

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislative
25th Day

Wednesday, March 29, 1972.

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to the House a group of 20 Scouts from Grenfell. They are in the west gallery, I believe. They are accompanied by Mr. Lorne Hexdahl. I hope they are enjoying their holiday from school. I am sure they are and I hope that they have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you a group of 31 boys from the Nipawin Air Cadets, along with their Commanding Officer Mr. Harry Moore. They are located in the west gallery. They have come from Nipawin and are on their way to Moose Jaw and I am sure the Members of the House will join with me in wishing them an educational stay here this afternoon, a safe journey to Moose Jaw and a safe journey home later this week.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you a group of Boy Scouts and Girl Guides located in the Speaker's Gallery. There are 11 Girl Guides with Captain Oliver, my wife, as their leader and 9 Boy Scouts under the leadership of Robert Raymond. They are also accompanied by the Brownie leaders, Brown Owl Judy Empey, Tawny Owl Marge Thibault. Also along as chaperons I suppose are Don Empey, Ann Empey and Armand Thibault the bus driver. I hope your trip will be very edifying and I wish you a safe trip home to Aneroid.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to this House a group of students from the Regina Vocational Centre in the constituency of Regina North West. As you know my colleague Mr. Whelan is away in Great Britain on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business and it falls to me to perform this pleasant duty. There are 120 students in the east and west galleries accompanied by their instructors Mr. Stan Medcalfe, Mrs. Isabelle Bushe and Mr. Murray McDonnell. I know that I speak for you, Sir, and for all Members of the House in wishing them a pleasant stay with us and we express the hope that our sample will be helpful to you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Legislative Assembly a group of some 51 ladies in the upper benches of the Speaker's Gallery who are here with

the SUMA people who are now holding a convention in this city. These will be the wives of the aldermen and mayors of the towns, cities and villages of our Province. I think that these men who hold these positions hold some of the most onerous positions in the country and these ladies, Mr. Speaker, will be the ones who exert the power over the people that exert the power. We should like to make them welcome here and we know they are having a very fine convention and hope it continues to be a good one.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, since this is the second day that we have had cadets with us and since I am a Member who is keenly aware of the role of the Armed Forces in Canada, I, too, should like to welcome the cadets with us this afternoon. I should like to say that I think it is indeed a pity that I am not giving one of my more controversial speeches this afternoon. For instance, such as the determination of the heat of the binary star system using Fraunhofer diffraction and ion absorption spectroscopy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier and ask him when we can start expecting some information of this Government. This is the 25th sitting day, Mr. Speaker, which normally would be well past the 50 per cent of the time this House normally will sit. We have asked for 40 Orders for Return, over 40. Today I am informed by the Clerk, we had none yesterday, that one has been tabled today.

Mr. Speaker, as you well recall one of the most serious complaints that was raised time and time again when you sat in these benches in the Opposition was that the Government was denying the Opposition information. I don't think there has ever been a time in history of this House, certainly not in the years I have sat in Opposition and in Government when any government has trampled on the rights of the Opposition and refused to give us information. It is a disgrace that in 25 sitting days and over 40 Orders for Return we have finally received one today. Will the Premier please either talk to his Ministers or give us some commitment when we can expect this information for which we have a right.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I indeed have vivid recollections of waiting some whole sessions for some Orders for Return by Members opposite. Most of the requests for Orders for Return have come recently. The replies are under preparation. The Attorney General advises me that they are beginning to come back now from several agencies to which they must go. We are expecting that there will be a substantial number tabled in the near future.

I venture to think that when the records are tallied up our record will be every bit as good as the record of the former Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What exactly is the Premier telling us? In the first place when you tally up the record, I am sure if your recollection is worth anything you will never be able to recollect a session of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, when after 25 sitting days, after 24 as of yesterday, we have yet to receive one Order for Return.

Mr. Boldt: — 72.

Mr. Steuart: — It is now 72 I am informed by my seatmate — 52, fine 52. We haven't got one, as of yet we haven't got one.

Mr. Blakeney: — Did I understand the Member to be asking a supplementary question?

Mr. Steuart: — Exactly when can we expect any? Never mind this weak excuse by Ministers of doing this, they are obviously not doing anything. When can we expect some Orders for Return?

Mr. Blakeney: — I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and all Members of the House that they will be forthcoming just as soon as they are prepared. I already indicated that they are under preparation and a substantial number will be coming. I invite him once again to do his sums.

SCHOOL GRANT ESTIMATES

Mr. J. C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) when he was going to be good enough to provide the House with a list of the 1972 school grant estimates. I asked that question on several different occasions prior to yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the reason I raise it again today, there is no such list of estimates on our desk. I wonder if the Minister is also aware, and I am sure he is, that a list of the 1972 school grant estimates has been available to teachers and many others around the province since the beginning of March, made available through the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla), a complete list, the very list we are asking for. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is utter disrespect for this Chamber for the Minister not to be good enough to provide the House with this list when it is already passed all around the Province through various channels and through their caucus. Again I ask the Minister to provide us with that list of the grant estimates. He has got the list, we know he has the list, Mr. Speaker, yesterday he was going to try and prepare it. We know it is prepared. I ask him why he isn't putting it in front of the House.

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the

Member for Wilkie. It wasn't until yesterday that I instructed the staff of the Department to prepare such a list to be tabled in the House. I think I indicated at that time that that list would be made available as soon as possible. They are under fairly extreme pressure because, as I indicated yesterday, we would welcome boards to come into the Department to discuss the problems that they have. Some of them have problems and we admit to that and we indicated that when we brought forward the grant formula, and they are busy with that. As soon as the information is put together it will be tabled in the House. I will deny categorically that any figures were made available to anyone else outside of the Department or outside of the Members of this side of the House. We made available to Members of this caucus working figures toward bringing in the new grant formula. They have not been made available to anyone else.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Minister but perhaps he isn't aware that the province generally is well aware of these estimates. If he is going to wait until every grant is finalized he certainly won't get the list to us during this Session. I would ask again respectfully, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would give us a definite commitment that we'll have that list of grant estimates and it can only be an estimate — we recognize this — before this weekend so we can have this for this weekend to go home when we are meeting with school boards and so on.

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday, and I indicated just a minute ago that I would make those figures available to this House as soon as they are prepared. If they are prepared today I will table them. The figures are available and they are only available to this point to the various boards and school systems throughout this Province.

CLOSURES OF INDUSTRY

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). I received another very disturbing report this morning, Mr. Speaker, from the city of Saskatoon, relating to once again the continuing closure of business and industry in this Province. With the unemployment rate at 20,000 people walking the streets of Saskatchewan, has the Minister heard that Westcore Steel and Saskatoon Iron Works have closed their doors and the employees have lost their jobs and opportunity. Could he give us a report on the position and the reason for these closures? Could he give us any indication as to whether or not the Government has done anything to assist these businesses or consult with them as regards the difficulty that they are experiencing.

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I have not personally heard from these people at all. I have been at meetings all morning, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not anyone in my Department of Industry and Commerce has heard from them, I do not know but I am very glad to have this information from the Member for Milestone and I will try to determine the facts surrounding the statements he has made.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Industry mind going ahead and investigating this for a change and giving a report to the House?

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister said that he would make checks, now it will be up to the Minister what he does with the information.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, I will just say that in view of the record of the Liberal Party I should be very cautious about taking advice from the Member for Milestone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that **Bill No. 9 – An Act to provide for the appointment of a Person to Investigate Administrative decisions or acts of Departments of the Government and certain other Organizations and to define the Person's duties, functions and powers** be now read a second time.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to place on the record my opposition to Bill No. 9, the Ombudsman Act, 1972. I do not intend to support this Bill and at the same time I should like to make it understood that I do not, in principle, oppose the purpose of the function of an Ombudsman. It is obvious with this Government's large majority that the Bill will be approved. Therefore when we consider the Ombudsman Act in Committee I will support certain amendments to enhance the power of the Ombudsman.

Government Members have stated that this attitude constitutes inconsistency. They say that it is inconsistent to oppose the establishment of an Ombudsman and then turn around and propose amendments that will make the Ombudsman even more powerful. There is no inconsistency in this attitude because as I have already stated I am not opposed in principle to the office of the Ombudsman, I am simply opposed to the Province of Saskatchewan having the office of an Ombudsman. However, if we are to have an Ombudsman then I think he should have powers, functions and duties that would justify the existence of an Ombudsman and justify the expense of such an office. Mr. Speaker, I can see the usefulness of an Ombudsman in the case of a large bureaucratic state. I can see justification for Ombudsman in Washington or possibly even in Ottawa. An Ombudsman I will agree is very justified in a socialist state, such as Sweden or New Zealand. A socialist state becomes very impersonal and extremely bureaucratic and therefore there is an obvious need. Any country that puts the welfare of the state before the welfare of the individual as does any socialist state, then I think that country is in need of an Ombudsman.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that our society is becoming complicated and I grant that bureaucracy is increasing especially under our new Government. But I think that our province of

900,000 people is still in fact a community when compared to socialist states such as Sweden. I do not think that our province has reached a degree of complexity that would justify the position of an Ombudsman. In Saskatchewan we have 60 MLAs to serve 900,000 people, these 60 MLAs are not kept busy in this Assembly for the full year as are Government Members in larger states. Our MLAs are busy with the business of this House for maybe three months of the year. This leaves some nine months for Members to serve on behalf of constituents without the pressure of sitting in this Assembly. This is a somewhat different situation from that of a Canadian Member of Parliament for example, who is kept busy in the House of Commons for the greater part of a year and is also removed by long distances in many cases from his constituency.

I feel that at this point in time the public is well served by the MLAs in Saskatchewan and we have not reached a point where it is an overbearing burden for the Members. I believe there are other areas which would be outside the jurisdiction of an Ombudsman that deserve attention by the Government before we consider instituting an Ombudsman. There are many rights and privileges that are accorded to the citizens of Saskatchewan and that are guaranteed by law. This present Legislature is guaranteeing by law even more rights to individuals. These rights may be of little value to some individuals if they are not known to them or understood or enforced. I believe that access to legal and other forms of counselling advice would go much further in protecting the rights of individuals.

May I repeat, I don't deny that an Ombudsman would have a useful function but at this time it should not have the top priority. An Ombudsman provides a social service and at this point in time in Saskatchewan there are many other social services that should receive a higher priority. Statistics already cited in this House have shown that the Ombudsman in both Saskatchewan and Alberta would have been able to deal with very few cases. Even the cases that they have handled by the office of the Ombudsman could likely have been dealt with by other existing methods. The office of the Ombudsman will cost Saskatchewan \$60,000 or more. It can be argued that if the office protects the rights of even one individual that it is money well spent. This may be so but I feel that there are other social services that this Government could provide for \$60,000 that are not provided now that would benefit society to a greater degree. This is my reasoning for opposing the Bill. If, however, we are to have an Ombudsman then he should have the power to do a proper job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to this debate in support of the principle of this Bill and I stress the word 'principle' of this Bill. I want to say a few words in support of this Bill and I suppose that in the traditions of this House that when one stands up to speak on a Bill he is supposed to make comments on the speaker before him. I am going to break with tradition and leave that for later on in my speech, Mr. Speaker.

Initially, I want to point out to those who argue that an Ombudsman is not necessary that they are not facing up to the realities of life and the realities of Government today. I

was rather pleased last night in the debate on this Bill to hear the Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) agree on the principle initially and then he eventually seemed to disagree with it. It was rather interesting, it seemed he never even bothered reading his speech before he gave it in the House. He didn't realize that he had said that he was in favor during his speech, including municipal governments, but when he was asked a question he said that he was opposed to it.

Twenty years ago as compared to the 1971 Government, Mr. Speaker, government was involved very little in the affairs of people. It was very little involved in the affairs of society and in fact, compared to the present, government was little involved in the economy of this Province. If we consider the situation today with any degree of seriousness this should be crystal clear even to those whose insight might be clouded by the desire to gain some political mileage out of arguing against the principle of this Bill. Government is not only extensively involved, Mr. Speaker, but it is becoming even more involved. Government is very complex today, every citizen of this Province is involved with some department or agency from time to time. And may I add also that the complexity is ever-increasing and that bureaucracy is growing and becoming more complicated and the larger it gets the opportunity for wrong decisions increases. It is not rare that administrative decisions or acts of departments of the government and other organizations are not totally just. Injustices exist, they will continue to exist and as government bureaucracy becomes more complex they will very likely increase. In regard to this I want to say that at some time in the future matters involving municipal government and school government bodies must be included or considered for inclusion. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it should be sometime in the future because I feel that in the introduction of new programs it is sometimes wise not to jump in the water with both feet first because it may be rather scalding hot and may need some cooling off to bring it down to a reasonable temperature.

I am saying this, support the principle of this Bill. Let's make it work and then let's expand it. The principle of the Bill is a good one. This concept has been instituted in other provinces in Canada, it is functioning in other countries of the Western world and the results have shown that the Ombudsman is needed and is useful. Now the political process is not one that functions all too smoothly and correctly so any improvement should be given serious consideration. I wish to remind this House that we are debating the principle of the Ombudsman Bill. We, on second reading, are determining whether the principle is good or whether it is not good. I submit it is good and there should be no question about it on either side of this House. I am surprised that there is some question about it on the opposite side of the House. I find it strange but not so hard to believe that some of the Members opposite would oppose the principle of protecting basic human rights. It has been suggested by some people in this debate, Mr. Speaker, that if the Members opposite do not change their approach in this House and begin to carry out their duties as an Opposition with some degree of responsibility that they will be doomed to the Opposition benches in perpetuity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I submit that

those suggestions are wrong, and I want to go on record as disagreeing with those suggestions. I submit that if the Opposition does not become responsible on the principle of this Bill or other Bills and responsible in their activities of this House, they won't even have any place in the Opposition.

Now the Member from Moose Jaw is to some degree putting his foot in his mouth with the comments he made a little while ago. In fact he was contradicting himself. He was saying he was in favor of the principle of an Ombudsman Bill or of an Ombudsman and then he was saying he was going to vote against the principle of the Ombudsman. Now I would think that he should make up his mind whether he is in favor of the principle or whether he is not in favor of the principle. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of government to provide all possible protection of basic rights and this Bill is a great step forward in that direction. Some argue that it is the role of the MLA to do this work but I say that in many cases that does not work or may not work. All politicians are not beyond their own personal or partisan political prejudices and I would think that our experiences over the last seven years are very clear proof of that. We had Members in government who would even take away the rights of people to decide which people they were going to have forming the government. Some people have strong political attachments to a particular political party and they find it difficult to approach their MLA. I would hope that this is rare but it must be recognized that it may and in fact does arise at times. I just want to stress once again that that situation does arise where the MLA may not help to correct a situation of injustice any more than the department or agency that caused the injustice. An Ombudsman would help to fill this gap, Mr. Speaker. May I add that the work of the Members is growing. Any Member that is doing his work today should be a very busy man or woman and it is becoming impossible to deal with all the problems one is confronted with. I can foresee that unless there is something like an Ombudsman, MLAs will be neglecting their duties of enunciating and initiating policies.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principle of this Bill and welcome this legislation. I invite all Members to support it and I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I favor the principle of an Ombudsman. I feel that within a very, very, very narrow context an Ombudsman in our system of democracy has a useful purpose. Unfortunately the purpose has not been covered by the Bill presented by the Attorney General. The real question here is the question of administrative review of tribunals and the decision-making process. The Bill presented by the Attorney General practically takes away all rights of review from the Ombudsman. It makes the Attorney General sole arbitrator of what constitutes what is in the public interest and what is not. These principles that have been set out in the Bill are wrong in my view, Mr. Speaker.

The Ombudsman, of course, is an the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) has stated, an indication that our own society has fallen down or aspects of society or governmental bodies in society have fallen down and have not done their duties. It is an indication that the legislators have not

done their duties. It is an indication that the legislators have not done their duty, and the courts have not done their duty, and that the Civil Service has not done its duty. All an Ombudsman is in reality is a reflection that our present organizations cannot do the job. I would think that the Attorney General and the Members opposite when they talk about responsibility would recognize that there are other changes that have to be made and yet we hear only about the Ombudsman. There have to be drastic changes in the Civil Service to make them reflect more the job that they should be doing and reflect the needs of society. There have to be drastic changes in our court system and there have to be drastic changes in our administrative tribunals, none of which are attacked in the Bill proposed by the Attorney General.

I am very concerned by Section 17. We get an indication from the Attorney General that perhaps this Section is going to be removed. I have stated before I am very concerned about the Government opposite when it talks about responsibility in the field of human rights, it is afraid of the bodies that they are now bringing before the House. They refuse to give the Human Rights Commission final power and they have now had to change that proposal. They refused to give court review of the decision of the Human Rights Commission. We now have an arbitrary provision in the Ombudsman Act which will allow the Attorney General to decide what the Ombudsman should or should not hear. These examples that the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) unfortunately has left are not examples of responsibility in the field of human rights, they are examples of window-dressing that are being brought in for political purposes. There should be absolutely no fear if you believe in the principle of an Ombudsman and if you believe in a Human Rights Commission, there should be no fear of complete independence of these bodies, and yet the Government opposite has done just the opposite. It has brought these bodies in with the tightest possible control by the Attorney General.

There has been one other aspect that has not been raised by the Members of the House to my knowledge and that is in reality the question of the man himself. There are many jurisdictions throughout the world that refuse to bring in an Ombudsman solely because they do not have the qualified man to handle that position. We have no indication from the Government opposite of who that man is going to be. I don't know how any Members of this House who is talking about responsibility can favor or argue in favor of this legislation without knowing who the man is going to be that is going to handle the position of the Ombudsman. Unfortunately that man should be one of the strongest, most independent, most intelligent, most thoughtful, most concerned person that this province can offer. Yet, if we are going to have a man like that why does the Attorney General insist on maintaining the final say, the final control in his own little hands. I think that, as I said, if it is a question of responsibility, you have such a person, give him the power. If you don't have such a person don't bring in a Bill such as this. I do not see, as I have said, how any Members of this House can talk about a principle of an Ombudsman who is to care for and protect individual rights and insure that administrative decisions are made in the best interests of the individuals of this Province, how anyone can even talk of this piece of legislation without knowing who that man is. I think it is incumbent upon the Attorney General and it should have been incumbent upon the Attorney General to advise this

House who he had in mind. Now if he is not sure of who he is going to be . . .

Mr. Snyder: — This is legislation.

Mr. Lane: — Somehow the Hon. Member of Labour (Mr. Snyder) is out of touch with the legislation himself because it has absolutely nothing to do with the point I am discussing. The point is that if the Attorney General knows who this man is going to be he must fear that man because he has taken all sorts of powers to him and that is the point and that is what is wrong with this Bill and is what's wrong with the way this matter has been proposed to this House. If the Attorney General doesn't fear the man then he should not have put in Sections such as 17, he should have put in the Bill the principle that the Ombudsman has the power to enforce his rulings which is not there. These are examples of how this has been mishandled by the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, as I have said I don't see how anyone can talk about the concept without knowing who this individual is going to be that is going to have the responsibilities, not that are in this Bill, but that an Ombudsman should have. As I say, I favor the principle of an Ombudsman in the Province of Saskatchewan. I do feel, however, that the Attorney General is not going to give us, by the legislation he has given us, an Ombudsman that is worthy of the title. I think the Attorney General should reconsider many aspects of this Bill and I think that the Attorney General too should consider and advise this House whom he has in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a very unfortunate position in that I favor as I said the principle of an Ombudsman. I feel that the Ombudsman should have the powers necessary to fulfil his duties, I feel that the position of the individual should be made known to this House. I favor the principle, I favor it in Saskatchewan. This Bill unfortunately is not an Ombudsman Bill, this is a Bill for political purposes to appoint someone to a position to do something that the Attorney General says he should do. For that reason, favoring the principle, I am going to abstain from voting on this particular Bill. I think it is wrong.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk for a few minutes about this particular Bill and I would like to ask the House to give me permission to adjourn the debate. But let's get down to brass tacks about what we are talking about.

We are talking about hiring at least one more high-priced civil servant to work for the Government, he'll have a staff I presume — or she — will have a staff. The job will be to cut through the red tape and the bureaucracy, to try and right injustices or unfairnesses that have been done to individual citizens or groups of citizens. We've got a fancy word for it called Ombudsman, it came from a position created in Sweden or in Switzerland. To talk against this principle is like talking against mother love. In spite of the fact that many of the Members on this side of the House say they favor the principle I want to go on record of saying here in the Province of Saskatchewan I do not favor the principle. I think that the

position of our other Members are honest too. They may favor the principle but they don't like the way you are handling it but what they are saying, Mr. Attorney General, is you are in fact shackling or handcuffing this man before you ever give him the job. Now you may change that and I hope that you do because I am sure your majority will pass this Bill and I am sure it will become a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I say in a Province like Saskatchewan where we have less than a million people, where our transportation facilities are second to none, where we have excellent communication facilities, where anyone almost anywhere in this Province can pick up the 'phone, or get in their car and they can be in touch with the centre of government here in Regina. I say it is an admission of failure by the NDP Government to say they have now, after eight short months, so lost control of the Civil Service or the bureaucracy, or they intend to build such a large and complicated Civil Service that they, the elected Members – 45 of them – are saying that they can't do the job to represent the people who sent them down here from back in the constituencies where they came from. I say if they admit this, it's nonsense and it's an admission of failure. Surely in a province of this size we have enough government. Surely in a country of this size we have enough government. In fact when we consider municipal governments, and we have them here in Regina today meeting, certainly they are the bedrock and the foundation of our democratic government. They are the closest to the people. Then we have on top of that layer the Provincial Government, and on top of that we have the Federal Government, plus school boards, plus local authorities. In fact we are without a doubt the most overgoverned people that exist anywhere on the face of the earth. We have 60 MLAs, we meet for about two or two and one-half months of the year but this may change. We are paid \$9,000 a year. Now if an MLA does his job and does it conscientiously this is not too much money. In fact if he does his job really conscientiously it may not be enough money, I don't know. Again if the Government intends to have sessions twice a year or on an average twice a year, then I think that the job of the MLA will have to be reassessed. But what I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, and I advocated this when I was in the Government, that what we should be doing rather than adding one more layer onto the Civil Service, one more addition to the bureaucratic setup that we already have in this Province – and I don't blame the NDP anymore than the Liberals or the Conservatives when they ruled this Province or this nation. We have all been guilty of adding on and on and on to the Civil Service in this country. Most of the jobs are necessary and the people do a good job. But let's not kid ourselves, a great many of them, Mr. Speaker, are absolutely unnecessary and they don't do a worthwhile job.

Surely, we should be looking at upgrading the job of the elected people. I have said this before and I will repeat it because I think it is absolutely vital in this debate. We have 60 MLAs. The Government back benchers over there right now, they are asked many more questions and they get many more delegations than the Members on this side of the House, as you know, Mr. Speaker, having been on both sides of the House. Where do they meet them? Well, they may have some temporary quarters right where they can meet delegations, but a great deal of the time if they get any kind of a delegation, they meet them in the halls, they meet them in the washroom, they meet them around the corner somewhere. How do we expect the people of this

Province to take this Legislative Assembly seriously and the Members of this Legislative Assembly seriously if we don't give them dignity and the decency of a year round office. I think every MLA on both sides of the House should have an office in this building. This building was built by the people of Saskatchewan to house the elected representatives and it has been taken over almost lock, stock and barrel by the civil servants. I say we should very politely excuse the civil servants from this building and find them some other quarters and give every MLA a year round office in this building and some secretarial help. I say if we tried that, Mr. Speaker, give them some expenses, not a great deal, give them some so that they can in fact represent their people on a year round basis. They could in fact, meet their delegations here in Regina when they come down to see the Attorney General or the Department of Highways or whatever. They could meet them in their own office, they could set the meeting up, they could plan their strategy in their meeting and then their MLA could accompany them. No matter what side of the fence they sit on politically, I agree, once you are elected as an MLA, you are the MLA for all people in that constituency. And, if it is a fact and unfortunately sometimes people who didn't support you feel I can't go to Steuart, I didn't vote for him, I won't go to him, I didn't vote for him or Baker or Smishek or whoever. I think if we had a proper setup here in these Legislative Buildings and our MLAs were given more assistance then a great deal of that feeling would disappear. And I should like to suggest, Mr. Attorney General, that you withdraw this Bill and that you try this approach of giving our MLAs more help, giving them some office space and then say to officials in each department that when the MLA whether he is on the Government side or the Opposition side contacts them that the MLA is to be listened to and they must cut through the red tape wherever possible and get that individual an answer.

Now, I freely admit that you can't have 60 MLAs contacting every department and issuing orders on this side or that side, it wouldn't work. As a matter of fact the government officials, the deputy ministers and their top officials find themselves in a very embarrassing position when MLAs contact them especially MLAs from the Opposition. And I say this in all sincerity they find themselves in a difficult position because they don't know exactly what information they should give them. They don't know exactly if they should give them any information. So you don't find any consistency throughout the Government in treating MLAs when they make direct inquiries and it was true when we were the government. Some departments will be very free and open with the MLAs both with the Government and the Opposition. In some departments they feel that they really shouldn't have anything to do with the MLAs and so they give them little or no information and ask them to refer to either the deputy minister or the Minister himself. I know the Ministers are busy and again I don't think it is reasonable that 60 MLAs or 44 MLAs or however many MLAs are left after the Government picks the Cabinet, should be able to contact every Minister on every little detail. I don't think they have time and I don't think it is necessary. But I would think along with giving our MLAs offices, secretarial help and some expenses, telephone expenses for example, some expenses to come back and forth to Regina a reasonable number of times. I think that in every department it would be a good thing if some fairly high level civil servant was named and it was indicated to him or her that their job was to give the information to the

MLAs on both sides of the House, that particular individual's job would be to answer the inquiries and be of assistance to the MLAs when they pose questions or they have problems or they are trying to do something on behalf of the citizens that they represent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Attorney General, I don't agree with an Ombudsman for Saskatchewan. I don't think we need one. But maybe we do, maybe you'd find if we gave the MLAs the opportunity and backed them up with some assistance and the dignity and the independence of an office and some help that the job couldn't be done. If that's fact and you came back in a year or two and said we have tried that approach and while there has been some improvement, still we find too many citizens, too many groups in our province have been poorly treated or mistreated and have not been given justice by the Government or by some departments, we still need an Ombudsman.

I am confident that if you took those steps you would do two things, you would upgrade the image and I think that is important to all the MLAs regardless of which side of the House they sit on. You would allow them to do a much better job for the people that they represent, you would upgrade in the eyes of the public this institution, the Legislative Assembly, and its Members and I think you would find in this Province at this time the position of an Ombudsman was unnecessary. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in conscience, although I recognize that there are some people treated unfairly, although I don't think there are a great many in Saskatchewan, either under your Government or under our Government. I don't think there are very many cases where people have been treated unjustly and have not been able to get redress. I don't think this has happened very often. But I am confident that if you give the elected representatives of this Chamber an opportunity to do a better job that any injustice that may have been suffered by the people or any need for an Ombudsman at this time in this Province would disappear and I urge the Attorney General to think about that. Since I have a few more things I should like to say on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder that **Bill No. 26 – An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1967** be now read a second time.

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether my seatmate wishes to speak on this or not but we have had pretty good agreement in this House that we would be proceeding down the list from No. 1 in order and now we find that they are jumping all over the place. I don't think we can expect our Members to sit here for every minute of every day. Surely to goodness, it's not impossible for the Whips to work out some procedures whereby we can follow an orderly procedure of one number after the next even if they want to jump around. If we knew in what order we could make sure that we have some of our Members here. So I should ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. It may not be strictly a Point of Order but to the matter raised by the Member of Athabasca. We seek to communicate that type of information almost daily. I am informed by my Whip, the Member from

Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) that we told your Whip, the Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) that we would start from the bottom and we would be working up with certain Bills not to be called. My Whip has informed your Whip, and I suggest to the Member from Athabasca that it is his duty to ask the Whip what the speaking order is. I don't mind being at fault when we have slipped up on that job but we have tried our best to do it and I reiterate again we did it in this area as well.

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to reply to that. It could be a misunderstanding. The Government Whip did ask to start at No. 12 and then I assumed that we were going right down the Order Paper. He could have mentioned the other way and it's a mistake that I will take part of the blame for but I just assumed he was starting at item one and going right down the Order Paper. He asked me to move to 12 and I agreed to that but I did not understand you're going backwards.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I don't think we can debate this on this Bill. If there is any misunderstanding I think that should be arranged between the two sides. The Member from Athabasca has asked leave to adjourn Bill No. 26.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, on that point, I know that the Hon. Member from Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) does wish to speak on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Hon. Member from Athabasca has asked leave to adjourn the debate and I can't permit you to speak at this time.

Mr. MacLeod: — I wonder if I could ask, Mr. Speaker, just this indulgence, that if that request to adjourn could be withdrawn and if we could ask that the House Leader ask for some other Bill at this time because otherwise Mr. Grant will lose his opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is not correct. He would not lose his right to speak.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on the suggestion made by the Member from Albert Park. I see the Member is now back in the Chamber. As far as I am concerned we could stand eight if the Member from Athabasca will withdraw his motion to adjourn. Would that be acceptable to you? He will withdraw his motion he indicates, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps we won't call eight we will call No. 7.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. There does seem to be a bit of confusion here as to workings this afternoon. Could you give us the next three or four items that you have there.

Mr. Romanow: — I had informed my Whip to

inform your Whip that we would start with item 12 on adjourned debates then we would go to item 8, item 7, item 5, item 4. We would then go to second readings. We would in the order . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Pardon me though, when you say item 8, 7 and 4 does that mean Committee of the Whole or adjourned debates, that's the problem.

Mr. Romanow: — I said adjourned debates. I repeat again to the Hon. Member, adjourned debates. I start again, adjourned debates item 12, item 8, item 7, item 5, item 4. Then after adjourned debates we intend to go into second readings in order item 4, item 5, item 7 and then if there is any time left over we will be going to Committee of the Whole taking the Bills in the number that they are listed from one down to 39.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I want to thank the Attorney General. I think that if he would do that on the proceedings of each day and make it perfectly clear, that it would be of benefit to everybody in this House and I thank him.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, we did, to your Whip.

Mr. McPherson: — Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before and I should just like to clear this up, the Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) did say we were going on 12 and I can't recall any mention of picking out 8, 7 and 5. We were going right down the Order Paper as far as I knew and that is the way I informed our caucus. We were going to go down the Order Paper. Now you want to go up the Order Paper?

Mr. Romanow: — Not now . . .

Mr. McPherson: — Listen, you just brought this in now, the way you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

An Hon. Member: — I seem to have no problems with Mr. Pepper at all and if he said we were going down the Order paper this is the way it will be. And that is what I told my Whip.

Mr. Romanow: — He did not.

Mr. McPherson: — Certainly he did.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think this discussion may be enlightening for the House but I think it is out of order at this time and the Government I believe has asked that item No. 8 remain stand. Was that the request of the Government?

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, on a person privilege, please, I think I should have a word on this. I informed the Whip on the other side that we would start on the adjourned debates on No. 12 and go backwards on this group, 12, 8, 7, 5 and 4. I think we have just misunderstood but this is the information I received and

what I presented to the Whip on the other side and I think this should clarify it.

Mr. McPherson: — We'll accept that that is probably what you said and I will take the blame if that's the way you want it, but I just understood we were going down the Order Paper and it is my misunderstanding, it's not Mr. Pepper's. But if we know ahead, Mr. Speaker, a day ahead of just exactly what House business we are going to do I think it would make it a lot better. I can recall, and I am not trying to make a speech, that the other House leader certainly told us in the past just what way we were going, we don't know until 1:15, Mr. Speaker, and the two Whips have quite a problem. There is no blame on the Member from Weyburn at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I very sincerely object to the Member from Lakeview saying this, because I endeavour to tell my Whip every night on adjournment what the order is going to be. Sometimes it is impossible because a Cabinet Minister has a delegation or otherwise. I do everything as much as the former House leader has done if not more. I stand by that, because I had many dealings with the former House leader. To the interest of the Government, to the interest of the Opposition and to the interest of business here that I do so inform him and I do. Now if this is a misunderstanding between our Whip and the Whip over there, Mr. McPherson, as he says it is, then I accept it as a misunderstanding, but I do resent the implication by the Member from Athabasca and the Member from Lakeview, not only today, but it has been three or four times, that somehow it's the House leader who is not telling them what the order of the business is. I say that the Member from Athabasca does it because he does it for cheap political advantage and I don't mind him arguing with me for philosophical or program reasons, but I must ask the Members not to put that type of responsibility on me when it is in fact not true.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, if I may, Sir, could I suggest that you rule this entire discussion out of order as it most certainly is. We'll hope that the House leader will come to know a little more about his responsibilities and let's carry on with the business of the House.

Mr. Romanow: — I resent that. I say that I have my responsibilities. If the Opposition would ever caucus and listen to their own Whip maybe we would get on with the business of the House rather than delay it the way you are delaying it all the time.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think that what we really would, and I offer it as a suggestion, and I am sure it was used before in past sessions by the House leader of the day, and that is simply this, that we simply cannot ensure having every single Member at a caucus meeting every single day to know at 2:30 precisely what the order of business is going to be. Now if the House leader who stands up and he has six or seven items that we will take in a row at approximately 10 to 3:00 and inform us as he did today it will cause a lot less problems for both himself and ourselves.

Mr. Romanow: — If that's the case then it won't solve the problem because if I announce it at 10 to 3:00, the Member from Athabasca is likely to get up and say, how do I know you're going to call the item. My deskmate isn't here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think that this debate is out of order and I think the arrangement that is supposed to be made doesn't affect the Chair so I hope we can get back to the Order Paper that is before us. What item does the Government wish to call?

Mr. Romanow: — Item 8.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, if this could stand for just later on this afternoon, I would appreciate it. I am sorry I wasn't in but I wasn't aware that it was coming up so quickly. I was out trying to prepare myself for it. I'll be in position within an hour's time.

Agreed to stand.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that **Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend the Teacher Salary Agreements Act, 1968** be now read a second time.

Mr. Guy — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in regard to this. It is quite obvious that there is a breakdown of communication on the other side of the House as well. First of all I am sorry that the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) who I believe is the executive assistant to the Minister of Education is not here today.

Mr. Romanow: — He is not.

Mr. Guy: — They have so many executive and legislative and special assistants it is hard to pick out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I wonder if we haven't had enough discussion, if we can't get down to the Bill before us please.

Mr. Guy: — I just wanted to refer to the gentleman by his proper term. I used the word executive when it should be legislative assistant and certainly when he speaks I am sure he is speaking Government policy on behalf of the Minister. The other day when he spoke in this debate he mentioned that the NDP had made a commitment in the election to bring about changes in The Salary Negotiation Act. Of course, we are all aware that the Members opposite used The Salary Negotiating Act in the election campaign for their own partisan political purposes so it's not surprising. What was surprising is that he mentioned that he sat down with teachers and trustees to get a new solution and they failed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is all the more reason why the amendment to this Act should not have been brought in at this time. If they failed to get an agreement with the teachers and

the trustees why then are they trying to push through some amendments to this Act when it is obvious that neither teachers nor trustees are in favor of it. And there is another point that I wish to raise while I am on this.

I don't know how the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) ever expects to sit down with the teachers and trustees of this Province when he behaves the way that he is. I picked up the paper this morning and I find in the Prince Albert paper: "The Teachers and Trustees get Lashing from MacMurchy." The Minister of Education gives the trustees a tongue lashing when he is speaking to the teachers, then he goes over to the trustees and gives them another lashing and then he comes to this House and he says, 'I wonder why we can't sit down with them and get some agreement on a new Salary Negotiating Act.' He'll never get agreement as long as he sits up in his ivory tower and takes the dogmatic view that he's taken since last September.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I remember last fall when the Minister supposedly made a plea and said, 'you know if the trustees and the teachers have any concern for me as a Minister of Education they will get on with the bargaining.' Well I can tell the Minister they haven't any concern, they don't care whether he is happy or whether he isn't. They just wish that he would get off his backside and do something and show that he has the interest of education and of the people of this Province at heart. They are getting sick and tired of listening to him say, well we are not going to take any sides. He was far from taking that position last June that he wasn't going to take any side. He took the teachers and made them into political tools of the NDP. Now he goes to them today and he says, 'oh fellas we are not going to do anything. We want to just play it kind of nice, kind of cool. We are going to let you solve your own problems.' He is the most irresponsible Minister of Education that ever sat on either side of the House.

Mr. Robbins: — Best one they ever had.

Mr. Guy: — I don't suppose we can expect much better when you consider the background. He is a complete failure when it comes to supporting the parents and the students and the taxpayers of this Province. He tried to take a position last June supporting the teachers for his own political satisfaction but today he won't support anybody. He is trying to ride a horse through the centre of the gate without touching either side.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education has the responsibility today to see that the two sides get together. He should give them some support, give them some direction, and do something but sit there and say, oh it's not my problem now, we don't want to interfere. I'll tell you that the parents and the students are looking to him for some guidance and some direction before the problem becomes worse. We don't want to see a problem in Saskatchewan like we have in Quebec where the students are out of school by the thousands. It is bad enough that we have had a few rotating study periods now and we will have a worse situation if the Minister of Education doesn't accept some responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave to adjourn this debate to give the Minister the opportunity before this amendment comes up for discussion again to do something concrete and show he's got the interest of the parents and the taxpayers and the students of this Province at heart.

I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 72 – An Act to amend The School Act.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, you know Bill No. 72 proposes a series of major and minor changes in The School Act. One of the major amendments is the addition of a new Section 3(a). This Section will allow the Minister to establish school districts and school units in the North. It will also allow the Minister to draft regulations regarding the membership of the school boards to be established.

At present there is no local Government structure for education in the North. Education is provided by the northern school board but there are no local community school boards.

When I was on a tour of the North in January many of the people whom we met were interested in having a greater local voice in the operation of their schools. There is no reason why northern people should not have the same say in their schools as anyone else. That is why this amendment is being introduced.

Mr. Speaker, the provision of a local government in education is part of a total package for the North. The new Department of Northern Administration is part of this package. We want to upgrade the status of the North and provide people who live there with the same rights and privileges as are available elsewhere in this Province.

Up to now the North has been treated much like a colony of the South and the people there simply do not accept this and neither does this Government.

This amendment to The School Act is a significant step to correct this situation. An amendment is being made in Section 106 of the Act respecting the elections to school boards. In cases where the size of a board has been increased there could be a lapse of as much as two years before elections could be held to fill the new position. This amendment empowers the Minister to order an election in a consolidated school district any time after the expansion and size is approved, so that the lapse need not occur.

The change in Section 107 provides for naming of the new northern school boards in accord with their corporate status.

Section 118 is being amended to raise the ceiling above which tenders must be called for capital projects from \$1,000 to \$5,000. Many school boards have their own crews to do small-scale work. Calling for tenders on small projects is just

March 29, 1972

simply unrealistic and is often just a nuisance. This change provides the same latitude to district boards as the units have had for some time.

The new Section 119(a) gives district boards the authority to levy a mill rate specifically for capital purposes. Unit boards now have this power and since it may be practical to finance capital projects out of current revenue, in some cases, we are extending the power to districts as well.

Section 126 is being amended to accommodate changes made in other Acts to pay trustees for extra meetings they attend as members of joint boards. The change will place district trustees on the same basis as unit trustees.

Section 206 is amended to make Remembrance Day a statutory holiday for school purposes. In some areas November 11th is already a holiday. We have been approached by the Canadian Legion and by trustees to make this anniversary an official holiday. We believe it is fitting that the proposal be taken up.

Section 225 is to be amended to do away with the need for a special contract for temporary teachers. They will now be employed using the same form as for regular staff. This amendment makes no change in the relationship of a board to a teacher. It is merely a housekeeping amendment.

The change to Section 230 provides that a school board may delay payment of the June salary for five days after receipt of reports. This change is being made because there have been cases where teachers have been paid in full at the end of the month and boards have subsequently had problems in getting their complete returns.

Section 232 is being amended to distinguish between temporary teachers and substitute teachers. Substitutes may be paid at a different level than temporary teachers who are in fact regular staff employed for less than a full year.

The change in Section 238 shifts the power to appoint Chairmen for Boards of Reference from the Attorney General to the Minister of Education. This amendment dovetails with similar changes in other Acts already discussed.

In the amendment to Section 242 we are requiring school boards to take out insurance against claims for damages against the boards and its staff. In recent years some boards have had to face large claims based on accidents. I am very familiar with this situation myself. These claims can bring on financial problems that insurance could avoid.

Section 246 specifically provides that all persons from the age of six to the age of twenty-one have the right to attend school and receive instruction. This will clarify the situation in this regard in case any questions arise from the application of other legislation.

The amendments to Section 247 are the same in effect as those introduced in other Acts to define resident status. They have been covered before so I shall not repeat them at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move that this Bill, Bill No. 72 be now read a second time.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a few relatively brief comments on the amendments contained in Bill No. 72.

I was rather disappointed that the Minister didn't give us more details of what he proposes to do with respect to the amendments Section 3(a) of the Act.

As I understand the Act there are local school committees already in existence in a number of communities of northern Saskatchewan. I realize that they are not elected boards. I should have hoped as I say that the Minister could have given us a more specific outline of how he proposes to go about implementing this particular provision.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the principle of 3(a) I'd have to certainly agree with the Minister. His move here to provide a more extensive setup, if indeed that's what's going to result from this change, is one that I am sure all Members of the House would welcome. I again only express regret that more details weren't forthcoming in second reading to enable us to judge as to whether or not this Bill will bring about meaningful local representation on those boards or whether indeed it is window dressing as such in this entire section. I hope it isn't.

Mr. Speaker, the other Sections referred to by the Minister are primarily those of a housekeeping and revisionary nature. They are sections that again there will be several questions to raise in Committee. In general there is no major new principle other than the one for school boards in the North.

Accordingly I shall be happy to hold any further questions until the Bill goes to Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved third reading of **Bill No. 6 – An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act** be now read the third time.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, we have opposed this Bill on second reading and we opposed it in Committee and we now intend to oppose it on third reading.

We have basically outlined our reasons for the opposition to this Bill. First of all, that we view it as another tax on the producer. Secondly, we do not think that the stated reasons for the Bill of reducing the amount of horned cattle marketed will actually take place.

We feel that the measure is largely a revenue raising measure for the Government from farmers and producers of livestock. We do not think that it will bring about any appreciable change in the amount of horns that are actually marketed in the province.

March 29, 1972

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we think that this is just another tax by the Government opposite on the producer, on the people of Saskatchewan, and we will not be voting for it on third reading, we will oppose it.

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

YEAS – 35
Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Wood	Smishek	Romanow
Messer	Thibault	Larson
Kowalchuk	Baker	Brockelbank
MacMurchy	Pepper	Michayluk
Byers	Thorson	Kwasnica
Carlson	Engel	Richards
Owens	Robbins	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Feduniak	Mostoway	Comer
Lange	Oliver	Feschuk
Kaeding	Flash	

NAYS – 12
Messieurs

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

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.