

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**39th Day**

**Wednesday, April 19, 1972**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS**

**PRINTING OF BILLS**

**MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a complaint that I should like to lay before the House and I have a question.

The complaint has to do, first, in a general way with the situation concerning the Bills before this House. We have 15 Members and we have been in the House now for almost two months, eight weeks, the Session was started late to give the new Government the opportunity to get its program ready. We have six Bills in second reading and none of them printed. We don't have an opportunity to even look at them to study them, to get a position ready on them. This is a very serious matter because we have a limited amount of research people at our disposal.

And the question is: when can the Government give us any assurance that these Bills will be printed so that we can look at them and start to get our position ready on them and be able to come into this House ready to facilitate the business of the House and make our position known?

The complaint I have is: Yesterday, or the day before, Tuesday, April 18th, there was an introduction of Bills by the Hon. Mr. Snyder, two Bills by the Hon. Mr. Thorson. Mr. Snyder introduced a Bill respecting The Trade Union Act. It isn't even before this House yet and he was on television and on the radio and the public media, and he was discussing and announcing details of this Bill.

On top of that we have information that Mr. Thorson, before this House received the Bills to amend The Mineral Resources Act and to amend The Mineral Taxation Act, these Bills were already in the hands of people involved in this industry. Now I have no objection to the industry being informed as I think it is an excellent thing for the Minister as soon as possible to make these Bills available to interested parties. And, possibly, and I am not going to charge that he gave them the Bills first before he gave them to the House. I am asking him if he did and if he did I hope he will recognize that this is again a breach of etiquette of the House. But there is no question that the Hon. Mr. Snyder, yesterday, last night or sometime before today, gave out information and details contained, I presume, in The Trades Union Act, before we in this House – and that is both sides of the House, this Legislative Assembly – even had the opportunity to look at them.

I don't think this is good enough, Mr. Speaker. First, as I say, it is a late Session to give the Government a chance to get itself organized. We have been here two months. Normally we should almost be finished the Session. Here we find ourselves

with six Bills in second reading and none of them even printed.

They announced today two major pieces of legislation, one to do with The Land Bank and the other with The Succession Duties, and God knows when they will be printed. If the same performance prevails they will be on the Order Paper, the Blues, on Friday for second reading and they will not be printed.

This is terrible organization. You can excuse some of it as it is a new Government. I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should take a look at their program. I think they are trying to do too much too quickly. I have no objection to trying to put in a large program and implement the various plans and projects that they have, but I do think that they should reassess their position and if they have more Acts and Bills I think they should consider letting them wait until the fall session. I suggest to the Hon. Members across there, that the world and the province survived for over half a century before they got here and I know they waited breathlessly for the advent of the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture, but I do suggest in all seriousness that the world and the province could almost survive until next fall without some of these Acts they are waiting in the wings to rush in with.

Let's clean up what we have here and get these Bills in front of the House so that we can look at them and study them, as should be the case – and not just us, by their own Members of the Legislature as well. And if there are some of those great Acts that will save humanity, I suggest that maybe they can just wait and they can take another look at some of them in the fall session.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might respond at least in part to the question that the Leader of the Opposition raises.

First of all I am very sympathetic to his remarks with respect to the question of the printing. This is certainly not a desirable thing for this House and it is not a desirable thing for the Government. We sought to introduce Bills in such a way that when they are introduced for first reading they are, indeed, printed and all Members can take a look at them and study them.

However, I am informed, and we have done some considerable inquiring into this matter, and I am informed that this is really a two or three-pronged problem. 1. For right or for wrong there is an extremely heavy workload now that is in effect plugging the machinery. I refer to the Legislative Counsel printing machinery. That in effect has created a bit of a problem. There are some very complicated and very lengthy Bills. 2. I should advise the Leader of the Opposition and Members of the House without disrupting delicate negotiations that are going on at this moment, there are in fact some problems that are related to the printing and those who undertake the printing in the area of labor-management as opposed to any other types of problems.

I don't know the details of these. I am informed by Legislative Counsel and by others that steps are being taken to provide for alternate printing of the material. This may take

**April 19, 1972**

the form of an Itek process which I understand is a more sophisticated type of photocopy or gestetner operation. I don't know the full details of it but I am assured that alternate means are being looked at with a view to getting these unprinted Bills printed in some form for the Members and for the public as a whole to see.

I should like to make one final comment, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will afford as much opportunity as possible for him and for his Members and for those on our side to adequately study and peruse the legislative program. We have lots of work in terms of Estimates that we should like to go through. The moment these Bills are printed if you people need extra days in order to consider the Bills, we are certainly not going to object to that. I think you have a full and absolute right to do that.

All I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and the House is that this is a worrisome matter for us, very much so. We desire to get this Session towards its conclusion. We are in this problem, not entirely of our own making, and we are trying the best to get out of it as quickly as we can.

**HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** — Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word in relation to the two Bills of which I gave notice last Friday.

I want to say quite candidly that on that day I also mailed a copy of each Bill to the Regina office of the Canadian Petroleum Association, to the Calgary office of the Independent Petroleum Association and to the Regina office of the Saskatchewan Mining Association.

In the normal course of the mail delivery that would have reached their offices on Monday. It is true, of course, that first reading of the Bills was not given in this Chamber until Tuesday. I apologize if that was taken as a discourtesy to the House. I had, of course, prior to that had a number of discussions with representatives of these industries. I had in mind that we were getting crowded for time. I wanted to be sure that they had an opportunity to discuss these Bills with their Members, although I was aware that they would have a general idea of what we had in mind because of the discussions that we have had.

I certainly want to apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House if I have offended in any respect.

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, regarding the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), yesterday a Bill was introduced into the House regarding The Trade Union Act.

It was first reading and we have not yet seen the Bill. The comments were made on CKCK television on the 6:00 o'clock news, which I watched myself. Now the point is this, Mr. Attorney General, that immediately after those comments are made we usually start to get a certain number of telephone calls, as do all Members of the Legislature.

It certainly puts the Members in a very difficult position to have a caller say, "Well we just watched the Minister talk about introducing a Bill", and we respond by saying we are

sorry we haven't got it yet.

The question is: is the Government going to continue the practice of giving information on Bills that have not been presented to the Assembly?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, well I think the desirable practice is to make comments preferably when the Bills are printed and before all members of this House and to give comments then. That is the desirable practice.

I know that I have been guilty of this on one occasion myself. It is sometimes very difficult to avoid. The questionings of the Press are not offered as a total excuse, but as a reality of life. I don't mean this in any provocative sense. I am informed by officials that that happened on occasion under the former Government as well. The occasions may be increased somewhat this year because of the printing problems that we are presently faced with.

So the only answer that I can give is that we seek to solve the problem by having the Bills printed as quickly as possible so that Members can take a look at the Bill and work from there.

**MR. THORSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not enter into any public discussion about the contents of these Bills. I discussed them with representatives of the industry. I understood, when I mailed the copies to them, that they were not going to make any public statements about them before Members of the Legislature would have the Bills in hand. I made no public statement about them until yesterday, the day of first reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't think that I can permit a debate on this. I think the Leader of the Opposition rightly raised their complaints. I think answers have been given back and forth. If there is any further discussion needed, I think it should be done privately between the Leaders of both sides, rather than debate it in this manner.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, they might consider the capitalistic Press. Take another look at them and they might find that things are speeded up.

**MR. J.C. McISAAC (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want one very short comment as a follow-up on this theme that we were discussing, Sir, to the Attorney General.

Can we take it from the fact that these Bills given first reading here this morning – and I know the Attorney General mentioned there would be lots of time and we could take lots of time – but the point is we have lost a lot of time. We should have had these Bills long ago.

My question is: can we take from the fact that they are appearing here today that they will indeed be printed and available to us on Friday at the time of second reading?

**April 19, 1972**

**MR. ROMANOW:** — One general comment about the question about these Bills with respect to the Succession and Gift Tax, I am informed that a lot of this depends upon the arrangements that are being negotiated with the other provinces. As you know this is a four or five province deal. The Premier knows more about this. That is part of the reason for the delay there.

With respect to The Land Bank, without provoking controversy the Minister of Agriculture has sometime just prior to the House Session, spent some considerable time in getting farm opinions and apparently these were used to correlate with final draft of the Bill. We can discuss that in second reading.

Specifically on the point that you raise, when the Ministers told me that they had been introducing their Bills today for first reading and giving notice on Monday, we talked about it and it was our intention then to have the Bills in a printed form on Friday. Frankly, it was my own personal hope that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture would be able to give a second reading speech on this, which of course, requires that it be printed on Friday. It would allow the Opposition a weekend to look at them and then the debate could continue. But I cannot guarantee the House that that is, in fact, going to happen, again, simply because of the printing problem that is upon us. I can give you this guarantee for whatever it is worth, that I am certainly hounding the Minister of Agriculture, who is hounding the various officials, to get this printed as quickly as possible. If at all possible it will be on your desks by some form or another on Friday.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Lumsden):** — I don't want to get into a debate, Mr. Speaker, but as a new Member in this House I am shocked that the Opposition is totally ignored on legislation being presented to outside parties without it given to the Opposition. I hope that the Government opposite will stop that practice . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't think this debatable at this time.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, my question to the Hon. House Leader, in light of the possibility of strikes or labor disruptions in the printing industry, is it the intention of the Government opposite to allow certain of these Bills that have not been printed to die on the Order Paper, and if so, in light of the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't think these are proper questions at this time. I think we are getting into too much detail of what should be taken up on Orders of the Day. I don't think that is what the intention of this phase is.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are sitting here as the Opposition and we are ready to debate these Bills and we are not getting anywhere. I think it is a legitimate question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — That is not the responsibility of the Chair. The Chair's responsibility is to facilitate. I think if there are discussions that way, they should be done through the usual channels between the two parties and not be debated on the Orders of the Day.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

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. A.R. GUY (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to this. We have our Education Estimates in front of us now so we can follow up any questions that we might have.

I might just say that when I adjourned the debate about two weeks ago, it was done for the purpose of allowing the Minister time to do something to bring about better relationship between the teachers and the trustees in the negotiating of their salaries. However, we have seen this time go by and the Minister has still done absolutely nothing. In fact, he has made matters even worse by announcing that there is a 7 per cent guideline that had been built into the grants. He has made it much more difficult for a settlement to be reached than it was if he had kept still. I suppose, we maybe have to take some of the blame because we asked him to do something and even though what he did was detrimental, we have to give him credit for at least doing that. But I think it is a disgrace and as I said the other day, he has to be the worst Minister of Education that this House has ever had the privilege of listening to. He has had all this time, yet has done absolutely nothing to assist in the settlement of the salary negotiations between the teachers and the trustees.

I would suggest that he has certainly been a disgrace to the two groups involved and he must be an embarrassment to the Government opposite.

Amendment negatived.

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, the passage of this Bill to remove compulsory arbitration is both a matter of principle and a matter of common sense.

The New Democratic Party is committed to the idea of free collective bargaining as a democratic right. Implementation of this principle was part of the New Deal for People program. We opposed the use of compulsion when our Party was in Opposition. We oppose it now as the Government. This is the major reason for the implementation of this Bill.

The removal of compulsory arbitration is also a matter of common sense. It is not possible to have free bargaining and compulsory arbitration at the same time. If we say that we believe in free bargaining, then we must be prepared to put our money on it and see it through to the finish. If we do not believe in it, we ought to replace it with something else.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard several speeches from the Liberal Members opposing this Bill. They want to keep compulsory arbitration. I'm not sure they are all saying the same thing. They are trying to work both sides of the street by pretending we have free bargaining at the same time that we have compulsion. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have shown neither principle nor

common sense and they are becoming a bad joke on both sides of this particular question. The use of compulsory arbitration is an interference in the process of negotiation. It is inconsistent with free bargaining. Either negotiations are free and the parties are at liberty to reach their own settlement or they are not free, and someone outside imposes the settlement. And you can't have it both ways. If the threat of outside intervention is present, if we keep compulsory arbitration on the statutes, we are demonstrating our lack of commitment and we are undermining the negotiations. If compulsory arbitration is available the parties may be tempted to stall, to delay, in the hope that an outside settlement would favor their position. If we are to have a free bargaining system we must also have the courage to back it up and live with it. Compulsory imposed settlements are the easy way out and they will sooner or later eat away the whole concept of free collective bargaining. Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of this Province have had enough of imposed decisions and arbitrary use of authority. They are not interested in compulsion as an everyday tool of government policy. They do not want Bill 2 or salary guidelines or pupil-teacher ratios. They do not agree with the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) who calls this sort of thing leadership. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Members opposite know the difference between leadership and dictatorship.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — This is one of the reasons they are going to stay in the Opposition for a very long time to come. In voting on this Bill all Members should keep in mind that The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation opposes compulsory arbitration. They should be reminded that the trustees have not asked that it be imposed, in fact, they do not even agree to the use of voluntary arbitration in this year's negotiations. As the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) said, if they do not want voluntary arbitration they are not likely to want it forced on them. Mr. Speaker, the question of providing leadership in the contract talks has been raised by the Members opposite. They say the Government should provide leadership in the work toward a settlement. I would remind the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that the Government, along with the Northern School Board has reached a settlement in the one area where we bargain with the teachers. In Area 13. We reached a settlement in that area based on a salary increase of 7.72 per cent. I believe this settlement is a good one. I believe that the Northern Board agree it's a good one. I believe that the northern area teachers agree with us also. I wonder if the Member for Milestone would call that an example of NDP leadership. Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of evidence to show that agreements can be reached without compulsion. Also there is evidence to show that these settlements can be satisfactory to both sides. I appreciate the calm, quiet comments of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I have a letter here from the northern area teachers. Enclosed with it is a copy of a letter the teachers sent to their representative, the Member for Athabasca. It points out how he speaks for the teachers in that particular area. Being a teacher himself we can appreciate the kind of comments he has made with respect to the settlement in the North, with respect to the whole business of compulsory arbitration. I will read this letter and table it. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. MacMurchy: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Guy, by myself, on behalf of the teachers in the northern areas. Our feeling is that Mr. MacDonald, in his remarks to the Legislative Assembly, did slight our organization and we feel that our representative should be aware of our feelings.

Yours very truly, P. Ray Jutras, NATA President.

The letter that he sent along reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Guy: We would like to bring to your attention the malicious misrepresentation of facts as given by Mr. Cy MacDonald in the Legislature this past week as reported by the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, in their Tuesday, March 14 edition. In his remarks, Mr. MacDonald states that our teachers in northern areas would receive an average salary increase of 2.74 per cent this year. This figure is correct but taken out of context re our complete salary agreement. Though it may be true that on the salary grid there is only an average increase of 2.74 per cent there is a second part of the salary package namely, our northern allowance scheme, where teachers of northern areas gain substantially. In fact, the average increase for the next year in the total package is 7.72 as reported correctly by Mr. MacMurchy. As a past teacher in northern areas you should be well versed re the type of salary package we as teachers in the northern areas do have. As things stand for this coming year our grid is well above the provincial median. In fact, it would take an average increase of approximately 6.5 per cent for the median in the South to match our grid for this year. Beside this grid, teachers of northern areas are paid a differential, a northern allowance which tends to compensate for such things as a higher cost of living, isolation, lack of medical services, etc. It was in this differential that most of the negotiation money went. For example, a teacher in La Ronge who previously received a northern living allowance of \$400 now receives \$725. Further, a teacher at Camsell Portage who previously received an allowance of \$1,250 now received \$2,175. Mr. MacDonald claims that the new northern living allowance scheme could not be considered a pay increase. Perhaps you could ask Mr. MacDonald just what these increases represent if not increases in pay. We also feel that the statements such as the lowest increase in the North American continent in reference to our salary settlement and his reference to teacher qualifications for Class 5 and 6 in the North, "there are no teachers in these classes in the North", was his comment, tend to slight our northern teachers in the eyes of our southern colleagues and are not only fictitious but also malicious in intent. We would hope that you, as our representative in the Legislature, will set your Party colleague straight and ask him, on our behalf, to refrain from making remarks out of context on matters he seems to know nothing about.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Where is Milestone?



April 19, 1972

MR. MacMURCHY: —

We would also ask that Mr. MacDonald retract publicly the misconception he has put forth.

Yours truly, Ray Jutras, for the Teachers of Northern Areas, NATA President.

Mr. Speaker, I table the contents of the letter that I have just read.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I have indicated both principle and common sense indicate that compulsion in bargaining should be removed. We have evidence that compulsion is not necessary. I would urge all Members on this side of the House and on the other side of the House to keep in mind the total consequences of their vote on this Bill. I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 99 — **An Act to amend The Mutual Medical and Hospital Benefit Association Act** be now read a second time.

MR. G.B. GRANT (Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, my comments on this, further to what I said when speaking earlier, would be a criticism of the explanatory notes which were tabled in this House the other day. They consist of absolutely no explanation. If the Hon. Members will refer to them they'll find that Item 1 quotes the existing sections in the Act and under the heading explanation they have just printed the amendments that are proposed to the new Act. This is of no earthly help to us whatsoever and I am sorry neither the Minister nor the Attorney General are in the House but I think the Attorney General should take it into consideration in connection with all Bills because I've seen several come in in this form and if this is the type of explanatory notes we are going to get they might as well save the foolscap.

The main provision of this Bill, of course, is to provide for global budgeting through the so-called community clinics and it is quite evident that there is quite a wide difference of opinion between the medical profession and the Minister in spite of statements by the Minister and in spite of statements by the Saskatchewan Medical Association. I feel that their statement was made with tongue in cheek because it is my distinct understanding that they felt that the relationship should be between the medical practitioner and the Medical Care Insurance Commission, or in other words the Minister, but this is not the case. Negotiations have been carried on by the Association and the Minister and in my opinion have been entered into illegally since March 1. I feel there are no legal grounds whatsoever for payments and the Minister indicated that the Medical Care Insurance Commission have 17,000 claims on hand that are being processed hopefully under the global budgeting principle, and if he does so I believe he is doing it illegally. There seems to be a feeling that these so-called community clinics are the answer to all, not all, but a good portion of the problems of escalating costs in the medical and hospitalisation field. This has been a bone of contention for some time and last year from pressure received from provinces, including Saskatchewan, the Federal government set up a Community Health Centre study under the chairmanship of Dr. John Hastings,

Professor of Health Administration, University of Toronto, School of Hygiene and voted \$147,000 for this study. The study is just nicely underway. The Committee is made up of about 25 people, all very well qualified people to study this question. It seems to me that the Hon. Minister has jumped the gun, maybe that's the best expression, by bringing this Bill in and taking the action which he took in March because he is not waiting for the outcome of these hearings. I might say the son-in-law of Mr. Tommy Douglas is on it so that the interest of your Party is certainly represented there and in spite of that the Minister has decided to go ahead and bulldoze his way through in this regard on the pretext that it is an experiment.

Well, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker it is not an experiment on the part of the Government, it is a definite plan to bring to the forefront the community clinics regardless of the outcome of Dr. Hastings' findings. I feel that there is really no discernible difference between the so-called consumer sponsored community clinics and the many multi-specialty groups that have been in existence for some time. There is a marked difference in one regard, because there is a considerably greater turnover of doctors in the community sponsored clinics than there is in the multi-specialty clinics. It hasn't as yet been proven and that is the purpose of Dr. Hastings' Committee, to try to establish whether the incidence of hospitalization of patients coming from the community clinics group is lower than elsewhere. This, in itself, cannot be looked at in isolation because other costs related to health care must be considered as well. A question of salary has always been a bone of contention with the medical profession and those who feel that fee for service should be done away with. I personally feel that the movement toward a salaried physician is not going materially to decrease medical costs nor is it going to improve quality, but rather I think it is going to jeopardize quality. One thing about a doctor, even though there are times when it is difficult to get him for a house call, they are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week and in case of real necessity your own doctor or someone substituting for him is available at the hospital at almost any hour of the day when the circumstances demand it. One must remember that the physician's time is largely taken up, or at least to a large extent these days, is taken up with routine examinations and call-backs and as they say examination of apparently healthy people.

I believe there is some merit in experimenting with the association of social workers more closely with doctors and I know this is one of the aims of the community clinics and also of the multi-specialty groups. Merely because you are going to inject more paramedical groups between the patient and the doctor does not necessarily mean a reduction in cost but rather could mean an increase in cost. It has been established beyond any question that the more doctors you have, the greater your medical care cost and this has certainly been demonstrated in the Vancouver area and in the Calgary and Edmonton area within the past five years. I have come to one conclusion that in Saskatchewan we do have a sufficient supply of medical personnel. The distribution and utilization of them can certainly be improved but we must bear in mind that when you relieve the doctors of some of the demands on their time this makes them available for other calls and you'll not only have the additional demand on their time, but also have the additional cost of the various paramedical personnel who are going to take over some of their duties.

**April 19, 1972**

I believe right today the paramedical people outnumber doctors by 25 to 1 and at the turn of the century it was about one for one. This is a subject that can be discussed at great length and I don't propose, Mr. Speaker, to take the time of the House to go into more detail on it, except to repeat what I have said earlier that the action of the Minister was hasty in proceeding with the scheme before the legislation was brought into this House. It was done in a manner that has disturbed quite a number of medical people in the clinics because of lack of consultation with them. The agreements have been entered into unilaterally without the concurrence in some cases of medical people involved in the clinics. The haste in my opinion has resulted in questionable legality as far as relationship between the clinics and the Medical Care Insurance Commission is concerned. The other criticism is that the Minister did not wait until the Hastings Committee brought forth its findings, which I believe will be later on this year, a committee established with the concurrence of most provincial governments, including our own and with the blessing of the Minister of Health, Mr. Munro. I think that is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Hon. Minister of Public Health has been detained this morning, May I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. D.F. MacDONALD (Moose Jaw North):** — I should like to introduce to you a group of students from King George School in Moose Jaw. There are 80 students present, two Grade Eight classes and one class of Grade Five and Six. They are accompanied today by their Principal, Mr. Murray, their Vice-Principal, Mr. Segall and a teacher, Mrs. Brooker. This tour was arranged to complement their course in Social Studies as it relates to the process of government. I hope that the group of students finds the visit to this Assembly most educational. I hope the Members of the House will be on their best behavior while they are here and I wish them a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to the Members of the House approximately 45 students from Montgomery School in the city of Saskatoon, coming from my constituency. I believe they are in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by teachers Mr. Krahn and Mr. Lozinski. I understand they have had a tour of the buildings and will be watching the Members of the Legislature in action — I am not sure whether those are two words or one word — but they'll be watching them in action in any case from here on in. I am sure that the Members will be on their best behavior. I welcome them to the city of Regina and welcome them to this opportunity of watching democracy on display in Regina.

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