

11. Teachers in most jurisdictions, like many other workers, have acquired certain statutory or negotiated provisions which ensure salary continuance to cover most instances of interrupted income. These benefits have been gained at the cost of accepting somewhat lower salary levels than would otherwise have been the case. Still others benefit from salary continuance group insurance schemes. To place upon employed persons the further burden of contributing to the cost of a scheme which offers no significant extra benefit (and which thrusts upon them the extremely difficult task of adjusting existing plans to achieve some workable form of integration or reconciliation) is patently unjust.
12. The rules applied to definition of "interruption of earnings", with their punitive overtones, are seriously discriminatory and unduly restrictive. There are professionally valid reasons for teachers to leave certain positions. The exercise of their right to leave unacceptable employment must not be penalized by denial of protection against loss of income. Moreover, the exercise of judgement by an agent of the federal government regarding the propriety of the dismissal or resignation of a teacher would be an intolerable intrusion into a field of provincial jurisdiction, as well as a violation of long-standing rights to due process established by collective agreement or provincial statute.
13. Because of the many special and peculiar conditions of employment which apply to teachers, as well as to many other groups, it appears unlikely that legislation based on the proposals of the White Paper can be designed to guard against abuse and, at the same time, ensure adequate protection without inequities.