

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
45th Day

Wednesday, March 28, 1973.

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

QUESTIONS

Were Intercontinental and Ipsco Shares Bought by SEDCO

Mr. D. G. Steuart: — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Mr. Thorson. The purchase of the shares of Intercontinental and of Ipsco, were they, in fact, bought by SEDCO or by any other agency or any Department of the Government. If so, who?

Hon. K. Thorson: — (Minister of Industry and Commerce) Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that in both cases (both companies) the agency of the Government which purchased the shares was Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.

RISING PRICE OF MEAT

Mr. K. R. MacLeod: — (Albert Park) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

I discovered that the price of such meat as bulk wieners has gone up 10 per cent in just over a month. I wonder what the Provincial Government, Department of Consumer Affairs, intends to do about it?

An Hon. Member: — How about bologna?

Mr. MacLeod: — For the assistance of the Minister, he gets bologna tomorrow.

Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski: — (Minister of Consumer Affairs) Mr. Speaker, I think the Member should await patiently the report of the Commission that is going to report to the Parliament of Canada on April 2nd, I believe. He should also keep in mind that the Parliament of Canada also had commissioned a report to look at rising prices of food and other consumer matters in 1966 and again in 1969. So maybe there is not much reason to be very hopeful of the report. But I think we will be looking forward to it.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 80 — An Act respecting the Negotiation of Collective Bargaining Agreements for Teachers.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — This Bill ranks alongside The Community Colleges Act as a major piece of legislation which will have far-reaching effects on education in this province and outside of this province.

The Government has two objectives in introduction The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act. One is to clean up the mess created during the seven lean years of Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Education cannot afford the bitterness and the discord that was grown out of bargaining under the 1968 legislation. We must have a bargaining system that works — works to minimize disagreements, not to accentuate them, works to bring the responsible parties together, not to divide them artificially. This new Act is designed for that purpose.

The second major objective of this Bill is to establish free collective bargaining principles as the basis for negotiations. Free collective bargaining recognizes that the relationship between the professional staff and the public's representatives is not one-sided, but is a matter for common effort. Free collective bargaining may not be a perfect method of settling differences, but the New Democratic Party believes it is the best system devised so far.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — To a very large extent, Mr. Speaker, it is a new concept in educational bargaining in Saskatchewan. I have a feeling it will be a welcome change after the experience of salary guidelines of compulsory arbitration and other dictatorial methods used by the Liberals when they governed this province.

The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act introduces a new concept in negotiations — the concept of bi-level bargaining. Bi-level bargaining will provide for negotiation of certain items at the provincial or central level, and for negotiation of other items locally or at the board level. This new principle recognizes the fact that education is a partnership in which responsibilities are shared between the province and the school boards. It will permit the negotiation of certain common items for the province as a whole. Matters that pertain to certain school units or systems will be negotiable at the level of that system to which they apply. Bi-level bargaining is a rational, common-sense approach that reflects the facts of life in education today. It does not attempt to hide behind

structures whose only remaining value is sentimental. It deals with realities and for that reason, I am confident it will work.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Liberal Members will give this new Act thorough consideration. I hope they will look seriously at supporting it. The Liberal Party could benefit greatly and it could enhance its credibility from a wise and careful decision. I would call on the Liberal Members opposite to exercise their own conscience. It would be unfortunate indeed for the Liberal Party to let the remarks of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) some weeks ago tie a millstone around their necks. This is an important piece of legislation and it requires that all Members exercise sound judgment. I trust the Liberal Members will approach this Bill with open minds and that they will not feel bound in advance to support an unproductive stand. Your decision will be with you for some time to come.

The relationship between teachers and school boards has always contained elements of bargaining in some sense of the word. In the days when every town and every village and every rural township had a school board, with fiscal responsibility, the relationship involved teacher and board directly on an individual basis. There was little use made of collective bargaining in those days. This situation had some advantages, to the extent that the absence of organized negotiation permitted an easy mixing of teacher and community. However, it was the teacher who bore the social burdens of his subordinate role, the status of educators as a profession was not high.

The introduction of The Larger Units Act in 1945 had wide implications. Larger units were established in recognition of the need for equal access to education, and recognition of the need for a higher quality in that education program. The unit system meant that district school boards grouped themselves together on a voluntary basis to improve the services they could offer, in the tradition of co-operation that is a characteristic of our province.

Larger school units also brought the Provincial Government into educational finance in a major way. The large-scale improvements intended by the unit system could not be paid for from local property tax revenues alone — or at least, could not be paid on an equitable basis for the programs in the province. Provincial support was necessary to spread the cost of good education over a wider area of tax resources. Provincial aid also recognized that a better educated public is a benefit not just to a local area, but to society and to the province generally. If we in Saskatchewan view Saskatchewan as a province with a character of its own, and if we wish this to be reflected in broad educational standards for the province, then we must accept responsibly to put our money where our goals are. Provincial aid to education is an outward and a visible sign on the part of the government that Saskatchewan people have common educational goals they want to pursue.

The acceptance of new goals in education required changes in the relationship of the teacher and the school trustee. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation developed as part of this change, as did the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association somewhat later. Provincial organizations were a response to the province-wide nature of many issues.

March 28, 1973

Larger school units employed many teachers. Together with a greater awareness of teaching as a profession and acceptance of collective bargaining as a legitimate way of ordering the affairs of teachers and trustees, the unit system brought on the introduction of The Teacher Salary Negotiation Act in 1949.

The Teacher Salary Negotiation Act was a landmark piece of legislation which laid the basis for free collective bargaining in education. It provided for collective bargaining of salary items and gave official status in negotiations to the Teachers' Federation and Trustees' Association. For nearly twenty years The Teacher Salary Negotiation Act served and served well, and I believe, helped to produce an era of educational harmony and progress.

One of the reasons The Teacher Salary Negotiation Act was successful related to the financial integrity of school units. I spoke a minute ago about how the larger units drew on provincial revenues for school purposes. Despite this new input, however, the fact remained that the largest part of school costs continued to be carried by local taxes. School grants rose every year as a percentage of the whole, but nevertheless by far the greatest portion was derived from property tax levies. This is significant, because the extent to which a party to bargaining is able to make responsible decisions has a good deal to do with the extent to which he is financially autonomous and is spending his own money.

Members may be interested in how the percentage of school costs covered by direct school grants has varied.

In 1933, 18 per cent; 1943, 25 per cent; 1953, 26 per cent; 1963, 44 per cent; 1973, 53 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, if the compensation payments being made by the province as Property Improvement Grants are taken into account, it will be seen as we saw in the Budget Speech, that a full 70 per cent of the costs are being paid by the province in 1973.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Financial integrity, then, can be seen as an important part of the success of local bargaining.

Local bargaining must be viewed in context. If financial integrity had a lot to do with its success, so did the lack of pressure for expansion of scope. Had there been a demand for negotiation of more working conditions, local bargaining would have been strained, because the power to make decisions on many working conditions — things such as pension, insurance, dismissal procedures and so on — these are central — power to decide these does not lie in the hands of school boards. This is also an important reason why local bargaining of the total package is not a workable alternative today.

The stresses and strains on local negotiations were starting to appear in the early sixties. The conciliation procedure lost much of its effectiveness in a series of disputes in 1961. Negotiations in later years showed the pressure of rising school grants and the resulting erosion of financial integrity. The growing strength and influence of the STF and the SSTA

organizations had a bearing. With the shortage of teachers exerting yet another pressure on local structure, bargaining became more and more a professional contest of considerable intensity.

In response to the added pressure at the bargaining table, many trustees sought for what they felt would be a more balanced system. Trustees felt that teachers had an advantage in local bargaining. Probably the advantage was due to the teacher shortage more than to any structural problem, but nevertheless trustees felt hard-pressed. The consensus was that 100 sets of negotiations for the same things made little sense. Many trustees felt it would be desirable to combine their efforts in one way or another. As a result, in 1966 the SSTA advocated that local bargaining be dispensed with and replaced by area or provincial bargaining. The Association expressed a preference at that time of provincial, or one-area bargaining. The magazine, *School Trustee* of July 1967 states:

Trustees believe the number of negotiations could be reduced to 12 or even one without prejudice to teachers' salaries, and with substantial benefit to trustees, the public and to children.

Concurrent with this, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation advocated retention of the local bargaining structure.

Mr. Speaker, the government of that day had an opportunity to face the question of how best to rationalize the salary bargaining laws. They had an opportunity to survey the trends in bargaining and the trends in school finance, and to project those trends into the future. It was an opportunity to devise a rational system of negotiations that would be capable of handling the pressures that were developing. I recall Liberals liked to imagine themselves as a Government that took a firm and responsible stand on all issues. I have heard them talk since I came into this House, of the courage that they had. Never let it be said that the Liberals backed away from an issue. But what did they do? Did the Liberal Government act rationally? Did they draft a forward-looking Bill, a Bill that could cope with what they knew was coming?

Mr. Speaker, the answer unfortunately for education, is no, they did not. The Liberals shirked their responsibility. They ignored the evidence and they compromised. The Liberals brought in a bargaining system that was neither fish nor fowl, a creation that was neither truly local nor effectively provincial. The Liberals bent to political expediency and their bargaining system showed it. They say a camel is a horse designed by a committee, and in that vein the area system is bargaining designed by Liberal politicians.

As was typical of the Liberal Government, they were careful to cover off on the short-term, and careless about the long-term consequences. I say that the inadequacy of area bargaining is a major reason why the Liberal Party lies in ruins to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — There has been considerable discussion of how the Liberals' area bargaining method failed to meet the needs before

it. I should like to enumerate some of the factors which were most important in its collapse.

I have said that area bargaining was neither fish nor fowl, and I would repeat that it was a basic flaw. Areas had no basis in economic terms; they were nothing more than arbitrary collections of school units. Likewise the area structure rested on no sound social foundation or no government foundation.

An area represents no community, it represents no government jurisdiction. The individuals who are forced to work in the area system had no regular connections with each other, no other formal framework to shore up to preserve relationships that would be needed to make bargaining work. The arbitrary nature of the areas might have been partially overcome if the Liberals had permitted school boards and teachers to come together voluntarily as the Moore Commission recommended. But no, instead of allowing their system to come together on its own they stuffed it in the ears of trustees and teachers, lock, stock and barrel. Many of their problems developed as a result of the way the former government introduced their Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Liberals, the former Minister understood and realized quite well that the structure they were imposing did not fit. They were trying to stuff a maturing adolescent into a child's clothing and that must have been quite obvious. The growing involvement of the Provincial Government in school costs was well known to the Liberals. Surely they understood the growing strength of the SSTA and STF central organizations, and what the power would mean in negotiations. I think the former Minister realized this and I believe he knew that provincial forces would be in play.

In view of these factors the question can be asked, "Why did the Liberals bring in a lame duck?" Now I don't pretend to know the ins and outs of the Thatcher Cabinet. I don't pretend to know the struggles that took place. No doubt there was some considerable debate on the Bill. But the result is what matters, and it boiled down to the conclusion that the Liberals were afraid to move to a province-wide system. They were afraid to move just as they were afraid to move on the School Grant formula which would provide full equalization. They were afraid to move on the bargaining Bill. They hoped that areas would work and tide them over the next election. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal record in education is like the story of the ostrich, their heads in the sand, avoiding the facts of life. It is a story of patchwork legislation and a story of haywire administration. It is a shame that it worked out so poorly because I believe that they had the potential to do better as I have seen them vote for major progressive legislation in education since I came into the House. But they did not, and it has fallen to the New Democratic Government to clean up the mess.

A second major flaw in area bargaining is related to the ease with which it was dominated by the central organizations of the trustees and teachers. When negotiations were conducted for each unit or district in the province, over 100 sets of talks occurred each year. Certainly the results of these talks often formed a pattern in which variation from unit to unit was small. But when over 100 sets of negotiations are in progress it becomes very difficult to control them, there are simply too

many, and physical contact breaks down. The independent thinkers had more room to move in local bargaining.

The reduction from 100 plus to only 13 sets of talks opened the door to the management of bargaining by the STF and SSTA representatives. Both organizations took advantage of the opportunity and I don't blame them for that is at least part of the reason that they exist. What I do say is directed to the Liberals: Why did you create such a dependent and helpless thing as area bargaining? You brought this creature into the world, and set it out there alone on the hillside, exposed to all sorts of forces, forces it had no way or will to resist. The areas almost fell into the lap of the provincial organizations which were ready, willing and able to take over, and that is exactly what they did.

Both organizations held provincial strategy meetings at which they mapped out plans for handling the area-by-area talks. Co-ordination was the name of the game, and these provincial planning sessions carried considerable weight back in the areas. Both STF and SSTA placed staff in the areas and on the committees, and they carried the work into the field.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want it to be thought that individual trustees and teachers who served on area committees were to blame. It may be appropriate in some cases to find fault with certain actors in the arena. But regardless of what had been involved, certain basic defects are evident. The structure itself was weak, it was exposed to manipulation. Indeed, its openness to the influence of professionals in the central organizations was even cited as an advantage by some at the time of the introduction. Those involved in introducing area bargaining were aware of this problem, they knew what it could develop into and yet they wrote the system into law. Certainly the participants at the table cannot carry the blame for this.

Some observers at that time predicted what the inadequacy of area bargaining could lead to and many more have seen it happen. Area bargaining became little more than a front — a false front — for what it was, in fact, provincial bargaining. Essentially this was the conclusion of the Toombs Committee — that group, which I think can be fairly said to have been an unbiased committee, recommended provincial bargaining directly with the SSTA and STF. What the Toombs Committee was saying was — let's make honest men out of the two organizations.

Mr. Speaker, it is the Liberal Members who must accept responsibility for the fact that area bargaining did not work. Areas were their creation. They introduced this weak and clumsy system and they must accept the consequences. The central control of area bargaining led rapidly to direct provincial bargaining. I would remind Members that the Liberals were told of this when they brought their Bill in. I have here a clipping from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of January 13, 1968. The headline reads: "Teacher Legislation said Reactionary." I should like to table this. And it goes on:

Premier Thatcher would not be heading Saskatchewan's Government today if recently proposed education legislation had been indicated during the election campaign last fall, John Egnatoff, public school trustee and former Liberal MLA said Friday.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: —

I find it difficult to believe a Liberal Government would try to enact such reactionary legislation, Mr. Egnatoff said. Mr. Egnatoff said he thought compulsory area bargaining was premature. It should have been tried on a voluntary basis first, he said.

He said compulsory area bargaining would inevitably lead to bargaining on a province-wide basis, and more centralization.

There is no mistaking this message. The Liberals knew their system was weak and their own Members told them so. Still they went ahead and eventually the voters of this province had to tell them too. And they did.

Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the need for financial integrity in a system of negotiations. By this I mean that a body which proposes to agree to spend money must have within its control the means to raise that money and also the will to do so. It is essential that a group, upon whose shoulders rests the duty of making a commitment, be able and prepared to accept the consequences of that commitment.

It has been pointed out how, over the years, provincial support took up an increasing proportion of the total costs of operating schools. No one would argue with this trend. It makes sense to spread school costs over the broad provincial tax base. The property tax is regressive, having a very poor relation to income, particularly in the case of farmers. Property simply cannot stand the burden of 100 per cent of the cost of a modern school system. In the last five years, as Members know, virtually all our farm and municipal organizations have asked that more of the costs of schools be a provincial responsibility. There can be no serious questioning that the trend to larger provincial grants is a positive trend and it will continue into the future.

In 1968 this trend was well established. Something in the neighborhood of 45 per cent of school costs were being carried by the provincial treasury. Now I was a candidate in the '67 election and there is no doubt that the Liberal Cabinet were aware of this. They had just come through that '67 election and they made considerable play on their share of school costs. The Liberals knew what this meant. They could see that the financial integrity of local bargaining in major money items was slipping away, and it took no great feat of logic to see that the same thing applied to areas. Knowing these things, why did they institute a system that was doomed before it started? While the brain told them to 'go provincial', the political pulse said, 'go area'. What happens when a negotiating system lacks financial integrity? A look at the history of the last five years shows what happens all too clearly.

Under The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, bargaining started in early fall. It is informative to compare the date at which bargaining started and the dates when agreements were signed. I don't recall any agreements signed before January or February, or March. Of course, this is no mere coincidence; there is a good reason for the pattern of settlement dates, and it relates

directly to the financial integrity of both area and local bargaining.

By and large, Mr. Speaker, the experience under area negotiation was that school boards hesitated to conduct salary agreements until the Budget Speech was made, and thereafter until the Provincial Government grant was made known. Boards hesitated to settle before they knew their grant because they felt they needed to know how much of an increase in grid and increments they could agree to without necessitating a rise in the mill rate. Quite understandably, most school boards did not want to risk having to increase local taxes.

I suggest that this development indicates a weakness in either the financial structure of education, or in the method used at arriving at settlements. If school boards and the Provincial Government were truly equal partners, and were equally willing and able to raise money, this pattern in bargaining probably would not have occurred. A truly equal system would mean that for most purposes the boards would have been able to look upon grants as 'found money'. They could have done this because an equal partner with financial integrity would have been able to raise any funds above the grant level from its own resources — not without protest, of course, but nevertheless with a measure of independence. People would have expected it, but such is not the case. In reality, added burdens on property raise a great hue and cry, for instance, a greater hue and cry than added burdens on income. The public resists more local taxation and this has a direct and serious impact on the flexibility of school boards. It means school boards must rely heavily on grants or face the wrath of their taxpayers. Anyone who has faced the wrath of the public as I have with respect to property tax knows which of the two he would prefer.

It can be seen that because of public resistance to property taxation, school boards have a somewhat limited scope in agreeing to contract settlements before they know the size of the grants.

A similar situation prevails on the teacher side of the bargaining table. Teachers also hesitated to sign contracts prior to grant time. Generally the unveiling of the grants reveals to both sides how much money they had to divide up. Teachers, of course, hesitated to put their cards on the table before the third and silent partner had shown his hand. Teachers did not want to be in a position of having assented to a settlement that was less than what could have been paid.

So the reliance on grants had a delaying effect on bargaining. But that was only the first stage of the problem.

Once the Budget Speech had been delivered and the school grant increases were known, the apportioning of the sums of individual boards became a bargaining issue itself. Teachers would point to the increase in grants and claim that its size should be reflected in the grid raises. On the other hand, trustees would say the Government has provided too little, and so the raise had to be small. What was really happening was that the Government was being criticized and in no respect did it have the power to do anything about that criticism. The two parties at the bargaining table, neither of them able to induce a settlement, passed on the problem to the third partner which

was not at the table and could not affect the situation. This had the unfortunate effect of eroding public confidence in the structure of school government, for it gave the appearance of passing the buck, of constant discord and constant bickering.

Financial integrity is essential. Without it, negotiations become a farce. In the case of area bargaining, where trustees and teachers deliberately organized their confrontation on a provincial basis, the absence of the capacity to raise funds with any degree of flexibility meant the eventual duality of the system. Central direction of bargaining tied its arms and the fight became a war of words. Area bargaining was bound hand and foot by the realities of school administration. To the extent that bargaining leverage depends on the increase to be divided up, both trustees and teachers were reduced to a war of words over someone else's money.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that this unfortunate situation cannot be blamed on either the trustee or the teacher. They did not create this structure. They do not pass the laws in this province. It is the Government that is responsible for laws and for the good working of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I lay the blame for the bargaining mess at the feet of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, at the feet of the Liberal Party who bungled their mandate and mismanaged our school system.

Now the fourth flaw in area bargaining, in my opinion, was the fatal flaw. Members will no doubt agree that no system of negotiations is going to work if the people involved do not have faith in it. The parties to the talks must agree that the method they are using is an appropriate means of settling differences. This was not the case with area bargaining. The structure did not have the confidence of those involved, and as a result, the effective negotiating was done elsewhere. Lack of faith in the capacity of area bargaining to deliver the goods is one reason there seems to be so much controversy at salary time: both parties take their cases to the public. They bargain in the news media instead of at the bargaining table. And it is only natural, for they are really spending someone else's money, and that particular someone is not sitting at the table and cannot be spoken to. Mr. Speaker, area bargaining has many other flaws. Like those I have discussed, they are inter-related.

The Liberal Party created area bargaining. It should never have been put into the Statute Books. But even worse, they imposed a six per cent guideline on negotiated settlements. The six per cent guideline was supposed to stop inflation. There is no need to mention its notorious failure in that regard. In the case of teacher bargaining, the only things the guidelines stopped were salary settlements. By clamping on an arbitrary limit, the Liberals stripped away what remained of the credibility of area bargaining. Even when the clumsy and awkward machinery did finally churn forth a contract, the Liberals quickly destroyed it with their guidelines. They cancelled contracts after both parties had agreed to them. The Provincial Treasurer of that day went around making obscure remarks about not contributing toward the cost of excessive settlements. He threatened not to pay a grant to school boards

which went beyond the six per cent ceiling, but he wouldn't tell them how to calculate that ceiling. Confusion reigned supreme.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the basic defects in design, I believe the six per cent guideline probably did more than any other single factor to doom area bargaining. And who is to blame for the guidelines? Not the trustees. Not the teachers. The people who can face the music on that one are the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Cabinet as a whole.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I would have to give credit where credit is due.

What was left of free bargaining after the six per cent guideline? Not very much. But if there were any small coals still warm in the ashes, the Liberals were determined to jump on them and stamp them out. And stamp them out they did. No sooner did they clamp on the guidelines but they nailed the system to the floor with the addition of compulsory arbitration. Members opposite talk about the misuse of power and they should recognize it, for they were pastmasters at forcing people into line.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — The Liberals didn't have the courage to take on a direct role in the talks; instead, they manipulated and controlled and forced others to do their bidding. And when they were finished, area bargaining was dead.

An Hon. Member: — And so were the Liberals.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government introduced area bargaining. They created it full of flaws and exposed it to all manner of forces. Then they proceeded to drive wedges into the cracks. The dictatorial attitude of the Liberals destroyed all traces of local independence, undermined school trustees, made scapegoats of teachers and finally drove the problem to a head at the provincial level. They focussed the bargaining question on the province. I have here a news item from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of August 21, 1970 and the headline reads:

“Steuart Holds Key to Whether City Schools to Open”.

And the story states:

Provincial Treasurer D. G. Steuart has emerged as the key figure in the struggle for a teacher contract in the Saskatoon area. On his decision rests the possibility of a teacher strike.

The story continues to describe how both teachers and trustees had ratified the contract, and states:

Now the question is whether Mr. Steuart will agree.

March 28, 1973

Boards do not want to jeopardize their positions by failing to come within Mr. Steuart's guidelines at the risk of losing their grants.

The situation is pretty clear. Mr. Steuart had his finger in the pie, maybe had his hand in the pie. I think he jumped in with both feet. He was directing the settlement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Is it any wonder that people began looking to provincial bargaining?

That same article contains a quote from trustee W. G. Manning of the Saskatoon school board and he said:

If the Government is going to tell us what we can do, that is, set the amount, then we might as well go to provincial negotiation.

He said it wouldn't worry him if that was the outcome, but he didn't expect the provincial government to agree to it and I quote:

They don't want the responsibility.

I should like to table this clipping.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal record and what came out of it. I trust that speakers from the Opposition will keep these facts in mind when they enter the debate. And I hope they will at least accept some of the responsibility for what they did when it comes time to vote.

Mr. Speaker, early in 1971 the New Democratic Party published its program for the election, the New Deal for People. It contained a specific response to the needs of education bargaining. I would refer Members to page 11, item 3, which states:

A New Democratic government will enact new legislation to replace The Teacher Salary Agreements Act which will permit free collective bargaining and remove political interference from the bargaining process.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — And this plank in our program found wide acceptance with the public. The education issue was prominent in the June 23 campaigning. Many people, and a lot of them Liberal Party supporters, felt there was a need to try to put a stop to deliberately provoked controversy over negotiations and get back to the real issues of quality and good instruction. I think this particular plank had a significant impact on the vote on June 23. I believe the people of Saskatchewan have charged the Government with a mandate to correct the problems and in fact to take action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — One of the first priorities

of our Government after we took office in July of 1971, was to review the options available in bargaining. In the early fall I called in George Slater, president of the SSTA and Larry Young, president of the STF. The purpose was to try the 'co-operative approach'; to see if careful discussion of the options could result in an agreement on how to reform the bargaining system so that it could work.

Mr. Slater, Mr. Young and I held several lengthy meetings. The discussion was exploratory, but it was very frank. I made it clear that the Government felt it necessary to make changes, and I told both men that we should like to be able to make those changes in co-operation with them and with their organizations. We had good meetings.

After the meetings with the presidents it was agreed that we should expand the discussions to include executive members from both groups and their staff people, and people from the Department. Several exhaustive meetings at this level followed, and we considered just about all the possibilities. A number of discussion papers were presented and analyzed, both formally and person-to-person. Despite this effort, however, it was slowly becoming evident that a compromise was not going to develop out of the discussion. I think neither side really took the deliberative nature of this effort seriously. Both teachers and trustees probably believed that the Government would end up by having to arbitrate a solution and they did not want to yield any ground before that decision was made. By Christmas time, after four months of discussion, the usefulness of the meetings had all but disappeared. I can tell you that it was with real regret that I called off this attempt at co-operation.

By this time we were well into the 1972 contract talks, and requests for conciliation assistance were starting to come in. In response, four conciliators were appointed to serve in six bargaining areas. My office and the Department kept a very close contact with these conciliators, discussing developments and comparing notes. We were highly impressed with the competence and the abilities of these men. The role of the conciliator is difficult, demanding keen perception of events, and a talent for getting to the bottom of the real issues. In all of these areas the performance of the conciliation men was of a high calibre.

Mr. Speaker, the attempt to develop a new act by common agreement had failed. Our next alternative was to seek the advice of an independent group qualified to make recommendations. We were impressed with the work of the conciliators. On March 27, a year ago, I constituted the four conciliators as an advisory committee with Mr. Ray Clayton of my Department as secretary. The chairman of the committee was Dr. Will Toombs of the Faculty of Education, University of Saskatchewan, here in Regina. Dr. Toombs has been a teacher, and he has been an administrator. He was director of Education for the Moose Jaw Public School Board. His reputation is well-established.

The members of the committee were Ken Norman of Saskatoon, a lawyer with extensive knowledge of labour relations. Members opposite will know him, they will recall that he served as a resource person at the 1970 convention of their Party. Another member was Derril McLeod, a Regina lawyer, a member of the University Board of Governors, and a first-class mediator. The third member was Peter Walmsley of Saskatoon, a professor of

March 28, 1973

Commerce at the University, where he teaches industrial relations. As I recall, Professor Walmsley served as a mediator when the Liberals went in office.

So I think the Toombs committee can fairly be said to be independent, competent and progressive. Their work was thorough — in fact, there were times when I began to wonder whether we would receive the report in time to bring in legislation. They put in long hours, researching how various other provinces and states handled bargaining, and comparing teacher negotiations to procedures in other jurisdictions. They did extensive work on the Federal Government's methods, including study of The Public Service Staff Relations Act. All of this study was done in light of their terms of reference. The terms asked the committee to consider bargaining between teachers and trustees, to consider at what level the bargaining should take place, what should be negotiable, means of implementation and other related matters.

The report of the committee was received on October 2 and it was released to the public on October 10. Personally I felt the report was impressive. It was rational, it was comprehensive, it was objective. It incorporated basic principles of free collective bargaining to the extent that it could, within its terms of reference. Most important maybe, was its proposal to decentralize many decisions from the Government, and put power in the hands of the trustee and teacher groups.

The basic message of the Toombs Report was that we should recognize the realities of negotiating and make honest men of the STF and the SSTA by conducting bargaining directly between the two organizations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Now the Toombs Report was released a full four months prior to the ordinary opening of the Legislature. In making it public, we asked for the reaction of trustees, of teachers and from anyone else. It was emphasized that none of the recommendations were in any way representative of government policy. Our objective was to have a good discussion and to get the views of all concerned before legislation was drafted.

Reaction came from the Teachers Federation. They expressed concern about the Teacher Relations Board, the personnel on the board, the powers of the board. They expressed concern that no government participation had been proposed. Their view of the Toombs system was that it simply moved from 13 areas to one area, without dealing with the question of financial integrity.

Reaction came from The Trustees Association. Their organization had supported retention of the area system and they rejected provincial bargaining. Most significant in their reaction was the criticism of the powers of the Teacher Relations Board. Trustees felt that the Board would take over many of their powers and it would centralize control within itself.

Mr. Speaker, the nature of the response from the trustees was such that I felt a need to discuss the question with individual school board members on a wide basis. During December and January I travelled out to meet fiscal boards in

their offices. Individual boards, boards in groups. I suppose I saw some 50 boards during that period. I met with boards in all parts of the province and we discussed various aspects of the Toombs proposal.

These meetings with school boards were very worthwhile. They revealed a diversity of opinions among trustees. Some were prepared to accept provincial bargaining, though these were a minority. Others wanted changes in area bargaining and some favored a return to negotiations at the board level. But all were concerned that program and content not be on the bargaining table.

As the Session approached, opposition to the Toombs proposal became bitter and pronounced. What it boiled down to was that neither of the parties who would be at the bargaining table could agree who should be at it, nor could they agree that the items for negotiation should be negotiable. Obviously the system would not work if those concerned objected to it as they did. Shortly put, we had reached an impasse on the Toombs proposal.

At about this time a number of school boards contacted me to suggest that if further discussion could be arranged, there might be the possibility of an agreement. In light of the impasse, this made some sense. In any case, from the Government point of view, the discussion could be worthwhile in regard to giving us some way of gauging the strength of feeling on various issues.

On January 31 I called together the presidents and the secretaries of the SSTA and the STF. The first meeting was not overly enthusiastic; however, we did get consent to meet again, this time with executive members in attendance. The larger meetings were more productive. At the suggestion of trustees, I put forward a proposal for a new bargaining act. This proposal represented an effort to meet some of the major objections of both groups to the Toombs Report.

In response to requests from the trustees, the powers of the Teacher Relations Board were limited. By way of a concession to the teachers, government involvement at the provincial level was included. A total of five meetings were held in February to consider the amendments. I can assure Members that we combed through the proposal in fine detail, and we labored over many small points at great length. This work brought out some areas of agreement, e.g. both sides consented to the modified Teacher Relations Board idea. In short, while no agreement was reached on the large question, we were able to defuse the controversy over some of the side issues.

Mr. Speaker, the February meetings represented the fourth attempt in 18 months to draw trustees and teachers together on bargaining. We had met in the fall of 1971. The Toombs Committee met both sides and tried to put forward a workable package. After that I met with trustees and teachers personally, and finally we met in February. Still there was no sign on the major issues of a willingness to concede and co-operate. In this situation the Government felt that it must act, recognizing that the responsibility for legislation is ours alone. We have tried to call the shots as we see them, with the best interests of education at heart, with every regard to the strengths of the opinions expressed by others.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 28, 1973

Mr. MacMurchy: — I should like to turn to the operation of the system of bargaining being proposed in this Bill.

First of all, I do not expect that The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act will make everyone happy. The purpose of it is not to give delight to trustee, nor pleasure to the teacher; its purpose is to set up a bargaining system that will work.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — We have designed the Bill with this goal foremost. We anticipate that some amendments may be needed to iron out bugs that show up and we will be ready to make the changes at this or subsequent sessions of the Legislature if that is necessary. But let me make one thing clear; those who want changes will have to propose them in terms of workability and in terms of improving the way the system functions. Changes designed merely to preserve or consolidate power structure will not be allowed to hamstring the good operation of bargaining under this Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The basic principle of The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act is new to educational relations. Bi-level bargaining recognizes that education is a partnership in which duties are shared between the provincial government and school boards. It permits free collective bargaining by giving access to the decision-makers at the levels that they make decisions. It is designed to facilitate, rather than to impede discussion of real issues. After all, what is the purpose of a negotiating system if not to supply a vehicle for resolving problems? A workable bargaining structure, therefore, must put the decision-makers into the process.

The bi-level structure proposed in this Bill provides for a negotiating pattern which will reflect the actual decision-making pattern of education administration in this province. To that extent we believe it should work and work reasonably well. However, let me point out that no one can predict how the pattern of school government may alter in the next few years. Changes can be expected. As they develop and as they affect bargaining there will no doubt have to be amendments and maybe even overhauls of the system specified in this Bill. It is not a be-all and end-all and we should realize that when we are debating it.

Mr. Speaker, I will be surprised if this Act is not criticized as some sort of attempt to erode the powers of school boards. And let us not be coy about it, this legislation does involve a realignment of responsibilities. It moves the location of bargaining from the area level to the board level and to the provincial level. It provides for government participation and for direct participation by both the trustees organization and the teachers' federation. Some will call these developments an erosion of autonomy, and I want to deal with that issue.

Members of this House realize, of course, that it is never possible to predict safely just what position the Hon.

Member for Milestone will adopt. Just the same, I predict he will stand on his feet and say that this Bill takes away some autonomy from school boards. Now I don't know how to convince him that this would be an incorrect assertion, but let me quote from one source whose authority he may respect. I quote from page 2431 of the Debates and Proceedings of the 1968 session:

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

Mr. Speaker, that statement was made by the former Minister of Education, the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac). I trust the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) will pay him some heed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Let me quote another authority with respect to the local autonomy of school boards. I quote from page 2408 of the 1968 Debates and Proceedings:

In most cases there is not individual bargaining. It is a question of accepting the settlement of the highest unit in the province and making that a model. It is neither competitive bargaining nor is it responsible bargaining. And, Mr. Speaker, you only have to look at the settlements of the past year and see all the school units of the Province of Saskatchewan regardless of class after class are within \$100 or \$200 of one another.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the former Welfare Minister, the Member for Milestone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — This is what he told the House in 1968 about local bargaining. His remarks apply equally to area bargaining in 1973, and no doubt he will reflect on this when he speaks on this Bill.

The point of this discussion is that what might seem to be a loss of local authority is really nothing more than a recognition that local authority has already left. The former Minister from Wilkie told this Assembly in 1968 that local bargaining was centrally directed, and I tell you today that

if it happened in 1968, in 1973 under the area system the effect was doubly confirmed. What we are changing is not a real thing, it is only the appearance of it. The effective power in contract decision is exercised provincially by the STF and the SSTA and by the Government. To provide for these groups to bargain directly is not to impinge on local rights, this Bill merely accepts the facts of life and tries to make the best of them in the over-all interests of our educational system.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — At the provincial level, bargaining will be conducted by a team representing the public and a team representing teachers. The Government will appoint five of the nine public negotiators, the SSTA will appoint four. The STF will appoint four negotiators to represent teachers.

The composition of the provincial bargaining teams reflects the extent of the various groups' involvement at the level.

It may be asked why the public team has nine members and the teacher team has only four. This composition was put forward at the request of some trustees and other members of the public. It will not affect the conduct of bargaining at the table, because either team as the legislation proposes may choose to be represented by a negotiator or negotiators who is not a member of the team.

In the event that either the teachers or trustees refuse to appoint negotiators to represent them, the Cabinet will have the power to make the selection for them. We feel that if The Bargaining Act is unacceptable to some people, those who feel that way should use normal democratic methods to change it. In the meantime the system has to handle the job assigned to it, and obstruction tactics should not be allowed to prevent it from doing so.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — One very important aspect of bi-level bargaining is the scope of negotiations. Provincially this includes salary and the salary grid, principals' and vice-principals' allowances, superannuation, group life insurance and incidentals related to these. As well, new items may be negotiated if both bargaining teams agree to put them on the table. Some items of this nature might be grievance procedures, tenure, dismissal, or method of payment. This is in accord with the express desire of the STF to be allowed, within reasonable limits, to negotiate as to what should be on the bargaining table.

I want to emphasize the intention of the new Bill in the area of scope. In this Bill we are proposing to bargain with regard to salary and major working conditions. That means negotiations would include the pay for a teacher's services, the terms under which a teacher is employed to perform services. It would not include the nature of the work to be performed, or who might be hired to do it, or how he might do it. It is the clear intention of this legislation to prevent bargaining of what is taught, how it is taught, and who is to teach it. This intention is laid out very clearly in identical clauses of the Act, Section 4 (4) and Section 9 (3).

The new Act specified that the term of the provincial contract shall be two years. We have written this into the statute because we want to avoid the hassle of contract negotiation every year. With more items in-scope and up for discussion, the process may take some time and a yearly period may not be advisable or adequate. One of the aims is to reduce the level of public controversy each time a contract is opened, and I think this will help. It may be argued that economic conditions cannot be foreseen two years in advance, but I really do not believe this fact is as significant as it might appear, as the margin we will be working with don't vary that much in any given year. I suppose if we lived in Argentina or some other country, with high inflation, the contract term would be a major question. Fortunately, not in Canada.

A fourth important feature of the Teacher Collective Bargaining Act is the two-route alternative for negotiation. We lifted this concept out of the Toombs Report and I believe the Toombs Committee took their cue in this matter from the Federal Government's Public Service Staff Relations Act.

Under the first route, either bargaining team may request arbitration of a dispute and arbitration shall be imposed, and the decision of the arbitration board shall be final and binding regardless of the wishes of the other bargaining team.

Under the second route, either bargaining committee may request the services of a conciliation board. The chairman of the Educational Relations Board may set up such a board if he deems that it would actually assist in the process at the table.

It is also possible, under Section 24, for the chairman to establish conciliation if he believes that it would be both useful and necessary.

Under the second, or free bargaining route, the use of arbitration would also be possible. The difference is that while under route number one, arbitration is imposed on request of only one side, under route number two, both sides would have to agree to it.

Because free collective bargaining is a right whose loss weighs more heavily on the employee than on employers, the choice as to which route would be followed would be up to the teachers. They would be obligated to advise of their choices prior to start of negotiations and in any case no later than September 14th.

I should like to point out specifically, a part of the Act that might otherwise be overlooked — the last half of Section 18. This part deals with the scope of the arbitration boards and it excludes from arbitration any item to which both committees have not given consent to negotiate.

This is a very important clause. It prevents either side from using the arbitration procedure to have new items placed on the bargaining table without agreement. I believe this is a vital section of the Act, especially in a sensitive field such as education. It will protect both the public interest and the integrity of the powers assigned to the bargaining committees.

Another major section of this Act deals with the Educational Relations Board. The Board will perform a referee function

in setting up impartial and competent mediation, conciliation and arbitration services. Members will note that it does not have any of the powers that prompted the old Teacher Relations Board out of the Toombs Report to be so condemned.

The Educational Relations Board is composed of five members, two nominated by the STF and two nominated by the SSTA. The fifth member is the chairman. He may be chosen by agreement, or by the Chief Justice, failing agreement. These people will serve to decentralize the appointment of professionals whose decisions influence or prescribe settlements by taking on this function previously performed by the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to Members' attention one final aspect of this Bill, contained in part 2 of Section 8. Section 8 outlines the scope of local negotiations. As in the case of the provincial level talks, a clause provides that the parties may put on the table any item which both agree to negotiate. Subsection (2) invests the local level negotiations with power to override the provincial agreement in the case of any new item put into a local agreement. This doesn't mean that provincial items may be rehashed locally, but it does provide that for new items agreed to at that level, the decision of the local bargainers shall have precedence. I consider this a fairly significant clause insofar as it will help to ensure a measure of flexibility in responding to unique local situations.

Before concluding my remarks I should like to thank publicly the members of the Toombs Committee, whose solid research and insight laid the foundation on which much of this proposed new system is built. Public recognition should also be accorded to Lyle Bergstron, my deputy; Dr. Lawrence Ready and Ray Clayton of the department, whose input and hard work has been invaluable in shaping this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this Act offers a challenge to the Liberals opposite. They may choose to try to defend their legislation by casting the blame for its inadequacies elsewhere, or they may own up to the mess created by their Act and by their crude and inept handling of it. The Liberals may show themselves to be a party of the past, unable to accept the realities of how things are, or they may show themselves to be a Party that is able to admit mistakes and concede that area bargaining did not work. But let there be no doubt that the advent of this Teacher Collective Bargaining Bill is tied directly to the spectacular failures of the last five years, and to the dissatisfaction and the controversy of that period. The vote on this Bill will test the credibility of the Opposition. I suggest to the Opposition that your stand will be with you for several years to come.

Mr. Speaker, The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act is landmark legislation. It introduces, in Saskatchewan, a system of educational relationships that are unique. It is another first for this province
...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — . . . that will help to restore us to the leadership position abdicated under the rule of the Liberals.

I believe the principle of bi-level bargaining will prove to be superior to any other method now in use in this country. It offers flexibility not available under local, area or one-level provincial setups. It provides a role for all parties to the education enterprise, roles devised not out of sentimentality, but out of regard for the realities and the facts of life. Bi-level negotiations, the two route alternative. The Educational Relations Board is new exciting unique educational negotiations legislation. It will bring Saskatchewan to leadership. It will, along with the Community Colleges Act, bring Saskatchewan to the forefront in education innovation.

I commend this Bill to this House. I am please, I am thrilled, I am proud, to move that Bill No. 80 be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald: — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, I think I have just a few comments on this Bill.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Minister of Education was back in the town of Semans, giving a political speech. Never in the history of this House have I heard a man stand on this feet for one hour and make excuses for introducing a Bill, and apologize for the makeup of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, he was far more concerned about politics and the possibility of retaining or gaining a few votes, than talking about Bill No. 80. He spent 95 per cent of his time criticizing my colleague the Member for Wilkie, the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government. I want to tell the Minister that there are parents, teachers, trustees and ratepayers in the Province of Saskatchewan who are interested in this Bill. Mr. Speaker, he never talked about the Bill until the last five minutes. I think there is a reason, Mr. Speaker, I think he was ashamed of the Bill. I think he knows the weaknesses of this Bill far more than he wants to admit. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we could come into this House and have an intelligent debate on the merits or demerits of this Bill. The Minister started off his remarks, "We are going to clean up the mess." Mr. Speaker, those kinds of political accusations are the exact reason that the Minister of Education is in trouble today in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Let me reply to a few of his comments before I talk about the Bill. He started off and said you know those salary negotiations, those salary guidelines, those six per cent guidelines, did more to destroy and interfere in collective bargaining. I should like to suggest that he examine his own conscience. I listened to him last year stand here and get on the radio and say we have got seven per cent for teachers' salaries. I read a letter and I will table it tomorrow in the House from the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) distributed to all the teachers in Saskatoon, saying "don't be satisfied with less than 7 per cent, because that is what the Government has got." Mr. Speaker, I say that Mr. MacMurchy had his hands in the pie; Mr. MacMurchy had his feet in the pie; and Mr. MacMurchy has got his face in the pie!

Mr. Speaker, he went on to talk about the length of

negotiations under area bargaining. I want to tell him that the length of negotiation has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of any settlement. Let's look at the Province of Quebec, they have provincial bargaining with the Government of Quebec. On one occasion it took more than two years with strikes, bitterness and frustration. Another comment, the Minister stands on his feet and talks about the great competence of the Toombs Report. If there is anything significant about Bill No. 80 it is that he has completely ignored the recommendations of Mr. Toombs and his Committee. All down the line. Then he got up and said, "You know, the professionals who participated in bargaining under the area system." He said that they created and generated most of the trouble. What does subsection (6) of Section 4 mean in this Act? It states that either bargaining team can provide professionals or anyone they like to do their bargaining. Mr. Speaker, he suggested the he hoped that the Liberals and that the people of the Liberal Party wouldn't hang the mill-stone of the Member for Milestone's remarks about local autonomy. Let me tell the Minister of Education, I make no apology for standing up for local autonomy or local control in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, he is the man who talked about the inadequacy of area bargaining. Well if there is any Member in this Assembly or any individual in the Province of Saskatchewan who should be an authority on it, it should be the Member for Last Mountain. When he was a trustee, he was the first man to refuse to accept the recommendations of the new Act that was going to be implemented at that time in that period. It is now ironic that he is the very man, Mr. Speaker, who has come into this House and introduced a Bill that will do far more to damage relationships in the field of education than ever area bargaining did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of the House and you, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to defend area bargaining. My position on area bargaining is very clear, I have made it in this House on many occasions. I believe in it and I always have. The reason I believe in it is because I believe it brought uniformity to salaries and fringe benefits between rural and urban and between various units. I also believe it minimized confrontation; I believe it at the same time gave representation to both trustees and teachers on all bargaining committees. Mr. Speaker, area bargaining is dead because this particular party across the way made a political issue of it in the last election campaign. I say now it is their responsibility to bring in a new Act. I am not here to defend area bargaining nor will my remarks be based on area bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, my initial reaction to this Bill is that it is a time bomb; Mr. Speaker, a time bomb, ready to explode with a multitude of parties, a multitude of circumstances and a multitude of occasions. The Minister of Education labored like an elephant, for an 18-month gestation period and all he could bring forth was an abortion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This Bill will generate suspicion, mistrust, confrontation, hostility between trustees and government;

government and teachers; trustees and teachers in the provision of educational services in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it will do nothing but breed conflict. It offers not a solution to existing problems in teachers' salaries negotiations but offers the potential danger of generating new and complex areas of increased conflict. It was the promise of this Government to solve the problems related to trustee-teacher relationships. If this Bill is their answer, it is an abject failure. Teachers, parents, trustees, ratepayers all held high hopes that this Bill would bring peace and common sense to salary negotiations in Saskatchewan. For the past few . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — say that . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — We'll give you an opportunity, Mr. Member for Nutana South. In fact we'll be looking forward to hearing what you have to say, you sit in the back seat and yak like a chicken with your head off. Wait for your turn.

For the past few years too much emphasis has been placed on salaries and on monetary issues. Education has often taken a second place in publicity concerning our education system. Both teachers and trustees want to concentrate on the business of bringing education to our children. This Bill does the opposite, it increases conflict. Surely the first purpose for any machinery for collective bargaining should have as its objective the reduction of the opportunity for friction and conflict. It should strive to concentrate on the responsibilities to negotiate in the hands of one group representing each side. It should permit differences to be settled by those who have the responsibility to represent those sides in the negotiation process. This Bill does the opposite.

First it brings in an intruder from the outside to sit at the table with the two responsible parties; secondly, it gives the intruder the power to make decisions for one side and even gives him a larger representation than either side; thirdly, it leaves a portion to be decided at a table distinct from the first. Let me outline a few of the possibilities of conflict.

First, at the provincial level. Trustees and government could enter into a dispute over principal's allowance. Second, on the same day, teachers and government could dispute the level of superannuation allowance. Third, on the same day at the same level teachers and trustees could dispute salary grid, then at the second level on the same day teachers and trustees could dispute special allowances for teachers in 100 different negotiations. Then the absurd possibility of a strike of one month or two weeks or three weeks duration at the local level. Then the next day, following the settlement of that dispute or that strike at the local level, a strike at the provincial level of another two or three weeks. Then who would the strike at the provincial level be against? The dispute could be with the government but the government is not the employer. By law the school board hires, fires and has all other powers related to the responsibility of employment.

Let me take the absurd situation of teachers striking against trustees . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . Yes, this is how absurd it is.

Teachers striking against trustees, who are their employers, who in fact may agree with the teachers. The only cause of the dispute is that they are outvoted by the government majority. The trustees could agree with the teachers, but there is a strike because the government outvotes the trustees. Mr. Speaker, never have I seen a salary negotiation where there is a Bill that has such potential for conflict and discord. I do not believe the Government should be a party to negotiations between teachers and trustees. I will tell you one thing, I would have a lot more respect for the Minister of Education and that Government if they had had at least the courage to go down one road or the other road so that the eventual result would at least make common sense.

What about the second area of difference in this Bill. It is political interference. The second aspect of this Bill that is of real concern is the Minister's complete failure to heed the basic recommendation of the Toombs' Report, his own Commission. The major thrust of the Toombs' Report was that it was essential to de-politicize the negotiation process. The Minister has ignored this completely and has done the opposite. He has thrust politics right smack in the middle of the negotiation table by intruding in the bargaining process. Power politics will be the order of the day. This Government has a lust for power that is unheard of in any other government in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The thrust of every Bill, every action since they have become the Government is to concentrate more power in their hands. Ask the hog producer, ask the university, ask the oil industry, the timber industry, the small businessman; they have intruded by the force of their majority into every aspect of our economic and social life. They have no faith in the ability, the integrity or the sincerity of any group. They are the Messiah, they know best. They have disregarded the rights and privileges of individuals and groups to achieve this goal. We object to this bare-faced seizure of power. The next step is greater and greater control at the university and yes, at the elementary and secondary level of education.

Teachers should ask themselves many questions: Will salary settlements be determined at Treasury Board or at the negotiation table? What impact will government fiscal policy have on negotiations? What pressures can the Government exert to force settlements? What will be included in the overall package? What does an election mean to negotiations? The history of provincial negotiations in other provinces has not been to the benefit of the teaching profession nor has that road to settlement been a smooth one. Why will Saskatchewan be any different?

I want to talk a little bit about local control over education. Perhaps the most serious implication of this Bill is the impact on local control and parental rights over education. The Toombs' Report states that local government in education is an essential and critical aspect of the education process in Saskatchewan. Surely I do not have to repeat the arguments concerning parental rights and local control. Parents to have a right to determine the education of their children,

they express this right in the election of trustees as their representatives to run their schools. The Minister of Education says this Bill will not erode local autonomy. I challenge that statement. Let the Minister point out one small single clause in this Bill where the school boards have been granted one speck more of authority or responsibility that they did not have before this Bill was passed. Let me tell him it is very, very easy to find out where this Bill takes away a large portion of their responsibility. It removes their responsibility to spend 65-70 per cent of their budget. The whole concept of democratic responsibility is tied to power to manage and control the fiscal matters under their jurisdiction.

What is his excuse? The Government provides 53 per cent of the funds compared to 47 per cent of the local government. I challenge that figure. The Federal Government has just given \$26.4 million, specifically assigned it to education in the Province of Saskatchewan for property taxes. The Minister has refused to indicate that he is going to pass this on to the local taxpayers. This \$26.4 million is more than 25 per cent of the total for school grants. Now the money comes first from the local ratepayers, next it comes from the Provincial Government and third from the Federal Government. Local taxpayers contribute by far the largest portion of local school costs. What he forgets to tell us is that taxes come from one source, the taxpayer in the Province of Saskatchewan, regardless of where they go and that people know that they go to pay for education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to Bill No. 80 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . the specific clauses of Bill No. 80 — first let me say it is a legislative monstrosity! It hits both teacher and trustee alike. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as a teacher I am convinced it is equally restrictive to the teaching profession as it is to the trustees. In an effort to appease first the trustees, second the teachers, he has satisfied neither. Instead he has created problems which will haunt both sides in the years ahead. This Bill appears first to appease one side, then the other and has focused on areas of conflict that will continue to be a source of friction for years to come.

Let me point out specific examples in the Bill. Section 3 — let me turn to this section of the Bill. It is the most insidious clause in the Bill and it deals with the makeup of the provincial negotiating teams.

First, the bargaining committee for the teachers will be made up of four members appointed by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. What right has the Minister to say that it will be four or forty. It is a camouflage to give the impression of equality to the number of trustees. Second, the Government committee, and I repeat, the Government committee, is made up of five government appointees and four trustees appointed by the Saskatchewan Trustees' Association. The Government has complete dictatorial power over this committee by virtue of their majority and no one can deny it. The trustees are given the semblance of power without any, if there is an area of conflict. They are in reality observers at the table.

March 28, 1973

The Minister of Education has stripped the school boards of any right to negotiate the salaries of teachers they employ.

Subsection (4) is more heinous than that! In order to impose his will on the trustees he has given himself the power to appoint the trustees if the STA fails to do so. He will appoint four stooges who do not represent anyone but himself. But even more heinous is the fact that if the teachers fail to appoint four members to the board he has the power to appoint their four representatives. Can anyone imagine Gordon MacMurchy negotiating with himself to establish teachers' salaries in Saskatchewan? Let me point out that that is not a joke. Conflicts will arise with this Government and perhaps with the next government. If the Government fails to negotiate in good faith in any one year the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation could fail to appear at the negotiation table in protest. Mr. MacMurchy has solved this problem by negotiating with himself.

What Minister has the right to give himself this power then have the audacity to call it free collective bargaining.

Section 4 and 8, these two sections allocate those items that will be bargained at the provincial and local level. Let me say that these items are not the items that should be negotiated at either one of those levels in most cases. Section 4 indicates the superannuation of teachers and group life insurance for teachers will be negotiated at the provincial level. I have no complaint with this. Superannuation and insurance are not board matters and if they want to negotiate them with the teachers, all well and good. They are presently covered by statute and discussion must be held with the Government to bring about changes.

But sick leave for teachers is a good example of a subject that is causing teachers real concern and that has little to do with school boards. Sick leave and most welfare benefits are included in a variety of jurisdictions and programs. Canada Pension, Unemployment Insurance, Superannuation Benefits at the Provincial level, long-term salary continuance, accumulated sick leave, are all part and parcel of the major overall problems of sick leave. They are the responsibility of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and local school boards. It is a hodge-podge of benefits and if there is going to be any rationality brought to that program it should be developed at the provincial level. Let the Government negotiate these matters with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation if it wants, but leave salaries to the school boards where they belong.

Subsection (4) of Section 4, the major area of disagreement with teachers with area bargaining was in the scope of negotiation. Teachers from every area complained that the scope of bargaining was restricted. I say that this Bill is even more restrictive and in no way broadens the scope of bargaining at the local level and it is also defined at the provincial level and is more restrictive than it ever was in the area bargaining agreement. Subsection (4) of Section 4 states and I quote:

No collective bargaining agreement shall contain terms regulating the selection of teachers, allocation of duties to teachers or quality of an instructional program.

The only item to be negotiated in this agreement that was not possible in area bargaining is salaries for substitute teachers, which has never been a major source of contention. It is true that Section B of subsection (3) indicates mutual agreement and provides for negotiations on other matters, but this has always been possible. Many local agreements existed under the area agreement, which were negotiated by mutual consent.

The city of Saskatoon is a good example, where not only within the same district but in different schools they had many different agreements. But this Bill does not legislate the right of teachers to broaden the scope of negotiation. It restricts it.

Section 5, the term of collective agreement is set forth by law in this section. Much can be said for two or three year agreements. Teachers have always maintained that this should be negotiated and not dictated by the government.

The Government does not even have more than one year negotiation agreements for the employees that they hire. (m) of Section 2 — the definition of a teacher includes everyone related to development, supervisor or administration of the instructional programs of the school.

This clause will automatically put in scope many people now excluded from the salary agreement. This will disturb trustees, just as other clauses will disturb the teachers. Trustees feel that many personnel now outside the scope of bargaining legitimately should not be classed as teachers. However, what bothers them the most is that these people will be placed in the scope of agreement whether they like it or not and this will be a major bone of contention with the trustees.

Section 11, the establishment of the Educational Relations Board is the biggest farce in the entire Bill. I have never agreed with the absolute powers assigned to the Teachers Relations Board in the Toombs' Report. However, there could have been a useful function for such a Board with reduced powers if they were restricted from making decisions of major substance.

This Board has absolutely no decision-making power itself at all. The only function is to initiate mediation, conciliation and arbitration which formerly belonged to the Minister. In fact, in most cases, it is not even the Board that initiates these procedures, it is the chairman himself as in Section 23 and 24.

The Minister has grasped all the power for himself and the Government, except where it might be politically unpopular to make decisions that have no influence on their overall policy, but might subject himself to personal criticism. He has established a bureaucracy that will cost the taxpayers thousands of dollars and could contribute nothing except to save his own face.

I suggest that he accept his own responsibilities and not pass the buck to anyone else.

Sections 13 to 21 and 22 to 31, the procedures established

March 28, 1973

in mediation, conciliation and arbitration are the major areas where I agree with the Bill. Certainly, it makes sense for the parties in negotiating to determine before the heat of battle the route that they will take, conciliation or arbitration.

It is also important that the steps or procedures be clearly outlined in following the route. The Bill does provide these alternatives and it does establish these procedures.

Section 35 — the Teacher Classification Board that has been established in legislation, is another basis of contention for the teachers in this Act. Teachers have always felt that where they were paid according to classification and that classification should be negotiable. Trustees have disagreed but this problem has in no way been resolved in this Bill. It will continue to be a bone of contention. These and other clauses in this Bill will not reduce conflict but sharply expand the areas of disagreements.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been one single area of conflict between the two parties that has found a solution in this Bill. Not one!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The areas remain, there is no compromise by either party. The Minister has absolutely failed in any negotiation between the parties. He has failed to negotiate any solution to the problems of teacher salary negotiations in Saskatchewan.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to say it was by his arrogant attitude, when he entered into the Trustees' convention and said, "Provincial bargaining is in the books, before consultation." He made a decision that affects teachers, trustees and parents in Saskatchewan without consultation. He has generated so much hostility between the SSTA and this Government that no agreement was possible. He built an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust, not between teachers and trustees, but the trustees and himself, that compromise was impossible.

This Bill is the result of this mistrust. It is a bad Bill and needs dramatic change if it is going to serve the interests of education in Saskatchewan.

I predict that in the weeks and months ahead an atmosphere of bitterness and frustration by trustees in every corner of the province and resentment by many teachers in many parts of the Province of Saskatchewan. I predict that the attitude of dedication and service of the trustees will be seriously impaired by this Bill. I predict that in years ahead major confrontation by the teachers, by Government and by the trustees, all parties within this Bill. I predict that parents will resent the intrusion of the NDP in the management of their schools.

I want to make it perfectly clear to the Minister of Education and I want to repeat, I am not here to defend area bargaining and as far as I am concerned I don't want to talk about it. However, that area bargaining is the past. The NDP Government has dedicated itself to its removal and it is their responsibility. All I want, and all the Liberal Party

wants, is that a new Act will accomplish two things — the removal for once and all of teacher salary negotiations from the political arena. 2. An Act that will be accepted by both teachers and trustees. No Act can satisfy the total aspirations of both, but I believe that a compromise can be workable if the Government stays out.

This Act is neither, Mr. Speaker. This has been made a political issue during the last campaign and I want to read again — or I won't bother reading it as the Minister read it — the Section in the NDP platform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, carry out that responsibility and bring some common sense to teacher salary negotiations. I hope that the Minister will sit down with both groups to listen to their recommendations now that they have seen this Bill. He indicated that he will be willing to listen to amendments. I hope he is sincere.

We will support efforts to make this Bill workable. Many amendments can be made that are not controversial. For example, the number of teachers on the negotiating team, the starting date for negotiations. I feel that even though area bargaining had its September 1st, both teachers and trustees would much prefer at a later date, in order for the school year to get organized, the date that the contract begins.

These and other amendments can help the Bill become more acceptable and be non-controversial to any one. But other major changes are needed and we will not support this Bill unless they are forthcoming. I should also suggest to the Minister that he ask trustees and he ask teachers if they are willing to sit down together, now that they have seen the Bill, and see if they can come up with a workable solution. I give him our assurance that this side of the House will delay the work of the committee on this Bill as long as that committee, or he is willing to meet with trustees and teachers to try and work out an acceptable solution.

Mr. Speaker, I have only taken a few minutes today. I have a great deal more to say and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

WELCOME TO 4H MEMBERS

Mr. Wiebe: — (Morse) Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be permitted the privilege of interrupting the proceedings this afternoon to introduce some 4H Members from my constituency.

They are situated in the east gallery and they are accompanied by their 4H Leader, Mrs. Isobel Curry. I am sorry that they were unable to obtain their seats at 3:30, when the schedule was first allotted to them, but I am sure they will understand the importance of the address which was given by the education critic this afternoon, that the teachers and trustees, of course, were quite interested in listening to it.

I should like to welcome them here this afternoon and do

March 28, 1973

hope that they do have an enjoyable afternoon watching democracy in progress. I am sure that the 4H Members whom we have in the gallery today will some day be the future leaders of the Morse community and in turn, the Province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972 be now read a second time.

Mr. H. E. Coupland: — (Meadow Lake) Mr. Speaker, just to conclude my remarks on this Bill, which to my way of thinking is a vicious Bill to bring into this House.

I am wondering about Section 4 where it says, 'to require any or all persons who are engaged in the production or marketing of any regulated products to register with the Commission.' I see that by this the small farmer who has probably three or four hogs mainly for his own use and so on, is going to have to register with the Commission. Then you get down a little further in this Bill, and this same farmer will have to buy a licence. This could not necessarily refer to farmers with hogs. I kind of think of market produce, say, where a Commission has set one up for vegetables. Then I can see the day when we all would have to get a permit to grow a bit of a garden or raise a few potatoes. Can you see yourself going in to get a licence before you can grow a garden?

Then to make it worse you go back to Section 31 (b) where in the prosecution for failure to obtain a licence or to pay these penalties or charges, the onus of proving that a licence was not required, is on the person who raised a few hogs or grew a garden and so on.

I don't know who they had to sit down and draft this Bill, but I think it is a very vicious piece of legislation. The Members opposite should be willing to move amendments to this Act, to allow the producers a democratic vote, for or against the board, and to allow those producers to have the right to sit on those boards and to regulate them insofar as the production and the sale of their product is concerned. Especially section 31 (b) should be removed, which is the reverse onus clause and should never be allowed to happen in a free democratic society.

If they are not prepared to do this, Mr. Speaker, then we will certainly be voting against this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feduniak: — (Turtleford) Mr. Speaker, I have some goodies for you.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Regina since the 20th of January last, and during this period I have not attended a movie. You may ask me why. Mr. Speaker, I have seen enough acting

and entertainment from across the floor here every day. This afternoon I notice that they are going to continue. It appears that we are going to witness a Christmas scene. I noticed that Santa Claus came in with a large bag filled with a lot of goodies, but the goodies are not for the good girls and boys, they are to be given to a giant business, who control and monopolize our livestock industry from outside our province, predominantly from the south. I notice that they took the bag back. I wonder if there was a little hog in it?

Mr. Speaker, after watching the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) perform last Thursday, I too, decided to say a few words about the Hog Marketing Commission. The Leader of the Opposition said that this was the worst Bill introduced in this Session, and in this House.

He stood up and snorted and stamped and pawed like a lunatic, criticizing everybody, including the news media. He doesn't believe the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix that the farmers endorsed the proposed Bill on the Hog Marketing Commission. The Members across the way do not know the difference between a board and a commission.

Mr. Speaker, he displayed a few stubs out of the wastepaper basket and he said that he received 800. If the truth were known I doubt if he had 80 in total and this would be the total number all the Members on his side got. Why didn't he save the envelopes to prove whom they were directed to? He was scared to table them because he thinks that it would not be in the public interest, just like the rest of his loose information.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are so concerned about the hog producers' freedom, where was the freedom of all of the citizens of our province when they gerrymandered our constituency boundaries? They forgot about democracy. Instead they engaged a couple of weasels who used a cheap, sneaky, dirty, cowardly, dictatorial, unscrupulous method to deny the people the freedom of choice.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is worried because he says that if this Bill is brought in by the Government it will defeat the Government in the next election. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he really believes this, he would be wise not to stop this Bill. He does not believe it and he very well knows that it is a good Bill. If he could destroy it, the hog producers could end up with 18 cents a pound for their hogs again as they did two years ago under the Liberal administration without any orderly marketing control and without any government concern of that date. Mr. Speaker, if this same condition repeated itself which could very well be without the assistance of the Hog Marketing Commission, the producers would no doubt tend to vote against the Government because he did not act to prevent this situation to happen again.

Mr. Lane: — . . . you are . . .

Mr. Feduniak: — You wait your turn there you. You just can't wait. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are not fooling the producers, they are

March 28, 1973

not fooling the Government Members and they are not fooling our business people in our province. The only ones they are fooling are themselves in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members opposite of the sad and pathetic situation they created when they influenced the hog producers to enter into large hog operations by building large hog barns and equipment and when the prices dropped to 18 cents a pound, the low return for hogs was far below the cost of production. With this kind of a situation it was impossible to make any payments on the large loans and as a result a great number of farmers and hog producers went under and in many cases lost their entire life savings. In the meantime the Liberals stood by and did nothing to correct this condition or assist in any way. Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) were big enough I would remind him of the big bad wolf which destroyed the two little pigs' houses by huffing and puffing. This he did during the years 1969 and on into 1971. Now, Mr. Speaker, 1973 he is huffing and puffing again, raging and trying to destroy the third little pig's house, the Hog Marketing Commission. But he is not going to destroy this house. He would very much like to come down the chimney but he knows that if he did he would end up in a tub of boiling water.

Mr. Speaker, the Hog Marketing Commission is designed to bring a sincere, honest and orderly production and marketing of hogs and to bring the highest returns to the producers. Mr. Speaker, this Bill would provide relatively the same results as the Wheat Board. We very well know the effects of the Wheat Board whereby every producer gets a fair and equal share of the price available for his product.

I would like to remind the Members on the opposite of the so-called free-enterprise marketing under which the producers of rape are subject to. Under this system a producer who may be just starting, or a small operator who has no choice where to sell his rape or when to sell it, he has to sell it because he is forced to sell it in order to clothe and feed his family, to pay his taxes or make payments on his land or machinery. Basing this producer's experience on last fall's prices, he had to sell his rape for \$1.60 a bushel. The privileged few who happened to be large operators, held their rape over until February and early March, 1973 and got from \$3.80 to \$4.00 a bushel for the same grain or more than twice as much. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this kind of marketing could be called 'orderly' or in any way just. I can apply this type of marketing to many more agricultural products including fruit growers in Canada.

The Liberals talk about plebiscites. Well, Mr. Speaker, why did they not speak of plebiscites when they forced their programs on the citizens of this province, on the sick people, on the aged and on the working people. Did they use this democratic procedure when they gave our forest and natural resources of this province to outsiders from New York and forced our people to finance these projects? No, they did not, Mr. Speaker.

For these legitimate reasons I strongly endorse this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. P. MacDonald: — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, it would appear that this is Cy MacDonald day.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that rural Saskatchewan is in a real state of turmoil here today in 1973. It has been very rarely that farmers in Saskatchewan have reacted to the way they have reacted to the imposition of Bill No. 50. They recognize it, first of all, as part of a pattern. A pattern to seize not only the control of their land and possessions, but also to seize control of their products. They look on Bill No. 50 as a supplement to the Land Bank legislation. They look on Bill No. 50 as a supplement to the Estate Tax or succession duties. They look on Bill No. 50 as a supplement to the purchase of Intercon. They have been able to tie them all together. They recognize that the socialists have a great number of planners. They don't impose four Bills going in four different directions, but each one of those Bills has the one same objective. But the major reason, Mr. Speaker, they are disturbed is that they are disturbed because of the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). The arrogance which has refused to give the producers an opportunity to express their approval or their disapproval of a Bill that will affect and control their means of livelihood. Mr. Speaker, they are also disturbed because the NDP has put forth itself as a Party of participation, a Party that is willing to listen to people and yet in this very important issue that affects the very basis of agriculture in Saskatchewan, they completely ignore the farmer who it will affect.

Their only argument, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Turtleford, (Mr. Feduniak) is a good example, the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer), every one that has stood on his feet and said, 'we support orderly marketing'. Those Liberals are against orderly marketing because they oppose Bill 50. Mr. Speaker, it is not orderly marketing that is an issue in this Bill, it is the method by which it is being imposed. There are two ways you can impose or can have orderly marketing. One is by a vote of the producer and second, producer control of that board. The other alternative is the alternative of Jack Messer, the Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, which says that we will put in Bill 50, we will ram it down your throats, we will not give you an opportunity to even discuss it, we will not provide you with any information, we will control the board, the producer will have no voice. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to believe that Members of the Hog Marketing Commission are travelling around the Province of Saskatchewan and they are refusing to tell the hog producer what the Hog Commission's powers and responsibilities will be. They are going and holding public meetings of interested farmers. These farmers are driving many miles because of their interest in this vital subject and members of the Hog Commission say, we can't tell anything until Jack Messer gets that Bill passed in the House so those Liberals shouldn't say anything bad about it while the legislation is being put forth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to review all of the arguments of my colleague on this side of the House, I am only going to enumerate them for you. The first one is the fact that the Minister of Agriculture misled not only this Assembly but the people of Saskatchewan in introducing the amendment one year ago. He gave the implication that it would only be used in the question of a crisis in the feed grains industry.

Mr. Messer: — That's not true at all.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, yes it is. The second thing, Mr. Speaker, he established . . .

An Hon. Member: — Read the . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — I did read them. You sneaked a line in there. Yes, you did, you sneaked a line in there.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, he established a commission which has one sole objective — to remove the vote of the producer and producer control. Then this year, Mr. Speaker, he brings in Bill 50 which brings the true implications of the amendments that he brought in last year. It is more vicious, more regrettable and has generated more opposition among the farming community than any agricultural Bill ever introduced in this Assembly. The licensing provision, the control over shipping, marketing, research, the reverse onus even challenge the question of justice. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing is that the farmers of Saskatchewan don't know what the total impact of this Bill is. They know that if this Bill is passed they can wake up tomorrow and there can be a cattle commission. They can wake up the next day and there can be a sheep commission and there will be no opportunity to vote on the complete and adequate dictatorial powers making Jack Messer the czar of agriculture in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) introduced an amendment. That amendment was a very simple one. It said that the Opposition is not opposed to orderly marketing. It said the Opposition is not opposed to a hog marketing commission. It said we will support it if you give a vote of the producers involved. Number two, if you include in it producer control by elected representatives. Number three, if you remove the reverse onus. The Member of the NDP turned that amendment down. Mr. Speaker, there is real disappointment by the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give the Government another opportunity to mend their ways, to prove to the farmers of Saskatchewan that they are democratic, to prove to the farmers of Saskatchewan that they will listen to them, to prove to the farmers of Saskatchewan that they are not trying to dictate their lives and their industries. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that that Government is attempting to do that is to start to set up legislative committees, to have participatory democracy. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they have even sent us as far away as British Columbia and Seattle. They sent us to New York and Chicago, to Denver, to give all the people of the United States of America an opportunity to consult in what goes on in Saskatchewan. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if they appointed a legislative committee for liquor, a legislative committee for welfare, a legislative committee for business, a legislative committee on foreign ownership, surely they will not refuse the farmers of Saskatchewan an opportunity to appear before a legislative committee to determine the very future of their industry. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that Party over there will not prove what hypocrites they really are.

Mr. Speaker, just let me give you an example of what a

legislative committee could perform in this province. First of all, they could give an opportunity for public representation, where the farmers of Saskatchewan would have an opportunity to come in and question the Minister of Agriculture on how that hog commission is going to work. They would have an opportunity to question him on his intentions toward cattle. They would have an opportunity to question him on his intention toward other natural products. Mr. Messer, the Minister of Agriculture, would have an opportunity to relieve their minds. I say, Mr. Speaker, that any Member of that side of the House who travels all over Saskatchewan and Western Canada and the United States on a legislative committee to give other people an opportunity to tell us how we are going to run our business, will not fail.

An Hon. Member: — You weren't . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, I was and that is why I want a legislative committee today. I will be most happy to sit on that committee, I will volunteer my services so that we can give an opportunity to the farmers of Saskatchewan to come in here and tell the members of this Assembly what are their true feelings. And, Mr. Speaker, if it is true what the Minister of Agriculture says that the hog producers will support this Bill, then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has no reason not to support this particular amendment. I should like to urge all Members to consider very carefully — look on top of your desks. The Member from Turtleford (Mr. Feduniak) just sat down and on his desk were all kinds of little articles from the hog producers. Every one of them and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just what his response to his mail was. Therefore, I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this Assembly support this amendment that I am going to move, seconded by my friend, the Member from Rosetown (Mr. Loken). This amendment will turn around and do one thing, give everybody an opportunity in the Province of Saskatchewan who is interested in the future of agriculture, on the future of orderly marketing, to voice by a vote, whether or not they think the Government can run their business better than they can without produce control, whether or not they are guilty until proven innocent by the reverse onus. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving this amendment:

That all the words after the word “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This House declines to proceed with this Bill until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a Select Special Committee of this Legislature with provision for public representations to said Committee and a report of such investigation is tabled in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Mr. Speaker, I make an appeal to the Members of the Government side of the House to please support this amendment on behalf, not of the NDP, but of the hog producers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow: — (Attorney General) On a Point of Order, with

respect to the matter of whether or not the amendment is in order, I would respectfully request that the Speaker reconsider that, because in my respectful opinion the amendment is not in order. It calls for an expenditure of public funds moved by the Opposition, something which the Opposition cannot call for. This amendment could be perhaps worded differently to get that intention across but the way it is worded now it asks the House to decline proceeding with the Bill and then calls for the setting up of a special committee of the Legislature with representations. Setting up of a special committee with representations requires an expenditure of public funds and my respectful submission to you, Sir, is that that is out of order and the amendment should not be allowed.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member, he knows he is flailing at a windmill. There have been precedents for this type of a motion before. They can be cited. I am sure, Sir, you or the Clerk could look them up. It is not a new kind of motion. We are not asking the Government to spend money, this asks the Legislature if there is any money spent. But there is certainly provision and there have been ample precedents. There is no way that this motion can be ruled out of order on the point very weakly made by the Attorney General.

Mr. MacDonald: — (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, the only reference to finances might be the fact that the Members might have to be paid. I want to say that I think this issue is so important that I will work for nothing and I think that every member of this committee would, and I think that every Member of this House will.

Ruling Re committee on Hog Commission

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that in this motion here, the motion doesn't say that this Special Select Committee has to sit between sessions. It does follow the right for a Select Committee to discuss it whether it is the Agriculture Committee as appointed at the beginning of the Session or any other committee with making provision for public representation. I can see where this could be a money bill if it was carried on inter-sessionally, but if it is carried on during the Session it wouldn't necessarily be a money amendment. I shall just wait until the Clerk has finished checking some information for me before I make my final ruling on it.

I am willing on this as I was on Bill No. 1 to withhold my ruling until the Members have a chance to express their opinion on it. I don't think any Members wish me to be — to force any Members to make representation on this Bill as on previous occasions.

If any Member wishes to raise any comments on the point that I have raised, I will be glad to hear them.

I shall read to the Members an amendment which was made on April 15, 1968, made by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd at that time. It was to Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. The amendment which was moved at that time was that all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This House declines to proceed with this Bill until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a Select Special Committee of this Legislature with provisions for public representation to said committee, and a report of such investigations is tabled in this Legislature.

Now the wording of the one today reads along the same lines — I haven't checked it word for word.

That this House declines to proceed with this Bill until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a Select Special Committee of this Legislature with provision for public representations to said Committee and a report of such investigation is tabled in this Legislature.

So I would rule that the amendment is in order and the debate continues concurrently.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Government opposite turned down an amendment that would have given them the opportunity to take Bill 50 back and guarantee . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Before we get into the debate on this amendment, the House has decided on a previous amendment which was voted down by the majority of this House and I hope all Members will not discuss what the House has already decided on. We will discuss what is before the House at this time.

Mr. McIsaac: — Just referring back to a previous amendment, I am going to relate my remarks strictly and entirely to the amendment before us. But I just wish to point out that the Government opposite turned down the opportunity to guarantee producers the right to vote prior to the establishment of a commission of any kind. They turned down the right to assure producers that they would be guaranteed elected representation on such a commission if indeed a commission were established.

Today the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has moved a motion asking the Government opposite to refer this Bill to a Select Special Committee to deal with the content of this Bill. They can refer it to the Committee on Agriculture, the Standing Committee, they can set up a special one. There are many routes that they could take to put this matter before a Legislative Committee, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest we need this matter before that Legislative Committee right here and now while this Session is in progress. We don't need to put it over until next summer. We don't wish to put it over, it needs to be referred to such a committee and needs to be referred immediately.

I hope, in view of their support, in view of their actions over the last year or two, in view of their use of Legislative committees, of one form or another, I can honestly wonder how they could even think of voting against this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

March 28, 1973

It will give not only hog producers, but cattlemen, producers of any agricultural commodity, the opportunity to come to the Legislature to come to that committee and report their views with respect to the proposals in the Bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say in support of this amendment, I beg leave at this time to adjourn debate.

Adjournment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 15

Messieurs

Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Coupland	McIsaac	Lane
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Guy	Weatherald	Grant
MacLeod	Wiebe	Boldt

NAYS — 39

Messieurs

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Dyck	Pepper	Faris
Meakes	Michayluk	Cody
Wood	Byers	Gross
Smishek	Thorson	Feduniak
Romanow	Whelan	Mostoway
Messer	Kwasnica	Comer
Snyder	Carlson	Rolfes
Thibault	Engel	Lange
Larson	Owens	Oliver
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Feschuk
Baker	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Cowley	Flasch

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, to me one of the surprising aspects of this denial of adjournment has to be the fact the NDP Government opposite don't think we are serious about this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — They think that this isn't a serious issue in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we have been debating this Bill almost every day that hasn't been a private Members' day, it has been up for debate. We haven't yet heard the Premier or the Attorney General speak from other than their seat on this Bill. They haven't said a word as to why they want the kind of dictatorial powers that are in this Bill.

I am speaking in support of the amendment from the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) to refer this Bill to a Select Committee of the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — One of the very key reasons and the Minister himself made no reference to it in his introductory remarks, one of the very key changes that he conveniently chose to overlook, is a change in the powers of the Commission. Last year he brought in legislation that would call for the establishment of a commission, Section 23, the powers of a commission.

This year this Bill before us seeks to amend those powers. The Lieutenant-Governor-in Council, Mr. Speaker, may vest in a commission any or all the following powers:

- (a) To determine the time and place at which the agency through which the regulated product or any variety class or grade thereof shall be marketed;
- (b) To carry out educational and research programs relating to natural products;
- (c) To accept from the plan and any order, any person or class of persons engaged in the marketing of the regulated product or any class variety or grade thereof.

So far we are talking about marketing.

- (d) To fix and collect charges for services rendered by the Commission from any or all persons marketing the regulated product.

I am sure Members opposite are aware of this change that is being sought this year in the amendment before us, Mr. Speaker. But as I say the Minister and no other Member from that side, the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) or anybody else has got up and spoken about the very, very dramatic change that they are seeking in this particular amendment.

I will read again the existing clause (d) that was brought in last year 1972, dealing with the question of marketing, and marketing only. It says:

To fix and collect charges for services rendered by the Commission from any or all persons marketing the regulated product.

That is last year's, 1972. That was the time the Minister brought in the Bill that he tried to tell us they would only use it in the case of a dire emergency such as now when pork is at 50 cents if that can be construed to be a dire emergency, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure for whom.

That particular Section, Mr. Speaker, which last year gave a commission authority to fix and collect charges for services rendered by the Commission for any or all persons marketing the regulated product. The Government opposite is seeking to change that this year as follows:

To issue licenses and to fix and collect licence fees, charges for services rendered by the Commission and penalties from any or all persons producing or marketing the regulated product.

And that, Mr. Speaker, as I suggest, is a very major change from the original powers insofar as were brought to this House last

year, at which time the Minister misled the House. I'm not sure if he misled all Members opposite. There are so few farmers over there it is easy enough to understand that they might have let this Bill go by and not really realized the threat that they were posing to the producers of this province — cattle producers, indeed of any natural product and that includes everything from beeswax to muskrat hair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular power . . .

Mr. Cody: — How much do you farm?

Mr. McIsaac: — I farm about five quarter sections. That's five more than you do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — “To issue licences and to fix and collect licence fees, charges for services rendered by the Commission and penalties from any or all persons producing or marketing”. That really is the most drastic part of the legislation before us — to fix and issue, to fix and collect licences. For the first time in the history of this province, farmers need a licence to operate, to produce hogs, to produce cattle or to produce indeed any product under this Act. The NDP opposite say that they had a mandate in June of 1971 to bring in a piece of legislation such as this.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't campaign on that, they will not want to campaign on that in 1975 either, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, but they will. They will have to campaign on that. Most governments it seems through the years try to bring in the rough legislation in the early years of the life. This is one, Mr. Speaker, that isn't going to die and be swept under the rug and be forgotten, prior to 1975. And it isn't going to be so for the simple reason that the Liberal Opposition are going to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, this kind of power, has never been sought for with respect to agriculture, with respect to farmers by any provincial government, other than British Columbia, referring to their recently introduced Land Act. I find it inconceivable that in the Government opposite, many Members like to get up and talk about farm legislation and they are supposedly so concerned about agriculture. Last year we saw them bring in a piece of legislation that will establish a Land Bank and return the present system of land holding and land tenure in the province to the old serfdom system and this year those same people lovers, those same friends of the farmers, are bringing in legislation that will license every farmer in the province, for producing or marketing any product under this Act. I find this inconceivable, Mr. Speaker, and again I have to wonder why we haven't heard more of the farm Members opposite get up and support this Bill.

Why do they need this legislation? They haven't told us why they need these kinds of powers. They haven't told us. I haven't heard from the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), maybe he spoke but I didn't happen to hear him if he did.

An Hon. Member: — He's going to vote for it.

Mr. McIsaac: — He's going to vote for it. I'm very surprised at the Member for Touchwood, the Member who knows the feeling of rural people in this province more so than most.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I rise on Point of Order and the Point of Order that I rise on is this: I believe that the Member from Wilkie constituency has already spoken on this main Motion when the Bill was moved for second reading. I'm not sure of the date, but my record says March 12. He is now seeking to speak again, when two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, he spoke on the main Motion and he now seeks to speak on the amendment. My understanding of the rules are that when he speaks to the amendment he should speak strictly to the amendment; that he ought not to be bringing into the debate on the amendment, matters which he ought to have, or could have raised when he had the opportunity to speak on the main Motion in second reading. And I have been listening now for ten minutes to the Hon. Member's speech and it's my Point of Order to you Sir, that the Member for Wilkie, in his remarks, is totally out of order because he hasn't made one remark or reference relating to the amendment, namely to the Special Committee. I would ask, Sir, that you call him to order and to bring him to the point.

Mr. McIsaac: — May I proceed, or did you wish to comment?

Mr. Speaker: — I was wondering if anyone else wished to comment on the Point of Order before I rule on it.

Mr. E. F. Gardner: — (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the Member is attempting to try and tell the House why it is necessary that this Bill should go before a Committee.

Now this is the gist of his remarks — we have received a number of coupons from people throughout the province and it indicates their concern. We could take all of these coupons I think there is well over a thousand, at this time and these are individual people who have indicated their concern and this is the reason . . .

Mr. Speaker: —Order, order!

I don't want to know how many, I just want to know what your opinion on the Point of Order is.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, I am trying to indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, that there is need for this particular Bill to be sent to the Committee and the need is indicated by . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

That is not the Point of Order. The Point of Order is, is the Member of Wilkie staying within the rules or is he exceeding his limits? It is not a matter . . .

Mr. Gardner: — The amendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment isn't before the House.

Mr. Gardner: — Well, the Member from Wilkie is simply trying to bring to the attention of this House the need for sending this to the Committee and I feel that the remarks that he has made are certainly along the line. He is trying to indicate to the Members present that there is some urgency in having this sent to the Committee and this is the purpose of his remarks.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I concur with the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). I think it is important why that we establish before the Members vote on this Motion, a reason why the Member would want this Bill sent to Committee and so he is not bringing in material that he maybe should have or could have on his main speech, his speech on the main Motion. If he is relating, and he has related several times, to this Motion to say that I hope the Members will consider this and this and this before they vote and he has referred to the amendment several times and I have listened to him very intently and if the Hon. Attorney General is not paying as much attention as he should, that's his own problem, but I am sure that you are, Mr. Speaker, and he has referred to the amendment several times and he is trying to build a case and I think he is doing an excellent job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I think on these types of amendments (they are very wide-sweeping amendments) when the amendment says, 'that this House declines to proceed with the Bill until the subject matter thereof has been investigated by a Select Special Committee', so the subject matter of this Bill is included in the amendment. I believe if any Member attempts, who has already spoken on the Bill, because the debate really concurs and if a Member hasn't spoken he would be at liberty to go deeper, but any member who has spoken on the Bill if he goes into detail on the clause and suggesting that the amendment should be the clauses, it maybe would be going too far.

The subject matter is what the debate is on that we should be referring to a Select Special Committee and, therefore, I would have to rule that as long as he refers to the subject matter of the Bill and purports to put forth his reasons for having this referred to a Special Committee, that the Member is in order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for your ruling. I will try and relate more to the reasoning as to why we are asking that this Bill be referred to a Committee, if for no other reason than for the benefit of the Attorney General.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He demonstrates once again

that he has been paying no attention to this Bill; that he is not concerned about the subject matter of this Bill

Mr. Romanow: — Two months.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker . . . March 1st, this Bill, according to my record, was given second reading or launched in second reading by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and that is scarcely a month. That, Mr. Speaker, is scarcely a month. The Bill was given second reading initially by the Minister less than a month ago. A Bill that is going to license farmers, a Bill that is going to hamstring farmers more so than they have ever been previously in this province or any place else.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Irresponsible.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I can well understand the Government's concern for getting this Bill off the Order Paper. Oh yes, oh yes! I can understand why the Attorney General isn't anxious to continue debating this Bill. That I can understand.

Mr. Speaker, the rights of farmers and producers, according to the Attorney General, are irresponsible.

Mr. Romanow: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

The Member from Wilkie quoted me. I did not take part in this debate. What I am saying is that nonsense speeches of the Members opposite are irresponsible.

Mr. Steuart: — That's not what you meant.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has had at least a month, according to the Premier — two months, to get up and get in this debate. Now I wish he would find some other time other than now to interrupt, Mr. Speaker. He has ample time to get into this debate and give us his views as to why he is seeking these powers; to give us his views as why he believes that we are irresponsible in trying to defend the rights of the farmers, which he claims are inconsequential.

An Hon. Member: — Lust for power.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, he has, and he will have opportunities later on in this debate, second reading, as well as in third reading, as to why this Bill should not be proceeded with at this point in time. And I am surprised at the Attorney General particularly, because last year we were debating another matter of real basic interest to farmers, and indeed all people of this province, the question of so-called foreign ownership of land. A foreigner, at that time, Mr. Speaker, was defined in their Bill as being anyone 'non resident' in the Province of Saskatchewan. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General got up in the course of debate on second reading and moved a Motion to refer the substance of that Bill to a Committee. Here today, they refuse to consider this amendment; they refuse to consider this amendment as to why the subject matter of this Bill, which is equally vital for the attention and the welfare

March 28, 1973

of farmers in the province.

Mr. Lane: — What did he say on that occasion?

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, he had a good deal to say on that occasion as he does on most occasions when he gets up in this House and I will try, for the benefit of my friend the Attorney General, and other Members, to indicate some of the reasons that he put forward at that time for consideration. I am sure they are equally valid today as they were last year when the Government did see fit to use a little wisdom and a little discretion. The kind of things we are asking them to do today, the very thing we are asking them to do here today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — To stop their steamroller tactics, their dictatorial approach to the farmers and to let this Bill go before a committee where producers, where meat packers, where truckers, where everybody involved in agriculture can come in and put their views, and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, excuse me for a moment until I find that particular speech of the Attorney General. He goes on to say that in supporting a similar amendment last year, dealing with the very future of agriculture — land ownership then — this time ownership of what's on the land, the hogs, the cattle and so on. Very little difference, very little basic difference, Mr. Speaker. He says 'the simple fact of the matter is' and I quote from the Attorney General, last years speech page 2058, 1972 Proceedings:

The simple fact of the matter is with respect to the Land Bank we were clearly elected on that issue of the Land Bank.

He's talking land and the reason he is going to refer that particular Bill of last year to the Legislative Committee. The Minister said:

We got a mandate on the Land Bank and we are proceeding with the Land Bank because we held hearings with the people of Saskatchewan.

Remember those hearings, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure all Members do. He went out and gave no details whatsoever. A few broad basic principles of the Land Bank, thousands of people turned up, not because they were there to learn anything or to help the Minister, he didn't want any help. They were there because they were afraid of the present land tenure system disappearing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He says, and again I quote from the Attorney General, page 2058 — Debates and Proceedings — 1972:

We did not campaign on the foreign issue (again foreign meaning anybody other than a Saskatchewan resident) — We did not campaign on the foreign issue and if we did,

the Minister said in second reading it is his intention to hand the matter to a committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no!

Mr. McIsaac: — Again, I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Now you people say it should be referred to a committee and we ask you to join with us in that task to make sure that we have to the best possible legislation on foreign ownership and corporate ownership that the Province of Saskatchewan can have to meet this very pressing and important problem.

Mr. Steuart: — For consideration today.

Mr. McIsaac: — Yes. For consideration today.

Mr. Romanow: — We have since learned how you work on committees.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, surely that same kind of co-operation the Attorney General sought last year, surely they are prepared the Members opposite, to extend that hand to us as we offer them this Motion and give them their opportunity to again demonstrate their faith in the committee system of this Legislature.

He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

And I say to the Members opposite that surely we can bury our political differences in the resolution of that problem. I am sure that those Members of the committee on our side will be prepared to do that.

This is one issue, Mr. Speaker, the rights of farmers that we'll be prepared to bury our political differences — no question. No question about that, Mr. Speaker. And I ask Members opposite to bury their political ambitions and give this committee every effort, Mr. Speaker, and every assistance possible to deal with this particular issue.

He goes on to say:

This committee can also do the same job very well. I am inviting the Liberal Party to join with us in that stated task by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, again, the arguments put forth by the Attorney General, for once I agree with, I ask him to give us the same consideration that he sought of this side last year.

He goes on and he says:

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the Motion made by the Minister of Agriculture:

That all the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

And I quote that Bill No. 115 (you may recall, Mr. Speaker, that

March 28, 1973

that was the iniquitous Foreign Ownership Bill, was presented to this House last year)

Bill No. 115, be not now read a second time;

because by that time, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting the debate had progressed, by that time representation had reached the Government opposite, not only from all over Saskatchewan on that Bill, but from all over Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Again I quote the Attorney General:

Bill No. 115 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of this Bill be referred to the Special Committee on Ownership of Agricultural lands, being composed of Messrs. Kowalchuk, Owens, Meakes, Pepper, etc. and so on.

He goes on to say:

That such Committee be directed to investigate the effects of the purchase and ownership of agricultural lands by non-resident, foreign and corporate persons;

That such Committee will have power to sit during the intersessional, etc. and so on.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Attorney General, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and Members opposite to support this Motion to refer this Bill 50 that is now before us to a Select Committee. They can name a special committee if they like, they can refer it to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, there are many options to them. We leave it up to them to choose the particular one that they wish to use. I only urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite, I only urge that they give this matter their immediate consideration for the simple reason that this is of vital concern to farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Any time a government will come to the House, come to this Legislature with a Bill that is not only designed to control or be involved in marketing but a Bill that is now going to be expanded to control producing and all other aspects of production as well as marketing.

One other event has transpired since this Bill was put before us and that is a move by the Government opposite by the Minister of Industry. We learned of the purchase of a major interest, if you like, not the major, but a major interest — in one of the packing companies of this province. We have complete government integration, complete government vertical integration in the farming industry — the very kind of thing that Members opposite have fought against. They don't like to see Safeway's owning a smaller store, owning some farm land or anything else. They don't like to see Burns Packing Company owning a feedlot, owning any land, marketing any beef, but it is all right for the Government to own the land, to license the farmer, to buy his hogs, to market them in their own NDP IPP plant. Vertical

integration of that kind is fine as long as it is the NDP brand of vertical integration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture who started off in his career as Minister of Agriculture a year or two ago, everybody was holding high hopes for the Minister. They thought here was a personable young fellow, a young fellow, a successful farmer, one who should be able to bring a fresh breath of air to the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know the kind of breath he brought, it stinks as far as agriculture is concerned, in many of his approaches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I think, Mr. Speaker, he topped all of the moves that he has made so far when he brought Bill No. 50 before this House and didn't have the intestinal fortitude to tell us really why he was seeking the powers that are contained and sought for in this Bill.

Mr. Messer: — Didn't you boys read the Act?

Mr. McIsaac: — I challenge the Minister and any other Member, the Attorney General included to get up and tell us why the Government needs these kinds of dictatorial powers over a hog producer, a cattle producer or any other kind of producer in this province. They have yet to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker.

Because these powers are now becoming generally known throughout the province, among not only hog producers, but cattle producers, rapeseed producers, producers indeed of any natural product.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out again that under our tenure of office three producer marketing boards were established of their own volition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — . . . they were established of their own volition, they are operational today.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.