthy discussion as to the pros and cons of the dispute. The facts are that I want to join with the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) in getting a wire off to the management of the railway companies and to the president of the union - the president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the presidents of the Canadian National Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I accept his suggestion and I am going to ask Members on this side of the House to join with Members on that side of the House in agreeing on a wire which would be sent to the presidents of these three parties who are involved in the dispute.

I welcome that suggestion and I hope that we as a House will follow up on it.

The dispute in its general background goes back over a year. The dispute between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the two railways has been struggling on through various stages of negotiation and conciliation for many months. The matters involved are very, very complex. The wage dispute is one wherein there was a conciliation board report. One can occasionally get a unanimous conciliation board report. One almost invariably gets a majority conciliation board report. It is only when the problems are particularly complex that you find three members of the board each putting in a separate report. But this unfortunately was the case with respect to the dispute between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the two railroads.

The conciliation board came up with not one report, not two reports, but three reports. And not only did they not come up with even a majority report on wages but the other issues which were to be dealt with were simply not dealt with by the conciliation board report. The chairman of the conciliation board indicated that the issues being dealt with by the parties were, and I quote:

. . . of an extremely difficult and technical nature requiring an understanding and appreciation of all of the many facets of railroading not possessed by the individual members.

I merely mention these items to indicate that this is not a dispute which is easy to settle. It's not a dispute where a debate in this House as to the merits on the one side or the other is likely to contribute very much to the solution of the dispute. I doubt whether this is the purpose of our discussion this afternoon. I think the purpose of our discussion this afternoon is to marshal as much pressure, as much sense of public opinion in the Province of Saskatchewan as we can and to apply this pressure to both of the parties - and I am willing to agree with the Provincial Treasurer in saying that at this stage of the game more to the union than to the managements - to see whether or not this dispute cannot, in the short run, be stopped, and in the long run, be settled. I think that we on both sides of the House should want to see this result.

I don't think this is the time for us to attempt to justify the positions of management or labor in this very, very technical and complicated dispute. I do not think that this is the time to go into a long discussion of whether or not this particular method of dispute or that particular method of solving a dispute could have solved this problem or can solve all problems.

What we are dealing with I suggest is the narrow matter of a dispute between the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the CNR and the CPR - a dispute which has in effect erupted this morning in a large number of withdrawals of service. My information was, and I listened with a good deal of care over the weekend, that the problems up until at least yesterday were relatively minimal. And the Western Producer indicates, at least in the week ending March 18th the movement of grain was at least up to an average week of movement. There has not really been much change in the pace of work interruptions between March 18th and the present time up until at least this weekend. The problem we face is one which has come to the fore, at least in any massive way, this weekend.

I believe that we in this House should join together without any attempt at scoring any particular partisan advantage to send forward to the President of the Union and the President of the Canadian National Railway and the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway the urgent concern of the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the farming people of Saskatchewan, about these developments and the urgent request that the union and management concerned get back to the bargaining table to solve these very complicated matters in dispute and that in the meantime work be carried on in the ordinary way so that the flow of grain and other products, but particularly grain, to the Pacific Coast ports would not be interrupted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest at the conclusion of my remarks or at the conclusion of the debate, if in fact the motion passes, that we join in the proposal put forward by the Provincial Treasurer in forwarding a wire to the appropriate people. I am going to suggest that we deal with the Resolution in the following terms and I am in no sense wedded to these words. But I think the idea is the one expressed by the Provincial Treasurer, which I share, and it can be expressed as follows:

That this Legislature forward to the Presidents of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, The Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways a telegram in the following terms:

The Saskatchewan Legislature unanimously (and I hope we shall be able to say that) urges all parties to your current contract dispute to take urgent steps to bring about an early contract settlement and further urges strongly that, effective immediately, no steps be taken which would result in the interruption of the free flow to the Pacific Coast Ports by rail of Western grain.

Now I think that puts together the ideas we want. First, that this Legislature is speaking unanimously; second, that we want to see some long-term settlement of the dispute so that we are not faced with further interruptions to the flow of grain; and thirdly, and most urgently, that any interruptions which are now going on and which are reported in the press, stop while the period of bargaining continues so that there will be no interruption of the free flow of grain to Pacific Coast ports.

Now those I think are the ideas we want to get across. If we attempt to put in any additional or further ideas I think that we shall only bog down and we shall not express the sentiment of the people of Saskatchewan. I think there is no point in getting into any big discussion about how all trade union disputes should be solved and I should suggest, in any case, that this would be

March 29, 1971

out of order because it is already on the Order Paper and our rules on this matter are very clear. The priority of debate under Rule 17 is meant to deal with the narrow question of the statement before the House and it will be known that any motion must not anticipate a matter which has been previously appointed for consideration by the Assembly, or with reference to which a notice of motion has been previously given and not withdrawn. Members will be aware of the Resolution moved by Mr. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch) and if we transgress on that area the motion will be out of order. So what we need to do, therefore, is to so frame a motion that we do not transgress on the general motion moved by the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch and that we come up with a motion dealing with this particular dispute. Now I think it is important - it is important to the people of Saskatchewan and it is important to the people of Canada - that we express unanimously the sentiment of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — And I don't think we should get ourselves hung up on any procedural points, I think we know the narrow course we must follow under the rules which we have before us. I believe that my Resolution does that, I believe that a Resolution which will urge that steps be taken to complete the collective bargaining process and that in the meantime interruptions stop, will be within the rules of the House, will catch the sentiment of the House, will effectively express the sentiments of the people of Saskatchewan and will get across to the parties concerned just how urgently, and just how seriously this whole matter is viewed by all of us in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — As I say the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) may well have another motion which will equally catch the unanimous sentiment of this House. I have deliberately tried to make mine one which I think all Members could adhere to and I know that he will want to do the same so that we do not in any way blunt what I hope will be the unanimous and overwhelming expression of this House to the parties concerned, that we are concerned - not concerned for the Liberal Party and not concerned for the New Democratic Party - but we are concerned for the farmers of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think that on that ground we can unite, we can come up with a wire which the Provincial Treasurer has suggested we send forth. I agree with his suggestion. I know that he will undoubtedly be working on the text of his wire. I have indicated to you the text of mine. Let's join in this way, let's agree on a wire which we can send to the presidents of these parties. Let's bury any differences which we may have in the interests of the overwhelming importance of the movement of grain to everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I find myself

in agreement with much, in fact, most of what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) has said. My only difference would be in degree. While I agree with his Resolution I don't think it goes far enough. I don't think it's tough enough. I don't think it expresses the outrage that is being felt by Members on both sides of this House, and I am positive, by the people whom we all represent, first the farmers of Saskatchewan and then all the other people in the small towns and cities that live on the farmers of Saskatchewan. I think the people of Saskatchewan have had enough, they have had more than enough. Whether the fault lies with the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railways or the management or the Board of Directors or the union or the employees acting on their own hook. I don't think that is as important now as what action must be taken and should be taken. I have framed a Resolution as a basis for a wire which I am going to read now. I am not moving it now, of course, this isn't the time, and if we can agree on this or some amended version of it, I am positive that this House can come out of this debate unanimous in support of getting the grain moving and getting it moving immediately and as fast as possible. This is the motion that I had suggested and it is the basis of a telegram I will suggest, to this effect:

That this Assembly demand that the railway unions, the employees and the management, the CPR and the CNR, take whatever steps are necessary immediately to resume a full movement of Prairie grain to Pacific terminals; and further that this Assembly demand that the Government of Canada, and particularly the Minister of Labour, forthwith call all parties together to bring about a speedy resolution of this dispute.

That would be the basis of the telegram to the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada; to the Hon. Bryce Mackasey; to the President of the Canadian National; to the President of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and to the unions concerned. I'll just repeat this Resolution:

That the Government of Saskatchewan demand that the railroads, the unions, the employees and the management of the CPR and the CNR, take whatever steps are necessary immediately to resume a full movement of Prairie grain to Pacific terminals. And further that the Assembly demand that the Government of Canada, and particularly the Minister of Labour, forthwith call all parties together to bring about a speedy resolution of this dispute.

My suggestion is that this Resolution, which I think is a little tougher than the one the Leader of the Opposition suggested, be the basis for our telegram and again in joining with him, speaking on behalf of the Government Members if he has some suggestions to amend this we should certainly be prepared to listen to his ideas. I think that we have to look at this whole problem not, as I said, whether it is the responsibility of management or the union or the employees. I am convinced that whoever is responsible, and maybe they are all responsible, they are acting in a most irresponsible manner. And I ask the Members of this House, the people of this province to notice the timing. It always seems that the railroads and the management, and the union come head-on into a dispute whenever we have the opportunity to move some of our grain. We are just beginning to get some grain moving, there's a little bit of optimism running across the Province of Saskatchewan and now we are faced with this.

March 29, 1971

Not a strike, but something more insidious than a strike. At least you can deal with a strike. People can see what is happening, there is some pressure, self-induced on the union and on the management. The management because their source of income is cut off, the union because their wages are cut off. But in this kind of a slowdown, work to rule, or whatever they call it, there is no pressure, or very little pressure on the employees - they can book off, they can take time off, they can work to rule. And again there is very little pressure on the management. We have to create that pressure. That's why this Resolution doesn't request or urge, that's why this Resolution that I am suggesting and the telegram that will come out of this Resolution demands. For too long, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan farmers have been second class citizens when it comes to the actions of the railroads. For too long we have stood idly by while we watched the railroads, and I am talking about the CNR and the CPR, give us second treatment, for example, we got into this dispute about potash. We could move our potash down into United States and move it by American railroads at a better freight rate than over our two Canadian railroads. They just got together and say, "That's the freight rate for Saskatchewan." It's the same thing when we faced the only increase forced on any pulp mill in Canada of any consequence, the one recently handed to the Prince Albert pulp mill, the one and only pulp mill we have here in Saskatchewan. The excuse we were given when we talked to the railroads was, "Well, we have tough competition by truckers and water transportation in connection with every other pulp mill in Canada," even the ones in Alberta, that's why the railroads didn't impose the same freight increase on them. Most of them didn't get an increase at all.

Well the thing I am referring to, Mr. Speaker, is discrimination. I think that the question of discrimination against the people of Saskatchewan by the railroads is relevant and I think we have an example of it right here and that is the only reason I brought it in. The unions themselves are protected, and I am not suggesting that they shouldn't be protected. The unions themselves and their wages are protected. Who are the only party in this dispute, the innocent victims, that aren't protected? We all know in this Legislature who they are and they are the farmers of Western Canada, the farmers of Saskatchewan. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, that it is time on an issue like this that our Assembly speak with one voice and let the chips fall where they may. If the management is wrong, if these negotiations have dragged out for a year, then they should be ashamed of themselves. If the unions are asking, and I see they are asking by one report for something like 13 or 14 per cent, if they are demanding too high a wage increase in the face of inflation and the problems and economic hardships facing our farmers, then they should be ashamed of themselves. I think we should take whatever action we think is necessary and, as I say, let the chips fall where they may.

I'll say, speaking on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the farmers in Western Canada and particularly of Saskatchewan, we'll fight the CNR or the CPR, the management or the union for the farmers of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I am pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition say that they will do the same thing. So I state that this side of the House will join with them and I invite them to join with us

and send this telegram, and I hope they can agree that it should be at least as tough as this. If they can make some suggestions that would be a lot tougher then we shall welcome them.

I have read the telegram and I'll send a copy over to the Leader of the Opposition. The telegram is not worded exactly right, it is taken off the proposed Resolution and I have put at the bottom that this telegram is endorsed by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in the Province of Saskatchewan. If the Leader of the Opposition and his people want to change that so that it is a unanimous telegram sent on behalf of this Assembly and not by the Government, joined by the Opposition, we would agree with that too.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this. I have information here that they have 7,000 boxcars backed up in British Columbia, over 6,000 boxcars backed up here on the Prairies and for the first time in a long time we've had a chance to move grain to the terminals and put some cash in our farmers' pockets and bring a little ray of sunshine, a little hope, not only to the farmers but to the people especially of rural Saskatchewan and those people in our towns and cities who depend on the farmers and the farm economy, then we are faced with this. If it was a strike we could deal with it but it's worse than a strike, it's a slowdown. I hope that all those responsible, the unions, the employees and the management will follow the leadership shown by Bryce Mackasey and that he will get them together and not just urge, but demand, that they take immediate action to get the grain moving as fast as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have just had a brief opportunity to look at the wording of the Resolution and the proposed telegram of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart). I want to say at the very outset that we on this side feel that the suggestions made by the Deputy Premier on the telegram are in essence good suggestions. The main thrust of the telegram, we on this side certainly will be able to support. There are, of course, some minor changes here and there, for example, "The Government of Saskatchewan." I think all Members would agree that perhaps it would carry more weight if we changed that to "The Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan unanimously demands." Perhaps if the telegram was sent by yourself, Mr. Speaker, it might carry a more unanimous effect that we wish to emphasize with respect to this dispute. So as I say, Mr. Speaker, we on this side really don't care very much whether it is the wording of the telegram by the Leader of the Opposition or whether it is the wording of the telegram as put forward by the Deputy Premier. If one analyzes both of the telegrams, I am sure that all Members will agree that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier are saying the same thing. They are saying that unanimously we want to get together to; (a) ask the working people who are now on a slowdown to go back to work because the grain must be moved; and (b) to get to the task of negotiating and bargaining collectively. That's what we are saying. That's what the Deputy Premier is saying subject to a few minor word changes. We on this side will accept the Resolution made by the Deputy Premier rather than delaying further this matter.

Before I take my chair, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say

however, just one brief word about the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) was able to, with, of course, the ruling of the Chair, get this matter before the House. This was a matter of extreme consequence and importance for the people of Saskatchewan, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated. It's a matter that I am sure shows concern for everybody - farmers and small businessmen. It's important that our grain keep moving. I think all Members of the House will agree with me that our farm economy is at an all-time low today. We cannot stand any further delay with respect to the shipment of grains. We've got to get as much cash and as much money into the hands of our farming people as possible. Wheat exports, for example, appear to be down from what was anticipated some time ago. Any delay in the movement of grains is only going to further handicap and hurt the farmers and the small businessmen of our province. No one in this Legislature can allow that to go. We on this side want the engineers to go back to the job. We on this side do not want the engineers to get involved in a slowdown. We say that the principle of collective bargaining is not helped any by the slowdowns that are not sanctioned by the due process of the negotiations, the arbitrations and ultimately the strikes. We all want to avoid a strike. We say that parties that go to collective bargaining, taking part in this type of activity, may be harming the principle of collective bargaining rather than assisting it and, therefore, like the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart), like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney), we urge the engineers in British Columbia, in some parts of Alberta, to go back to work, to ask their agents to go back around the collective bargaining table, to help with the assistance of the Labour Minister in Ottawa, to get both parties behind the table to negotiate and negotiate and negotiate until they can get an agreement without a strike. Otherwise the people and the farmers of our province are hindered by it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And, Mr. Speaker, as my Leader has so obviously indicated, and I think so eloquently, in putting this Resolution before the House and taking the leadership in putting the Resolution before the House, shows that the purpose of this debate is to tell all of Canada that this Legislature of Saskatchewan, all the Legislators, and political parties can bury their political differences in the interest of all the people of Saskatchewan. Nothing good can be done by injecting party politics into this debate. Any politician who injects party politics in this debate, in my view, will be doing the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan a disservice. We have unanimity. We have agreement on the principles so I say to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) we will accept the telegram that you suggest. We accept the wording of the telegram subject to a few minor changes and let's get on with the business of expressing our opinion to the people involved in this dispute and get the grain moving again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take part in this debate and make some remarks that were made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). I was surprised, you know, to hear from him that he only today found the seriousness of this strike. You know, Mr. Skoberg was in Saskatoon the other day - I believe it was on Saturday - when he said that there was serious

curtailment of wheat being moved and he had wired the Federal Minister on Saturday that he should look into the rail strike situation. Then the Leader of the Opposition says, "you know, I didn't know that this was serious until I looked at the Western Producer over the weekend." That Western Producer is a week old. But apparently he has a lot of faith in that Western Producer - that's old news. Now all of a sudden he wakes up and finds out that there is something seriously wrong with the movement of grain. I think the farmers of Saskatchewan, and I'm a farmer, are fed up with the way the Federal Government has operated with the labor unions and the labor legislation. I think it will be put to the people of Saskatchewan very shortly that the only way the farmer will be satisfied with labor legislation - what's going to happen to us is that the Federal Government bring in Bill 2, something like Bill 2 that we have here in Saskatchewan.

I should like to go so far as to say that if Trudeau, Mackasey and Otto Lang cannot solve this problem within a couple of hours that they should resign because farmers in Saskatchewan are just fed up with strikes, not the right kind of grain and everything that can be thrown into the hands of the farmer is being done. Now they talk about collective bargaining. You know collective bargaining has never worked for the farmer. Collective bargaining has taken a year and one-half in this case and if you want to go ahead with collective bargaining, it will take another 18 months. I, Mr. Speaker, am against strikes of any kind. Nobody has the right to strike and I want to pick as the first one, the farmer. The farmer has no right to strike because the price isn't right. The farmer has no right to keep his milk away from hungry children because the price isn't right. The farmer has no right to keep wheat from the hungry nations of the world because the price isn't right and he has no right to go on strike and keep that wheat away from the hungry nations. By the same token I say that no union, in my humble opinion, has the right to strike and keep grain away and keep money away from the pockets of the farmer.

I hope this Resolution or this wire will help, but I doubt it very much. I doubt that there is going to be much confidence put in this. It will take its average turn of events. Somehow I am not quite too sure just whether we are bargaining in good faith. You know about three months ago we were going to have 500 million bushels of wheat sold. Now it has been dropped down to 400 million and maybe it is going to drop down to 300 million. If the strikes are long enough it will be 300 million. Maybe that's all the sales there are, I don't know.

I hope that if this Resolution or wire is going to go to Ottawa that they are going to give serious consideration of it. I think that this is the least that we can do. But the seriousness wasn't there today, the seriousness has been there since Thursday of last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it is difficult not to become a little provoked when you follow the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) but I'm going to make that kind of Hercules effort today by keeping my cool.

I just want to say a very few words, Mr. Speaker, in connection with a problem that I think all of us in this House are

March 29, 1971

deeply concerned with. Some of it has been in evidence in the past, contrary to what the Minister of Highways has had to say. This has not been an acute situation. The slow-ups have not been responsible for the piling up of large amounts of grain as has been indicated. I was informed as late as this morning of the fact that in the terminal at Swift Current, there has been in excess of 300 cars in storage for a matter of weeks. The reason for this grain not having been moved is not because of any slow-up in the railroading operation. The reason is because of inadequate facilities for handling the grain elsewhere. I'm told that a similar situation exists within the terminal of Moose Jaw and also at Broadview. So I think there has been no question about the stockpiling of grain. It has been stored in storage tracks at a number of terminals across the Prairies and west of here. But this hasn't in any measure contributed to the difficulty that we are talking about at this present moment.

I just want to say very briefly without getting very deeply into the contract dispute, that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers have been working in excess of a year without a contract and management has been adamant during this period of time. They refuse to discuss any matters except for the financial considerations that are involved. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that there has been a Conciliation Board report with respect to wages. The three parties have submitted three different proposals, three different recommendations. I suggest to the House today that these recommendations are not so far apart but what some settlement can be reached. One of the real difficulties that is involved, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that management at this time refuses to talk of other items which have been regarded as negotiable matters with respect to pensions and with respect to the lay-away clause in the contract which at the present time provides that an employee may be held at the other end of the road away from his home terminal for 16 hours after his arrival without receiving a penny of pay. We say that in the 20th Century, this is somewhat excessive and at this time should be reduced. There has been another difficulty that has arisen by virtue of the fact that the company has refused to discuss such matters as dead-head clauses and they have refused to talk in terms of negotiating these matters, also matters of time on duty, health and welfare benefits and others.

I just want to suggest to you that the company has taken a rather adamant position, which I hope this motion if it is passed and if the wire is sent, will possibly be instrumental in bringing these two parties together. I should hope that these three groups would see fit to bargain in good faith. I understand that the company and the union are to meet next Tuesday and I suggest that the motion that is before us may help to strengthen the hands of those who are attempting to solve the problem as it exists today.

I would be happy to support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, certainly I don't think there is any question about the fact that there is a unanimous feeling in this House today. I think that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) who has just spoken in this debate has pointed out some of the details about the negotiations and I am sure that many of us in here, while we were aware that negotiations have been going

on, haven't been too cognizant of the particulars. What we are looking at today though, this difficulty that we are facing in regard to our railways, appears to us here in the House, that the management, the employees and the unions are here in a dispute that is at this stage clearly a display of power. Through this display of power we find our Prairie economy is caught in the middle. We simply aren't in a position to stand by and witness this. There is just no way we can sit here and tolerate the fact that our railways are going to be shut down. It is quite obvious that there are some things here that are in need of correction. The delay in arriving at an agreement for such a long time is certainly evidence of the need for something different by way of approach to management and labor bargaining.

In many cases we have companies and unions that are not big enough to cause a concern in the general economy when they are in a dispute or in a disagreement. But here we have two veritable giants - the railway companies on the one side and the railway unions on the other. These are very, very strong people. The railway companies are just huge corporations and the railway unions - believe me there is no question about the strength that they have and the way that they are organized. They are very, very formidable in their own right. Here then we are seeing something that is really affecting our economy and it is too bad that we have to sit by and watch this and not be able to do anything about it. To say who is wrong is not a simple thing. When we get to this stage, it is easy enough for somebody to say the union is wrong; it is easy enough to say that management is wrong.

It is only over this weekend that we have become aware of the seriousness of the situation that exists today. While the situation as it stands seems to be a very simple one to understand there is no great difficulty in understanding what we see in the news but certainly the background for this appears to be rather complex. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) has pointed this out and you see here that through the points that he made about the bargaining, this is not an easy matter. It is a rather complex matter. But it is simple to see it now and as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the railway crews because they are not able to arrive at an agreement with the railways, after more than a year of negotiating - a very, very excessive period for a negotiation - have decided now on taking this very drastic course of action. I think this surely is understandable to some degree.

The railway workers in order to try to bring this situation to a head and to force the railways into an agreement have applied pressure by simply working to rule as they call it. Well, because the companies are the ones that wrote the rule, then the workers are in a position where apparently their part of the case is completely justifiable. Maybe it is and maybe it isn't. I don't think it is but they are in a position where they can simply point to the rule and the fact that the company wrote the rule. Well, again I say that's just too bad for us to be caught in the middle of this. If a railway worker happens to have a drink 12 hours before he is called, then according to the rule he can't go to work. If he has a headache he can book off, they are sick and so on. But the result of this is what we should face, Mr. Speaker. The result of this work to the rule is what we are seeing reported by our news media today. It is making us aware of how very, very serious this is. Never mind who is right or who is wrong. This country here simply cannot stand to

March 29, 1971

see our railway shut down and not running. We cannot survive. Our Prairies cannot survive without the railways. No matter whether it is work to rule or whether it is the companies that have refused to bargain in good faith or whatever this situation is or the way it has come about. We are looking at a pretty grim picture today and this is what we are concerned about. I'm sure we are unanimous in the concern that we have.

The railroaders are now booking off under the 'Work to Rule'. There are obviously enough number of them to cause a complete shutdown. This is unbelievable in a way. But when you get 40 in one group that are simply working to the rule and by working to that rule, they don't show up for work, believe me this isn't a very funny matter. This is a matter that is serious enough, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we as Canadians must not only show concern, but we should surely see in this a need to revise our labor laws and to revise them in a manner that we can somehow avoid shutdowns in industry while bargaining sessions are being carried on. There is just no sense to us being in here and trying to pretend that we are intelligent people and we can condone this kind of thing going on in our economy. We are wrong to tolerate this. It is wrong that we don't get together to try and devise some proper means of negotiation.

There is no question about the strength of unions now. Unions are terribly strong. There is no question about the strength of corporations. But for us as people to watch this complete shutdown and simply see our economy strangled is wrong. This is very, very wrong. We have to find some way to do this in another way. This shutdown now is crippling the whole of our Western economy. It is creeping right across in a matter of days. It will be at the Lakehead and it can affect the whole of Canada but Western Canada right now is facing something that is completely intolerable. There is no way that we can condone this. Even when our railways, Mr. Speaker, are operating on a regular basis, you know that we face continual difficulties. These are pointed out by the difficulties in freight rates, the difficulties in moving grain and so on. Well, God knows, we can try our best to live with those kinds of conditions but to have the whole thing shut down there simply is no way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we are coming to a point where compulsory arbitration of some kind has to be considered. This is not the point here of debate. It has been pointed out here that we do want to keep an unanimous feeling. We don't want to get into pretending that we have the answer for this and it should be compulsory arbitration or it should be something else. I do think though that it does point to the fact that we as people, we as Canadians must somehow face the fact that we must do something about our labor laws and I don't think we have to go to Sweden or Australia or any place else. Surely to goodness as Canadians we are facing a picture now that we must do something about. I should hope that this wire that is going out surely has the unanimous feeling of this House. Let's hope, Mr. Speaker, that through this wire we can somehow or another point out the very serious feeling that we have as a Canadian people here that something must urgently be done about keeping our economy going while labor disputes are underway.

Certainly I am very much in favor of the action that we are taking today, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support the Resolution from this House on lines that have been urged by my Leader or one that is a composite of his Resolution and the one that is suggested by the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart). However, if I have to accept a Resolution of this kind for reasons that are urged by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) I should find it very difficult indeed to vote for it. I am hard put sometimes to understand the phenomenal ignorance of the Minister of Highways in matters of this sort. I also find it rather hard to understand his criticism of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) for having, in his words, only "Found out about this issue today." I want to remind the Minister of Highways that there is no one in this House who could have taken action through this House except today. Otherwise I suggest the Government might have urged something last Friday. But Friday last, the dispute that we now know, had not become a dispute. It seems to me that a very picayune kind of a criticism was made by the Minister of Highways of the Leader of the Opposition today.

The Deputy Premier has said that the Resolution that we have urged doesn't go far enough. I should like to suggest that what has been urged either in his Resolution or in the Resolution that we are supporting from this side of the House doesn't go far enough in the terms that have been discussed by a number of the speakers today. We are not going to solve the kinds of problems that we are discussing by this Resolution or by the kind of means that were urged by the Minister of Highways. I want to suggest that if we are talking about part of the Resolution that is demanding of the Federal Minister of Labour certain things, I wonder has the Department of Labour of this Province been in touch with the Federal Minister of Labour and has the Department of Labour or this Government been in discussions with the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackasey, on the type of problems that we are talking about in this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think that what we need is a continuing committee of the Saskatchewan Department of Labour and the Federal Department of Labour to deal with this class of a labor dispute and with these kinds of problems.

I think that we should be anticipating these problems far ahead of the disputes themselves before they come to a head. I don't think we have done that.

I think that one of the primary causes of difficulty is the terrible lack of communication that exists in this country, not only between the Federal Department of Labour and our own Department of Labour, but between this Government ourselves, the labor unions, the railways and all other employers and employees who have to do with the movement of grain. I don't think that we are going to bring solutions in the kind of fashion suggested by the Minister of Highways in this debate. He said this whole matter could be solved in a couple of hours, that we should bring in Bill 2 and compulsory arbitration.

I want to suggest to Members of this House that we are not going to bring about solutions in that kind of a manner. What we shall do is bring about confrontations that in other parts of the world, have caused not only unrest but continuing violence, continuing difficulty and conflict. This will always be present when collective bargaining can not provide one of the safety valves of society.

March 29, 1971

While I shall vote for this Resolution, I want to suggest that it cannot be because of the reasons that have been advocated by the Minister of Highways. The Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) has made a number of remarks here this afternoon. I can appreciate his more temperate delivery and message while I don't agree with everything he has said. But I do regret that we have in this House this afternoon a debate on a Resolution that should have been discussed within a more moderate sphere, the things that the Minister of Highways, the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) has told us. I want to emphasize that we are not going to get solutions to problems merely by a resolution of this type. I think that I would go along with this part of the Resolution particularly. We should try to work out with the Federal Department of Labour some means that would increase consultation, contact, communication between ourselves, that is the two Departments of Labour directly concerned and all the parties that are involved in these disputes. I don't think that exists at the moment and I believe because of that, we shall continually see unrest, continually see a round of difficulties.

I want to associate myself with this Resolution because I think in the sort of unanimity that I hope the Resolution will gain this afternoon, that it will bring about, not the outright and drastic remedies that are envisaged by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) but will bring about a greater degree of understanding, to the end that we shall be able to come nearer to the solution of disputes that not only disturb the agricultural economy, but other parts of the population and consumers in Canada.

Someone has said here this afternoon that these are very complex matters and I agree they are very complex matters. That is why I feel so keenly and object so strongly to the remarks of the Member for Rosthern who believes that these types of problems can only be solved by outright action, the kind of outright action that in our society would undo the hundreds of years of trial and error that have led to collective bargaining, that have led to better means of solving conflict within society. All of this would be done away with. It would cause a further confrontation and violence such as we have not known in our society for hundreds of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture): — I want to be very brief in this debate because many of the issues that have arisen by virtue of the Resolution that was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition would take hours and hours to answer and I am going to avail myself of that opportunity at some later debate.

I want to indicate at the outset that I was very disappointed in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). He introduced the Resolution purely for political reasons only half an hour before the House started to sit. This is a subject that has been going on for weeks and when he got up and spoke, he said not one word in defence of the farmers of this province. This comes as no surprise to the farmers. They are fed up to the teeth by strike after strike after strike for years and years. In 1968 things were tied up, they couldn't deliver a bushel of grain for two and one-half months. It is going on and on. And

then when we had the opportunity to deliver the highest amount of grain in the history of this province, 700 million bushels, they had been waiting for an opportunity. You either have a work slowdown or a strike and in this case we have had to deal with strikes and I think the public opinion has got to the point now where they realize these people aren't getting engaged in strikes. Now they are doing it by another method which is a work slowdown which is even more disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it on the record that the Conciliation Report came down. It was rejected by the union. And I put too on the record that the Minister-in-Charge of the Canadian Wheat Board has been wiring the heads of the unions, asking that in the interest of the continuing movement and in the interest of continued confidence, and this is very important, of our overseas customers, in our ability to meet contracts that they go back to work on the job pending negotiations. This is the same request that was made of the Federal Minister of Labour some time ago when he settled a similar situation at the West Coast. But in the meantime what has happened? Because of a work slowdown in mid-February, we saw where over 3,000 boxcars of wheat couldn't be unloaded and the Canadian Wheat Board had to re-program their unit-train calendar, set it back another week, 3,000 cars of grain couldn't be unloaded at that time. But now, Mr. Speaker, that represents 6 million bushels of wheat. What happens in this case?

There are about another 7,000 boxcars tied up, they can't be unloaded. This represents 14 million bushels of grain. Now it is a situation that as far as one of our co-operative organizations is concerned, their unloads have been slowed down at the West Coast from 600 boxcars per day down to a mere trickle. What's happening in the case of our leading farm co-operative grain companies? They are at a point right now where there are only 2 million bushels of wheat in the West Coast terminals, to try and meet the demand from our overseas customers. But more important still, the total of 12.4 million bushels was in the West Coast terminals a very short time ago. Now we had orders for this. Most important to the wheat farmer in Saskatchewan is that for the moment we are very short of No. 2 Northern wheat and there is a heavy demand and by the end of this week we shall be short of being able to supply No. 2 Northern wheat. So in all the months past when they've been trying to make the sales commitments and provide unit trains and provide the system whereby they could get the right grades at the right places at the right time, we are faced with a situation now where it is practically impossible to deliver.

At the same time today I am told that at the West Coast there are four ships being loaded and another five ships waiting. So, Mr. Speaker, I think this points out the urgency of the situation. I think that this Resolution must be passed this afternoon and I should go even further than that and say that in the interest of the farmers and the farming industry in this province they are absolutely fed up with strike after strike, year after year, and the results in payment of wages to the ones that go on strike is ultimately reflected in the cost of protection that goes into the cost of operation of the farmer. So here is just one more case. When they are in the position when they could look forward to the movement of the greatest amount of grain in the history of this province something has come along to impede that movement and possibly to reflect in lost sales as well. But if we lose the movement this year, Mr.

March 29, 1971

Speaker, next year we are asked to produce enough grain that would entail the movement of 900 million bushels of grain. If we get behind this year we shall never be able to keep the commitments for one year hence.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will see to it that this Resolution does get to the proper authorities and I hope that by virtue of the action we may take here this afternoon it will end this type of problem that the farmers of Saskatchewan are up against every week and every month and every day year after year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to be controversial. I was a little surprised at some of the figures used by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). I simply want to say that I reject his suggestion that we are not concerned with the future and the economic welfare of the farmers of Saskatchewan. I want at this time to reject that in the strongest possible terms without making a lengthy point of it. But I will make that on another occasion. I was surprised at his figure of a possible 700 million bushel export of grains. I note the figure for wheat in the little mini-outlook of March '71 to be 400 million plus, and I noted the barley figure at about 150 million, making 550 million. I don't know where he was going to get his other 150 million bushels of oats or whatever. My Understanding is, that as of now, not one bushel of sales has been lost. That is the import of what I understood from Mr. Mumford's remarks this morning. He was indeed concerned that the flow of grains to the terminal elevators at British Columbia had ceased and he felt that in a very short time they would be unable to meet delivery commitments. That is certainly a sufficient reason for us to be concerned and we can be concerned without him suggesting that somehow substantial sales have been lost. I think there is no evidence of that yet. But there is concern that those sales may be lost and that is sufficient reason for this House to act.

Mr. Speaker, I might well have quibbled about the motion of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) but I think this House is not a very good place to start dotting I's or crossing T's. In the interest of unanimity I shall accept the wording of the motion moved by Mr. Steuart and I should suggest that it might carry a slightly greater impact if he would move it and I should be happy to second it if that arrangement is satisfactory with him. If he would prefer to have it seconded by the Hon. Mr. McFarlane, I shall support it.

With respect to the telegram, again, I might quibble about the wording but basically I will support that as well. I suggest that it read not the "Government of Saskatchewan" but "The Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan." If it turns out to be unanimous, as I hope it will be, then I suggest we insert the word "unanimously". I noted it is directed to the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau; the Hon. Bryce Mackasey; the President of the CNR; and the President of the CPR. I should also suggest that we direct it to the President of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers whose name does not come to my mind at the moment but I think he should also be in receipt of this.

With those suggestions which I think all will agree are of the most technical and minor nature, I find myself in support

of both - I am laying aside any technical quibbles that I may have - of the motion and of the telegram suggested by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and I should suggest that we vote on the Resolution before us. The Provincial Treasurer moved the motion and I would be prepared to second it if he wishes. I leave that to him. I hope we shall have a very brief debate on the motion - since I think we have had our debate - and then get the telegram off for whatever impact it may have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. KRAMER: — Before the Member sits down, did I understand you to say that you are satisfied to let the word "Government" rather than the words "Legislative Assembly" go through?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, no. I am suggesting that the first three words "the Government of Saskatchewan" be deleted. The Provincial Treasurer has dealt with this by saying "the Government of Saskatchewan" and at the bottom of the telegram he says that it is endorsed by Her Majesty's Royal Opposition. It looks like the Government and the Opposition are not acting in the Assembly.

I suggest and I am not being hard on this, I am suggesting that we delete the words "the Government of Saskatchewan" and insert "the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan unanimously" if in fact unanimously is the case.

Motion agreed to.

MR. STEUART: — Before I make this motion I should just like to state or rather I should suggest we pass this motion which will read:

That this Assembly demand that the railway unions, the employees and the management of the CPR and the CNR take whatever steps are necessary to immediately resume full movement of Prairie grain to Pacific terminals and further that this Assembly demand that the Government of Canada, and particularly the Minister of Labour, forthwith call all parties together to bring about a speedy resolution of this dispute.

I should then suggest that we collaborate on the telegram which will be recorded to indicate "that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan demand," and indicate that it was unanimous. And that we send that telegram not only to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Labour of the Federal Government, the heads of both the railroads, but also the heads of the unions involved as is indicated in this motion. So I take pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving this, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

MR. E. F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather strange debate. It has carried on pretty well by non-farmer Members of the Legislature and being a farmer I feel that I should say something on the motion. I haven't seen any of the farm Members opposite speaking on this and surely this is the purpose of the whole exercise. The problem is with the movement of grain, the problem that is facing the farmers of the province and we certainly haven't heard from them to any great extent.

Now the problem we are debating today is perhaps of

March 29, 1971

greater magnitude than many of us imagine and I should like to give you a little background on it. For the past six to eight weeks there have been periodic slowdowns at the West Coast although the terminals have been working pretty well to capacity. I think the terminals really have done a very good job. We have seen some ships tied up over this two-month period. The waiting period generally has been short and problems not too severe. Although, as I have said, during all of this time we have had periodic railway slowdowns. Last fall there was a serious slowdown caused by employees of the CNR and the terminals ran into problems for a short period in the fall. Recently it has been CPR employees who have caused these slowdowns. The CPR to get around this recently cancelled their shipping orders for one week to catch up. Even this loss of orders for one week has been a great loss of delivery opportunities for the farmers in Saskatchewan who are hard-pressed for cash at this time. During the last couple of months terminal stores have gradually been reduced and last Thursday was when this problem came to a head. It was almost a complete shutdown on the West Coast because railway workers were not moving the cars. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool did handle cars Friday with some supervisory personnel. The shutdown then became complete and it is still complete on the West Coast. There is no car unloading today at the West Coast. There are 11 ships in the harbor, five of them are still loading today and there are loading berths available for more ships but no grain is being loaded into these ships because of the action of the railroad workers. There are certainly ample cars under load, there are about 1,600 cars in the Vancouver area and, as been mentioned here before, 6,000 to 7,000 cars are under movement from the Prairies. Railroad employee walkouts at Calgary and Lethbridge as well as further West have virtually halted all movement of grain to the West Coast.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, at this time there is an embargo on grain to the Lakehead so this means that no grain is moving any place today. It has been mentioned I think also that this is not a strike but is a booking-out by large numbers of railway employees. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the results are very serious and I don't agree with the assessment of the situation as expressed by the two Members from Moose Jaw. In fact I don't completely agree with the assessment by the Member on this side from Saskatoon University, and perhaps this is because I am a farmer and they are not.

There are large numbers of ships due in port in Vancouver in the next two weeks, a great number are en route to Vancouver and even if loadings and normal activity began today we should still have very, very great difficulty in meeting this commitment. Further tie-up is pretty well assured by the slowdown that we have so far. The ships that are in Vancouver that are waiting are not the main concern. The big problem is ships that are destined for Vancouver and may be diverted elsewhere because they feel that they would have a tie-up at Vancouver. The owners of these ships, the shipping companies, may simply send them someplace else. So it is not merely those in the port but those en route that we should be concerned about. Sales are almost sure to be lost unless this is settled almost immediately and at a time when we can't afford to lose even the sale of one cargo.

Now the background causes of this tie-up are perhaps complicated and I am certainly not going to go into them, but the immediate cause, Mr. Speaker, is the booking-off work by the railroad union members and the immediate solution is for these

union members to go back to work.

We have a telegram here and it perhaps will do some good. I am not completely in agreement with it because I don't think it deals directly with the immediate cause. The immediate solution as I mentioned is for those railroad employees who are booking off to go back to work. I had hoped that the union leaders, Mr. Speaker, would get their men back to work and prevent loss of export sales at this critical time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, while I support this telegram which has been proposed to the Assembly, I also feel at this time while we are facing a crisis as far as movement of grain is concerned, that even though we can't overcome this problem, it will only be a very stop-gap measure that at very best carries us through until the next crisis. I was absolutely amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Member from Moose Jaw stand in his place and say that he looked down upon the remarks of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). And all I can say in that regard is that the Member for Rosthern knows what it's like to get his income from grain, the Member from Moose Jaw may not be quite so familiar.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this brings us to what Members on this side of the House have been saying for a long time - we are drastically in need of a new way of solving labor disputes regardless of whether the company or the unions be at fault. Mr. Speaker, this is directly related to the problem because if we had a solution to this problem we should not today be debating such resolutions or such telegrams. It is very obvious that the railroads and the unions have been negotiating for the past year and one-half. These negotiations have failed, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is equally obvious that while we ask these two parties to come up with a satisfactory solution to the problem I believe, speaking for myself as an individual Member, that it is equally necessary that, particularly in view of the fact that a Crown corporations like the CNR is involved, that it is equally necessary that this solution and this new agreement which is hammered out, is not one which pays exorbitant wage rates and hence the people of Canada will again be stuck with a fantastic subsidy to the CNR.

Mr. Speaker, referring to the past St. Lawrence Seaway increases, certainly we got a wonderful settlement and we got all the men back to work at an increase in wages of something over 30 per cent. It took us the next five years fighting inflation to try and bring this inflation spiral, brought about by that settlement on the St. Lawrence Seaway, somewhat under control. It is quite true that we have been paying for the painful effects of this fight against inflation but it is equally obvious, while we want the men and the railroads to arrive at a negotiated settlement, that we who are paying the freight rates can simply not have these fantastic increased costs passed on to the consumers whether they be people who support the CPR or the CNR. It is obvious to everyone, Mr. Speaker, the CNR is a Crown corporation that has been running a deficit for a substantial number of years. It is also true that these deficits are paid by the taxpayers of Canada and while I am not arguing that a realistic increase in wages should not be allowed to the employees, I think what the Company can afford to pay should also be considered.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is this that while we are anxious to have a settlement, this settlement should not be a fantastic increase in salaries or wages to people who run the railroads as they will just be passed on to the consumer with the point of view that we can pay whatever the settlement that was arrived at. This is a problem which concerns farmers more directly than anyone else and as a farmer I have been convinced for some time, as I have said on previous occasions, that we simply must have a new way of settling these disputes. I realize, in listening for a number of years to the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), and the Member from Moose Jaw, that they seem to feel quite satisfied with the present systems of conciliation and arbitration, mediation and so forth. Mr. Speaker, they go back to the time-worn ideas that we have been trying to use for 50 years and it never proved satisfactory in the more modern days.

I think, before I close, that I might just say one last word. I think that if there was any benefit to be derived from this Resolution and I am sure there is, that what would do a great deal of good, Mr. Speaker, is to have the Members that are involved in the Labour Union Movement to stand up and tell us exactly where they stand and tell us exactly what their opinions are on whether these men should go back and man the railways or not. I think the Member for Regina North East should tell us what he thinks about the men booking-out. I think the Member for Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, should tell us what he thinks about the men booking off work because I am convinced that their views and their influence with the unions will carry far more weight than any Member coming from rural Saskatchewan like myself or the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to those Members standing in their places and giving advice through the medium of this Legislature as to what should be done between the companies and the unions. I am sure the employees will listen with great respect to their remarks as they are leaders in that movement. I am sure the companies will listen with great interest, Mr. Speaker, because they are negotiating with those unions.

I wholeheartedly support the telegram, Mr. Speaker, but again I emphasize that it is only a stop-gap measure. We on this side have advocated for a long time that we are badly in need of a new solution for these problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, just very briefly for the records in this House, I want to make it plain to the Members opposite that there is not one Member opposite on that side of the House who is more concerned about the incomes of farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan than I am today. That also applies to every farming Member and every Member on this side of the Legislative Assembly so let's not misconstrue the facts here today. The reason we have restrained ourselves from taking debate in this debate was because of the seriousness of the matter and the urgency for a telegram to be sent in regard to this problem. The Members opposite have seen fit to take the time of this Legislative Assembly to bring up facts that are not relevant to the problem today. We are not seeking a solution to the problem, we are asking the three parties involved to continue the transporting of grain to West Coast facilities. Certainly there are going to be some problems in regard to coming to an agreement

and even after there will be other problems but the urgency of the matter today is first of all to demonstrate emphatically with all the seriousness of this situation in relation to the incomes of the farmers in Saskatchewan, the need for the operators to get back to work, so that we can then hopefully have time to come forward with a solution. Now there are a great many other points that we could debate if we wanted to hold up that action but because we do not, on this side of the Legislative Assembly, we hope that we will pass the telegram so that we can get on with other matters of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Before any other speakers take part in this debate, perhaps it is not the responsibility of the Chair to bring this matter to your attention. I do so in any event because I have heard repeated allusions to a telegram. I make no comment on the motion, but I do draw your attention to the fact that if a telegram or telegrams or letters are to be sent anywhere by anybody, it is incumbent on this House to say who shall send them. Now possibly we can get back on to the motion.

HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I had in mind that if the first motion passes that there be another motion, and the Clerk is preparing it, that the Clerk of the Assembly be instructed to send the telegram.

MR. SPEAKER: — There can be another motion that can be moved by leave.

MR. KRAMER: — . . . the fact that the Clerk is setting it, is it sent by Mr. Speaker or by the Clerk?

MR. SPEAKER: — It can be done either way. It can be sent by the Clerk or transmitted by the Speaker. In either case it is the voice of the Legislature if the Legislature decides to do it that way. But the Legislature itself must decide on the manner of the doing.

MR. HEALD: — I thought the Clerk, but it doesn't matter anyway as it carries the weight of the Assembly.

MR. KRAMER: — I should suggest, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, we shall settle that when we come to it. I just brought it to your attention.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

HON. J. C. McISAAC (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 19 - An Act to amend The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, 1968.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 19 the Bill before us is one that

March 29, 1971

provides for a number of amendments to The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, which was originally passed in this Legislature in 1968.

Let me first say, Mr. Speaker, in the three years of experience with this legislation, that the basic principles and objectives contained in that, have certainly proven to me sound ones. Among those objectives, Mr. Speaker, was a timetable for various phases in arriving at a settlement. First of all there was a stated period of time for negotiation. There was a stated period of time for conciliation and, thirdly, there was a procedure set out to initiate arbitration if no settlement was arrived at. This objective of a timetable and an orderly procedure set out to initiate arbitration if no settlement was arrived at. This objective of a timetable and an orderly procedure of events was one that teachers and trustees agreed upon when the Bill was first discussed and introduced. And today there is still complete agreement on this particular feature of the legislation.

Under the existing legislation, Mr. Speaker, ample opportunity is provided for negotiations, for conciliation procedures and so forth. One of the problems, I think, can be summed up in fairly simple terms. In a number of negotiation areas established under the Act, both teachers and trustee groups have paid little or no attention to the dates and the timetable of procedures as outlined under this Act. Despite the fact, as I mentioned to begin with, that everybody agreed that such a timetable was essential and that such a timetable was very desirable.

Now I should like to deal first of all, with those amendments relating to the timetable of events. Several of the amendments contained in the Bill provide an advancement of those various dates and phases. Perhaps I can first review the present legislation in this regard. Under the existing legislation negotiations must commence by November 15 and conciliation may commence after January 7th. There is, of course, provision in the legislation for the area committees to commence negotiations at any time prior to November 15th. Experience has shown in this regard, however, that very little serious negotiation really took place prior to November 15th or even in November and December.

I think that it is obviously desirable to have negotiations complete if possible, certainly not long after the date, under which the new agreement is to come into affect, and that date being January 1st of a new calendar year. This is the reason for advancing the dates by which the various phases of negotiation must commence.

Under the proposed amendments contained in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the following time changes are proposed. First of all, that the notice of intention to negotiate a new contract must be given no later than September 1st rather than the present date of October 15th. Secondly, that actual negotiations must commence no later than October 1st rather than November 15th as the Act presently states. Thirdly, that conciliation may commence by November 25th, rather than after January 7th in the following year as the Act again presently states. Fourthly, the conciliation phase shall cease under our proposed amendments by January 7th rather than February 15th.

Thus in effect, Mr. Speaker, the schedule for negotiations is advanced by about 45 days. The changes proposed, I think,

provide for a better opportunity to bring about settlements prior to the beginning of a new contract year, which as I mentioned, comes at the beginning of any calendar year.

I believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that the time periods allotted for negotiations and for the conciliation stage are adequate in and of themselves as far as the length of time is concerned. I think that that is so has been proven in this current year, Mr. Speaker, by the speed with which 1971 settlements were reached in the great majority of areas this year. I think the same can be said for the time period allotted under the present Act and in the amendments as far as a period for conciliation or mediation is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the negotiation phase and the conciliation phase, the existing legislation provides for still another avenue through which to obtain a settlement. The parties may enter into binding arbitration on a voluntary basis. In the past two years three settlements have been brought about through that particular section of the legislation.

This brings me really to the major amendment proposed in this legislation. What happens if months of negotiations and conciliation fail to bring about a settlement? And what happens, Mr. Speaker, if subsequent to that the parties do not agree to proceed to arbitration? Well, I suggest one thing that we do know can happen and has happened is that the entire process can then drag on for months and months with no real progress being made, in fact, retrogression takes place. And frequently attitudes in that period of time on both sides harden to a considerable degree with the possibility of future settlements being diminished rather than enhanced.

This drag out phase, Mr. Speaker, for want of a better name, involves not only the teachers and the trustees, but as well the average ratepayer, the government, and above all the school students. The problem is that the arbitration process is an entirely voluntary one. If either party sees any possible disadvantage in arbitration or advantage in delaying consent for arbitration they then refuse to give that consent.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.

MR. McISAAC: — Before dealing with the Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, I should like to distribute to my friends opposite a booklet outlining the scope of each school vote in the Department Estimates. I do so in the hope that it will be of assistance to my friends opposite and indeed our Members on this side, in asking questions as to which sub-vote they are under. This is a point which we had some problem with last year, and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to distribute these to Members of the House so that they may have some better idea where, at least, to ask the questions.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Bill before us, The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, when we rose for supper I had pointed out the changes in the proposed amendments with respect to the timetable change for the process of negotiation and for conciliation. I had also pointed out that the existing procedures in the legislation provide for voluntary arbitration procedures, and how in actual fact these had not worked to the best advantage of all people involved in the course of the last three years in which they have been the law of the province.

March 29, 1971

I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, the problem as we saw it was largely that the arbitration process was entirely a voluntary one. And if either party, on either side, saw any possible disadvantage in arbitration or any possible advantage in prolonging the dispute, they could well refuse to give consent and, in some cases I am led to believe, that is exactly what happened. This Government is simply not prepared to allow protracted teacher salary negotiations or the lack of them to endanger the educational environment of Saskatchewan students. We feel that there must therefore be some further provision for bringing about a conclusion to negotiations when all normal procedures have apparently failed.

Under this proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, Section 14(a) the Minister may send disputes to an arbitration board whose award is binding. I believe, Sir, that the key word here is 'may'. There is no definite dateline set out for the initiation of this procedure. I believe that by not setting out a definite date, this provision very effectively voids one of the main criticisms levelled at compulsory arbitration procedures of this kind, because it allows each particular case to be judged on its own merits in the light not only of the progress that has been made, but the actual situation and the intentions of the parties involved following conciliation and mediation efforts.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that I can see no Minister of Education or a government implementing this provision until they are completely satisfied that all normal and reasonable approaches have been unsuccessful. I am convinced, for example, that there need not have been a strike in the Prince Albert Area 9, had this legislation been in effect. I am also convinced that the Regina Area 4 teachers would have been receiving pay increases for 1970 and possibly for even 1971, many months ago had this provision been indeed law in the past year or more.

I am sure that some of my friends opposite will have remarks to make with respect to this legislation, and with respect, I am sure, to collective bargaining generally for teachers and trustees in this province. I want to point out to them, indeed, to all Members of this House, that legislation cannot in and of itself bring about good will between both parties, nor can it resolve substantial differences of opinion. I want to reiterate that the negotiating procedure in this Act, Mr. Speaker, and in these amendments, is sound and is capable of functioning smoothly if the parties concerned will allow it so to do.

Mr. Speaker, what do the teachers in Saskatchewan say about area bargaining after the last two or three years that we have seen this legislation in operation? I think, first of all, we are well aware of the rather negative attitude taken by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation itself with respect to this legislation. But what about the average teacher, Mr. Speaker, in particular the rural teachers of this province? Under the old salary negotiating procedures established and in operation under the previous administration, there were wide disparities between the salaries of rural teachers as compared to urban teachers in particular. Now this Government believes that all teachers should be well paid and a teacher's services are equally valuable in all areas of this province. I want to point out that in area bargaining under these procedures, we now have a number of areas in the province where we have parity of salaries between rural and urban districts. And in certain other negotiation areas substantial progress has been made toward that

objective of parity.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the average classroom teacher in this province, will welcome the step that we are proposing here in Section 14(a) as a means of avoiding the protracted negotiations that took place last year. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that a great majority of teachers would have been happy last year to make immediate settlements within the guidelines set out by the Government, not only for teachers but for other employee groups and reached those settlements with a minimum of delay and got on with the job of teaching school. Nor should we forget some other facts of life in regard to negotiations under procedures prior to area bargaining.

In its later years, prior to implementing The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, negotiations were just as contentious and just as protracted, in some cases even more so. But let us add to this the fact that negotiations then involved hundreds of boards and teachers in the province - 125 boards or better to be exact rather than the 10 areas that are now involved. In every school district trustees and teachers every year, had given weeks and often months, almost exclusively to negotiations and to the strains that developed and the loss of time from education in that period of time.

I certainly, Mr. Speaker, have not forgotten the numerous representations of teachers and trustees to me and to the Government, urging that some way be found to improve the whole process of salary negotiations to reduce or to eliminate, insofar as possible, the problems inherent in the old procedures. I believe that the area bargaining legislation has indeed been proven to be sound in this regard, in that it has removed from the school level at least, the damaging effect of salary negotiations on the relationship between teachers and trustees. It has left time for more boards and their local teachers to get on with the business of education rather than negotiating.

I think that it has been accomplished, Mr. Speaker, without removing the entire process in any way of negotiation from where it belongs, namely, between teachers and trustees. I just want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to comment on negotiation procedures and the general picture in some of our sister provinces in Canada.

I can quote here from numerous press clippings to indicate the unhappy situation that we find in the Province of Quebec. I could also point to the situation in the Province of Newfoundland. May I also point out that in the case of Newfoundland and in the case of Quebec, teachers there are negotiating directly with the government.

May I just read one statement into the records of the House, Mr. Speaker, made by a Canadian educator in Edmonton last September to give some idea of the situation with respect to negotiations across Canada. Here is what this gentleman says and I quote:

As I view teacher negotiations this past year in Canada, I can only predict increasing turmoil in the years ahead. The average Canadian school board and teacher association spent nearly eight months in negotiating in the past school year. I feel that is extremely unfortunate indeed almost tragic, that negotiations have not produced a new

March 29, 1971

collective agreement in a shorter period of time. These eight months represent valuable time that could have been spent by both teachers and trustees in improving the quality of education, rather than in many cases, hindering the growth of education.

The spirit of this nature, regardless of the conduct of the parties, tends to produce wounds that sometimes take years to heal.

And that was an excerpt from an address, and he goes on further to discuss further points on that, by Mr. Carmen Moir, Superintendent in Winnipeg, made last year at the Canadian Education Association conference in Edmonton.

I want to repeat a statement here, Mr. Speaker, that I made in this House as well as outside on many occasions. One of the basic difficulties in arriving at teacher-trustee settlements not only here but across this country, involves the rigid, the antiquated and the outdated methods employed in Saskatchewan and in most Canadian provinces, used to remunerate their teachers. Here we have, for example, one group of people rendering a service, and yet most of the agreements in this province provide for 60, and in some cases 70, different pay levels for that service. Teachers progress onward or upward on the ladder by virtue of two criteria and two only. Firstly, the actual number of years that an individual has taught whether or not he or his students will benefit from that experience; and secondly, the number of years of academic training that a teacher has taken. And again whether or not those years equip him to do a better job for the students in his classroom, remains in question.

I suggest again, as I have on other occasions also, Mr. Speaker, that up to now it has been the refusal of organized teacher groups across the country to consider more up-to-date, more acceptable approaches to remuneration that, in my opinion, has posed the single largest stumbling block to satisfactory negotiations. In this respect I certainly want to compliment and to pay tribute to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and their Easter caucus last week when they debated and gave serious consideration to a resolution that will reduce the number of classes and consider other ways and means of moving a teacher up the ladder and remunerating that teacher for his services. I think that's an excellent move and I hope it is one that they will continue to discuss and may I assure the Members of the House it is one that we, as the Government, will be happy to discuss with them.

Mr. Speaker, this problem - as I have tried to indicate - with respect to teacher-trustee negotiations is by no means peculiar to the Province of Saskatchewan. Indeed, I believe, that in general the climate of the whole negotiating process here in Saskatchewan is definitely superior to that of most other Canadian provinces, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, our legislation is superior to that in most Canadian provinces. I suggest when those proposed amendments before us here tonight are adopted, we shall have without doubt the best possible legislative structure for arriving at teachers' salaries of any province in Canada.

I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cut Knife): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is one of the more obnoxious ones brought before the House this Session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — The Minister, as usual, in his comments about the Bill shows his complete lack of understanding of the negotiating process - its background or its purpose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first major change in this salary act proposed by the Bill - that of moving dates and deadlines for negotiations ahead six weeks has some merit but it's nothing that we on this side of the House can get too excited about.

The original salary act had logical deadlines but when negotiations were not being carried on in good faith, I never heard the Minister encouraging anyone to meet those deadlines. To my knowledge, negotiations in the past two years have seldom met the deadline in any area in the province. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one can have all the deadlines in the world and they'll never be met until this Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) learns that it's high time that he removed political interference from the bargaining process in Saskatchewan.

As far as we are concerned on this side of the House, that's the key issue here. You can do anything you want with legislation but as long as he interferes, we'll never get anywhere. As I see it, settling the six per cent wage guideline hampered the whole negotiation process last year. The trustees of the Province said it was too high. The teachers said it was too low. And so the fight was on. And further, the Minister would not give a concise answer immediately as to the full meaning of the six per cent. Did it mean total salary grid? Did it include or exclude the normal increments? So the fight was on and I could just see the Minister, he must have been clapping his hands with glee in the background because he had started another row and could create division among our people of Saskatchewan once again.

But one thing is abundantly clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The policies of this Liberal Government opposite always consist of pitting one group against another - farmers against workers, trustees against teachers, hospital boards against employees. This has been the Liberal program. This is the old divide and rule game that they play. That's what is wrong with the whole negotiating business in this province. We've got a Government that adds fuel to the fire instead of urging co-operation, consultation, meaningful dialogue, conciliation and mediation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unless the Government changes its attitude toward negotiations, changing deadline dates are of no value at all.

But the major principle in this Bill that we on this side of the House really object to is that when conciliation has failed, the Minister will appoint a board of arbitration, without request of either committee. In short, the Minister is ramming binding compulsory arbitration down the throats of school trustees and teachers. This is pretty well total dictatorship.

March 29, 1971

What has happened to the freedom that the Liberals so often boast about? I am amazed at the ignorance of the Minister in posing binding compulsory arbitration upon teachers and trustees of this province. I am amazed because after studying the matter of arbitration, I came upon some very famous and wise comments on the subject which show clearly how wrong compulsory arbitration really is. The International Labor Organization, for my first support of my argument, the ILO, back in 1917 exposed the main flaw of compulsory arbitration in these words, quote:

A free society cannot coerce any section of its population into working conditions which are not freely and generally acceptable.

The Hon. Minister knows that coercion and compulsory arbitration will not cure the ills in education. I am sure he is aware that coercion breeds contempt and disgust for the government that imposes it.

A second authority, Mr. C. L. Eldridge, director of industrial relations for the Stokley-Van Kamp Company, an American food canning company, had this to say, quote:

It is my opinion that compulsory arbitration would definitely destroy the entire concept of collective bargaining. I am of the definite opinion that compulsory arbitration is not the answer arising out of collective bargaining because I am absolutely certain that if those in management, charged with the responsibility of collective bargaining, and those in unions charged with the same responsibility, conscientiously do their job no outsiders will be required to settle issues.

A third, Leon Keyserling, former chairman of the United States President's Council of economic advisors had this to say about the matter:

Compulsory arbitration is not consistent with industrial freedom and, therefore, in a free society it is not consistent even with industrial peace as experience elsewhere has shown.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even some Federal Liberals have enlightened views on negotiations and arbitration. Let's take a look at what the Hon. Louis St. Laurent had to say, quote:

In our country arbitration is accepted, even in emergency, only with the greatest reluctance. It does not seem to be a satisfactory substitute for other regular processes of determining pay scales.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in 1964 Ontario set up a royal commission which brought in its report on compulsory arbitration of disputes affecting hospitals. It had this to say:

There is consensus in Canada and in the United States that the application of compulsory arbitration to settle contract disputes between labor and management in industry is repugnant to our free enterprise system and our free democratic institutions.

Still another source of information, if the Minister so wishes, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation in a brief

presented to the Provincial Government on April 4, 1966, commented on compulsory arbitration. The Federation had had the opportunity to see how compulsory arbitration works in British Columbia. I wonder if the Minister looked into that in British Columbia. I quote:

Too frequently under British Columbia conditions the negotiation pattern is one of an obstinate group of teachers facing an obstinate school board drifting through the mere passage of time into a hastily arranged hearing before a hurried and harried arbitration board which makes a poor best of a bad job under impossible conditions.

And that's the experience in British Columbia, and they add:

Such a procedure cannot solve the real problem. At best it postpones for a year the search for a solution.

And that's all you are doing, Mr. Minister (Mr. McIsaac), is postponing the inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble opinion that this Government by implementing compulsory arbitration has again shown contempt for wage-earners and their right to bargain collectively. This Bill is another extension of Bill 2 which is the cause of many strikes and much labor unrest today in Saskatchewan.

Liberal leaders have promised repeatedly that they would end strikes and they are hoping the general public will buy compulsory arbitration as the cure-all for strikes. At almost every session of the Legislature, the Liberals have brought in anti-labor laws. The approach has not worked. It will not work. In fact it has made the situation worse. Their own figures prove it. Here is the industrial relations record of the CCF and Liberal governments from 1960 to 1968: four CCF years - 31 strikes, 5,200 man-days lost; take four Liberal years - 73 strikes, 40,000 man-days lost. This is conclusive proof that the number of strikes has more than doubled under the Liberal administration and their approach and not only do we now have more strikes in Saskatchewan but they are longer, indicating greater difficulty in achieving a settlement. The amount of time lost went up over 750 per cent under Liberal laws and here today again we see more compulsory binding arbitration being proposed to yet another group of some 11,400 teachers in this province and all the trustees as well. More fuel is being added to create more strikes and dissension among the people of Saskatchewan. And what is the record in our province in regard to teachers' strikes? Between 1944 and 1964, the 20-year period that Liberals so often like to talk about when they want to degrade a system, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was not one strike by teachers in 20 years. Not one teacher day lost in 20 years of CCF government. Oh, yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be honest with you and the Members of this House, I must admit that there was a strike in that 20-year period. One teacher walked out for one day in a wildcat strike because he got mad at his local school board.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years of co-operative CCF government - no Bill 2, no compulsory binding arbitration and a 20-year period that was 99.99 per cent free of teacher strife in our province. This is proof that New Democrats are on the right track when it comes to preventing strikes.

Now what's the Liberal record, Mr. Speaker? In the seven

years of Liberal Government there have been several strikes, mass resignations, withdrawal of extra curricular services, deductions from teachers' pay for strike funds, and it goes on and on. Never in the history of our province has there been so much friction and discord.

Since the inception of compulsory area bargaining in 1968 by the Minister of Education there have been no less than six strikes or walkouts in six different areas of the province. The total teacher days lost and withdrawal of services has amounted to 6,213.5 teacher-days lost. And of course if our record in 20 years was no strikes except for one day, this is an increase of 6,213.5 per cent increase over the previous 20-year period and record of the CCF government. So all this goes to show conclusively that the Minister of Education and the Liberals in Saskatchewan have failed to stop strikes. They are mounting every day. Their whole approach to labor relations has been a colossal failure. The same approach is now being shoved on to teachers and school boards as well. We in the New Democratic Party have the only sensible approach - sincere bargaining, no political interference, conciliation and mediation without the sledgehammer approach of compulsory binding arbitration.

The records of this province prove, without a shadow of a doubt, that New Democrats are on the right track. Now, it should be obvious by now that the sledgehammer approach to salary negotiations simply doesn't work. Many claim that this Liberal Government has actually caused strikes and I have been given good grounds to confirm that claim.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best statements ever made regarding compulsory arbitration came from the Hon. A. McEachen one time Federal Minister of Labour. He had this to say, and I want the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to listen very carefully to this statement, but unfortunately he is not in his seat. He doesn't listen to his Federal Liberal counterparts. Anyway, Mr. McEachen said, quote:

When you provide for arbitration it seems to reduce the necessity or desire to settle disputes before the arbitration stage. In some cases compulsory arbitration is advocated where the public interest is involved. I don't think there is any need whatsoever in Canada to consider compulsory arbitration in the settlement of disputes.

This is without a doubt the most important reason against compulsory arbitration. It seems to reduce the necessity or desire to settle salary negotiations before the arbitration stage. And I can see this happening in the whole negotiation process in Saskatchewan whereby boards maybe, or teachers maybe, will just sit back all year without really doing any serious negotiating because in the end it'll be compulsory binding arbitration anyway, so why should they worry about any type of settlement.

Furthermore, how can the Minister expect school boards and teachers to trust this Government when the arbitration award handed down in the Estevan area last year brought in an entirely new clause, not recommended by either side in its negotiations, that clause was some form of merit rating. Now, maybe there is something to be said for merit rating, I don't know, but why bring it in in this method? If the Minister intends to use compulsory arbitration to bring in entirely new and uncalled for clauses of his own making, then he'd better take a good look at the image he has created of himself. The Minister has already

brought in budget scrutiny, arbitrary teacher-pupil ratios, it has closed down hundreds of classrooms, forced boards to cut teachers and programs, he's eroded local autonomy and local decision-making. He has refused the bursary program for students for seven years now, but we have finally got something going this year. He rammed compulsory area bargaining through in 1968 and now he proposes to ram compulsory binding arbitration down the throats of school boards and teachers.

Mr. Speaker, this Education Minister (Mr. McIsaac) has once again shown his true self. He's a Minister with a split personality, a two-headed serpent, if you like. To the general public he portrays himself as the smiling prima donna of Saskatchewan education while in the back rooms of the Department of Education in the Liberal Party, he seems to be setting himself up as a little Hitler of Saskatchewan. He makes all the decisions - compulsory binding arbitration, compulsory this, compulsory that.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are vitally interested in a good educational climate. It appears that the one very basic need for a good educational climate . . .

MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University): — On a point of order. I question . . .

MR. KWASNICA: — . . . of a good teaching force.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, to refer to someone in this House as a Hitler? I think not, but I'd like to hear your ruling, please.

MR. SPEAKER: — No more than unless they'll refer to anybody as a little Stalin.

MR. KWASNICA: — It appears that the very basic need of a good educational climate is that of a good teaching force, a teaching force that is well-trained, experienced, secure, interested, confident in their rights and enjoying the confidence of their employers.

This Bill lacks good common sense. It does not deal with the real problem of collective bargaining. The real problem, as I see it, is that the teachers know full well that when they negotiate with school trustees, they are really negotiating with the Government, which has been calling the shots all along. The trustees have stated openly that any agreements they sign must be approved by the Government. Therefore they are just really puppets in a negotiation process, front men to take the brunt of the criticism. The teachers know it, the public knows it and I am afraid the school trustees know it too. They really know just what you are doing to them. This Government must do one of two things; either remove its political interference in the bargaining process or agree to negotiate directly with the teachers of the province. No use pussy-footing around. As long as it continues to do its fancy foot-work behind the scenes, there will not be a harmonious atmosphere in education in this province. This Bill does not even suggest the use of a mediator.

MR. McISAAC: — Have you read it?

MR. KWASNICA: — Yes, sure. How successful has that been? What is wrong with a well-trained nationally known mediator to settle disputes. If this Bill had such a suggestion in it, we would probably buy it and make it work, but because it proposes compulsory binding arbitration without consent of either negotiating parties, we cannot in the name of democracy support the Bill. This Bill is even far worse than Bill 2, The Essential Services Act, which, at least, requires Cabinet approval before compulsory binding arbitration is brought in. This Bill gives the Minister of Education, one man, the sole authority to decide that compulsory arbitration be imposed on any given negotiation area. A one man show. Mr. Speaker, we shall be voting against this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to comment on this Bill at this time but the Member from Cut Knife has made some observations which I really think should be answered. Probably because of his youth he can be excused for some of them, but for most of them he cannot really have any excuse. I just wonder if he has the support of his colleagues when he refers so freely to the Members of the teaching profession in the same breath as he is talking about trade unionists. All the way through this speech of his he has been talking about the ILO and trade union criteria for judging teachers' disputes. I should really like to ask the Member if he really feels that he is representing the teaching profession when he is saying that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, in effect, is a branch of the trade union. Now I have heard the Waffle candidate who is running in Saskatoon University say this exact same thing and the Waffle candidate actually believes and says publicly, that the Class IV and V teachers in the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation are exploiting the Class I, II and III teachers. I just wonder whether this is the kind of thinking that is going on that they are going to have an equal level of teaching based on the fact that all teachers are equal whether they have one year of education or whether they have five or six years of education. This is the obvious sort of conclusion that one can arrive at from hearing people like my friend from Cut Knife and the Members of the Waffle group of the party talking. The Member from Cut Knife made the observation that the Minister of Education was attempting to divide and conquer. At one time we had somewhere over 150 boards involved in this situation, in which case the members of the teaching profession had 150 boards to work with, they obviously could divide and conquer on the basis of 150 boards better than they could with 13 bargaining areas.

The Member for Cut Knife has been talking about friction and discord as being brought in by the Minister of Education. I maintain that the amount of friction and discord that we bring in is in direct proportion to the amount of unionizing that we do with members of the teaching profession. It was very obvious that Members of the New Democratic Party, and I really believe that they were on the right track when they reduced the number of bargaining areas drastically when they brought in the legislation which produced school units. This was quite all right obviously to reduce the number of bargaining areas tremendously

with the introduction of school unit legislation. The Member from Cut Knife is saying that we shouldn't reduce it any further than this, that the school units somehow become sacred because they were numbered and the hairs on their head were counted by the CCF Party of that day and the New Democratic Party of the present day. This is a type of presentation, Mr. Speaker, that I think does nothing to the dignity of this House. I think it does nothing to add to the solution. It is very obvious that any type of bargaining which has produced the number of frictions that have existed is a wrong type of bargaining.

We are bargaining on the wrong type of schedule. I argued on the trustee side of it, admittedly in the days when the former Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Education, and there was friction of this same type at that time. It has increased and increased, but it did exist at that time, and will continue to exist obviously as long as we have the same type of schedule that we have at the present time. A schedule which rewards him for having had two or three more classes every two or three years. This is a schedule which is open to question and I challenge both the trustees and I challenge the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation to come up with a schedule which does not include both of these factors, because obviously it has been a source of friction and will continue to be a source of friction. I think that we have got to do some basic thinking on the whole situation, and that basic thinking is going to come up hopefully if the better minds in the Teachers' Federation and the better minds in the School Trustees' Association will work with the Department of Education. I think we can produce a schedule which is based on what we all admit, that a good teacher is worthy of a good return, economically and a social position which is second to none in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. E. BYERS (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add just a few comments on this Bill now before the House. I think the Bill in itself is an admission by the Minister and I think he did admit partly in his remarks to this House today that there are some serious shortcomings in the present Salary Agreements Act. Essentially what this Bill attempts to do is to eliminate those shortcomings by bringing in compulsory binding arbitration to replace voluntary binding arbitration or conciliation and mediation as alternate means to settle salary and other questions. I am not surprised that a government, which only a few short years ago was elected to power on a promise to reduce the amount of compulsion in government, again takes in its own hands to bring in legislation which in effect imposes more compulsion on one more professional group.

I am very pleased that the Minister has begun to see some of the weaknesses in the present Act. I want to point out to him some of the other weaknesses that we see in it and really need to be corrected and shouldn't have been put there in the first place. I want to say a word about the argument the Minister has used with respect to the former process of negotiations causing a lot of wear and tear on trustees, taking up a lot of their time unnecessarily to discuss matters of salary. I served nine years as a negotiator on the local level, the unit level. I might say that in those nine years that there was only one case when conciliation was necessary, and that was in the very early phases of negotiations, which negotiations served a far

March 29, 1971

greater purpose than to settle salaries alone. I know and I think teachers who have served on negotiations - I don't know whether the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) or the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) have had these great experiences in their lives or not - but they were, at least, an occasion for teachers to discuss with their employing board many changes, alternatives and programs within the school system. I should add to that, that with the inception of area negotiations that kind of dialogue between teachers and boards has decreased and that has been part of the problem as to why the whole area negotiation process has not functioned as freely as it might.

I want to raise this point for all Members of the House. I want to raise this point particularly for the rural Members of the House, that what The Area Negotiations Act really did was that it removed, and I speak here of the School Unit Boards, their responsibility to a very great degree for fiscal autonomy in the area of salary negotiations.

Let's just take a look at how the Act is set up with respect to school units, the same can be said of city boards and the other types of school jurisdictions. The School Unit Board is elected by the ratepayers of Saskatchewan and they are elected for the purpose of determining salaries and other matters, but under The Salary Agreements Act, they must elect an area committee, that is, one or more persons from each board may be elected to an area committee, and the same with the teachers from each jurisdiction. From the area committee is selected the negotiating committee, and it's the negotiating committee which really carries on the negotiation process.

Here is where the whole weakness of the negotiating committee comes into play, Mr. Speaker. Take an area made up of 10 school jurisdictions. The negotiating committee for that area may have these possible combinations. From each school division there may be a teacher on the negotiating committee and no trustee. There may be a trustee from each school division, but no teacher. There may be a trustee and a teacher from each district or there may be neither. Yet this area committee is charged with the job of working out a salary schedule, that will apply to all of the school jurisdictions in that particular area of the province. Here you have an area committee which may be made up of no teachers or no trustees devising a salary that will apply to 10 school jurisdictions. This is really I think one of the bad features of the Act, I don't know whether it would be desirable to have one teacher and one trustee from every school unit or school district on this negotiating committee. But the point I really want to make is: the negotiating committee is not in the long run responsible to the school boards who must finally pay the salary bill and all the other bills.

Why does this whole structure break down, Mr. Speaker? I think the Minister is well aware of this. I don't think that he has really done anything in drafting this Bill to correct the lack of communication that now exists under the present Act. What do you frequently find? You frequently find that the Unit Board, particularly one that has no representative on the area committee doesn't know what the negotiating committee is doing. There is a lack of communication both up the trustee line and down, and up the teacher line and down. This is an area I think that if we must continue with area negotiations, certainly needs a good deal of correction.

Well, my friend from Cut Knife has mentioned some of the other weaknesses in the current Act and the application of it. I think it is fair to say that the whole collective bargaining process operates at its best when there is a minimum of interference by the Government. I think it is fair to say that in all the years that the previous Act was in existence, there was a very minimum amount of interference either by the Minister or by the Premier or by the Government in the whole process of negotiation. I think it is also fair to say that never has there been a time in the history of negotiations as there has been in the case when this Act has been in effect when there has been more interference in the whole negotiation process by the Minister and by the Government. The Minister here says that the reason that he is bringing in the amendments to this Bill is that the negotiators ignore the timetables, they have ignored the timetables and so he is going to draw up a different calendar for them. He says, "Boys get back at the job."

Let's just review last year's negotiations. I don't follow the actual mechanics of negotiations that clearly, but might I remind this House that it was into September of 1970 before the Department of Education had clarified their dictum as to whether increments would be included or not included with the 6 per cent guidelines laid down by the Government. It was well into the fall of 1970 before that particular element of government interference was given even minor clarification. That has been one of the major reasons for unnecessary and protracted delay with respect to negotiations. I don't think these amendments are going necessarily to improve that either. I raise this whole question with the Minister; if the Government firmly believes that the elected representatives of school boards, even at the area level are to carry out negotiations with the teachers, why any deadlines are necessary at all.

Are deadlines really a necessary feature of the Act? I want to say to the Minister that the deadlines have now been in the Act for two years of negotiations and I wonder if it has been the negotiators, either teachers or trustees who are at fault that those deadlines have not been adhered to or whether it is the Minister who has been at fault in seeing that those deadlines were adhered to. The old Act did provide for conciliation after a certain time and I believe it was in the spring of 1970 that conciliators were appointed to settle the contract for the previous year. I may be wrong on that, Mr. Minister, but there was a time when you did appoint a group of conciliators for a very short time. My argument is this: that conciliation ought to be a fundamental part of the collective bargaining process and that where negotiations tend to break down that the negotiating parties be able to apply to the Minister for conciliation and that they be granted it when they both agree. This is the path that they want to take. But further, I think that it is very important that the Department make available to the area teams men of stature who are able to carry out that conciliation process. I want to say that in the one time that I sat on a conciliation board, the conciliator appointed by the Minister at that time was Dean Cronkite who was then Dean of the Law College, a man who was able to bring the two parties together, who had the capability and the know-how to bring about a very satisfactory situation. I don't think either the Boards of the teachers of this province while this Act has been in effect have had that kind of service from this Minister or from this Government. That is part of the problem that we are now faced with.

March 29, 1971

I raise this whole question of agents, because I think the use of agents has contributed substantially to the breakdown of negotiations in this province. But go and talk to your teacher negotiators, go and talk to your Board negotiators and they will tell you that they have gone to negotiation meetings; they have agreed on a meeting time; they have gone to meet with the agent to find that the agent came in for an hour and then left and the whole thing was dropped for that particular time. The whole question of agents, I think, in the process of bargaining, from my point of view, leaves a good deal to be desired and if they were stricken from the Act as a means of bargaining I think the whole process would be much better off. I think that I have raised one of the points in that the present Act, undesirable as it may be, could have been made to function much better than it has if the Minister and the Department had seen fit to provide proper and adequate conciliation services when it was needed and particularly, in the early years of this Act's operation. I think if they had wanted to that could have been done. The Minister is using his past failure in that respect as an excuse to sneak compulsory binding arbitration into this particular Bill.

I'm going to say to the Minister that if area bargaining continues to be used as a method of settling, not only salaries, but other questions with respect to the operation of schools, I think this question needs very, very careful consideration.

I don't know whether we could go back in this province to the system where salaries were negotiated locally. That would be my own personal preference. I don't know whether the idea of Provincial bargaining is more desirable than this. But I want to just raise the matter in this House that Legislators better look pretty carefully at this whole question because if we don't work out a climate that is less restrictive than where we are heading that provides for a good deal more of movement for both teachers and trustees in this whole business of negotiation then what might well emerge in the years ahead may be a national bargaining organization on behalf of the teaching profession. I don't know whether that would be a desirable approach or not. I don't know whether that approach is inevitable or not.

MR. ESTEY: — Nonsense!

MR. BYERS: — It isn't nonsense my friend. I am simply saying to the Members of the House, and that includes the Minister of Industry (Mr. Estey) that if we do not . . .

MR. ESTEY: — Provincial negotiations?

MR. BYERS: — Well all right. That this is another alternative that Governments may well have to deal with and cope with in the years ahead.

Well, those are just a few comments I have on this particular debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. C. L. B. ESTEY (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I have not occupied the enviable position of a teacher as has the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica)

and the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) but some time ago under the former Government I was a trustee for some years and was involved in what has been spoken about here tonight. I cannot comment on the Member for Cut Knife because I could not follow his address, Mr. Speaker. But insofar as the Member for Kelvington is concerned, he made this remark and I think I wrote it down correctly, "Conciliation is a fundamental part of the negotiation process" and we of the Liberal Party think that that statement is absolutely true and under Section 14A of this Act we are seeking to perpetuate the concept of conciliation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ESTEY: — Neither one of the speakers, Mr. Speaker, who spoke before I have spoken, referred to any section of this Act. I don't know whether they have read this Act, but if they would read Section 14A - Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the time to read this section and comment on it:

(1) Where the committees in a negotiation area have failed to adopt a salary agreement for the area and conciliation has ceased, (and I emphasize that's important - conciliation has ceased) the minister may appoint a board of arbitration in accordance with Section 15 for the area without the request or consent of either committee.

(2) Where the minister decides to appoint a board of arbitration under subsection (1) he shall forthwith give notice of his intention to do so to both committees.

(3) Within ten days after the date of receipt of a notice mentioned in subsection (2) by a committee, the committee shall deliver to the minister a concise statement of its claims.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the important portion of Section 14A is subsection (3). If the teacher committee and if the trustee committee are in earnest and conscientious about reaching a conclusion by conciliation rather than arbitration they have an additional 10 days in which to do it subsequent to receipt of notice by the Minister. That is the best evidence, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Government can give that we favor conciliation if it has a possibility of succeeding. If the parties are at such odds and such animosity exists, that there can be no solution by conciliation then the only solution must be arbitration. But I submit that the Minister in bringing in 14A, which I don't think either of my learned friends have read, the Minister by bringing in this procedure is giving another chance to the committee to perform their work on a conciliatory basis if they wish to avoid arbitration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. S. LLOYD (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a few words to the discussion of this legislation. I want to refer first of all to some of the remarks made by my friend, the Member from Nutana South. He seemed to deplore the fact that there is some suggestion that the Teachers' Federation was something like a trade union. He seemed to be saying that there was a great difference between a trade union and a professional group when it came down to matters of this kind.

March 29, 1971

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish that people wouldn't try to pretend because a group of people are organized as a professional association instead of a trade union, they are somewhat purer in motives and in methods. I've had the experience of dealing both with trade unions and with professional groups and I haven't seen all that much different at times. I suggest to my friend that he consult with his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and see which he would rather deal with. I think there are times when the Minister of Health would much rather deal with a good, solid, straight, strong trade union than with some of the professional groups he has to deal with.

I should hope, Mr. Speaker, and quite seriously, I should hope that Members in this House would not try to give the impression that because a group of people happen to be called a profession rather than a trade union, they are somehow superior and purer in motives. I think that's the kind of talk that's bad for any of us or for any legislation or for any group of people.

Secondly, my friend from Nutana South was admonishing my colleague from Cut Knife for having said something or other about blaming the Liberals for sowing discord, of setting group against group and so on. I ask my friend from Nutana South to cast his mind back to who it was that said that most recently, before my colleague from Cut Knife. Just go back a couple of days. I think he will find that the person who was accusing the present Government of doing that wasn't my colleague from Cut Knife. The person who was doing it was the former MLA for Melville and the Minister of Public Works, former Executive Secretary of Homecoming '71 in this province. He was the one who was saying and documenting how this Government tends to set group against group and to cause dissension in that way.

Both the Minister and the Member from Nutana South suggested that one of the main problems in this whole matter of bargaining, one of the main causes of difficulty was the type of schedule which teachers insisted on continuing to negotiate. I am quite ready to admit there are problems there and there are complications there which probably could be got rid of. But I ask the Minister, or I ask the Member for Nutana South, what in the world this change in legislation will do to cure that situation? I submit it does nothing whatsoever, to remove the thing which both of them said is a major kind of difficulty and a major kind of problem. If they want to get rid of that problem then there is a different approach which comes out before leadership from the Department and from the Minister rather than imposing this kind of Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister began his remarks, as I got them, by saying that the experience of the last two years has shown that the basic objectives and procedures of the Act were, I think he said, "sound". He concluded his remarks by suggesting that the situation in Saskatchewan was so much better than any other province in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I have to raise the question of events that you haven't seen apparently or haven't heard of in the last couple of years because I don't think anybody could view the scene of negotiations between teachers and trustees in the last couple of years in this province and then to get up blindly in this House and say that the whole thing is in good condition and that it is so much better than the rest. Mr. Minister, perhaps one of the problems is, you aren't talking to the right people, you aren't listening to many of those who are involved, because certainly, I don't

think the Government would wish to deny that the difficulties of getting salary settlements between teachers and trustees in these last few years has been immensely greater than I think ever before in the history of this entire province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The Minister, I think, should look at that particular situation before he enters into this role or realm of self congratulation by saying all has been well in fact so well that it is better here than in any other place in Canada because I don't think the facts would substantiate that position.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill and the legislation which it amends is, I submit, proof in living color of the Government's inability to keep people working together. This Bill is just one more attempt by the Government to solve by legalistic methods, problems which are basically those of relationships between people. What I want to query is whether we can, by legalistic methods, solve problems which are basically those of human relations. I don't think we can. I suggest that this Bill manifests, demonstrates one of the severest criticisms which Saskatchewan people have of the methods of the present Government. I have already referred to that. It does manifest inability of the Government to encourage good relationships between groups of people and indeed, I'm afraid, it suggests, as some people have said, that it manifests some interest on the part of Government in setting one group against another.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — At the very minimum it indicates again the readiness of the Government to resort to force in restrictive legislation, legislative action. It does this, when instead, it ought to be putting its energy into creating understanding, into developing patterns for co-operative solution by those involved. Because I'm afraid, contrary to what the Minister has said, this proposal is going to hinder rather than to promote the co-operative efforts of teachers and trustees to find the answer to their problems of human relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I submit that the Government gives up too easily. It has too little patience with people; it has too little confidence in people and as a result we get this kind of restrictive legislation.

The Act does something else which I think the Minister and the Government ought to think about. This Act, once again, concentrates more power into the hands of the Minister. This Act, once again, erodes and takes away some of the power from the hands of locally elected officials and the teachers who work in designated local areas. I think that when the Government continues to move authority from the local area from the hands of locally elected officials into their own hands then this is not desirable legislation and should be opposed.

May I just remind this House that last year the Government asked, and got, for the Minister, the exclusive right to determine

March 29, 1971

what school grants are paid - and it is his right - he doesn't even have to - and he was good enough to admit this in this Legislature last year - use the same rules for one jurisdiction as he does to the next one with regard to school grants. They put that into his hands. The Government last year ordained what the salary increase should be, or at least that it shouldn't be greater than the six per cent guidelines. There was no basis of authority in legislation for the Minister and the Government insisting on this. They just took this power into their own hands to use, and use it they did. The Government, this year says, the Minister says, "We will not tolerate certain things and so we have this Act before us."

The Minister has suggested to us that one of the virtues of this Act is that it says that the Minister 'may' use this. I submit far from being a virtue, that that is indeed one of the vices of this Act. Regardless of how well intentioned the Minister may be, let's look at the kind of authority this does give him. In spite of the remarks of the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Estey) just a few minutes ago, let's look at the authority this does put in the hands of the Minister of Education, because it does say that he 'may' make this Act applicable. The Minister, in fact, may wake up some morning, being bothered by a bit of undigested beef from the night before, and say, 'now that group over there hasn't got together on their salary settlement, so we will have compulsory arbitration in that area.' I know that I am making an extreme statement, but nevertheless that is the realm of power, that's the dimension of the power that this Act gives to the Minister. He may act in that way under those circumstances.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce suggests the fact that there has to be a ceasing of conciliation before this can happen. That doesn't explain anything, because the act of conciliation is in the hands of the Minister. He is going to decide who is going to be conciliating, when, where and for how long. So in fact the Minister may determine the conditions under which compulsory arbitration goes into effect. This is worse than Bill No. 2.

I know that some of my friends across the way are proud of Bill 2, I submit that not all of them are. I submit that there are a lot of Liberals across this province and across this country who aren't very proud of Bill 2.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — But Bill 2 at least has this kind of protection. The Cabinet must decide that there is, first of all, an emergency of some kind. The Cabinet must then decide, as I recall it, to apply that Bill. But none of those safeguards are in this Bill. The authority is put into the hands of the Minister, to wake up in the morning and say, that area over there is going to go into compulsory arbitration and the findings shall be final and the findings shall be binding.

I submit that is not a healthy situation. It gives the Minister, of course, power to appoint certain personnel, which gives him still greater authority in settling this matter. I realize that it is always easier to impose a solution than to work one out. And authoritarian governments succumb to that kind of temptation. The problem, is, of course, in using that

kind of power, and we have seen it exemplified here, and the next time it is easier to use it. The history of this Government is that it is used and the next time it is a little simpler to persuade themselves that it ought to be used again, more and more. We get this concentration of additional authority into the hands of the Cabinet, into perhaps, the hands of the Premier. That isn't good government.

I wonder when the Minister or the Government is going to use this in regard to other groups in society. I think for example, there are relationships between local governments and the government and veterinarians. I wonder why we don't have compulsory arbitration to fix the rates and the fees and the expenses, and so on, to veterinarians who are employed by local governments. I suggest that if this is going to be done here, why not go on to veterinarians, to medical doctors and to a whole bunch of others. The Government is inconsistent when it applies this power in just one area only.

Let me comment, Mr. Speaker, by referring to an editorial in the Star Phoenix of last November 17th. The editorial says and I quote:

The Saskatchewan Government is considering the insertion of a compulsory arbitration clause in The Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act according to a Regina Leader-Post news report.

Dr. J. C. McIsaac, Minister of Education has declined to comment.

Later on the editorial states this:

It would be unfortunate if the Provincial Government found it necessary to introduce compulsory arbitration. This would tend to perpetuate the guideline technique, putting a ceiling on teachers' salaries, an act that is compulsory in itself.

But the closing paragraph of the editorial, Mr. Speaker, is most worth noting and I hope that the Minister pays close attention to it. The closing paragraph reads this way:

Any compulsion involving teachers will be tolerated only in the short run. In the long run the electorate will reject such involvement of education in the political arena in a way that is disturbing to the whole system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — What the editorial says, is that any compulsion of this kind will be tolerated only in the short run, and the next step for the electorate is to take it out of their hands and make a different kind of decision. I think that is a statement worth noting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of other comments. If the Government insists in passing this legislation, then there are two further items which I think are deserving of consideration. In the first of these I admit, Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily speak for all of my colleagues. It is an item that has been suggested widely by teachers and teacher groups across

March 29, 1971

the country. That is that as the intention of the Government seems to be to move more and more to the point where the Government, in fact, controls the negotiations ending up with teachers' salaries, then we ought to cut out, eliminate, some of the shadow-boxing if you will, and put the two groups that are going to make the decision anyway directly together in the first instance. In other words the suggestion has been made that the teachers should bargain on a province-wide basis with the Government and the representatives of the school trustees. Let there be one negotiation to settle the entire matter or to establish a series of grids for the whole province.

I think that is worth considering. I want to add this, that if this were done then perhaps teachers and boards within their own units or city systems, could have more time to get down to the basic matter of discussing educational matters between them and making educational decisions. I hope that one of the aspects of educational planning and decision-making in the future will be that there will be a lot more decisions taken as a result of teachers and boards and others sitting down at the same table and making educational decisions at that level of local government and for their employees and their staff.

I hope that the Government doesn't rule out too quickly the possibility of some kind of action like this. I am not suggesting less time on negotiations between school boards and their employees, I am suggesting as much time, or more time, but that this time be spent in considering the educational objectives of the area and the means whereby teachers and trustees together can reach those objectives. I think that something very healthy may come out of an arrangement of that kind.

The other proposal that I want to make is one which I know the Minister has already heard from representatives of the teachers' organizations. That is if there are to be arbitration boards of this kind appointed, then the chairman of the board should be appointed by someone other than the Minister of Education. Certainly the Government has too much, in effect, a larger degree of authority than should be put into the hands of the Government as the paymaster. I suggest to the Government that they can find a precedent for an arrangement like that if they look, for example, at the law which governs relationships between the Swift Current Health Region and the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission in regard to differences of opinion there. They will find out that the government at that time, when that was set up, said, "We will not select the chairman of this board who will make this decision, but the chairman of the board to make this decision will be established by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, (I believe) of the Queen's Bench Court."

I urge the Government to consider an arrangement like this. It can do nothing but redound to their credit if they are prepared to say: the Minister will not appoint the chairman of the board but rather the Chief Justice of one of the court systems in Saskatchewan will establish the member of the board.

I think in the end, Mr. Speaker, the test of the legislation before us, is whether or not this legislation will improve human relations between teachers and trustees. I submit that the answer to that question must be "No". I can't see this legislation improving those relationships, I can see and I do fear, that the relationship will be worsened as a result.

We are dealing here with organization, an organization of effort if you will. An organization has three main parts. An organization is made up of people. An organization has a structure and an organization has a spirit. Let's look at these three aspects of this human relationship which we are talking about. The people involved are teachers and trustees of Saskatchewan or their representatives. And by and large these are well motivated people and well motivated groups of people who have a common objective. They are neither all saints nor all sinners. They are human beings and they make mistakes just as this Legislature or that Government will make mistakes. But by and large the people are fundamentally persons of good will and good motivation and interested in doing a good job for Saskatchewan education.

Secondly, there is this structure and the Minister is tinkering around with this structure trying to improve the relationship between the groups of people involved. I submit that far from improving those relationships, the structure that he has proposed has altered and has harmed that relationship. I am afraid that the evidence in the Province of Saskatchewan in the last couple of years shows just that. One has only to read the utterances from various groups involved in this to be convinced of the damage that has been done to the relationship between these two groups.

The third aspect of this relationship to which I referred is that of spirit. I am afraid that is the problem. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that for a host of reasons which I won't go into tonight, the spirit by which these human relations are established has deteriorated. I suggest to this Government, I suggest to the Minister, that they indeed have to take some basic responsibility for the fact that this spirit has deteriorated. I submit that it is not until the Minister and his Department goes out to build up that spirit of good human relationship between these two groups, that we shall ever be rid of the problems which have bedevilled us so much in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I can't see this Bill leading to any improved creative effort to settle differences between teachers and trustees. I can see it only as making it worse. Because I object to this principle of compulsory arbitration, left in the hands of the Minister to trigger, almost at will, I think the Bill must be opposed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. C. P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments on this Bill.

First after listening to the debate this afternoon, I must question the statements of some of the Members opposite. First they based their arguments on the fact and let me quote the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers), "Collective bargaining works best with a minimum of government interference." And yet this afternoon we heard that Party endorse a telegram to the Government of Canada, asking them deliberately to interfere in the labor dispute on the West Coast. The telegram said:

That this Assembly demand that the Government of Canada, and particularly the Minister of Labour forthwith call

all parties together to bring about a speedy resolution of this dispute.

I find it unbelievable. This afternoon I strongly suspect that Members of the Opposition were calling this resolution and this particular emergency debate, to get themselves off the hook, to get themselves off the hook on a very delicate and sensitive political issue. Then tonight they took the exact opposite stand stating that they abhor Government interference in salary negotiations. I find it completely inconsistent with their remarks.

I find that the statements of the Members opposite seem to point the finger at area bargaining. They seem to suggest that the cause of the teacher and trustee salary difficulties in the Province of Saskatchewan are directly related to the passing of The Teacher's Salary Act and area bargaining a year or so ago. I find, once again, this completely inconsistent with any statements they have ever made in the past in relation to hospital workers or any other union. Every union in the Dominion of Canada is calling for larger bargaining areas, all unions are calling for expanded bargaining and negotiation units. Yet The Teachers' Salary Act, they say, oh, no because the STF abhors this principle, or objected to it. They now take the completely opposite viewpoint on this question to which they do with every other single union and every other single negotiation or agreement that has occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan and that includes every single Member opposite. I find this completely inconsistent.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the problems of teacher and trustee negotiations in this province, I happen to be a school teacher. I happen also to realize that there are other teacher problem areas in Canada.

MR. ROMANOW: — You might be on the STF Commission.

MR. MacDONALD: — Not only that, I might like to be on it. But I shall be representing the Government. I want to tell you as an example, they have never mentioned the problems in Quebec or the problems in Newfoundland or the problems in British Columbia. There isn't a single taxpayer in the Province of Saskatchewan who doesn't recognize that the problem in education has not related to the type and method or the machinery of negotiation between teacher and trustee, it rather has to do with the economic situation and the grain sales in the Province of Saskatchewan. This is particularly true of property taxes because of the lack of financial revenue on the part of the farmer, and the growing awareness of the farmers and the taxpayers of this province that there is need to stop the escalation in school costs. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the majority of taxpayers in Saskatchewan appreciate the efforts of this Government.

Another thing the Opposition have stated is that the power of the local trustees is being diminished, eroded. Well I can remember a few years ago when I was a school teacher, the concern, and real concern, of trustees and taxpayers was the fact that there was no local authority. That there was no local responsibility, because the negotiation of teachers' salaries in the Province of Saskatchewan had been so fragmented and so dissipated among 150 individual salary negotiating teams, that there was a conflict not on 13 levels but 150 levels. And 149 of those

levels waited not because of difficult negotiations, but waited until one or two school units in this province, that had the wealth and high assessment, made a settlement. That became the standard. It had no relationship whatsoever to the financial capacity of the taxpayers and the individual units to pay that bill. It had no relationship whatsoever to the ability of that particular individual school unit to meet that tax bill, it was directly related to the highest standard that could be achieved by another unit in the province. If anybody suggests that this is sincere and adequate negotiations in 1970, I say they are barking up the wrong tree.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we talk about human relations. Well I can remember talking to trustees and teachers too. 150 negotiating teams, or whatever may have been the number and they talked for weeks, and months and occasionally years in which that conflict between those two bodies developed, carried on, and extended over. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that trustees and teachers alike in this province are extremely thankful that now the responsibility of this long and tedious and important task is given to other people more professional and more concentrated so that the efforts are not scattered among the 150 negotiating teams, but a very few.

I don't want to get into the argument of the old Teachers' Salary Act, because as a teacher I have always believed in area negotiations. I have always believed that the teachers in Milestone or Wilcox had as much right to an equal salary as the teacher in Regina or Saskatoon if he had the same qualifications. I have always believed that the teacher in Milestone had the same right for the same sabbatical leave and the same sick pay and the same benefits as the teacher in Regina, Saskatoon or Moose Jaw. Those conditions did not exist before the area bargaining and Teachers' Salary Act was amended. I believe that there were 150 units and 150 different salary schedules when you include all the benefits paid in the Province of Saskatchewan, I say that was a disgrace. There is one thing that we are moving toward and moving very rapidly toward, is an equalization of salary schedules among rural and urban centres. We are moving very rapidly toward an equalization of benefits between rural and city areas and in most units there has been a gradual schedule to arrive at that kind of a situation over a period of years. I think that this is one of the benefits of area bargaining and I could go into the arguments for area bargaining which I have long believed in and long before I arrived in this Legislature. I believe it is for the benefit and the advance of all the teachers in the Province of Saskatchewan regardless of what the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation says. You know when you talk about area bargaining, then you listen to the STF say, "We want single area bargaining, we want provincial negotiations." Then at the next breath they disagree with area bargaining. As my friend from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) indicated, it was the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) who introduced area bargaining in this province and don't let him or anybody else tell you differently because they took away the local negotiations between Wilcox and their local school unit. They made more changes, destroyed more bargaining units in their piece of larger school unit legislation than we ever did in the area bargaining or The Teachers' Salary Act. All I am saying is that that is not a bad thing, as a teacher I am not disagreeing with it, I am merely pointing out that area bargaining was initiated, was started, was commenced by the NDP and not by the Liberal Government of this province.

March 29, 1971

MR. ROMANOW: — With the co-operation of everybody!

MR. MacDONALD: — Oh, was it! Come out to the Milestone School Unit and talk to a few of those little communities where they closed their schools and destroyed their rural areas. Don't tell me that that was with the co-operation - you were still in knee pants when they started closing schools in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we have had some problems, but the problems in Saskatchewan, as the Minister of Education has indicated, are rather of a minimal nature when you look across the educational problems in the Dominion of Canada. You look at Ontario where they are putting a ceiling on escalation, at the Province of Alberta, at the difficulties in the Provinces of Quebec, Newfoundland and in British Columbia and other provinces of Canada. I am saying that by setting a schedule to demand sincerity of negotiations . . . You can go and talk to many trustees and teachers now, and the one thing they point out in the past year is the frustration, the thing that has driven us crazy is the frustration caused by the lack of sincerity of one party or the other. All this Act does is set up a schedule and demand sincerity, and if they negotiate with sincerity then steps will be taken to bring about arbitration. I agree with it and I think the majority of teachers in this province agree with it. I know that the majority of trustees agree with it. I also say that in a few years, a few years, that the Teachers' Salary Act and area bargaining and this development that has resulted out of area bargaining will be looked upon as a very progressive piece of legislation by the teachers of the Province of Saskatchewan as it is now by the trustees of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to detain the House at length tonight. I am sorely tempted to reply to the remarks of the Member for Milestone, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) but I don't know how I could do it and still be in order, since I wasn't aware that this Bill opened up the matter of area bargaining. I see nothing in this Bill which puts into question anything said about area bargaining, much less about grain handling. I think that the points made were fairly simple notwithstanding the fact that real attempts were made to obscure them, for example, by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). Everyone admits that the introduction of school units very substantially reduced the number of bargaining areas. My colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale was indeed in knee pants, he perhaps didn't know about that, but some of the older Members in the House recall that it in fact took place. The Member for Milestone has indicated that he knew what happened back in the '40s.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Even the Junior Member can remember that!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Junior Member for Saskatoon City Park-University, indicates that he too remembers.

The point that was being made by many was that teachers have expressed a desire to bargain with their employers. This was possible under the Larger School Unit arrangements; it is not now possible under the Area Bargaining arrangement. This is one of the difficulties, one of the sources of the frustration and the lack of sincerity, or the feeling that there is a lack of sincerity, which the Minister of Welfare pointed to. I agree with him that in the last couple of years there has been real frustration, real frustration - and I am not suggesting it has only been present in the last couple of years, but it has been present in abundance during the last couple of years. A frustration, a feeling that there was no way to get a handle on salary negotiations. But I want to say to the Minister that if he believes that the introduction of compulsory arbitration will remove frustrations, will remove this feeling of lack of sincerity, then I think that he is sorely in error, because every observer of negotiations, whether those negotiations be between management and labor or between a professional body and an insuring agency, every observer says that if at the end of the road there is compulsory arbitration you very quickly erode any meaningful negotiation in front of that. That is the bedrock agreement against compulsory arbitration. The Minister if he denies that should tell us where there is an effective system of negotiation which terminates in compulsory arbitration. I think he will find that on any real analysis of the situation, wherever this system has operated, and I invite him to look at some places where it has operated, he will find that significant - and to use the Minister of Welfare's adjective, "sincere" collective bargaining has gone out the window by slow degrees. All parties begin to make their moves on the basis of how it would affect the arbitration. When this happens we find that there are no real and significant negotiations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — However, I want really to confine my remarks to one particular area. If there is to be compulsory arbitration as there is under this Bill, then I suggest that the framework of the compulsory arbitration is absolutely crucial. If the determination of teachers' salaries is going to be done on a quasi-judicial basis and not on the basis of negotiation, then it is absolutely imperative, not only that the arrangements be fair but that they be above reproach. They must have the attributes of Caesar's wife, they must be above reproach - above either side saying that they are getting a bad deal. Under these circumstances the selection of the chairman is crucial.

We all know how arbitration works. Anyone who wants to study this matter will find that where parties to a dispute appoint an arbitrator, he becomes only in part an arbitrator and largely an advocater. Anyone who doubts that may read a recent book studying the arbitration in the Brandon Packers' Dispute and he will find there that attribute acknowledged by the judge, who was the chairman. He indeed expected the parties' nominees to the arbitration board to be, in effect, advocates. The decision - and I think none of us is surprised at this - the decision comes down largely to the decision of the chairman. I know this, I have been on arbitration boards as a nominee of employees and as a nominee of employers and I have been a chairman of an arbitration board and I appeared as counsel before an arbitration board both for employers and employees. I have been the route, and I can say, and everyone who has been this route knows, that the decision is made effectively by the chairman,

unless the dispute is a very remarkable dispute.

How can we convince both teachers and trustees that the chairman is perfectly impartial? Can we do it by having the chairman appointed by the Minister of Education? This is not a criticism of this Minister of Education or any other Minister of Education. It is a simple bald fact that the teachers' salaries in this province consume more than \$100 million. A difference of 1 per cent or 2 per cent of a decision means \$1 million or \$2 million. Because of the growing public feeling that the Provincial Government is responsible for financing education - and no one can deny that growing public feeling - the Minister knows that if teachers' salaries increase by \$1 million or \$2 million or \$3 million, there is a real chance that the pressure on him to increase school grants by that amount or a significant portion of that amount will be very great. Under those circumstances, when he knows that the decision will create for him substantial pressures for the spending of an additional \$1 million or \$2 million he has a difficult time being impartial. He has an even more difficult time convincing anyone that he is impartial. Again I am not pointing my finger at the present Minister of Education. If I were the Minister of Education, the situation would be exactly the same. Who would believe that I as Minister of Education was perfectly impartial when the decision that I made might affect \$1 million or \$2 million of public funds and I had a dozen places where I wanted to use that money to increase a program that I was proud of and that I wanted to advance.

So those are the facts. It is going to be very difficult under those circumstances to convince people that a chairman appointed by the Minister of Education will be totally impartial in all cases. We recognize this.

I remember at the time in 1962 when the Medicare dispute was being wound up, and the terms of the legislation for the Special Session in August were being finalized, the original draft which some people believed came out of the negotiations at Saskatoon provided for arbitration between the Medical Care Insurance Commission and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Nobody was wedded to this. But I remember very well, and I wish the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey) was in his seat, because his partner said, "Well, the College of Physicians and Surgeons is really unwilling to commit themselves to arbitration. We want to know far, far more about who is going to choose the chairman before we'll commit ourselves to arbitration." The proposal then of course was not that the arbitrator be appointed by the Minister of Public Health or any other governmental officials. The legislation simply didn't make this clear. I really couldn't fault the College of Physicians and Surgeons on that score and we simply dropped that out of the proposed Bill. We said, "We understand your point of view, it is understandable, so we'll drop that."

Again the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) has pointed out the arrangements with respect to the Swift Current Health Region. When that arrangement was negotiated with them and when that was going to be a matter of their money out of the kitty from the Medical Care Insurance Commission, we agreed that this should be settled by arbitration. Once again it was agreed that under the circumstances, because in effect the result was going to affect in a major way the government budget, it was unfair to have that chairman appointed by a minister. We decided that this should

be done by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. The Attorney General will know and the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre will know that when businessmen decide that they are going to settle a contract by arbitration, suppose it is a building contract, they don't ordinarily provide that the chairman would be appointed by, let's say, the Minister of Public Works. They wouldn't decide that. They know that the government is in the business of building, or its budget is affected by building, and the Minister might have an interest in how the decision came out. So they provide in The Arbitration Act that the chairman shall be appointed by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. That makes a lot of sense.

It seems to me under those circumstances that if the Government is going to proceed with this Bill - and we have already tried to point out our objections to compulsory arbitration - but if the Government is going to proceed with compulsory arbitration, we should urge upon the Government that the chairman of the arbitration board not be appointed by the Minister of Education who has a vital monetary interest in the result, not be appointed by anyone of his colleagues, who will similarly, only by one step removed, have a vital monetary interest in the result, but that it be appointed by someone who can be demonstrably fair. I would suggest the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan as we provided for with the Swift Current Health Region, or a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench as is provided by businessmen under The Arbitration Act, or there may well be some other formula, the president of the University of Saskatchewan or whatever. I suggest that some person who is not intimately affected by the result in the line of his work should appoint the chairman. I think if this is done, and I am not saying that I agree with the principle of compulsory arbitration, but if this is done, much will be done to carry to the teachers and the trustees the conviction that the arbitration board is fair, is above reproach and that they, at least, can get a fair shake before that arbitration board. Without that and if the appointment is in the hands of the Minister it will not be possible to convey to teachers and trustees alike, as Ministers change, that the chairman of the arbitration board is fair and impartial. We shall have, not the tranquillity which all of us seek, but a continuation of the frustrations and annoyances and all of the growing problems which we have had. We shall see these compounded. The relationships between teachers and trustees will not enjoy the improvement which the Minister hopes this Bill will provide but will in fact be soured even more than they are now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McISAAC: — Mr. Speaker, I shall comment rather briefly on some of the remarks made by our Hon. friends opposite beginning with the remarks made by my Hon. friend from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) in the order in which they participated in the debate.

Now I am not sure from listening to my Hon. friend from Cut Knife just what he would want to see happen with regard to either the present legislation or any other improvements that might be suggested. I gather that he wants to see a continuation of prolonged disputes. He admits that changing the dates for the negotiations and conciliation procedures will not of themselves resolve the prolonged disputes we have seen not only here but elsewhere, but he doesn't go on to say what kind of amendments or what kind of measures he would like to see introduced

to bring about a resolution of that particular problem. I can point out to him and indeed to others who have raised it, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation dealing with arbitration procedures is not similar to that employed at the moment in British Columbia in resolving teacher-trustee negotiations or disputes. The Member for Cut Knife did refer to the main need for a good educational climate being that of a good teaching force. Now with this, Mr. Speaker, obviously every Member on this side of the House can well agree. However, I should only point out that the longer my Hon. friend from Cut Knife spoke it seems to me he himself demonstrated the difficulties here in the distance we have to go to get the kind of a teaching force that he is concerned about.

Now the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) in his remarks pointed out that I, in my introductory remarks, seem to feel that Section 14A was not an answer to the protracted negotiations we have had to deal with. I hope that it will be an answer to the kind of long protracted negotiations that we have encountered. This has been really the only major problem and I know there have been many problems that one could attribute to the legislation because you were seeing the same kind of problems prior to its introduction and you were seeing the same kind of problems in other provinces with different legislation than we had here.

Area bargaining is in no way a step that has removed fiscal autonomy from local school boards, again a point made by my Hon. friend from Kelvington. The total number of teachers employed and the total number of teachers in each class are two much more pertinent factors, Mr. Speaker, in determining a school unit or school board salary bill than the actual pay levels.

My Hon. friend from Kelvington spoke of the negotiating committee in the area boards perhaps not containing school board representatives, and he went on to point out that he felt there should be a teacher from each board going to constitute the main area committees. I certainly don't disagree with that concept, I just wonder how he explains the fact that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation last year, their Central Office, took over from local teachers as far as membership on area committees is concerned. He went on to point out that in his opinion, and I respect the sincerity of his remarks, that date deadlines as such were not necessary in this legislation. Well surely, Mr. Speaker, the Member knows full well that a legislative framework such as we have in this Act should be as flexible as possible, there has to be a framework of dates for the various procedures, negotiations and conciliation, and then in the event of no resolution of the dispute, where do we go from here?

The Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) next spoke on this particular issue and he pointed out that there is very little distinction in his experience between a trade union and a professional group. Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to get involved in this particular discussion or argument, I only wish to point out that I said many times, where the complications come in is when you get a group trying to wear both hats at the same time. That's my only problem with respect to my friends in the STF in this sense. I don't suggest or didn't suggest that the legislation before us would solve the problems of differences, disharmony if you like, with respect to negotiations and negotiating procedures, Mr. Speaker. I didn't suggest for a moment that the new Section 14A would resolve all those differences. I did say and pointed out in my opening remarks that I felt one of the

main contributing factors to all of the problems we have seen here in Saskatchewan, in Quebec, in the States, if you like go to Britain, with teacher-trustees negotiations has been the rigidity of the various classes of pay and the various categories and the number of automatic steps that have been built into those through the years. I don't blame the teachers for this at all, because I realize that these were negotiations worked out between both parties through the years. I just say that the rigidity of that structure is at the bottom really of a lot of the problems. I think that my colleague, the Member for Milestone, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) touched upon another one when he said that the growing and the rising cost of education has in and of itself been responsible in Saskatchewan and in other Canadian provinces for pressures on school boards in this respect.

I did not wish to imply, Mr. Speaker, that things are that much better here than elsewhere. I do think at the moment they certainly are a good deal better than most other Canadian provinces with respect to negotiations. I think the climate here in Saskatchewan is a good deal better than that of almost any other Canadian province one would wish to look at today.

The Member for Biggar mentioned that he believed consideration should be given to one overall bargaining area between the STF and the School Trustees' Association. I don't think that this is a move that everyone should be afraid of or back away from, and certainly the Government doesn't and the Government hasn't in that sense. I do think it might well be a move that could be considered now or in the next year or two or three. I do think this, Mr. Speaker, that it could not have been considered up to this point in time. But I think as a result of three years under area bargaining and the much greater uniformity we see in not only pay scales but in other provisions relating to employment sick leave and so on and so forth, that this is a consideration that could be looked at by all parties concerned. There is nothing in the present legislation to prevent that step from developing at any point in time as far as that goes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) in his remarks in this debate, I suggest were very good remarks and very much to the point, and I appreciate the arguments and the sincerity with which he advanced them. I don't know whether the procedures for the establishment of arbitration boards that are proposed here are perfect, Mr. Speaker, I don't suggest that they are. They are the same procedures that I think have worked under this Act in the last three years when three boards were appointed. They are similar procedures to those employed in the establishment of other boards of arbitration, the Trades Union Act and others. I am not sure what the correct move is, Mr. Speaker, to improve on the procedures here and I appreciate the difficulties pointed out by my Hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition. I can only say again, Mr. Speaker, that we shall look at this provision. I think this that there is no change here from the present provisions, which I suggest have worked and have worked well. I should point out, as I have in introducing this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that we know very well that these amendments being proposed here will not in and of themselves bring about better relations or goodwill, if you like, between both groups but certainly they are designed to improve that climate, which, as I say, is not that bad in this province at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 29, 1971

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

YEAS - 25

Messieurs

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Boldt	Heald	McIsaac
Guy	Loken	McDougall
Coderre	Larochelle	MacDonald
Estey	Gallagher	Breker
Leith	Weatherald	Mitchell
Gardiner	Coupland	McPherson
Charlebois	Forsyth	McIvor
Schmeiser		

NAYS - 22

Messieurs

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

MOTION - SLOWDOWN OF CNR AND CPR

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — May I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Leader of the Opposition) by leave of the Assembly:

That Mr. Speaker be instructed by this Assembly to transmit forthwith by telegram the complete and exact text of the Resolution on the matter of grain movement which was given "Priority of Debate" and passed nemine contradicente by the Leader of the Opposition of Saskatchewan on Monday, March 29, 1971 to the following authorities or persons:

The Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister; The Honourable Bryce Mackasey, Minister, Department of Labour;
President, Canadian National Railways;
President, Canadian Pacific Railways;
Mr. J. F. Walter, Assistant Grand Chief Engineer and National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers;
Mr. W. J. Wright, Assistant Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers;
Mr. H. L. May, Assistant Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.