



SECOND SESSION - TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(HANSARD)

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Don Toth
Speaker



MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Speaker — Hon. Don Toth
 Premier — Hon. Brad Wall
 Leader of the Opposition — Lorne Calvert

Name of Member	Political Affiliation	Constituency
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Belanger, Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornerud, Hon. Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Boyd, Hon. Bill	SP	Kindersley
Bradshaw, Fred	SP	Carrot River Valley
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Brotten, Cam	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Calvert, Lorne	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Hon. Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Hon. Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Furber, Darcy	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
Gantfoer, Hon. Rod	SP	Melfort
Harpauer, Hon. Donna	SP	Humboldt
Harper, Ron	NDP	Regina Northeast
Harrison, Jeremy	SP	Meadow Lake
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Hon. Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Hon. Darryl	SP	Prince Albert Carlton
Higgins, Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Hutchinson, Hon. Bill	SP	Regina South
Huyghebaert, Yogi	SP	Wood River
Iwanchuk, Andy	NDP	Saskatoon Fairview
Junor, Judy	NDP	Saskatoon Eastview
Kirsch, Delbert	SP	Batoche
Krawetz, Hon. Ken	SP	Canora-Pelly
LeClerc, Serge	SP	Saskatoon Northwest
McCall, Warren	NDP	Regina Elphinstone-Centre
McMillan, Tim	SP	Lloydminster
McMorris, Hon. Don	SP	Indian Head-Milestone
Michelson, Warren	SP	Moose Jaw North
Morgan, Hon. Don	SP	Saskatoon Southeast
Morin, Sandra	NDP	Regina Walsh Acres
Nilson, John	NDP	Regina Lakeview
Norris, Hon. Rob	SP	Saskatoon Greystone
Ottenbreit, Greg	SP	Yorkton
Quennell, Frank	NDP	Saskatoon Meewasin
Reiter, Jim	SP	Rosetown-Elrose
Ross, Laura	SP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Schriemer, Joceline	SP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Stewart, Hon. Lyle	SP	Thunder Creek
Taylor, Len	NDP	The Battlefords
Tell, Hon. Christine	SP	Regina Wascana Plains
Toth, Hon. Don	SP	Moosomin
Trew, Kim	NDP	Regina Coronation Park
Van Mulligen, Harry	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
Vermette, Doyle	NDP	Cumberland
Wall, Hon. Brad	SP	Swift Current
Weekes, Randy	SP	Biggar
Wilson, Nadine	SP	Saskatchewan Rivers
Wotherspoon, Trent	NDP	Regina Rosemont
Yates, Kevin	NDP	Regina Dewdney

[The Assembly met at 13:30.]

Clerk: — Members, I wish to inform you that Mr. Speaker is not present today to open today's sitting.

[Prayers]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, seated in your gallery today is a great group of Saskatchewan young people who have joined us for the proceedings. There are 40 students from the Paul J. Hill school of business at the University of Regina who are joining us today.

These students earned, Mr. Speaker, second place in the Jeux du Commerce West, which is a case competition held annually. They were just a few points, just a few points behind the host Alberta team in the field of 14 business schools and 600 students, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So it's obviously a great achievement, and we want to acknowledge all of them and welcome them to the Assembly here.

Joining them, by the way, are faculty adviser Ernest Johnson, one of the professors; and student co-captains are here, Jon Di Stasi, Tricia Gillis; and Anne Lavack, the dean of the faculty. They're also joined by the president of the University of Regina, and the vice-chancellor — Dr. Vianne Timmons is also here today with us. This is her first opportunity as president of the University of Regina, I think, to visit the Assembly, to join us here at the Legislative Assembly.

I'm going to have a chance to meet with these students and the faculty and the leadership of the University of Regina after question period. I'm looking forward to it.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to ask if they'd all stand up so that we can properly welcome them and congratulate them as they've come to their Assembly today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Massey Place.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with the Premier on behalf of the official opposition in welcoming all of the business students that are in the Assembly today, as well as extend our welcome and appreciation for Dr. Timmons and the rest of the faculty and administration who are here with us today. Welcome to your legislature.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome my uncle, David Rosom, a resident of Regina, who often watches from home but is able to join us today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to do an extended invitation.

The Deputy Speaker: — The Minister of Agriculture has asked leave for extended introduction of guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried.

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I meant was actually introduction. Thank you for that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce members of a newly appointed agriculture youth advisory committee. I announced the formation of this committee this morning, Mr. Speaker. The committee will provide advice and direction to the provincial government on how to attract and retain young people in the agriculture industry.

The members of the youth committee come from a variety of farming operations from around Saskatchewan. I'd like to welcome the members of the youth advisory committee. And I'd invite them to stand when I say their names.

The chairperson is April Nichol from Qu'Appelle; Jeff Prosko from Rose Valley; Max Halyk from Melville; Derek Tallon from Lafleche; Daryl Frank from Southey; Landon Swityk from Spiritwood. And unable to be with us today — also though, on the committee — is Colin Wilgenbusch from Halbrite.

I would ask all members to recognize this young group and thank them for the participation into where we head with young people in agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Douglas Park.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, seated in the east gallery are the members of the University of Regina men's curling team that on March 29 won the CIS — Canadian Interuniversity Sports championship in Montreal.

The team had a very successful championship week, finishing with a perfect seven and oh record. They outscored their opponents by nearly five points per game, and that is a remarkable achievement, Mr. Speaker.

Their victory was the first for a U of R [University of Regina] curling team on the national level and the fourth Canadian title in the history of the university for any sport. And next up for the team is to represent Canada at the 2010 Karuizawa Invitational in Japan.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask our guests to rise as I call their name. From Biggar, Saskatchewan, he is a fourth-year Education student. He was also the all-star skip at the CIS championship, Mr. Speaker — Chris Busby, skip.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — From Weyburn, he is a fourth-year Kinesiology student — the third, Jason Obst.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — From Regina, he is a fourth-year Administration student — the second, Justin Mihalicz.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And also from Weyburn, he is also a fourth-year Administration student — the lead, Brad Wallin.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And joining them, Mr. Speaker, is John Papandreos, director of recreational services and curling liaison at the University of Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, not joining them today are the alternate, Brent Rodgers of Regina, and the coach, Wayne Obst. Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to join me in welcoming again these Canadian champions and in recognizing their achievement.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Weyburn-Big Muddy.

Mr. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to join with my colleague across the way in welcoming the CIS gold medal winning team, curling team to the Assembly, particularly, Mr. Speaker, the two members of the team from Weyburn, Jason Obst and Brad Wallin.

And I also want to note, Mr. Speaker, that aside from curling, Brad Wallin is also the co-inventor of a new putter grip, a newly designed putter grip that he and two of his business colleagues are looking at marketing. And in fact Brad has been most recently to, I believe, Florida at a golf trade show. And hopefully it looks promising that a major company will pick them up.

So I just want to again welcome them to their Legislative Assembly. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Nutana.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join the Minister of Agriculture in welcoming the youth

advisory committee to the legislature this afternoon and also to welcome their appointment. I know that there are more and more young people that are getting involved in the field of agriculture, particularly young women, and it's wonderful to see that one of the members of the committee is a young woman that's actively involved in farming. So on behalf of the official opposition, I want to welcome the youth advisory committee to the legislature.

And while I'm on my feet, I also, as someone that hails from Biggar, Saskatchewan — was born in Biggar; and we are the curling capital, I think, of this province — I want to congratulate the skip from the U of R team, congratulate him. Biggar has a proud tradition of great curlers, and it doesn't surprise me at all that we have the skip coming from Biggar, Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's also my pleasure to be able to introduce to you and to the members of the legislature, 50 grade 10, good-looking grade 10 students from the city of Melville with their teacher. And I know all members, or most members, will recognize this name. Perry Ostapowich is their teacher, who faithfully brings his classes into the legislature and we all appreciate that. Another teacher accompanying them is Don Coleman and their chaperone is Bob Simpson.

And I also want special mention for Stewart because I met with him a few minutes ago and he felt it was necessary that I actually picked him out and highlighted him here today. So I want everyone to welcome them to their legislature and thanks for coming.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave for an extended introduction of guests.

The Deputy Speaker: — The member from Regina Coronation Park has asked for extended leave of introductions. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried.

Mr. Trew: — I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank all members for this courtesy. Today, Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to introduce two constituents who are determined to make their province a better and a safer place. I'm going to ask my guests to rise as I introduce. Sharon Gallenger is the widow of Jim Gallenger. Crystal Gallenger is their daughter.

Jim Gallenger drove snowplow since 1984 for the then Department of Highways, now Ministry of Highways. January

16 this year, Jim's snowplow broke down on the highway and he called for help. Then as is so typical of many Saskatchewan people — certainly typical of Jim Gallenger — when a car slid into the ditch nearby, he went to help. Jim and another good Samaritan were helping the driver when just after 4 p.m. on January 16, a semi slid into the ditch, sadly killing both men.

Sharon and Crystal Gallenger are here today to see the first of their petitions being presented as a first step to making Saskatchewan highways safer for highways workers and the public. And for that, I thank you both.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all hon. members to join with me in welcoming Sharon and Crystal Gallenger to their legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to join my colleague in acknowledging the presence of Sharon and Crystal Gallenger today in the gallery. Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to attend the memorial service for Jim Gallenger, at which time I learned much about this man. He'd served with our Ministry of Highways for many years, a very dedicated worker. One who was first on the job often, who went beyond the call of duty, and in this instance, certainly showed his commitment to helping his fellow man by providing assistance to a stranded motorist.

The impact of that particular accident was tragic for the family, and I think I would like to express my condolence once again to Mrs. Gallenger and her daughter. But it was also a very difficult situation for Jim's fellow employees who had worked with him for many years, who knew him as not just a co-worker but as a very good friend. And I would like to acknowledge that commitment that Jim showed to his colleagues and to his daily job and recognize that we have many public servants in the employment of this province, of this provincial government, that bring the same level of commitment day after day.

And so to those employees who are serving the people of Saskatchewan faithfully, I offer my acknowledgement and appreciation. To the Gallengers, I express my condolences once again and thank them for having shared their husband and father with our ministry for so long.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister for Enterprise and Innovation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Hon. Assembly a man well known in the city of Regina — Mr. Bruce Anderson, president, Regina Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Anderson is seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that all members will give Mr. Anderson a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, it is my honour today to present the first more than, well more than 400 signatures in a petition dealing with *The Highway Traffic Act*. And the petition reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to enact changes to *The Highway Traffic Act*, to be referred to as the Gallenger amendment, which would require all vehicle traffic to slow to 60 kilometres per hour when passing a snowplow with their warning lights activated on Saskatchewan highways.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that these, well more than 400 signatures, have come in less than six days since this petition was first started, and I am very confident it is the first of many to come. Most of this batch are signed from people from Regina, but I can assure you there are scattered names from all across the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[13:45]

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's well known that inadequate access to quality and affordable child care is a major roadblock for parents who want to access the labour market or further their own education, and we also know that too many Saskatchewan families are struggling with this issue and unable to find child care. And the petition reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government through consultation with the child care community to immediately invest in growing the capacity of early child care community and to enable new child care spaces. This investment must include infrastructure funding for new facilities and expansion, funding to significantly increase the number of early childhood diploma and certificate training seats, and funding to ensure that the sector is able to increase its wages and benefits to attract and retain the needed personnel.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so present on behalf of Saskatchewan families.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to present a petition in support of the indexing of minimum wage. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to commit to indexing Saskatchewan minimum wage to ensure that the standard of living of minimum wage earners is maintained in the face of cost of living increases.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And the petition is signed by residents from Weyburn, Estevan, Unity, Battleford, and North Battleford. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to present a petition today calling for wage equity for CBO [community-based organization] workers. And we know that these workers in community-based organizations, CBOs, in Saskatchewan have traditionally been underpaid and many thus continue to earn poverty level wages. I'd like to read the prayer, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the development and implementation of a multi-year funding plan to ensure that CBO workers achieve wage equity with employees who perform work of equal value in government departments.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And these folks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, come from the communities of Regina, Yorkton, Prince Albert, and Moose Jaw. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of rural residents of Saskatchewan who question why the Sask Party government is leaving them behind when it comes to providing safe and affordable water. Mr. Speaker, the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to financially assist the town of Duck Lake residents for the good of their health and safety due to the exorbitant water rates being forced on them by a government agency, and that this government fulfills its commitment to rural Saskatchewan.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

These petitions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are signed by the good residents of Duck Lake, Hague, and Rosthern. I so present. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today to present a petition in support of a new Saskatchewan Hospital. The petitioners note that the nearly 100-year-old existing structure is in much need of replacement. Mr. Speaker, the petitioners ask that:

. . . the Legislative Assembly call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately recommit funds and resources for the continued development and construction of a new Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford and provide the Prairie North Regional Health Authority with the authority necessary to complete this essential and much-needed project.

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners are all from the city of North Battleford and the city of Saskatoon. I so present, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Massey Place.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition in support of the expansion of the graduate retention program. As you know, graduate students do not qualify for this program which would include, of course M.B.A. [Master of Business Administration] graduates here in Saskatchewan. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately expand the graduate retention program to include master's and Ph.D. graduates.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, the individuals who signed this petition are students from the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Regina, as well as a number of health care professionals who practise here in the province who have graduate degrees. I so present. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

Technology Safety Workshop for Parents

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today to speak about a workshop that will be held at Vanier Collegiate in Moose Jaw on April 21. This workshop is to give parents a better understanding of issues when it comes to their children using technology to their best advantage.

As your children are putting information on Facebook or other social networking sites, what could put them at risk? If you've ever asked yourself this question, you are encouraged to attend

this free technology safety workshop. The workshop is open to the entire community of Moose Jaw and surrounding areas, and will include presentations from members of the Moose Jaw Police Service and personnel of Vanier Collegiate, among others.

The speakers will give presentations that demonstrate proper netiquette. Netiquette are rules of etiquette that apply when communicating over the Internet. This will help show parents how they can use computers and social networking sites to better ensure the safety of their children, and how some sites can be harmful. This workshop is for adults only — parents, guardians, or anyone who is in contact with children on a regular basis. Another workshop will be held specifically for students the next day at Vanier.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of vast options for communications and interest in technology safety, I ask that the members join me in thanking Vanier Collegiate and all those who helped coordinate this important workshop. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

National Archery in Schools Program

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motto of the national archery in schools program is: Changing Lives — One Arrow at a Time. This program is now offered to grades 4 to 12 students in the United States, Australia, the province of Nova Scotia, and most recently in Saskatchewan.

Right now in our province, as many as 7,200 students in 34 schools have the opportunity to experience all that the sport of archery has to offer. With the assistance of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, school divisions are able to implement the NASP [national archery in schools program] program in their schools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this past Friday afternoon I had the opportunity to attend the provincial silver medal presentation to the NASP team from the Canora schools, with instructors Mr. Thomas Lowe and Mr. Rodney Steciuk. The provincial gold medal was won by the Melfort school team, instructed by Mr. Randy Steciuk. Congratulations to the two brothers on their provincial awards.

Mr. Speaker, two grade 5 students, Shale Tratch and Bailey Steciuk from Canora Composite School, won provincial silver and gold medals respectively in the grades 4 to 6 boys and girls individual category. They will now advance to the national competition being held May 8 and 9 in Louisville, Kentucky. This is the first time that Saskatchewan and Canada will be represented at the national level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in congratulating these students and wish them well at the national competition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Hockey Star from Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to profile another northern athlete who's an exciting female hockey star named Jayden Campbell of the English River First Nations.

Jayden was put on skates by her grandmother when she was just two years old. Jayden fell and got up and fell again, and the second time she got up, she never looked back. And now the 16-year-old phenom has all the makings of a future hockey star from the Northwest.

Jayden never liked girls' skates and wanted Wayne Gretzky skates and got those skates for Christmas. She played minor hockey in Meadow Lake and played with the Beauval novice and atoms in her early years, and even had her grandpa coach her.

In her first game, Jayden scored five goals and four assists. And since joining the Beaver River hockey league at the age of nine, she scored 52 goals and had 54 assists in 17 games with the Beauval team, Mr. Speaker.

At the age of nine, Jayden played for her home team of Patuanak in a tournament in Prince Albert. She was the youngest player and was so exciting that even the opposing teams cheered when she made a good play or scored a goal. Jayden played with the P.A. [Prince Albert] Thunder when she was 13, played in the winter games in Nipawin, and also played in the National Aboriginal Hockey Championships.

At one game Jayden shot the puck so hard that she knocked down a player, but her motto is, don't talk about it until everything is over. Her grandparents are very proud of her. She wants to be a professional fighter, is looking at playing university hockey, and is dreaming of playing in the Olympics. Based on her skill and the support and sacrifice that her grandpa, Ray, and her grandma, Sharon, are giving her, remember the name Jayden Campbell because I predict we'll be hearing a lot from that name. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Humboldt.

Humboldt Broncos Win Championship

Hon. Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I know that the member from Saltcoats will enthusiastically join me today to acknowledge what has become a yearly tradition. The Humboldt Broncos, for the third year in a row, captured the Credit Union Cup as champions of the SJHL [Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League].

Last night in front of 1,700 fans, the Broncos defeated a strong Melville team 5 to 1, to win the series four games to one. The Broncos will now move on to the ANAVET [Army, Navy & Air Force Veterans in Canada] Cup against Manitoba

champion, Portage Terriers.

This is the Broncos' eighth title, Mr. Speaker. As the coach and general manager of the Broncos, Dean Brockman, said, "It never gets old." Special congratulations to Matthew Kirzinger, who was named the SJHL playoff most valuable player.

Mr. Speaker, there was a reason that Humboldt did so well in the Kraft Hockeyville 2009 competition that recently concluded. It is a strong community with enthusiastic people willing to work hard to get the job done. These are the same traits that the Broncos continue to exemplify and the reason they are once again champions.

Mr. Speaker, the Humboldt Broncos are not only the SJHL champions three times running, they are also the defending ANAVET Cup champions which goes to the best team from Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as well as defending the national Junior A champions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to please join me in congratulating the Humboldt Broncos on their season so far, and extend their support to the Broncos in their pursuit of their second straight ANAVET Cup over the next couple of weeks, and hopefully another national championship.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

German Language School Easter Celebration

Ms. Morin: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, on Saturday, April 4, I had the pleasure of participating in the Regina German Language School's annual Easter celebration. The school is comprised of children learning German who can even qualify for high school credits, as well as adult learners from beginner to advanced.

This celebration allows the students and their families to engage in traditional aspects of the German culture with respect to how Easter was and is currently celebrated. One such historical fact is that the first edible Easter bunny was created in the early 1800s, using pastry and sugar.

Mr. Speaker, students and guests were able to engage in games, crafts, songs, and stories, and of course indulge in delicious baked goods and some good, strong German coffee. Canada Safeway Ltd., through store manager Dean Shaw, sponsored the event as his reason was, "This is a small role that Safeway can play in promoting harmony through understanding different cultures."

One of the unique aspects to this yearly celebration is the invitation that was extended to the students and teachers of the Japanese language school, as both schools operate from the Campbell high school location. They participated enthusiastically, which is a true testament to how similar interests in learning additional languages and cultures can cross any boundaries.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to commend the dedication of the students, families, teachers, and volunteers for maintaining the

German language and culture in Regina and the surrounding community. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Wood River.

Provincial Championship Hockey Teams

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Today I'd like to recognize the accomplishments of three provincial championship hockey teams from the area around my hometown of Glentworth. On March 8, the Glentworth Thunder midget hockey team won their first provincial title since 1994. Also the Wood River Ice Cats took the provincial championship over the Carrot River team by a score of 11 to 5, and this follows up on their championship win of 2007. Plus the Wood River Wildcats beat the Biggar Nationals to capture their second straight provincial championship.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these amazing athletes came from various communities in my constituency. They travelled many miles. They got up early in the morning on numerous occasions for practices and games which they had to drive for ice time, gave up weekends and personal time to become the champions.

Mr. Speaker, the players aren't the only ones who made sacrifices. The parents did also. And we can't forget the volunteer coaches who go through many stressful hours watching the games and put in many hours at practices and mentoring our young people.

[14:00]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Glentworth Thunder, Wood River Ice Cats, and the Wood River Wildcats for becoming the provincial champions. I'd also like to thank the parents and coaches for their support of minor hockey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of the Assembly in joining me in congratulating the teams, coaches, and parents for a very successful season.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Coronation Park.

Regina Community Living Spring Fling

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Regina Association for Community Living held its most successful Spring Fling ever last Saturday. There was a perfect mix of great meal, both silent and live auctions with our favourite special guest CC of Z99 as the auctioneer.

My friend CC used his very best humour to coax mostly willing bidders to dig very deep in their wallets and beyond. Corporate sponsors were numerous and generous. Happily, Mr. Speaker, people attending the 2009 Spring Fling responded with generosity, fed by our firm knowledge that all people deserve respect, the opportunity to be the best we can be, and we all

need connection with other people. In other words, we need to love and be loved.

Seldom am I in such a large gathering with so much civility or with so much determination to do what we can to make our world a better place. I'm left with the thought that the lives of all would be richer if, as a rite of passage, every person was forced to attend at least one Spring Fling. As we were leaving, my wife and I felt very good about humanity and the future that continues to be ever more inclusive, caring, and sharing. That future will indeed have no one left behind.

Congratulations to the Regina Association for Community Living on hosting such a terrific annual Spring Fling.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION PERIOD

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Drinking Water

Ms. Morin: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a public meeting in Hepburn last week confirmed the severity of the problems facing the community's water supply. Seventy-five per cent of wells tested exceed the maximum allowable limit for substances that could have an adverse effect on human health, including uranium and coliform bacteria. Forty-four per cent of people draw water from wells that do not have adequate treatment and even some infants in the community drink untreated water.

To the minister: what is the Sask Party doing to provide the people of Hepburn with safe, clean, and affordable drinking water?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to answer the member's question.

Like so many other issues, this one has a long and sad history. Last fall our government, through the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, offered free water-quality testing to every single resident in Hepburn. The town has had a precautionary drinking water advisory in effect since June 12, 2007, which, if I am not mistaken, was during the time of the previous NDP [New Democratic Party] government — the same government, Mr. Speaker, that was in office when similar problems came to light in the town of Duck Lake. Under our direction, SWA [Saskatchewan Watershed Authority] has now focused the delivery of its rural water quality program . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Under our direction, the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority has now focused the delivery of its rural water quality program

on high-risk communities serviced by private groundwater wells like Hepburn. Previously, Mr. Speaker, private wells were sampled in an ad hoc manner, i.e., waiting for clients to call in and say that they had a problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — The minister himself has just admitted that they knew about the problem for 18 months since they've been in government and done nothing about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Morin: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we saw in Duck Lake what happens when people can't afford to pay for safe, clean drinking water. Now people in Hepburn are facing a similar situation.

A solution to Hepburn's water crisis will likely cost this town of approximately 700 people between 5 and \$6 million. The cost to users will be at least \$10,000 — that's approximately \$8,000 for construction plus 2,500 for hookup when all is said and done. People who don't have that kind of cash lying around — and it's fair to say that that would be most people, Mr. Deputy Speaker — will be forced to take out loans to cover the cost. Many people simply won't be able to get a loan.

To the minister: what will she do to make safe, clean water more affordable for the people of Hepburn?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Mr. Speaker, happy to undertake a quick gender change to solve the problem from the member opposite here. I have to complete the previous answer. Previously, private wells were sampled in an ad hoc fashion under the term of the previous government, and this simply allowed problems to go unnoticed and unattended. What we've decided to do is to do something entirely different.

We're doing the following. The previous government's policy of waiting until problems occur has now been changed. We're working with the town and a number of government agencies to find a solution to this problem in a timely fashion.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I would ask that you respect the person that has the floor. I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude with the following remarks. We have actually attended that same meeting on April 2, the MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] from Martensville, her chief of staff, my chief of staff, met with the Village Council of Hepburn. The village council discussed the need for a new water system which we understand, presented options provided by a private consulting firm.

Later that same evening, they along with officials from Saskatchewan Watershed Authority and the local health region attended a public meeting attended by 100 folks in the school gymnasium. The community appears to have the support of the residents to pursue a project related to the Intervalley Pipeline project with a cost of around \$5.3 million. They're going to apply to the Building Canada fund. We'll assist them, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — The sex change was not necessary since the questions were posed to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, each family in Hepburn will be forced to pay more than \$10,000 upfront for water, even after the province's stimulus money and the Building Canada fund are taken into account. And this is before they get their new monthly water bill, estimated by village officials to be approximately \$100 a month. One hundred dollars a month just to have access to safe, clean water.

Many families simply can't afford it. Many are saying that if something isn't done to bring the cost down, they will be forced to leave Hepburn.

To the minister: how does she plan to help the families who simply can't afford to pay \$10,000 upfront for safe, clean drinking water?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the town of Hepburn, like all communities, are now benefiting from the largest investment in infrastructure in Saskatchewan's history under the MEEP program, the municipal economic enhancement program, plus the largest increase in revenue sharing in the province's history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Mr. Speaker, we are assisting all communities, including Hepburn in the following fashion as well. Through the Saskatchewan infrastructure growth initiative, money has already been provided to towns for worthy projects: Big River, Biggar, Birch Hills, Buena Vista, Carlyle, Colonsay, Dalmeny, Estevan Hague, Kindersley, Kipling, Lajord, Leroy, Macklin, Melfort, Midale, Milestone, Moose Jaw, Muenster . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — I would ask that all members, each of you will have a turn. You allowed the question to be put. I would ask that you allow the answer to be put. I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll complete the list under the SIGI [Saskatchewan infrastructure growth initiative] program. That includes Moose Jaw,

Muenster, Oxbow, Porcupine Plain, Prince Albert, Regina, Rocanville, Rosetown, Saskatoon, St. Brieux, Strasbourg, Swift Current, Turtleford, Unity, Wakaw, Weyburn, Wilkie, and Yorkton — \$75 million worth of worthy infrastructure projects, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Six million dollars to buy out Victoria Park Capital could have paid for this project, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Morin: — Hepburn isn't the only community facing a water crisis. Another five families in Duck Lake had their water disconnected on Monday — 16 disconnections in total so far. As of last Friday, there were nearly 150 precautionary drinking water advisories and 54 emergency boil water orders in the province, and the Watershed Authority's plan for the upcoming year says there are at least two other high-risk communities where the authority will be conducting an assessment.

To the minister: what are the names of those communities? And just how big is the water crisis in rural Saskatchewan? And what does she plan to do about it?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, one thing I'd like to mention is that by simply getting out of the terrible Victoria Park Capital deal that the former government got us into, we're going to be saving something like \$80 million which we'll use on further projects, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Mr. Speaker, on top of all of the other dollars in all of the other programs I've mentioned, we need to talk about the Building Canada fund in partnership with the municipalities, the provincial government, and the federal government.

Here's where the money is going: Arm River, Big Arm, Big River, Bredenbury, Britannia, Buckland, Buffalo Narrows, Burstall, Carrot River, Chaplin, Cole Bay, Creighton, and Cudworth, Cupar, Denare Beach, Dundurn, Englefeld, Gull Lake, Herbert, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Insinger, and Kannata Valley, La Loche, Lajord, Langham, Leask, Loon Lake, Lloydminster, Meadow Lake, Mervin, Miry Creek, Morse, Osler, Pense, Pinehouse, Prince Albert, Rose Valley, Rosthern, St. Louis, Stony Rapids, Unity, Viscount, Weyburn, Willow Bunch, Wilton, and Yorkton — Mr. Speaker, almost \$96 million of more infrastructure investment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina

Rosemont.

Curriculum Materials

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. According to the action plan of the Ministry of Education, one of the key strategies of the ministry is to, I quote: “Develop K-12 curriculum that includes environmental education, conservation and sustainability.” This was important to this government, so important that that Premier put this goal in the mandate letter that dictates and directs the Minister of Education.

To the minister: can he confirm that environmental conservation education is a key goal of his ministry?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in Saskatchewan we have what is referred to as a green curriculum. It constantly changes. It’s constantly updated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we’ve been working on the science curriculum in a number of the grade areas where we’re going to be enhancing that curriculum with material that will recognize environmental concerns. Those are being done on an ongoing basis, and I can provide the exact information as to which curriculum will be affected in which grade to the member in a subsequent release of information to him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority has two education programs — one called Project Wet and the other is called Project Wild. I would like to quote from Project Wet’s website: “The Saskatchewan Ministry of Education highly recommends this interdisciplinary program for the core science grades 1-10, [and for] biology 20 & 30 and chemistry 30.”

Will the Minister of Education agree that these programs meet the mandate letter perfectly, and can he confirm that his ministry is still recommending these programs?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I indicated in my first answer, we work with a number of officials within the curriculum department within my ministry. We work with teachers. We work with a number of people in the entire education community. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Western Canadian protocol assists in developing curriculum right across Western Canada to ensure that measures are dealt with on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendously mobile population, and we have to ensure that curriculum in Saskatchewan, curriculum in Alberta, curriculum in Manitoba has content that is similar. And the material that the member talks about has been discussed at the appropriate levels, and there will be constant updates to the curriculum of the courses that he’s just mentioned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, according to the Saskatchewan Watershed’s annual report for last year put out under that government, it turns out that 949 educators in 2007 alone utilized these programs — Projects Wet and Wild. Almost 1,000 educators per year, Mr. Speaker, benefiting from a program that teaches environmental conservation, education, and sustainability. But in this year’s budget, this government, that government eliminated both programs.

To the Minister of Education: why did he let the Minister of Environment cut a program that is recommended by his own ministry and benefits almost 1,000 teachers a year?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are materials that are presented to teachers, that are materials that are presented to my curriculum individuals to assist and to ensure that it is made available to all schools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we’ve had a number of changes to curriculum in this province. One of the largest changes that has been made, new introduction of new materials, was the treaty curriculum information that has been implemented in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Speaker, we will continue to assess and to analyze material. As new material becomes available, we’re going to ensure that it is analyzed, that it is assessed. And if it is relevant material that will assist teachers in doing the jobs that they want to do in providing quality education in this province, we will do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[14:15]

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Eastview.

Health Disparity in Saskatoon Report

Ms. Junor: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. *The StarPhoenix* is reporting today that a well-respected researcher and co-author of the *Health Disparity in Saskatoon* report is

stating that he's been fired by the Saskatoon Health Region. Dr. Lemstra and his co-author wanted to release the report months prior to the final date but were continually delayed by government interference. The delays were to the point that the authors were becoming embarrassed. This demonstrates what is becoming apparent in many sectors — the heavy-handedness of this government and their my-way-or-the-highway approach. Dr. Lemstra has been given the highway.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Minister of Health: why did this government interfere and delay the release of the report and what were they afraid of the public seeing?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, to the first part of that question regarding Dr. Lemstra or Mr. Lemstra's employment with the Saskatoon Health Region, I can unambiguously say that we, our government, had absolutely no input as to the release of that . . . as to his employment status.

There was a decision made by the Saskatoon Health Region, strictly by the Saskatoon Health Region. And I think if you follow through the article, there are a number of people — one person, for sure — that says that, that we had absolutely nothing to do with the release of Mr. Lemstra.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Eastview.

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the health disparity report is damning and it challenges the government on a number of issues. On Monday, April 7, in the Human Services Committee, the Minister of Social Services made her displeasure with the report known when she went on to call the report's recommendations, “. . . blue sky in nature . . . blue sky recommendations with no substance as to how in the world you would ever make them happen.”

She went on to describe, “others [meaning recommendations] . . . are absolutely outrageously impractical and borderline irresponsible.” The minister finished her comments by saying, “I don't have a lot of patience for blue sky statements and mission statements . . .”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the minister: why did this government instruct the health region to dismiss Dr. Lemstra? Was it because they received a report that was not favourable to the government and that they had no patience for a blue sky statements or mission statements?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Harpauer: — Mr. Speaker, I've said on a number of occasions, including committee, and I'll say it again. There were a number of recommendations made by this report that we

implemented even prior to the report coming out. There are other recommendations that we will give some consideration to. And there are recommendations that are simply impossible to implement and that they are vague in nature, and it would be very, very difficult.

But you know what we did do, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We've increased and indexed shelter rates. We increased and indexed rental supplement. We increased the mileage rates paid to support travel. We increased the house heating allowance for clients on TEA [transitional employment allowance] by 20 per cent. We increased the seniors' income plan. We introduced a low-income tax credit, putting money directly into people's pockets. We introduced a drug plan that includes children 14 and under. And we have an active families benefit.

We have done a lot to fix the disparities for people that are struggling, that was left for us by the NDP when they were government and when Lemstra actually did his study.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Eastview.

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's all very well and good. But the government's track record on accountability, transparency, and openness is not good.

We've seen a number of blacked-out reports, and now we are seeing a well-respected researcher being dismissed because of a report that the government views as blue-sky or borderline irresponsible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the minister: how can the minister expect the public to have any faith that any report generated by this government will be fair and unbiased in light of what happened to Dr. Lemstra?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister for Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Harpauer: — I just have one quick question for the member opposite. Does she agree that we should freeze spending on health care? And if she does, that means we will not have the money for the children's hospital in Saskatoon. Is that what she supports? Because that was one of the recommendations. And if she thinks all these recommendations should be implemented and, if indeed that they are responsible, there will not be a children's hospital because that goes under the health care budget that he suggests should be frozen.

As well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are other recommendations that are extremely difficult to know how they would be implemented. So I would like her to explain if she agrees with freezing health care spending.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Nuclear Development

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe it was earlier this week, the Premier was called upon, in the rotunda of this legislature by the journalists, to justify this two-week consultation period that his government has put in place to deal with this very significant issue of whether or not Saskatchewan ought to have a nuclear reactor. To justify that, the Premier's response was, well it needs to happen this quickly because a decision — a decision — on the reactor will be made by the end of this year.

Now last night in a committee hearing in this same legislature, the minister responsible for the file, when asked about the Premier's announcement that a decision would be made by the end of the year said, and I quote:

Certainly I don't think any decisions will be made in any time frame that would even resemble that one. This is a long-term proposition. No decisions will be made for a very long time.

So who's right? Is the decision going to be made by the end of this year, as the Premier has announced, or is it going to take a long, long time, as the minister said last night?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister for Enterprise and Innovation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we've embarked upon here is a very long-term, multi-step process that began with the commissioning of the Uranium Development Partnership. And now we've received the report from the UDP [Uranium Development Partnership] and have proceeded on to planning our public consultations and have indeed started the public consultation process as of last Friday, April 3, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that public consultation process will continue for some two and a half months — not two weeks, as that member keeps repeating incorrectly — until June 15.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, through that multi-step process there will be, there will be many jumping-off points for this government and many decision points for this government. One of them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, may occur by the end of this year, assuming that Bruce Power or someone else determines a site.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious discrepancy between what the Premier of Saskatchewan has said to the people of Saskatchewan — that a decision would be made by the end of the year — and what the minister responsible is saying, who says that there will be no decision for a very long time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, an issue of this magnitude demands openness, transparency, clarity.

So my question is to the Premier: what decision will be made

by the end of this year?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Minister for Enterprise and Innovation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What I've begun to try to explain to that member who insists that the public consultation process is a two-week process when it's indeed a two and a half month process — I hardly know where to start, Mr. Deputy Speaker — but through this multi-step process, there will be a number of decision points for government and a number of jumping-off points for government, I must say as well.

One of those decision points may come this fall, Mr. Speaker. If Bruce Power or someone else decides that they would like to build a nuclear power plant on a specific site, that would trigger a decision by this government that would be critical to the piece. It would certainly not be the final decision in the process, but it would be one that could end the process right there and then, so I'm sure that's what Mr. Mandryk was referring to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — You know, I'm not here to question what Mr. Mandryk may or may not have said. I am here to question what the Premier and the minister responsible may or may not have said to a reporter. A reporter's question which went as follows: when your government would hope to say yes or no to a power plant, by the end of the year? That was the question. The Premier's answer, by the end of the year.

The Premier has announced that the decision on the reactor will be taken by his government by the end of the year. The minister says no such decision will be taken. Again I ask, who is right? Who is telling the truth?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Having reviewed the comments that were made last night in the committee meeting, there is complete consistency along the front benches of this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister just stood in his place and said by the end of this year there will be an opportunity — if indeed we have some more information from proponents of nuclear power — that the project potentially ends, that the proposition ends if it doesn't meet with our basic standard of affordable power, safe power, environmentally sustainable power for the province of Saskatchewan.

If we decide together as a province to move ahead with it, we're talking about a number of years of process, and that's exactly what the minister said. The environmental process in itself, and rightly so, is an extended process.

Now consider that, contrast that transparency and this debate we're having now with what we got from that member opposite. What we got from that member opposite when he was the premier of this province was just declarations that we were going to go ahead with the nuclear power, and he consulted precisely nobody in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Calvert: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it is in fact the case that there is lots of opportunity, decision points down the road, then why in the world would this government not offer to the people of Saskatchewan a fair, a fair opportunity to consult, a fair opportunity to have their positions put?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Why will they not extend the period available — this two-week period of public hearings?

We call upon them again today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I call upon the Premier. Will he expand the process? Will he develop a process that in fact fully engaged the people of Saskatchewan in a hard look at all of the options before us in an extended period of time beyond this truncated two weeks they've set up now? Will they change their mind on that, if he's changed his mind on the decision-making process?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, the track record, the track record of that hon. member who just asked the question is interesting. He called nuclear power the dirtiest form of energy, but on the other hand said we should do a reactor and said we should store the spent fuel in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. He made these pronouncements without engaging the people of the province of Saskatchewan in consultation.

Now very consistently the next leader of the NDP, Mr. Lingenfelter has said there ought not to be any debate at all, Mr. Speaker. That's the view of the next leader of the NDP.

And, Mr. Speaker, given what Mr. Lingenfelter's been saying lately about nationalizing the oil industry and nationalizing the potash industry, I think the people of the province of Saskatchewan welcome the debate and the consultation put forward by members on this side of the House. And they're scared to death of whatever would happen in this province if they ever ran the show again, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Wood River.

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on the Economy to report Bill No. 46, *The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008* without amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: — I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on the Economy to report Bill No. 46, *The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008* without amendment. When shall this Bill be . . . I recognize the member from Enterprise and Innovation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill and that the Bill be now read for the third time.

The Deputy Speaker: — The Minister of Enterprise and Innovation has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill No. 46, *The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008* without amendment. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried. The minister may proceed to move third reading.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 46 — *The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008*

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move that this Bill now be read the third time and passed under its title.

The Deputy Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister of Enterprise and Innovation that Bill No. 46, *The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008*, without amendment, be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[14:30]

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried. Or is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Deputy Speaker: — Is the motion carried?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Agreed.

Clerk: — Third reading of this Bill.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Chair of House Services.

Standing Committee on House Services

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am instructed by the Standing Committee on House Services to report that it has considered certain estimates and to present its sixth report. I move:

That the sixth report of the Standing Committee on House Services be now concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: — It is moved by the Deputy Chair of House Services:

That the sixth report of the Standing Committee on House Services be now concurred in.

Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 79

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by The Hon. Mr. Krawetz that **Bill No. 79 — *The Education Amendment Act, 2009 (No. 2)*/Loi n° 2 de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1995 sur l'éducation** be now read a second time.]

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to rise in debate here today to discuss *The Education Amendment Act, 2009 (No. 2)*, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I guess at first glance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this side of the House, we're quite confused why this government would be adding this as an amendment to a Bill that's already on the Table and in committee when this could have very simply, expediently, and efficiently been dealt with in committee, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose they maybe wanted to frame it in a sense as if they were doing something significant. However nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. This Bill pertains to the newly legislated schools of opportunity legislation, Mr. Speaker. This legislation was presented last year around this time in this House, and it was intended to fulfill campaign promises around stopping school closures across Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We know now that nothing could have been further from the truth.

Schools have continued to struggle to keep their doors open, and many communities have continued to lose their schools, which is a fair cry of course, Mr. Speaker, from the strong and bold campaign promises and rhetoric from that side opposite, Mr. Speaker, for many, many years around their actions on school closures.

So we are addressing a piece of a legislation that was introduced only a year ago, and we see changes to that this year — an extension of what they call schools of opportunity from two to three years with this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

But we know already that this whole piece of schools of opportunity itself has fallen far short, Mr. Speaker, of meeting the needs of Saskatchewan communities. And we hear it in the media. We hear it in communities. Saskatchewan people are still very much concerned about the viability of education within their communities, and they do not feel as if they've been responded to by this government. They certainly recognize the broken promises.

But it's worthwhile to note, I guess, that certainly here in this Bill, we have an extension from two years to three years and it simply lengthens the period of time for which a school of opportunity might be designated, Mr. Speaker. We wonder why this simply wasn't amended in committee because it would not need to merit the time within this House for that entire discussion, Mr. Speaker. On the surface it looks quite possibly, Mr. Speaker, that this unfortunately might just be an extending of that period for schools of opportunity that would take the members opposite past the next provincial election.

And, Mr. Speaker, if that's what's driving policy from the Sask Party — getting past the next provincial election — that's a sad day for good policy here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. So we're concerned about a policy that's simply intended to serve them well around an election period. So we see that this change is simply for political reasons and not necessarily intended to address the needs of schools.

And you know, I have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Sask Party puts forward a Bill that barely fiddles with the edges of a piece of policy. And communities across Saskatchewan are concerned about school closures. They're concerned in urban ridings, Mr. Speaker, such as Regina and in Saskatoon, but they're concerned as well in specific communities here right now, such as Wishart, that yesterday was simply . . . had the motion go forward for school closures.

And I know the member from Kelvington is saying, with nine kids that school should close, she's saying. Why would you keep that school open? Well I know the community's feeling different, Mr. Speaker, and I know at one point they felt like they had the ear of the Saskatchewan Party to effect some sort of change around how to keep a school open.

Certainly that's a good example though, Mr. Speaker, of why many, many schools in Saskatchewan have closed, is that with declining enrolment and changes in where people are living that we have struggled to keep that population to keep education viable. This side of the House knows that all too well, and it was very responsible and never took that job lightly. But we never gave the kind of hope and promise that the members

opposite gave — false hope, Mr. Speaker.

They are also concerned, I know, communities like Chaplin right now and in Morse, in Major and Meota. Chaplin and Morse, Mr. Speaker — viable communities. Viable education is a concern for those communities because they're being considered for closure here this year. More than likely, they're also going to be considered for schools of opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

Now the boards haven't actually set closure motions on either of those schools here yet. But the change that's put forward limits the ability of the board of education, but limits the ability of the community to have enough time to show that the school in the community is actually viable.

And so here we have a government who's putting a fixed time period on economic growth, Mr. Speaker. And if we think of the many external factors — world pressures and economic challenges that relate back to our current place and time here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — a lot of projects unfortunately aren't going ahead that could be and should be with the right market conditions, Mr. Speaker.

So it's concerning that we see a fixed period of time on economic growth for communities, when much of the economic growth that should and will be spurred on with the right global capital markets may be simply a year or two or three down the road. We don't know this, Mr. Speaker, so we're wondering why they're fiddling away with a fixed term. On that note, we're concerned that communities might not have the time to be able to justify their case. And why are we prescribing a fixed period of time on this amendment here, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

It's also been known that the schools of opportunity process itself is a resource-straining activity. It's not a simple exercise, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And of course it's very important to communities. As I said, right now it's important to communities such as Chaplin or Morse.

We can use Chaplin for example. As I understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's required a lot of human resources from within the community and also financial resources, Mr. Speaker. And here we have a community — the example being Chaplin, as I understand — has spent actually \$60,000, Mr. Speaker, by business people, by individuals, and by the local municipalities who have chipped in to be able to provide the dollars needed to make an application to the minister for his school of opportunity status, something that then will have a prescribed and fixed period of time on it.

We're concerned about this, Mr. Speaker, because not only are they engaged in an expensive activity, but they're engaged in an activity that takes them away from their focus on where they may be placing those otherwise: supporting their communities through their community involvement, supporting the economic growth through strategic plans and through putting those efforts into building that local economy.

We're concerned that they're caught in a bit of a politicized wild goose chase, Mr. Speaker, because the criteria for who will actually be accepted as a school of opportunity is very ill defined, Mr. Speaker. Those criteria aren't set so it then simply

goes to the Minister of Education to consider that presentation.

So we're concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we have communities investing huge amount of time, of financial resources, and that we see a very non-consequential amendment that simply keeps a fixed period of time on a school of opportunity status when we really don't know what the world's economy holds and how that relates to Saskatchewan and what that means for the viability and the vibrant economies that local communities are looking to stimulate and to grow.

I know that there's been questions across from certain communities, and I pose this simply as a question, but I wonder if the minister's considered or contemplated allowing grade discontinuance to be eligible for funds. Certain schools and communities, I know, I believe this has been pitched to the minister. And in fact I would look forward to committee just to see where the ministry is at on that consideration and what their thought around that is.

We know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this all relates back to school closures. Big campaign promises from the Sask Party. Now Saskatchewan people know that that's been a big failure by this government to respond to the needs. And as a result many communities are still waiting and concerned and wanting a policy that reflects some of their concerns in a more accurate way.

The handbook that was put forward by the minister last year and championed as his response to school closures simply fell far short, Mr. Speaker, from having any meaningful change. It certainly did validate and verify the best practice that many and most school divisions, school boards have been engaged with around the school closure process for many, many years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this point, because we do want to have more of a conversation in committee, we're wondering why this Bill was even brought to the House and not simply an amendment brought forward to committee for thoughtful and constructive discussion. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why that wasn't the case.

But here at this point in time, we have more questions that we look forward to engaging with the Minister of Education in committee, some constructive discussion, and we have more questions with the communities who are facing such challenges, Mr. Speaker, and with the stakeholders, the education sector, to see how this process is working for them.

But at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move this Bill — I'm not sure if this is Bill no. 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the amendment . . . Oh, it's no. 2. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, my mistake — *The Education Amendment Act, 2009 (No. 2)*. And we will now refer this Bill to committee, and we look forward in engaging in conversation.

And I know the Minister of Education is shouting across the floor here right now. He's angry. He's an angry, mad man, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And it might be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I believe, on this point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in Murray Mandryk's column on December 31, 2008 in the *Leader-Post*, this very politician, the Minister of Education, was referred to as the most disappointing politician of 2008. "Ken Krawetz . . . [for among other things his failure to do] much to address

school closures . . .” So I can understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why the minister’s agitated.

I know there’s much dissent in that caucus between numerous powerful ministers within that caucus as to what the best policy is to go forward.

The only thing that’s very clear right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that that government, that Sask Party continues to fail the people of this province on an area where they had very clear promises.

I now refer this Bill to committee and look forward to constructive dialogue.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is a motion by the Minister of Education that Bill No. 79, *The Education Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried. Order.

Clerk: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Deputy Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

The Deputy Speaker: — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

Bill No. 49

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McMorris that **Bill No. 49** — *The Ambulance Amendment Act, 2008* be now read a second time.]

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Ms. Junor: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Saskatoon Eastview. I’m happy to speak today on Bill 49, *The Ambulance Amendment Act, 2008*. Most of the Act is basically housekeeping. It’s repealing sections that are no longer needed in this Act, as they are covered in *The Regional Health Services Act* and the more recently proclaimed paramedics Act. There is really no significant or appreciable changes in service delivery inherent in the changes.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is some benefit to having a clear delineation of authority that the health regions will have for ambulance and EMS [emergency medical services] delivery. It also reinforces the new self-regulatory authority for paramedics by *The Paramedics Act*.

We all agree with the importance of the emergency medical services that are accessible to all Saskatchewan residents, and

we all agree with the need to have highly qualified EMS staff in ambulances and appropriate response times for emergency calls across the province. And many of my colleagues have spoken about that and how much we appreciate the services that are delivered through EMS.

[14:45]

But since the Bill is being opened, there are many improvements that could be made to strengthen our emergency medical system. And I know that the minister has said in committee that there is a current review being done on road ambulance and air ambulance as well. There will be, I assume then, some changes being made again. We’ll have to open this Act yet again.

And I do know that we’re going to see some, we do have some lobbying going on right now with firefighters coming and talking about they expect to see or would like to see a change in the way their members are utilized in emergency service delivery. They feel they’re being underutilized and basically could contribute more in emergency medical services.

We definitely think that this, as I said, this Act is really inconsequential for anything that will change in service delivery. And I think probably we’ll see some changes anticipated as well in the patient-first review. So I am expecting to see this Act again in the near future, in the next legislature, I would assume, our legislative session. And the stakeholders that I have spoken to of course have no question or no problems with the proposed changes as they are really not very significant.

So we can certainly see that this Bill can go off to committee, and we’ll have further debate and discussion there. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion by the Minister of Health that Bill No. 49, *The Ambulance Act, 2008* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — Carried.

Clerk: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Deputy Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

The Deputy Speaker: — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

Bill No. 43

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 43** — *The Trespass to Property Act* be now read a second time.]

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member for Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A lot's been said in the legislature on this Bill since it was introduced. And a lot of it had to do with the Bill and some of it had to do with the concept of trespass more generally and maybe a little bit less to do with the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

But I just want to very briefly focus attention on the Bill and a concern with the Bill, which I trust is a result of an oversight on the part of the government and not deliberate, Mr. Speaker. And it's a criticism that I made when interviewed about the Bill when it was first introduced. It's a concern that I continue to have and it's a concern that I'll highlight in this debate briefly, not at great length, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it needs great length to bring it to attention.

The Bill sets, I would say, a minimum standard or a minimal regime for trespass across the province because the Bill sets out that any municipal bylaw, any municipal legislation in effect would actually trump the Bill. That this, unlike some legislation that says notwithstanding any other Act or certainly any enactment of municipal government, this is the case. This Bill doesn't do that, Mr. Speaker. This Bill says it is subordinate to any municipal trespass law. So any trespass bylaw brought in by Saskatoon or Kindersley or anywhere else that has different provisions that are in conflict with this legislation, those provisions would carry the day, Mr. Speaker.

So I have a question as to why we would have legislation that effectively takes the place of a municipal bylaw for a municipality that didn't want one or didn't want one badly enough to pass one, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure I understand the motivation for the Bill.

But the Bill raises for me a constitutional concern and that is that, unlike similar legislation . . . And I would use the example of Manitoba for example that's had a petty trespass Act similar to this legislation in some ways — perhaps not as well drafted in some ways as this legislation is, but superior to this legislation in one key respect, Mr. Speaker. In the Manitoba legislation for example, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't want to suggest this is unique to the Manitoba Act, but the Manitoba legislation provides a defence, and the defence is a constitutional defence, Mr. Speaker.

Before the enactment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Canadians expected to be able to assemble and freely express their opinions, not just on publicly owned land, but also on land that is normally accessible to the public without fee or charge — what one might call quasi-public land, Mr. Speaker.

And if that exercise of freedom of assembly, peaceful expression of opinion caused some concern or acted against the interests of the owner of those premises, Mr. Speaker, then the owner, the occupier of those premises or the associated premises could apply to the court for an injunction enjoining the demonstration or the assembly, whatever form it took. And the interests of the property owner would be balanced by the court against people's right to assemble freely and to express their opinions, Mr. Speaker.

These freedoms that would have to be balanced in such a decision are now entrenched in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They are part of the constitution of the country, which brings me to my concern about the constitutionality of the Bill.

The Bill suggests that one no longer has to go to a judge to have that balancing done between the interests of the property owner — which are quite valid and legitimate and often win out in these cases, Mr. Speaker — against people's freedom to assemble and express their opinions, sometimes in respect to the activities of that very same person.

These injunctions are granted all the time, but the Bill would seem to suggest that you no longer have to do that because now it's trespass and it's an offence. And the fact that you are gathering to express your opinions as provided for in the constitution of the country, that you are assembling to do so as provided for by our constitution is not a defence to the trespass. There is no such defence in this Bill. There is in the Manitoba legislation, for example, Mr. Speaker.

Now either the government overlooked this very fundamental problem with their legislation — it's an oversight which I would call upon them to address, Mr. Speaker — or they decided that, well, you know, if the legislation is not constitutional, the courts will fix it. And that is a common attitude of governments, not just this government, Mr. Speaker. Common attitudes of governments unfortunately across the country is that, well if there's a constitutional problem, the courts will fix it.

Well how does that happen, Mr. Speaker? The only way that can happen is that a group of people exercise the constitutional right to assemble and express their opinions. They would be charged under the trespass Act. The police would not understand that there is a problem with the constitutionality of the legislation that they are making the charge under. There's no defence set out in the Act, Mr. Speaker, and then the matter would proceed to court.

And the problem the member has from Saskatoon Northwest is he only listens to part of the argument, Mr. Speaker.

Then the charge is trespass, would proceed to the court. People would raise the fact that, the defence that well in fact we were exercising our constitutional rights under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and rights that we had before then, but we certainly do have now entrenched in the Constitution. And a judge would find that yes indeed, you do, and the legislation has to be read down to include that defence and to include that exemption or exception to the trespass Act, Mr. Speaker.

Well why should free Canadians, exercising their freedoms — their constitutional freedoms of assembly and expression, Mr. Speaker — why should any of them have to go to court to argue and establish that the legislation is unconstitutional; when we can, by reading it and by comparing it to similar legislation across the country, see that that is the case, Mr. Speaker? And surely it's the duty and responsibilities of legislators to ensure the minimum constitutionality of legislation, and not to leave it to courts to fix, Mr. Speaker.

And that is the key. That is the key problem, the key issue with this legislation. It's the key concern of the opposition in this respect, that the legislation is not constitutional. It's not constitutional in a fundamental way in that it fails to protect fundamental freedoms ensured in the Canadian Constitution, Mr. Speaker, and we will be continuing to raise this concern. But I am, for the moment, finished expressing it in this Chamber. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — I recognize the member for Regina Lakeview.

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to take a few minutes to support the arguments that have been made by my colleague who's just completed his talk, and just add a few more questions around this particular legislation. I think that he has quite adequately outlined the concerns that we have about the Canadian Constitution.

But one of the other concerns that I have is where trespass to property Act laws have been used, in what subject areas. And I think sometimes people look inward and not outward when they bring forward legislation into this Chamber. So I just want to point out a few areas where trespass legislation has been used in other jurisdictions and point out that there may be some particular problems.

One area that trespass legislation has been used in a number of jurisdictions relates to air quality and pollution, and the issue is dust and other particular irritants or emissions from factories and how they end up causing damage to neighbours.

And this is quite a different area than what this particular legislation seems to be addressing. And I just want to point out that in Arizona there's a part of their legislation relating to trespassing that deals with fugitive dust emissions on a vacant lot or open area, and so therefore there has to be control measures that are brought in by the trespasser. So I would just say that there's a whole area as it relates to environmental rules and laws where this Act may or may not apply. We can't tell so far.

Another area where trespass legislation is used, and I know others have talked about this already, relates to protests of various kinds. And last year there was a protest in California along the Union Pacific branch line by the seaside town of Santa Cruz where the railroad tried to enforce trespassing laws to keep citizens away from their particular rail line. The actual issue was the development of a trail on an old rail line. This use of the trespass legislation is quite different, but in fact we have many rail lines in Saskatchewan where similar issues may arise.

Another interesting place where trespass legislation has been used, and this is in Ontario, and it's in some ways the political cousins of the present government which is the Ontario opposition Conservatives, where their former leader, Mr. John Tory, pledged that he would use Ontario trespass legislation to crack down on illegal occupations such as the long-simmering standoff between Native and non-Native protestors in Caledonia. And what he was going to do was to go into the province of Ontario trespassing laws to make sure that there would be some provisions there that would assist him in that.

We don't know whether that's part of the intent of this particular legislation. I think that that's something that we will be able to find more out as we go into some of the questions as we go into committee. But I just want to identify that there's a place where this particular trespassing legislation has been identified as a tool.

[15:00]

Another rather strange situation where trespassing legislation has been used relates to a number of jurisdictions in the United States where people have been picketing funerals. And this is quite an unusual situation where numbers of people who are part of churches in Kansas, but it's also happened in other states, have gone and picketed funerals of people who have died in Iraq or Afghanistan. And basically they are saying — in that particular situation, it's more of an information type of a picket — that the results of US [United States] combat in the Middle East and the deaths of American citizens are God's punishment for the nation's tolerance of homosexuality.

And so in that particular situation, the courts have been asked to use the trespass laws to try to deal with these informational pickets. It's quite an unusual situation, but it is a situation where we need to know what kind of perspective the provincial government has as they bring forward this legislation.

In US labour law — and you kind of get a sense of where some of these issues arise, and I think my colleagues have mentioned some of them as it relates to Canadian law — but in the United States they have a ongoing journal. It's called *The Developing Labor Law*, and it's continually issued in new editions. It has a whole section on trespass law and labour law.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are concerned that any use of this legislation, as it relates to some of the perception that we have of the province's new labour laws, will be in any way damaging to the whole process of collective bargaining. And it relates, once again, to the ability to communicate with employees and with the public and, in fact, which areas are available for communication. And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to monitor what kinds of things are said, and will be asking questions about this in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the issues that I wanted to raise this afternoon, just to have them on the record and to make sure that we get an appropriate response from the government as this Bill moves forward. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — The question before the Assembly is the motion by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 43, *The Trespass to Property Act* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — Carried.

Clerk: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.

Bill No. 76

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Heppner that **Bill No. 76 — *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act, 2008 (No. 2)*** be now read a second time.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — I recognize the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to discuss Bill No. 76, *An Act to Amend the Wildlife Habitat Protection Act and to amend the Wildlife Habitat Lands Designation Regulations*.

The Saskatchewan wildlife protection Act is an important piece of environmental legislation in this province that protects our biodiversity, the immense variety of plants and animals. We know that biodiversity is integral to our province's future well-being. People of Saskatchewan have the privilege of being surrounded with a rich diversity of landscapes, watersheds from prairie grasslands to arboreal forest, from sand dunes and sand hills to abundant lakes, rivers, and bogs.

Saskatchewan's prosperity is drawn from this rich endowment of biodiversity demonstrated in our agriculture, forestry, hunting, fishing, and tourist activities in our economy. So too, Mr. Speaker, is our health, from the safety of our fresh water to the air we breathe and the land we walk. It is more than aesthetic appeal. Biodiversity allows our ecosystems to function, keeping our soil rich, our water sparkling, and our air clean with less carbon dioxide.

In developing our economy, Mr. Speaker, we need to do a better job accounting for the full consequences to our environment and biodiversity in particular. Habitat loss, alteration, or fragmentation combined with the invasion of exotic species and pollution represent the main sources of negative consequences that can result from an economic activity.

Mr. Speaker, when legislation is put forward by the Sask Party government to remove the areas that were once given protection under *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, those elected to this legislature have a responsibility to ensure that such removal considers the potential consequences to our biological diversity in plant and animals. After all, these lands are being removed from the protection schedule.

In addition to the consideration of negative consequences to the removal of protection status from certain parcels of land in our province, those elected to this legislature must also ensure that public consultation has taken place. Public consultation is not, as the Sask Party government routinely demonstrates, just an excusable formality. It is how democracy should, on principle, function.

While the NDP was in government, we prepared an action plan for the protection and management of Saskatchewan's biodiversity. The biodiversity action plan supported the green strategy that was consequently gutted by the Sask Party government upon their election in 2007. The biodiversity action plan had an articulated vision of responsibility, effective public participation, balanced values, and knowledge-based decisions that would guide the conservation and management of out-of-province's biodiversity.

In particular the biodiversity action plan guided the efforts of government to improve policies, programs, planning, management systems, and access to information in support of biodiversity. Some of this work, Mr. Speaker, has already been done, while other initiatives contained in the plan were scheduled to continue even now. In essence, the biodiversity action plan advanced by the former New Democratic government established a prospective to growth that better balanced the social and economic needs of productive activities, and conversely the fundamental need to protect the integrity of the environment.

When reviewing the proposed amendments contained in Bill No. 76 to the wildlife protection Act, it is imperative that we consider the ideological agenda of the Sask Party government. The Sask Party government is already failing on climate change. They have spent more time gutting the plans to achieve the former NDP carbon emission reduction targets than finding an alternative solution that works.

Instead, all Saskatchewan people have received from this government is an ideological denial of the problem of climate change and a mounting bill for the mega projects like carbon capture and storage for coal and the biased nuclear development process, that together will still fail to meet the specified targets the Sask Party government adopted in their 2007 election platform. Indeed, the second budget delivered by the Sask Party government on March 18 of this year confirms that conservative ideology simply offers no real action on climate change and, worse still, an ideological motivation to push through environmentally sensitive projects using backroom deals with blank cheques of taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party government record in protecting the biological diversity is also dismal. In December 2008 I asked questions in this legislature as to why the Sask Party government decided to quickly include, without consultation, the ecologically sensitive area known as Dillon-Vermette. The 41 000 hectares of land in northwestern Saskatchewan was on the verge of receiving protection designation with reports that several environmental organizations had reached an agreement with the forest company of Mistik Management and the Ministry of Environment to designate the area as a protected site until it appeared on the list of Crown land to be auctioned by the Ministry of Energy and Resources eight months later.

With the Sask Party government, nothing is off limits when short-term profit can be gained. Sustainability, to the Sask Party, is one of those trendy catchphrases that they need to use to appear moderate.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I view changes made to the very environmental legislation that conserves nearly one-third of all

wildlife habitat in the agricultural region of our province, I do so with some circumspection and caution.

New Democrats believe that our natural and cultural heritage is simply too valuable to quickly be put up for sale, and the government has the ultimate responsibility to manage our Crown lands and to protect their unique diversity with all due diligence. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — The question before the Assembly is a motion put forward by the Minister of Environment that Bill No. 76, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act, 2008* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — Carried.

Clerk: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantefoer: — Mr. Deputy Chair, to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

Bill No. 61

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hutchinson that **Bill No. 61 — *The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 2008*** be now read a second time.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — I recognize the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise and add some comments to the debate on Bill No. 61, *An Act to Amend the Local Government Election Act*.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill before us, *The Local Government Election Act*, is interesting because I know we all are aware of the rules and regulations that are in place for elections, whether municipal or provincial, but we don't often think of where they spring from or where they are contained in legislation within the province. But it is *The Local Government Election Act* that provides the legal framework to enable all local governments, and that could be urban or rural municipalities, northern municipalities, villages, towns, or cities, and also school boards — the rules and regulations for those elections are all contained within this Act.

And I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we all understand that there are rules and regulations that are needed to be in place for these elections, and that from time to time they will need to be adjusted or updated. Or there may be requests from the various bodies that are covered by this legislation — changes that they would like to see. This seems to be a similar circumstance

where we're seeing a general updating and maybe modernizing of this piece of legislation.

There are a number of areas that I'm sure there will be questions for the minister when we finally do move into committee. And I know there have been a number of concerns or questions that we have been asked from our constituents as to the effect of this. And I know one of the first pieces that's dealt with is that the minister is proposing is allowed within this legislation, if it's changed, is that in the event of a by-election for a mayor or reeve — a mayor in the case of an urban municipality, and a reeve in the case of a rural municipality — that the changes to the Act would enable councillors to run for the vacant position of mayor or reeve without stepping down from the seat that they now hold.

And most of us know that in general elections that you can not put your name forward for more than one office at a time. But when the Bill was tabled and we heard the comments from the minister, he made it clear that there's been concern expressed that if a number of councillors want to run for mayor, then their seats would have to become vacant in order for them to do that with the current legislation. And then you may have to have further elections to fill those vacant seats. And if enough councillors ran, then you would have a council that would not be able to constitute a quorum to conduct business.

So I don't know if this has ever happened. I have never heard of an instance where, because of changes in the elected officials and a number stepping aside to seek the position of reeve or mayor, that it in effect has made the councils unable to operate. It's not something that I've ever heard about happening in municipalities. So I guess we have to question what really is the extent of this issue in Saskatchewan, and is it something that needs to apply to everyone.

So I guess a little more information in that area is going to be one of the things that we'll be asking the minister for when we are in committee.

[15:15]

And one of the other changes that are proposed in the legislation, I don't think anyone has any concerns with. We look at the city of Saskatoon, after the municipal elections that were held there, have put in place a bylaw that requires campaign contributions to be disclosed. So that if someone is running for councillor, someone's running for mayor, the city of Saskatoon has taken the position that those who run should disclose contributions from whatever the source.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you look at this, there have been a number of changes right across the country at a variety of levels of governments — whether municipal, provincial, or federal — where we have looked at the issue of democratic reform. And financing and the declaration of financing through a campaign is often a priority in many of the changes that are put forward. And I think all of us would applaud Saskatoon in the changes that they went ahead and initiated through their council and with one of their bylaws. So now what we see is there will be changes in the legislation, and the Saskatoon proposal may spread quite a bit farther than what was initially intended.

One of the other requirements in this legislation is a request by rural municipalities that they also be allowed to adopt or to put in place voters lists. And here again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all of us are accustomed to dealing with voters lists, whether we're running in a provincial election or a by-election, or whether we are helping out with a federal. And there are some of our colleagues in this House that have also ran in a federal election. So we're used to dealing with voters lists.

But this is something that the municipalities are looking to have the ability to adopt or put in place, voters lists for their communities. And I know there is always a fair bit of discussion that when you get into an election, the issues that may arise when you're discussing eligible voters and what identification you may have to take with you to the polling station to make sure that you are able to vote, causes a bit of problems.

So my understanding is that the municipalities, the rural municipalities feel that this may make it easier and may do away with the whole identification process, or at least a cumbersome identification process. And I'm sure that that's very appealing to a number of the rural municipalities.

I know by law we have to carry around our driver's licence and the Saskatchewan driver's licence does have a picture on it now, but they may not be in the best shape all the time. And I know there was other instances where other pieces of identification have been required. So it may simplify the process if this is allowed to happen in a number of the RMs [rural municipality].

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the notion of a voters list to clearly determine upfront who may or may not be eligible would be welcome by those municipalities as a way of reducing some of the conflict that they have seen in the past. I'm sure it won't do away with all of it, but it does help and it does make things a little easier at the polling stations and on election day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think probably the most controversial item that has been commented on and has concerned the municipalities is not in fact something that's contained in the Bill. The minister had indicated that the provincial government is not proceeding with a request from the municipalities to move from a three-year term for urban and northern municipalities and school board officials, because at this point those locally elected officials from urban municipalities, northern municipalities, and school boards are elected for a three-year term.

There was a fair bit of discussion over this issue and add to a few more complications into the whole issue is that rural municipalities operate differently. And their people are elected for two-year terms. And now the associations and those that are responsible for some of the urban municipalities — I think primarily the urban municipalities — are requesting that we go from a three-year term to a four-year term. And they felt that by the time a newly elected councillor was getting to understand the system and the issues that they were dealing with, it was almost time to run for re-election again. And they felt a four-year term may be more appropriate.

And I guess also, there was a point when people . . . Well when

people are elected to the provincial legislature, it's a four-year term. And I guess there were some that were questioning why should it be any different for urban municipalities as the issues that they deal with on a day-to-day basis are getting to be more and more complicated. It's interesting that the minister in his remarks, in speaking to this when he moved the Bill, said that while there was support from the municipal and the education sector, other stakeholders expressed concern. So I guess the big question was who are these other stakeholders who expressed concern and are obviously in a position to change the minister's mind.

This was really a collective decision by the municipalities and the education authorities who had requested that their terms be extended. But someone else has been able to stop that collective decision that had been put forward, that both the municipalities and the education authorities thought was a good idea. Obviously the minister is listening very closely to other stakeholders. So we really need to ask those questions as to who is opposed to changing it from a three-year term to a four-year term, and how does one sector have a say over what others will be doing when the others have both agreed. The ones that are impacted with the decision and had made the request were in agreement with it.

So we're seeing some hesitation on behalf of the minister and I know he has often talked about his role as a member of the Regina City Council. And Regina City Council has taken the position that we ought to be moving forward to a four-year term. But obviously once the minister moved away from municipal politics, he also seemed to change a number of his opinions and take a different view on a number of things. So it'll be interesting to see how he lays out his decision to pull this piece out of the Bill and take a totally different view on something that previously — not that long ago — he would have supported.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know there's a couple of comments in the minister's statements where the minister said that he and the government have conducted extensive consultations with all of the organizations that represent municipalities, not just the organizations that represent elected officials — such as SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association] or SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities] — but also with the associations that represent the officials that work for those local governments such as the Association of City Clerks, the Urban Municipal Administrators' Association, and the Rural Municipal Administrators' Association, and on and on the list goes.

So obviously there's been some extensive consultations on the changes that are being proposed in this Bill. We have had a number of discussions on it and, Mr. Speaker, I think, while all of my colleagues or most of my colleagues have had an opportunity to express their views and make comments on the legislation, I think in all in all, the major changes that are being put forward in the Bill, there will be some questions that we have. Some of the issues of the length of term that have been left out for some reason, we will have a few questions on that.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will kind of reserve the rest of my comments for when we're in committee and we're able to ask questions and receive responses directly from the minister.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — The question before the Assembly is a motion by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that Bill No. 61, *The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 2008* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — Carried.

Clerk: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Ms. Harpauer: — To Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.

Bill No. 59

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 59 — *The Election Amendment Act, 2008*** be now read a second time.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — I recognize the member for Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is another Bill on which I will be relatively brief — perhaps not as brief as members of the government would like. But still a lot has been said on this Bill, and I will be somewhat repetitive in respect to the Bill because it's a relatively straightforward Bill in its intent. And the difficulties in actually carrying out the intent, I think, are pretty easy to find and have been commented on previously.

But just briefly, Mr. Speaker, this Bill clearly is intended by the government to work in tandem with the fixed election date legislation previously brought forward by this government and enacted by this legislature. And this legislation, if adopted or when adopted, Mr. Speaker, would purport to limit the amount of government advertising that can be placed for a certain period of time prior to an election, which one can only reasonably even plan to do if one has some idea of when the election is going to be so that one can count back from that fixed election date.

So this legislation is, in the first place, dependent upon the soundness of the previous Act that I refer to — the fixed election day legislation — to actually guarantee that there will be a fixed election date.

Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the intentions of the government were good in bringing forward that legislation. But that legislation contains the same loophole that the federal legislation on a fixed election day brought forward by the Conservatives in Ottawa had. And that is, that unless the

legislature's dissolved, earlier dissolved, there will be a fixed election day and this would be the date. Well unless the legislature's earlier dissolved.

Well we saw in Ottawa that parliament was dissolved early so there was no fixed election date, Mr. Speaker. And really all for naught, even from the Conservatives' point of view, because after breaking the promise on the fixed election date, there's an election and there's another minority Conservative government. So the government did not advance its interest by breaking its promise. And I would think that this government probably wouldn't advance its interest by breaking its promise either, Mr. Speaker.

But this legislation that's been proposed here on advertising prior to an election day is only as good as the fixed election day legislation. And that legislation I think has a caveat to it. And I think the opposition, for example, would be foolish to assume that that is necessarily the date, although the date set in the legislation is probably the date, Mr. Speaker. That all said, the intent of this legislation on government advertising as we approach the election is, I think, well intentioned; maybe hastily drafted, Mr. Speaker. And perhaps there really is no way of addressing some of these concerns.

Somehow one has to calculate what will be acceptable and will not be acceptable, Mr. Speaker. And the legislation makes that calculation by going back to a previous period, and taking the average of government advertising in that previous period and saying in the next period it can't exceed that or cannot exceed it except by a set amount, Mr. Speaker. And that, I think, is a good concept, Mr. Speaker.

The government has sort of adopted in this particular case — unfortunately not in very many cases, but in this particular case — at this legislation, sort of the maxim out of the Democratic Party in Chicago, as I understand it, "good politics is good government" and good government is good politics. And this is legislation I think they see is both good politics — certainly on the surface it looks good — and good government if indeed its intent is carried out.

[15:30]

Some government advertising in respect to programs that people want access to, that people should know about, is good government advertising. Nobody's going to dispute it. Nobody's going to argue with it, and of course the legislation allows that to be done, Mr. Speaker.

But it allows more than that if one manipulates the period which one uses as the standard. So, as this has been pointed out by members of the opposition, this doesn't work very well if it just increases government spending in advertising in the period before the period set out in the legislation, the period by which one sets the standard for what government advertising is appropriate.

If indeed the government decides that it does want to ramp up advertising prior to an election in 2011 — despite their stated intention not to do so — then to do so and to be in compliance with this legislation only requires them to ramp up their spending on advertising even earlier, Mr. Speaker. And then it

would have, I believe — because I don't want to cast aspersions here — I believe the unintended effect of having a period in which there's increased government advertising immediately prior to the election and a period before that of enhanced government spending primarily for the political purpose of increasing what the government can spend on advertising in the upcoming period prior to the election. And that would defeat the very purpose of the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

That said, if that doesn't happen and the government fails to comply with the legislation, this Bill contains no penalties. This Bill contains no sanctions, Mr. Speaker. And if the legislation isn't followed, well what does anyone do, Mr. Speaker? So that may also be because the legislation was hastily drafted. But it becomes more a statement of principle than a legislative regime that prescribes certain behaviour and has certain sanctions or penalties if that behaviour is not followed.

It seems very strange that the government forgot to include a sanction for failing to follow the regime of which they are so proud. And the toothlessness of the legislation is one of the concerns that the opposition has expressed.

So I suppose concerns are threefold. Having stated that we understand the principle, we understand the politics, we don't have much dispute with the principle and we don't have much dispute with the politics. Because this is not an empty, symbolic Bill in its entirety.

The concerns are three. One is, it really depends upon the fixed election date being a fixed election date, Mr. Speaker, and in recent political history we've seen that that's not necessarily the case.

Secondly we have, and actually again, I'll say it again, I believe unintended consequence. That as political realities become apparent to government members, as we get closer to 2011 and they realize that their ability to advertise their good programs — what they believe are good programs people should know about — might be hampered during the period up to the election, there will be a temptation to expand what can be spent in that period prior to the election by expanding what's spent in the period prior to that . . . [inaudible] . . . judge. And that is the second concern.

And the third concern and the last concern, Mr. Speaker — I'm about to take my chair — the last concern of course is, if one wants to bring in a regime and not just a statement of principles, and it's a regime that says we take this behaviour seriously, we want this conduct to be followed, then there are usually, Mr. Speaker, particularly, you know, with a party that I think prides itself on being a law-and-order party, a party that prides itself on being tough on crime, usually if you're going to be sanctioning conduct because you don't think it's appropriate conduct, you're going to have some penalty if people do it anyways despite the legislation.

And this legislation strangely, strangely doesn't include any penalty. And I don't suggest any bad intent on the part of the members opposite, the government, but it would be legislation that we would be more supportive of — not just in principle, but more supportive of in its body — if it addressed those concerns that I have briefly outlined, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — The question before the Assembly is a motion by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 59, *The Election Amendment Act, 2008* be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — Carried.

Clerk Assistant (Committees): — Second reading of this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Standing Committee on House Services.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on House Services.

Bill No. 60

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 60** — *The Senate Nominee Election Act* be now read a second time.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — I recognize the member for The Battlefords.

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise for the second reading debate on Bill No. 60, *The Senate Nominee Act*. Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated some of the interventions that have preceded me, particularly the intervention of the member from Regina Douglas Park who opened the comments for the opposition caucus, and who spent a considerable time, Mr. Speaker, outlining exactly the circumstances that we find ourselves in today, surrounding the future of the Senate in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, before I put my own comments on record for those watching today, and for those who will be reading my remarks independent of anyone else's remarks, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to spend a couple of moments to review what the minister said, the Minister of Justice said when he introduced this legislation at second reading.

To be very brief and simple, coming from those remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice said that, and I'll quote from his remarks, the provincial “. . . government is taking an important step towards ensuring that in the future Saskatchewan senators can be chosen democratically by the people of our province, rather than in the backrooms of Ottawa.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will elaborate on that point later. But I think that it goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't really matter how people get to the Senate; it's what they do once they get there that matters, Mr. Speaker. And that will be the heart of my comments.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation, according to the Minister of

Justice, is quite simply to ensure that we send more people to the Senate in Ottawa — a Senate that's not changed in any way, the current Senate. The only trouble is or the only circumstance is, Mr. Speaker, we will elect those people instead of having them appointed by the Prime Minister in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice also outlined that this Bill will authorize provincial elections held to elect individuals to be put forward as Saskatchewan nominees for federal appointment to the Senate. So in fact, Mr. Speaker, the original point, which was to elect senators, Mr. Speaker, is actually somewhat contradicted in the second remarks of the minister — that in fact what we are actually doing is not electing people to the Senate, but we are electing them to a list that could possibly be available for individuals to be nominated to the Senate in the old-fashioned way, Mr. Speaker.

So the number of nominees, Mr. Speaker, isn't set out by the legislation. The legislation quite simply says that there would be an order in council, or the cabinet would actually decide how many people elected by Saskatchewan people would actually go onto the list for consideration by the Prime Minister's office in Ottawa. And more importantly, Mr. Speaker, this order in council would determine a number that depends on the number of Senate seats that are available at that given time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's just think about this for a second, how valuable this little tool is in our arsenal of democratic armaments, Mr. Speaker. We're currently in a situation where the provincial election is two years from now. There is no vacancy in the Senate today, Mr. Speaker. As I will say in a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, that vacancy, one that existed when this legislation was first introduced, has been filled by an appointment of the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, an appointment in December of this year. So the seat now, the vacancy is filled, Mr. Speaker. And the Prime Minister has indicated that that seat now, those appointed senators, will serve for eight years.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have no vacancy today. Provincial election will be held in two years from now. There would be no point of a Senate election because there's no vacancy available, Mr. Speaker. The next provincial election, because we're now on fixed election dates, is four years after that. There'll still be no vacancy, Mr. Speaker. And so the following election is four years after that under fixed election dates.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have three, 4-year terms before we actually likely have a vacancy in the Senate. Three 4-year terms is 12 years, plus two years from now until the next election, Mr. Speaker. So we're looking at a period of about 14 years before this Act actually has any relevance to the Saskatchewan people, if indeed it has any relevance at all, which is part of the argument that I will be making in my remarks.

Just from a practical perspective, Mr. Speaker, we're spending time on this legislation, and the priority for the Saskatchewan people or the needs that the Saskatchewan people have about having a second view of what's going on in Ottawa from the Prairie and Western perspective, Mr. Speaker, this Bill doesn't actually address it.

The other thing that the Minister of Justice indicated, Mr.

Speaker, is that pretty much the only criteria for someone to stand for election is that the nominee qualifications are those established by the constitutional requirements for a senator. Well really, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the historic value of the Senate and Senate appointments, the criteria that was originally set and how the constitution looks at this, the only real value, the only real qualification that makes someone eligible for sitting as a senator, Mr. Speaker, is the provision that they must own property, property within Canada, Mr. Speaker.

So I think some people will remember — those who remember their history from high school and some who have taken history classes at a post-secondary institution beyond high school. And if they've studied the history of Canada or if they've studied politics or parliamentary procedure, Mr. Speaker, they will have some memory of the fact that when the Senate was first initiated or the House of Lords in England, Mr. Speaker, essentially, really the only qualification was that you own property. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, was to protect the value of that property from those who sit in the elected seats, Mr. Speaker, who have a tendency to try to redistribute the value of property.

So, Mr. Speaker, the history of the Senate or the House of Lords in England, was quite simply to protect the propertied classes, Mr. Speaker, or more importantly, the wealthy against the commoners elected by ordinary people. So that chamber of sober second thought was simply a way in which the King of England could ensure that the propertied classes had some protection from the commoners, those who are generally elected by ordinary people, ordinary citizens.

[15:45]

And one assumes that when you're elected to a legislature or the parliament by the people, Mr. Speaker — and it's a direct election — and once you're elected you take a seat, and you are responsible to those who elected you, Mr. Speaker, that indeed you are representing the interests of the people of the country or the province or your own community, Mr. Speaker.

So the Senate, the qualification for the Senate is you must own property, protect the value of the propertied class. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the history of this country, the history of England and other Commonwealth countries, Mr. Speaker, has indicated very clearly that what members of the Senate have done over the years has not represented, sort of, that chamber of sober second thought. The value of what they do have not been in the long-term interests of ordinary Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do have a few more things to say about that too, in a few moments, but just to carry on with what this Bill does and to outline again, as I said, for those watching, the Minister of Justice in his opening remarks also said a decision to hold the Senate nominee election would not be automatic with every provincial or federal election. If it's not viewed as necessary to identify additional nominees, there will be no Senate nominee election held at that time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, just simple mathematics would show that we are unlikely to identify a time for an election in the very near future, Mr. Speaker. The legislation is quite clear — that if it's not necessary, it won't

happen. And, Mr. Speaker, the legislation quite clearly says that the term of a Senate nominee would run from one Senate nominee election to the next.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible that someone could stand for nomination, could be elected to the Senate, be put on the nominee list, Mr. Speaker, and before the next provincial election, that Senate nominee could in fact not be nominated to serve in the federal Senate or the national Senate, Mr. Speaker. And therefore we'd have to go through the whole process again because the legislation prevents this nominee to stay on the list for any extended period of time, Mr. Speaker. So we could in fact find ourselves looking at quite a number of individuals who want to step forward, want to serve their province on a national basis and, Mr. Speaker, then find out that it was all for nothing — all for naught.

More now to my specific concerns, Mr. Speaker, and let me address these things in a little more detail. And I frame this from the perspective that over the course of the development of the New Democratic Party, both in Canada and in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats have not felt that the Senate does provide value for money for Canadians. And our favoured position over the years — and hasn't changed much ever, Mr. Speaker — our favoured position is to simply see the Senate itself abolished.

Mr. Speaker, in many Commonwealth countries, provincial governments have senates. Mr. Speaker, we in Canada do not have that second level of government within our provincial jurisdictions. Mr. Speaker, it could easily be argued that that second body, parliamentary body, isn't necessary at the national level either.

It can be argued, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill really is nothing more than an empty gesture, that at the end of the day, we will have gone through this process; we have used considerable amount of legislative time. We will have engaged certain members of the public, and, Mr. Speaker, we have communicated messages to the Saskatchewan people. But at the end of the day, we have not actually achieved anything. We have not changed the way in which this country operates or thinks or is able to do business. Mr. Speaker, it is an empty gesture.

But what we are seeing is the Saskatchewan Party government prepared to expend taxpayers' money to obtain very little, other than the satisfaction that some of them will receive from some of their most conservative supporters. Mr. Speaker, that is not a value to the majority of Saskatchewan people.

We know a lot about this process, Mr. Speaker, because the province of Alberta has initiated this process already. And as we know, members of the Saskatchewan Party have been quick to follow the lead of their cousins and friends in the province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker. And so what we see here is there's been an attempt to influence the nomination process in Ottawa from the province of Alberta, and Saskatchewan is now simply trying to do much the same thing.

It is obvious from the nominations that were made in the month of December by Prime Minister Stephen Harper in Ottawa, it is obvious that the Prime Minister, the current Conservative Party

Prime Minister, has no interest whatsoever in a democratically elected Senate, Mr. Speaker. To serve his own interests, as other Conservative and Liberal ministers have done in the past, they have simply used their authority to try to stack the Senate to ensure that the Senate supports the wishes of the government in power, Mr. Speaker. These efforts being made by the province of Alberta and now the province of Saskatchewan to try to influence a nomination process that's being ignored by the federal Prime Minister and federal prime ministers before him, Mr. Speaker, simply sends a message to Saskatchewan people that this is an empty gesture that comes at considerable cost to the taxpayers, the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill actually accomplishes nothing in the way of meeting Canadian's desire for change at the Senate level. If you are not one who supports the complete abolishment of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, or if you are one who simply acknowledges that it will take time to abolish the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and that in the meantime effective reforms need to be made, well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill doesn't address any of those people's concerns about reforming the Senate.

After all, Mr. Speaker, I remember it wasn't that long ago that there was a tremendous call for — from the people of Western Canada — a call for, from the people of Western Canada, a call for a Triple-E Senate. And that Triple-E, Mr. Speaker, was very simple. They wanted an elected Senate because they were tired of the prime minister's buddies managing the system, the political system out of the Senate. They wanted equal representation, Mr. Speaker. Because as long as the appointments to the Senate are based on this population base that exists, again from Western Canada's perspective, from Atlantic Canada's perspective, the Senate simply represents the population base in Ontario and Quebec as the House of Commons does.

Mr. Speaker, some would argue that in the United States, whether you live in Rhode Island or whether you live in California, you have two senators, Mr. Speaker, and that's seen as being more equal representation from each provincial jurisdiction. If you are electing senators, Mr. Speaker, there should also be some recognition that the work they do when they get there has to reflect the interests of the provincial jurisdictions or maybe even regional jurisdictions because some who understood the argument of a Triple-E Senate, Mr. Speaker, recognized that equality could apply to regions not just provinces.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other E in the Triple-E — elected, equal — the third E, Mr. Speaker, was effective. What is the role that the people of Canada want their senators to perform? And how do we know that they're performing that role, Mr. Speaker? They must be effective in what they do. Well many of us also understand and remember some of things that have taken place in the Senate. And certainly it is not seen, and there is very little evidence to establish how the current Senate can be anywhere near being considered an effective body.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can elect people to go on a list all that we want. If they're still appointed, if there's no equality of regions, we cannot ever expect that body to be effective in terms of responding to the needs of Canadians from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, Western Canada does have a lot in common with Atlantic Canada. We are not out of line in any of our conversations either to each other or to the public, Mr. Speaker, when we raise concerns about what happens with our resources, Mr. Speaker, or our raw products.

Some have argued that the producers of the Prairies and the producers of Atlantic Canada share an awful lot in common, Mr. Speaker. Whether you grow wheat or whether you harvest fish, Mr. Speaker, someone other than you that is the farmer or the fisherman, Mr. Speaker, someone other than you is setting the value of your product, is determining the price that you get for your product, and is imposing rules and regulations on how you can sell that product, Mr. Speaker. So when we are talking about the economy of our primary producers, Mr. Speaker, we are very similar in nature.

Also, Mr. Speaker, most recently we have seen our resource base, whether it's forestry or whether it's oil and gas or whether it is minerals, Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Canada and Western Canada are not treated very differently, except, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the value that provincial governments can retain from the sale of those resources. And, Mr. Speaker, had we an effective Senate, Mr. Speaker, we would see the regions of this country treated more fairly. If there was a energy accord signed with Newfoundland, that accord would also apply to the province of Saskatchewan.

Was that the case, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely not. Did any of our members of parliament stand up for a fair resource return for the province of Saskatchewan in recent years, Mr. Speaker? No, our members of parliament did not. Did any of our representatives in the Senate stand up for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? No, they did not.

Is the Parliament of Canada, the House of Commons and the Senate, Mr. Speaker, being fair to the regions of this country when we are dealing with issues like that, that are clear and now in the memories of Saskatchewan people? No, Mr. Speaker. The Senate is not an effective body representing the regions. The Senate is a body, Mr. Speaker, that is there to represent essentially the propertied class of Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, that simply means supporting the desires of the majority who live in Ontario and the province of Quebec.

We can elect, we can spend money to elect, we can put people on lists, we can spend money to put people on lists, Mr. Speaker, but the people of Saskatchewan want either the Senate gone and our MPs [Member of Parliament] doing the job we've elected them to do, or they want to have that Senate body, if it exists at all, being effective. This legislation simply acknowledges that this government is not prepared to do the work that needs to be done to represent to Ottawa what is really fair and what is required by the people who live in this province.

[16:00]

This Bill actually then, Mr. Speaker, we could argue, reinforces the unequal representation of the Senate. It simply acknowledges that the status quo works. Well, Mr. Speaker, the status quo doesn't work and you won't find a person in Saskatchewan that believes that the status quo works. Therefore

why are we spending the time and the money to reinforce the status quo, give the Prime Minister another opportunity to nominate people who will not be able to do the job for us?

And that brings us up to that nomination, most recent nomination, Mr. Speaker. The only rule really is you have to own property; they don't really say where you have to own that property. But, Mr. Speaker, we at least are trying to ensure that the Prime Minister knows that if you own property — and that's the rule, Mr. Speaker — that property should be in the province in which you want to be a representative.

Now is owning a cottage at the lake that you visit once a year adequate to make you a resident of a particular province, Mr. Speaker? I don't care how much we like certain individuals, if you don't hold a health card in a province or you don't hold some identification like a power bill in your name and those sorts of things, you aren't actually living in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. A nomination should be for a person who lives in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Prime Minister has ignored that in at least two cases in his nominations in December of this year. Saskatchewan was one of those, Prince Edward Island was one of those. Nominations were for people to represent us who, Mr. Speaker, may come home once a year to visit friends and neighbours.

And it doesn't matter how much they adore the province that they were born in, Mr. Speaker, and how much they care about that province, Mr. Speaker. The work that they do in the Senate requires them to have a working knowledge of what's happening within their community, within their neighbourhoods, within the boundaries of that province on a day-to-day basis, Mr. Speaker. And visiting once a year and having a cottage inside the community doesn't cut it, Mr. Speaker.

So not only have we got a piece of legislation that now reinforces unequal representation, we also have legislation that allows the Prime Minister to ensure that someone who has an affinity towards the community they currently live in, as opposed to the community where they once lived, Mr. Speaker. A health card, I think, is a useful identification for someone who represents a province.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, not only that, perhaps even consideration of where the individual who stands for nomination pays their income tax, Mr. Speaker. Do they file a form with the taxes coming back to the province of Saskatchewan? Or do they file a form where the taxes they earn on the income they're paid get sent to the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker? I think this is something that we that need to consider when we are looking at the legislation in front of us.

I hope that I've made a reasonable case that says that it makes no sense to just elect senators in the absence of other reforms. This government is ignoring that entire debate, Mr. Speaker, simply by saying, let's be democratic; let's elect people to the Senate. Well let's be clear. We are not electing people to the Senate. It's not terribly democratic either, but it's not electing people to the Senate. We're electing people that put their name on a list, and then the Prime Minister continues to do whatever the Prime Minister wishes to do. He can appoint or not appoint

these individuals as he sees fit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we know, the Prime Minister, as the Saskatchewan government has done and others, passed legislation for fixed election dates. Well, Mr. Speaker, we just came through a situation whereby the Prime Minister didn't listen to that legislation either. He did whatever he felt he could get away with. He called an election despite the fact that there were fixed election dates, and as a result of that, tremendous cost to the Canadian people and the Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Tremendous cost with absolutely no change in Ottawa — had a minority Conservative government before the election, had a minority Conservative government after the election. We achieved absolutely no progress.

A Prime Minister who ignored his own legislation. The Prime Minister will most likely ignore this legislation as well if we ever get to a point where we can have the election and put somebody's name on a list going forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this government has talked recently about public consultation. We are currently going through what should be a broad-based debate in this province over the future of energy development in the province of Saskatchewan. What are our options for the future of energy in this province, this wonderful province of Saskatchewan?

But, Mr. Speaker, this government has said that as far as consultation is concerned, all the information they need is out there. People can go and look, find their own information. In fact, the Premier indicated that because there's information out there, that people should do their own research to inform themselves as to what's going on with the future of energy options in the province of Saskatchewan. And so the consultation process that they have put in place is — correct me if I'm wrong now — nine meetings over a two-week period of time across the province of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of the Environment just concluded a series of consultations on regulations which I think we will discuss in the Assembly here at some point in the near future, Mr. Speaker. But on regulations within the Department of the Environment, over a 12-month period, the consultations, there were 18 consultation meetings, Mr. Speaker. And one of the recommendations in this process has been to consult further. This is all information released just yesterday here in Regina, Mr. Speaker.

So the Minister of the Environment believes that a year-long consultation period with 18 meetings is necessary to discuss regulations, and the Minister of Enterprise and Innovation and the Premier believe that a discussion about the entire future of energy production in this province can be handled with seven or nine meetings over a two-week period of time.

Not a very clear message that's being sent to the people of Saskatchewan, unless of course, Mr. Speaker, you understand that this government does not believe seriously in broad-based consultations. But, Mr. Speaker, they talk frequently about how consultation is important to them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this government is serious about broad-based public consultations, then, Mr. Speaker, they should be thinking about this issue of Senate reform in terms of what do the people think.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a chance of a public referendum on the next provincial election ballot. Members opposite have already said, an election promise, daylight savings time, we don't need to discuss it here in the Chamber any more; we'll put it to the people. Referendum, Mr. Speaker, on the next provincial election ballot. I expect to see that coming forward by this government in the near future.

The government, should there be no Senate election, Mr. Speaker, could also add to the ballot, what about abolishing the Senate instead of this nonsense about spending money to put somebody on a list?

But, Mr. Speaker, if they can't do that, and if they truly believe in public consultation, then when they draft the election ballot, Mr. Speaker, and you've got the names of various individuals who wish to stand for election for this list, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the ballot could be (a) such-and-such a name, (b) such-and-such a name, (c) such-and-such a name, and (d), Mr. Speaker, none of the above — abolish the Senate.

Every Saskatchewan resident, Mr. Speaker, who would stand to be counted in an election should be given the opportunity to tell this government how they feel about not only this legislation, this process, but, Mr. Speaker, also the future of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt about it that this legislation really serves no purpose whatsoever. It's going to come at great cost to the Saskatchewan people and, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the public still hasn't had any real say in this.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of quotes to put on the record today in my remarks. An interesting article from May of last year, written by a *StarPhoenix* columnist, Mr. Speaker, in which he reviews the possibility of an elected Senate. And he says, by golly, there's a lot of questions to be asked here. And he says this. This is quoting Randy Burton, Thursday, May 22 in *The StarPhoenix*:

There was no mention made of Senate reform in the Saskatchewan Party's election platform last year and there has been no discernible public demand for the concept in recent years. Now suddenly we're told that Saskatchewan is on a course that will see it hold a Senate election in conjunction with the next provincial . . . election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite now in government are proud to stand up and say they're meeting the promises to the Saskatchewan people. We know of several promises that they have not yet kept, Mr. Speaker, but here they are proceeding with something for which there's no outcry in the province and for which there was no debate prior to the election. Mr. Burton certainly hits the nail on the head there.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he also says, and I quote, "Perhaps, but so far at least, voters really have no idea what they're going to be getting, other than the possibility that they have a second choice to make on the next provincial ballot."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, you will elect a provincial MLA, and there could be another ballot that suggests a couple of names who could be serving in the Senate. The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, really will not be able to adequately judge the value of the contributions of a senator, Mr. Speaker, when they are debating issues of provincial interest in a provincial general election Mr. Burton alludes to.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a question asked by Mr. Burton, and again I quote from his column. It suggests:

For example, if senators are to be elected under provincial laws . . . [this would] suggest there will be 10 different dates for Senate elections across the country. If the prime minister then appoints the winners to the Senate when it strikes his fancy, there will be no relation [whatsoever] between elections for the House of Commons and the federal Senate. Does that make any sense? [Mr. Speaker, when we're dealing with issues that are common to our federal situation.]

Then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Burton also asks, "Will there be riding boundaries established, or will candidates be elected through an at-large system?" Well it certainly appears that Saskatchewan is looking at an at-large election, Mr. Speaker. So you've got campaigns that could possibly run from Estevan to Cumberland through La Ronge, Uranium City, and Swift Current, Mr. Speaker. One heck of a constituency to represent and to campaign in, Mr. Speaker.

This suggests — and let's be very clear about this, what this suggests, Mr. Speaker — if candidates are elected in this fashion, obviously, the larger population areas will have the larger influence over the outcome of this election. One therefore can argue that this process favours those who represent or live in or have their base in urban Saskatchewan as opposed to rural Saskatchewan.

This legislation, it could be argued, Mr. Speaker, is very urban-oriented in a province where the representation in Ottawa is required primarily from a resource and primary producer perspective, as opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the interests of the larger communities where many of the senators currently live, as they've been appointed from those communities, Mr. Speaker. So I think Mr. Burton raises some very interesting questions, and we would be wise to keep those in mind.

[16:15]

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think there was also some interesting comments made, could be made by a fellow by the name of Troy Lanigan who's arguing we need to abolish the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, Troy Lanigan writes, and again I quote, and he's speaking primarily from a federal prospective. We need to keep this in mind when we are thinking about it from a provincial prospective. Troy Lanigan says: ". . . Prime Minister Harper's earnest attempt to address the concerns by appointing senators elected in the provinces is wrong-headed for three main reasons."

And then he argues one of the points that I've made already: it legitimizes the current ineffective Senate. Mr. Speaker, he also

says it rekindles the regional disparities that exist, for the points that I've already made, and then he says, ". . . it takes focus off reforms [that could be] more important and more realistic."

So in other words, instead of debating the issue about how do we make a second body more effective or getting rid of it all together, instead of that debate, we are debating whether or not we should elect or not elect the people who will be appointed. So Mr. Lanigan's comments are very wisely put on record, Mr. Speaker, that this takes away the focus on real reform of the Senate and we simply are talking about the simple matter of how do you get people to be there.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is very useful for the public to know, and again this comes from Troy Lanigan's comments. And I quote him:

If you elect them, you legitimize them. Suddenly we'll have another 105 politicians running around the country — with all the trappings of office — telling us there is no problem that can't be solved with more tax dollars.

So, Mr. Speaker, this was one of the criticisms of the appointed Senate, that you have unelected people who are simply assuming office and spending money, taxpayers' money. Now you're electing them to do exactly the same thing — more people who are unrepresentative, Mr. Speaker, of the very areas that they're supposed to be representative of.

Mr. Speaker, "Strengthen the role of the regions by strengthening the role of the provinces," is the last argument that I wanted to bring forward from Mr. Lanigan. Let me repeat that: "Strengthen the role of the regions by strengthening the role of the provinces," is an important issue that we should be discussing, Mr. Speaker. It's another area of focus. If there are concerns about the regions not being well represented in the elected House of Commons, and if the Senate can't do that, Mr. Speaker, then they should get out of the way and give some real strength to the provincial governments, Mr. Speaker.

We have the Council of the Federation that meets. This is, in some cases, the first step towards legitimizing provincial representation at the federal level. And perhaps we need to be thinking about focusing on that debate as well.

And actually, Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues indicates that Harper ignores — Prime Minister Stephen Harper ignores — the wishes of the Council of the Federation at this time as well. So, Mr. Speaker, as long as you have prime ministers who are not willing to accept the wishes of the provinces, their citizens, or the regions in which they live, Mr. Speaker, no amount of reform will actually have any real value across the country.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will see this legislation proceed through its normal course here. It is interesting, of course, that this Bill will soon go to committee for study. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the government members have brought the Bill in. The Minister of Justice made some short remarks about what the Bill appears to do, and we've had no debate, inside or outside this Legislative Assembly, by members of the government since, Mr. Speaker.

This Bill will proceed because the government has the majority.

The Bill will likely pass. And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, we are actually adding to the costs for the Saskatchewan taxpayers of electing members to go on a list for this — in effect to be appointed to this ineffective body in Ottawa.

This legislation really does nothing except increase the costs of democracy to the Saskatchewan people. The government has not addressed that, Mr. Speaker.

I think our leader has indicated, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, and our critic, the member from Saskatoon Meewasin, has indicated that there's an opportunity to provide some amendments to this legislation in committee. I look forward to that process, but at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I hope Saskatchewan people will realize that this government has simply increased their costs, done nothing else for the people of Saskatchewan. And at the end of day, nothing in Canada has changed as a result of the efforts of this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that I close my remarks, and I look forward to the committee meetings as this Bill proceeds through the legislature.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion that Bill No. 60, the senate nominee election committee be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Clerk Assistant (Committees): — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred?

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Speaker, to the Standing Committee on House Services.

The Speaker: — The Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on House Services.

Bill No. 51

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 51 — *The Provincial Court Amendment Act, 2008*** be now read a second time.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I last spoke on this Bill last week. I think I spoke to 5 o'clock. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, you cut me off in mid-sentence, but I will not — I will not, despite the encouragement of my friends on this side of the House — start over, Mr. Speaker. I do have a few more remarks to make about the Bill.

Previously I had been commenting — and I will not repeat all my remarks — but previously commenting on the importance of the provincial court, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that it deals

with so many issues of the vast majority of people who appear before court. It deals with the vast majority of criminal cases. It deals with all the small claims cases and so, Mr. Speaker, it sees most accused, most victims of crime, and most self-represented litigants. And although there is appeal often from Provincial Court, the means for appeal and the means relative to the matters involved, Mr. Speaker, mean that that sometimes — and often actually, Mr. Speaker — is more theoretical than actual.

And so the face of justice for many, many people who go to court is the Provincial Court, Mr. Speaker. They don't see the superior courts. They don't see the appeal courts. They don't see the Supreme Court of Canada. And it's the interpretation that Provincial Court gives to the law — established by legislatures; established by parliament; established by the superior court, particularly the Supreme Court of Canada in its interpretation of the Constitution, interpretation of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms — it's the interpretation given to that by Provincial Court judges that has a real effect in people's lives.

If Provincial Court doesn't understand those laws, those rights, those freedoms, then to a certain extent — to a large extent, Mr. Speaker — they are illusory. They are not really there. Because people who can ill-afford arbitrariness or negligence or harshness, undue and unnecessary harshness on the part of a judge, really have in many, many cases no actual appeal from the Provincial Court.

And, Mr. Speaker, in many western democracies, people would be surprised by the powers of this Provincial Court of Saskatchewan that possesses many, many of the powers that what we call superior courts possess. And to a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, it is a misnomer to call the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan a lower court. The Provincial Court of Saskatchewan is a trial court, Mr. Speaker. And it's a trial court from which many people have no — because of varying circumstances; monetary mostly I'm referring to, Mr. Speaker, but otherwise as well — have no actual appeal.

And so the way that we as legislators, and the way that we as government treat all our courts, including our Provincial Court, is extremely important as well. When I previously spoke on this matter, I spoke about an issue that gave rise to the part of the amendment to which I am addressing my remarks. And that's the part of *The Provincial Court Amendment Act* that allows the Judicial Council the power — rather empty power — but the power to pursue investigation of a judge who is no longer a judge.

And I don't think it escaped the attention of anybody that was listening that it was highly critical of what is a political exercise, Mr. Speaker. The Judicial Council is not going to pursue a person against whom they have no sanction, and the legislation gives no other sanction here, and highly critical of putting into legislation what is really political face saving on the part of the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General.

And I said previously when I spoke on this matter that I did not wish any of my remarks to be taken as condoning or excusing behaviour that resulted in an investigation by the Judicial Council, that legislation can never be a replacement for the

exercise of character or good judgment. My remarks are not to excuse or explain away any error in judgment that would result in an investigation by the Judicial Council of Saskatchewan. And I don't care to do that, Mr. Speaker.

But I also want to put my concerns about the actions of this government in respect to the court and the rule of law and the independence of the court in perspective as well, Mr. Speaker. And I am going to be somewhat critical of the Minister of Justice and the motives behind the provision which is contained in this Bill. But before I am, I want to say a couple of things, because I don't want to be misunderstood.

There's no question in my mind that the current Minister of Justice is intelligent and capable, and one of, one of the more capable ministers of the Crown in this government. There is also no question in my mind that he has a sincere interest in human rights, a progressive interest in human rights, which I don't believe are necessarily shared right across the government benches, Mr. Speaker. But there's no doubt of that in my mind as well. And there's no doubt in my mind that it is certainly his preference that the office of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Justice not be subordinated to political concerns. And I believe that all those things are true.

[16:30]

What I am somewhat concerned about, Mr. Speaker — given my time in this Legislative Assembly, these five going on six years — is that the minister doesn't necessarily always have the fortitude to withstand pressure from within his caucus, now the government caucus, in respect to some of these important issues of the rule of the law, judicial independence, and independence of other bodies, Mr. Speaker. And this provision in this Bill is symptomatic of that, Mr. Speaker.

I know that the Minister of Justice understands his role, I think, in a constitutional democracy. But I know also that he's sometimes not able to fully explain the importance of that role to some of his colleagues because of things that have happened in this legislature in the few years that we have been here and years preceding the contribution of the current member from Saskatoon Northwest. And again this is one provision, this is one symptom of that, Mr. Speaker, that we would even have this provision here and the reasons that we have it here.

But I know that the current Minister of Justice knows that this legislature should respect judicial independence, Mr. Speaker. I know that because when someone rose from the Saskatchewan Party benches, when they were in opposition, to attack the decision of a judge, it wasn't the Justice critic, Mr. Speaker. He wouldn't do it. It was actually, on one occasion, the member from Swift Current who is now the Premier. But the Justice critic, the member from Saskatoon Southeast, wouldn't do it. So I know he knew better, Mr. Speaker. But I also know that he wasn't able to stop it from happening, Mr. Speaker.

And what is in this Bill is also symptomatic of that. As I stated last week, when this investigation arose and it became public that there was an investigation, the current Justice minister said to me . . . volunteered to me, Mr. Speaker; I didn't ask for this. When you're government minister, as the ministers across there know, you wait for questions and you have to anticipate any

number of questions because nobody's going to tell you what they are and nobody's going to tell you what they aren't, as a rule. And that's one of the funs of being on that side of the aisle and I guess that's part of the fun of being on this side of the aisle as well.

But the Justice critic volunteered to me when we were discussing another matter, right behind where I stand right now, that he did not think it was appropriate to ask questions about the investigation taken by the Judicial Council. Well that's fine. I agreed with him, but I didn't rely on it, Mr. Speaker.

Then within days he gets up in his seat — the Justice critic at the time — and asked questions about the Judicial Council and implies in his questions that the government-appointed lay people on the council should report to the Minister of Justice, which was then me, about the investigation which had not been completed, which was in progress, Mr. Speaker, and that I should report in question period to the legislature. Entirely inappropriate, Mr. Speaker.

And I note that now the Minister of Justice agrees with the police chief in Saskatoon that investigations of police officers should not be disclosed and discipline of police officers should not be disclosed. Mr. Speaker, I said some very kind things, which I believe about the Minister of Justice. I'm not sure he was listening at the time I was saying them. But this, this is hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. It is.

To say that the investigation of a judge by an independent Judicial Council should be subject of the debate in the legislature, but the discipline taken against a police officer following an investigation should be kept secret, that is not — that is not — two positions which one can reasonably hold and explain against each other, Mr. Speaker. It simply is not.

So outside the House, outside the House, the Minister of Justice no longer wants to take the position that the Judicial Council's investigation should be subject to debate in the legislature. But he has to say something. So what does he say? Well we shouldn't allow judges to simply resign and escape sanction from the Judicial Council, the investigation should be able to continue, Mr. Speaker.

Well that's the origin of the provision in the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That's the origin of the provision in the Bill. That's what he said. And I don't know if he would have — I doubt very much if he would have — independent of the other changes that have to be made to bring this forward, Mr. Speaker. But how could he — I think he should have by the way — but how could he, without losing some face, have brought forward these changes in respect to benefits and pensions and the other the matters dealt with by the Bill which we will deal with in committee, and which I do not wish to diminish by not addressing them in the Chamber.

But he would have been asked the question: well you said in opposition you would make this change; now why isn't this change in the Bill now that you are amending it, in the legislation now that you're amending it? So it is, Mr. Speaker. But that's what it is. It's political face-saving that we are going to put a provision in a Bill because of ill-thought-out, ill-considered questions that fail to show respect for the

independence of our court and the legislature, that we're going to put a provision in our Bill which will never be used, in legislation which will never be used, Mr. Speaker.

That's not appropriate. That's not right. It's what's going to happen. And by itself it may be meaningless, may be irrelevant, superfluous, little section of the legislation that'll never be used, that will never be brought in by this government in respect to any other profession or any other occupation, Mr. Speaker. But it is indicative of a tendency to put politics above good governance. And it's particularly troublesome and problematic when it's dealing not with this branch of government, the legislature, which can take care of itself in this Chamber, and not with the executive branch of government which certainly can take care of itself, Mr. Speaker, but dealing with the judicial branch of government which should be treated with more respect.

The party opposite when they were in opposition liked to use the Legal Aid Commission as a political football, on occasion judges as a political football; in this particular case, the Judicial Council as a political football, Mr. Speaker. I hope that they would not carry this on into government. And in part, the length of my remarks and the seriousness of my remarks are to raise the concern that they not do that.

I was very interested in the Minister of Health's comments today that Dr. Lemstra's firing had nothing to do with the government, that it was entirely the decision of the health region.

I remember when Mr. Hillson was terminated by the Legal Aid Commission, members opposite would not, would not accept that that was a decision of the Legal Aid Commission which it certainly was, Mr. Speaker. The independence of that commission was not accepted then, and the independence of the Judicial Council was not accepted then.

I want to return in concluding my remarks in saying that I know that the Minister of Justice understands what I'm saying. I know that the Minister of Justice agrees with what I'm saying. And I want to encourage the Minister of Justice to have the fortitude and strength in the debates and discussions within his caucus and within his government to stand up for the specific and important role of an Attorney General within a cabinet to ensure that the rule of law is respected, to ensure that the constitution is respected, to ensure that judicial independence is respected. That is a role that falls to one minister at the table in particular.

And I have said in private conversations with the Minister of Justice, that if there's anything that I can do to ensure that he is more able to make the right decision — even it's a politically unpopular decision — I would do that. I say that today so that he and I both know that I'm accountable. It's in *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker.

He has a special role within his government. I'm not sure that his government appreciates the special role of the Attorney General. I hope that they do from here on in. I said last week when I spoke to this Bill, that I think there was a road being walked down in this legislation that is not a road that the government is committed to, that I hope they do not walk down any further, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot support the provision that's in the Bill in respect to the direction being given to Judicial Council for entirely political reasons. I'm concerned about what motivates it and what motivated it, Mr. Speaker. That concern's expressed. I trust I've been heard. There are a lot of important mechanics to the legislation that actually brought the legislation itself before the legislature that need to be dealt with by the appropriate committee and we will now allow that to happen.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 51, *The Provincial Court Amendment Act, 2008* be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Clerk Assistant (Committees): — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Gantefoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that this Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.

The Speaker: — This Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.

Bill No. 87

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Gantefoer that **Bill No. 87 — *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Douglas Park.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, so I'll just ignore what he's saying or trying to interject here. But I would point out that we provide all members with an opportunity to get on their feet and to contribute to debate.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill in question is *The Income Tax Amendment Act*. The minister tells us this Bill makes amendments to the existing research and development tax credit to convert it to a refundable tax credit. It proposes amendments to recognize a new federal small-business tax limit and to maintain the \$500,000 provincial small-business tax limit.

We in Saskatchewan have a corporate tax rate but for small businesses that have, how shall I say, revenue or a business less than \$500,000 a year, we've reduced the corporate tax rate significantly for small businesses. The federal government also did that for small businesses for federal taxes. They have now made change in the tax limit from 400,000 to 500,000 to correspond to ours. So to ensure that businesses are not adversely affected by that, the Bill proposes some amendment. And we agree with that.

Also the federal government recently announced a series of

changes to the taxation of dividend income. These changes will have an unintended impact on provincial taxation of this income. In order to ensure that the provincial tax on this dividend income does not increase, this Bill proposes amendments to maintain the current dividend tax credit rate for eligible dividends.

And significantly this Bill also — and this probably will be of greater interest to at least young people in Saskatchewan — this Bill introduces an amendment to expand the definition of eligible tuition fees under the graduate retention program. And these changes are to include people who are enrolled in post-secondary institutions out of province so that they are extended the same graduate tax credits that are available to people who are enrolled in universities in Saskatchewan, or to Saskatchewan people who are enrolled in institutions out of province. This change will now be extended to all those from out of province who graduate and want to move to Saskatchewan.

So that is the change. I might point out that the change does not extend to Saskatchewan people who are enrolled in master's and Ph.D. [Doctor of Philosophy] programs. So we may have some questions about why the government would extend a tax credit to people from outside of Saskatchewan — not to residents or students from Saskatchewan but would extend it to people from outside of Saskatchewan — but not extend that to master's and Ph.D. level graduates that are Saskatchewan citizens, Mr. Speaker.

[16:45]

So we have some questions about that, about the fairness of that that we will be dealing with in committee, as I understand it, and I would leave it to my colleague, the critic for post-secondary education, to deal with this in some greater detail in the committee when we get to it.

There's also some technical amendments to the former R & D [research and development] tax credit provisions that have been requested by the Canada Revenue Agency in order to clarify administrative issue to that credit, and we don't see any problem with doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I just might say that the government very apt, very fond of trumpeting all the changes they have made in tax regime in the last 18 months or so that they've been the government. And I would just point out that these are not the first tax changes that have occurred in Saskatchewan, point out that the previous NDP administration made hugely significant changes in taxes, starting with a very major change and reform of the income tax system both to ensure that our income tax system was more competitive with other jurisdictions; to ensure that our income tax system was fairer than had been the previous system, so that the load was lessened for people of lower incomes; and also to ensure that whatever changes were put into place were done in an affordable way. Because it's not as if the NDP administration had the wealth of revenues that the current government has had to play with. We had to be a little bit more circumspect and a little bit more playful in terms of what we did.

And I know that the other members always like to mock us

about doing things in small, measured steps, but, you know, we took the approach that you start small but smart, and that's what we did in terms of significant tax change. Might also point out that over time we were able to reduce the provincial sales tax to the current level of 5 per cent which is usually significant for people. Also point out that the previous NDP administrations started with major changes to corporate income tax and also changes to royalty revenues in some of our industries to facilitate, encourage, promote expansion both in some of the resource extraction industries and also, significantly, in other corporations.

And I think we're seeing the fruits of some of that development now, especially as I look at the announcement by a company to expand warehousing of grocery items outside of Regina. And one can trace that decision back to changes that were made by the previous government or initiated by the previous government in the area of corporate taxation.

So you know, the government can say all it wants about everything that they're doing and how wonderful it is. I'm always reminded that this is a government that is doing so little with so much, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the previous government that was able to do a great deal with very little. So there's a big change here, Mr. Speaker, in terms of, you know, when you have the revenues to make things happen, this is a government that, frankly, has done very little, given all the wealth that it has.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go on. We look forward, as I indicated, in committee, to put the questions to the minister about how some of these specific provisions will be implemented and how they will affect Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan interests. And so at this point, Mr. Speaker, I'd say that we're prepared to let this item go forward to committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 87, *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Clerk Assistant (Committees): — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Speaker, to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

The Speaker: — The Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

Bill No. 88

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Gantfoer that **Bill No. 88** — *The*

Corporation Capital Tax Amendment Act, 2009 be now read a second time.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Douglas Park.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill is an amendment to *The Corporation Capital Tax Act*, and the minister's explanation, second reading speech was very brief in terms of what the Bill is hoping to accomplish.

He stated that the amendment provides the authority for remission of corporate capital tax to those financial institutions that acquire, through amalgamation, the assets of a non-financial corporation and create a capital tax liability as a result of that acquisition. Tells us that the amendment applies to those amalgamations occurring on or after July 1, 2008, and that this coincides with the elimination of the general corporate capital tax.

And he says that this particular amendment provides a remedy for an, I think, unintended tax consequence of a financial institution which did not have a permanent establishment in Saskatchewan prior to, again, acquiring the assets of a non-financial corporation. He points out that this step is necessary because it will help to encourage a business to expand in Saskatchewan or businesses to expand in Saskatchewan.

So we're trying to read between the lines as to exactly what this specific change is intended to do, if there is simply a very small group of businesses that he's not in a position to deal with in committee. So we look forward to an opportunity to get a briefing on this matter so we know what specific questions we can and should be asking in committee.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, at this point we're prepared to let it go forward.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 88, *The Corporation Capital Tax Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the second time.

Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Clerk Assistant (Committees): — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Speaker, to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

The Speaker: — The Bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies. I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Mr. Speaker, it being near the time of

adjournment, I move this House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: — The Government House Leader has moved that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. This Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 16:54.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Wall	2705
Broten	2705
Bjornerud	2705, 2706
Van Mulligen	2705
Duncan	2706
Atkinson	2706
Trew	2706
Elhard	2707
Stewart	2707

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Trew	2707
Higgins	2707
Iwanchuk	2707
Forbes	2708
Morin	2708
Taylor	2708
Broten	2708

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Technology Safety Workshop for Parents	
Higgins	2708
National Archery in Schools Program	
Krawetz	2709
Hockey Star from Northern Saskatchewan	
Belanger	2709
Humboldt Broncos Win Championship	
Harpauer	2709
German Language School Easter Celebration	
Morin	2710
Provincial Championship Hockey Teams	
Huyghebaert	2710
Regina Community Living Spring Fling	
Trew	2710

QUESTION PERIOD

Drinking Water	
Morin	2711
Hutchinson	2711
Curriculum Materials	
Wotherspoon	2713
Krawetz	2713
Health Disparity in Saskatoon Report	
Junor	2713
McMorris	2714
Harpauer	2714
Nuclear Development	
Calvert	2715
Stewart	2715
Wall	2715

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on the Economy	
Huyghebaert	2716
Standing Committee on House Services	
Taylor	2717

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 46 — <i>The Labour Market Commission Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Stewart	2716

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 79 — *The Education Amendment Act, 2009 (No. 2)*

Loi n° 2 de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1995 sur l'éducation

Wotherspoon	2717
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2719
Bill No. 49 — <i>The Ambulance Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Junor	2719
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2719
Bill No. 43 — <i>The Trespass to Property Act</i>	
Quennell	2720
Nilson	2721
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2722
Bill No. 76 — <i>The Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act, 2008 (No. 2)</i>	
Morin	2722
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2723
Bill No. 61 — <i>The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Higgins	2723
Harpauer (referral to committee)	2725
Bill No. 59 — <i>The Election Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Quennell	2725
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2726
Bill No. 60 — <i>The Senate Nominee Election Act</i>	
Taylor	2726
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2732
Bill No. 51 — <i>The Provincial Court Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Quennell	2732
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2734
Bill No. 87 — <i>The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Van Mulligen	2734
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2735
Bill No. 88 — <i>The Corporation Capital Tax Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Van Mulligen	2736
Gantefoer (referral to committee)	2736

GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN CABINET MINISTERS

Hon. Brad Wall
Premier

Hon. Bob BJORNERUD
Minister of Agriculture
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Crop Insurance Corporation

Hon. Bill Boyd
Minister of Energy and Resources
Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs

Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff
Minister of Crown Corporations

Hon. Dan D'Autremont
Minister of Government Services
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan Liquor and
Gaming Authority
Minister Responsible for the Information
Technology Office

Hon. June Draude
Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations
Minister Responsible for Northern Affairs

Hon. Wayne Elhard
Minister of Highways and Infrastructure
Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission
Provincial Secretary

Hon. Rod Gantfoer
Minister of Finance

Hon. Donna Harpauer
Minister of Social Services

Hon. Nancy Heppner
Minister of Environment

Hon. Darryl Hickie
Minister of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing

Hon. Bill Hutchinson
Minister of Municipal Affairs
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Gaming Corporation

Hon. Ken Krawetz
Deputy Premier
Minister of Education

Hon. Don McMorris
Minister of Health

Hon. Don Morgan
Minister of Justice
Attorney General

Hon. Rob Norris
Minister of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour
Minister Responsible for Immigration
Minister Responsible for the Workers'
Compensation Board

Hon. Lyle Stewart
Minister of Enterprise and Innovation

Hon. Christine Tell
Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport
Minister Responsible for Capital City Commission