



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.]

[Prayers]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cut Knife-Turtleford.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you officials from the Pacific North West Economic Region, PNWER, who are visiting Regina as one of the several provincial and capital visits during the year. As Saskatchewan is a new PNWER member and also the upcoming host of the legislative academy and winter meetings in November, the leaders are interested in learning more about Saskatchewan and our interest in their organization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce — and if you would please stand — Senator Lesil McGuire from Alaska. Senator McGuire is the incoming president of PNWER. Jeff Morris, representative from Washington state and a past president of PNWER; Matt Morrison, executive director of PNWER, from the Seattle office; and Wendy Baldwin from the Canadian Consulate in Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we welcome these, and I would also like to recognize Melinda Carter from protocol who is making sure that we're showing them the best of Saskatchewan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member from Cut Knife-Turtleford.

Mr. Chisholm: — Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, it's also a pleasure for me to introduce to you a young gentleman who will be working with myself this summer, and particularly spreading the PNWER word and to our private sector community. Reagen Reece is just finished his first year of Commerce at the University of Saskatchewan, and Reagen will be working with me both in Regina and in our home constituency. So I would ask that we welcome Reagen to his Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Lakeview.

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join in with the member opposite in welcoming the guests to Saskatchewan. We're very pleased to have these people here in Saskatchewan.

And I think our member from the southwestern part of Saskatchewan, the Cypress constituency, isn't here today, but we always like to say that Wallace Stegner, the American writer, is one of our favourite sons because he spent a good part of his . . . I guess up to age 12 living in Eastend, Saskatchewan. And he always talked about being Western North Americans or

Western Americans, and basically that was because he'd lived in North Dakota; Saskatchewan; Salt Lake City, Utah; Washington state, and then spent the end of his life in California. And whenever you look at a writer like that, what you see and what you feel is this sense of comradeship that we feel when we work with the PNWER people.

And so what I want to say is that you are part of our extended family, and we very much appreciate having you here. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Humboldt.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, I'd like to introduce eight guests from the Canadian Paraplegic Association who have joined us on the floor of the Assembly this afternoon.

With us today we have Del Huber. He is the president of the Saskatchewan chapter of the Canadian Paraplegic Association. We also have Don Shalley, director of fund development of the Saskatchewan chapter.

We have four members of the CPA [Canadian Paraplegic Association]. There's Miranda Biletski, who is a competitive wheelchair rugby player and was recently named to a tournament all-star team in Vancouver. We have Clayton Gerein, who is a member of the five national champion wheelchair rugby teams from Saskatchewan, and is a seven-time paralympian and multiple medallist in wheelchair racing.

We have Sean Smith who also plays wheelchair rugby, was a co-founder of the multiple-award-winning Poverty Plainsmen country music group, and helps manage the band and still sings with them on occasion. We have Doug Tratch who learned how to skydive so he could set a significant example of the CPA's message from their campaign, "The sky is the limit for people with spinal cord injuries and physical disabilities."

We have a volunteer with the CPA, Cheryl Huber, and one of the CPA staff, Sheila Flasko. Could everyone please join me in welcoming them to their Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all the members of your loyal opposition and all members of this House, I would like to join the minister in welcoming these folks from the CPA here today. I understand there are some interesting news that we'll be hearing more about, and we all appreciate when they can come out and see the proceedings of the legislature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

Mr. Reiter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to this Assembly I'd like to introduce a couple of friends of mine, Ron and Colleen Kostiuik from Foam Lake. Give them a wave, folks, or stand up, if you would. Ron is a former colleague and also both are very good friends, and I'd ask all members to please give them a warm welcome to their Assembly. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make note of Mr. Clayton Gerein. He's not only very adept at the sports that were mentioned already; he was also an opponent of mine in a fundraiser for abled skiers. And unfortunately he beat me and my team, but it was a very good competition and I certainly enjoyed it. So he's also a very accomplished skier as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, through you, and to all members of the Assembly some guests that are seated in your gallery. And they are seven students from Riffel High School here in Regina, accompanied with some other folks as well, and perhaps they could stand as I call their names. There is Lacie Ripplinger, Braxton Entwistle, Angelica Jackson, Eden Timm, Kaitlyn Juba, Caitlynn Beckett, and Miranda Dipaola. These students are doing a magnificent job in the community of the Northwest, not to mention the entire community of Regina.

They are accompanied here today by two of their teachers. These students are part of the grade 11 advanced placement art class, and their teacher in that program is Karen Luzny. And with this particular project that they've undertaken, this other wonderful teacher, Karen Lach, has accompanied them and assisted them. She's an English teacher from Riffel High School.

Unfortunately the principal for Riffel High School, Sharon Bender, wasn't able to make it today, but she's very supportive of the project. But two very, very supportive parents are also here in the audience with them today, and that's Art and Debbie Timm. And I'd like to welcome them to the legislature.

They are currently working on a project to raise awareness of the water situation and the world crisis that exists. They are raising consciousness of water issues regarding conservation, commodification, and global responsibility. They have a display of their artwork in the rotunda today, so if all the members would like to take a few minutes and view the artwork, it's on display in the rotunda.

And a few of the students are actually going to represent their high school and Regina in Montreal in a few weeks to discuss issues around water further. So please join me in welcoming them to the Legislative Assembly today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you and to all members of the Assembly, it is my pleasure to introduce a group that is seated in your gallery, a group of individuals that have each earned graduate degrees and that chose to live and work in Saskatchewan. I would like to specifically recognize, and I ask each upon recognition to wave or stand, Dr. Kristi Wright, Dr. Laurie Sykes-Tottenham, Mr. Nick Carleton, Dr. Regan Hart-Mitchell, Dr. Allisson Quine, and Ms. Bridget Keating.

These individuals, Mr. Speaker, are but a small sample of professionals that possess graduate degrees and that utilize their education to support vital needs and vital support to our province as a whole. They enrich our province. I ask all members of this Assembly to join in offering our kind welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today, and indeed my honour, to present a petition in support of changes to *The Highway Traffic Act*, to be referred to as the Gallenger amendment. 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 roadways.

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

Mr. Speaker, today's petitions are predominantly from Regina. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition that speaks to the need of the Government of Saskatchewan, that they need to recognize the essential role of all health care providers as valued members of the health care team, and that government needs to realize that the utilization and the value of a full range of professional skills offered by health care providers is promoted through the address of retention and recruitment issues and by ensuring safe staffing levels. And such promotion can only be achieved through a commitment to adequate funding and the installation of good faith in the provincial collective bargaining process. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon.

Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to commit to maintaining quality health care services and job security for all public health care providers.

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

Mr. Speaker, I so present on behalf of members of SEIU [Service Employees International Union] West and the citizens of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I stand to present a petition in support of indexing the minimum wage. As we all know, indexing minimum wage would ensure the minimum wage earners would be able to maintain a standard of living as the cost of living increases. 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 of Moose Jaw. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition in support of wage equity for CBO [community-based organization] workers. And we know, Mr. Speaker, that the low wages paid to the workers who work for CBOs, the community-based organizations here in Saskatchewan, results in high staff turnover. And the subsequent lack of caregiver continuity has a negative impact on the quality of care clients receive. I'd like to read the prayer, Mr. 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 petitioners come from Melville and Kamsack. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh

Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of rural residents of Saskatchewan who question why the Sask Party government is leaving them behind with respect to providing safe and affordable water. And 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.

These petitions are signed by the good residents of Rosthern, Waldheim, Duck Lake, and Prince Albert. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present petitions in support of needed expansion to the graduate retention program. The prayer reads as follows:

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.

These petitions are signed by concerned citizens here in Regina, Mr. Speaker. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition in support of a new long-term care facility in La Ronge. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately invest in the planning and construction of long-term care beds in La Ronge.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by the good people of La Ronge and area. I so present.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

Avenue Community Centre for Gender & Sexual Diversity Annual Awards

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On April 17 the Avenue Community Centre for Gender & Sexual Diversity held its annual gala awards. My colleague, the member from Saskatoon Meewasin, and myself were able to take in the 17th annual event. Through these awards the Avenue Community Centre recognizes people who have made significant contribution to a strong, vibrant, and healthy LGBTTT [lesbian, gay, bisexual, two-spirit, and transgender] community.

The winners for the Community Service Award were Herb McFaull and Tony Bidulka. Herb has been a long-time board member while Tony is the well-known author of the Russell Quant series featuring a Saskatchewan queer detective. Currently they are involved in establishing Camp fYrefly-Saskatchewan, a four-day leadership summer camp for LGBTTA [lesbian, gay, bisexual, two-spirit, transgender, and allies] youth that aims to give youth a stronger sense of identity.

[13:45]

Judy Krause was also recognized as a tireless volunteer doing what she can to strengthen the Saskatoon Diversity Network Pride events.

Becoming well known to Saskatoon as the voices on Rainbow Radio on CFCR, adding their special spin on queer life and queer culture in Saskatoon, Dwight Austin and Brian Bogdan were recognized as well.

I was very happy to see the Special Merit Award go to Blooms Flowers and Box Office Video, a business in my own riding.

Neil Shaw and Maynard Rust have always been huge supporters of Pride in the Gala Awards. They are very well deserving of this special award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in congratulating these special people who go above and beyond in supporting diversity in Saskatoon. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

Spinal Cord Injury and Physical Disabilities Awareness Month

Mr. Reiter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to inform the House that our government has proclaimed the month of May as Spinal Cord Injury and Physical Disabilities Awareness Month.

According to the Canadian Paraplegic Association, about 900 Canadians sustain a spinal cord injury each year. More than 40 per cent of those injuries are caused by motor vehicle accidents. Other common causes of spinal cord injuries in Canada are diving and other sports-related injuries and falls.

Mr. Speaker, a large percentage of spinal cord injuries are

sustained by Canadians under the age of 34 — young men and women in the prime of their lives who are suddenly confronted with life-altering disabilities that will affect them for the rest of their lives. The mission of the Canadian Paraplegic Association is to help persons with spinal cord injuries and other physical disabilities achieve independence, self-reliance, and full community participation.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan is pleased to join with the CPA to help raise awareness about spinal cord injuries and other physical disabilities through this important proclamation. Our government also remains committed to investing in support of people with disabilities to ensure that they are able to live safe, secure, and meaningful lives. I ask all members to join me in recognizing May as Spinal Cord Injury and Physical Disabilities Awareness Month. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Remembering Peter James Bear

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, in my life I have been blessed to meet many great people and make many good friends. And, Mr. Speaker, one such great friend was Peter James Bear of Sandy Bay. Peter, more commonly known as PJ, was a dedicated person that cared for his family, his community, and his people.

We need to appreciate good friends each and every day, Mr. Speaker. I valued my time and friendship with Peter, and last month Peter was tragically killed in a vehicle accident. The entire North was shocked and mourns the loss of one of its community leaders.

Peter and his wife, Mona, were blessed with 10 children — the youngest one being two. And yet Peter devoted time to serve as an alderman for his community of Sandy Bay. Peter was an employee of SaskPower and also served as a member of the first responders team in co-operation with the RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] for 10 years. He served on numerous boards such as the Mikisew preschool board and Northern Lights School Division, just to name a few.

PJ Bear was a relatively young man, and yet he had accomplished so much for the people of his community and the people of the North. There were numerous times that Peter would go above and beyond to help as many people as he could — and Peter helped many, many people.

We laid Peter to rest, and I want to thank his family for sharing him with all of us. I would like to thank his community, and I thank you, the Creator, for giving us time with PJ Bear. May he rest in peace as his work on earth was well done. Until we meet again, my good friend.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Kelvington-Wadena.

Foam Lake Company Active in Biodiesel Industry

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of this Assembly the accomplishments of one of the very dynamic businesses in Foam Lake, Milligan Bio-Tech.

In the past I have spoken about the accomplishments of Milligan Bio-Tech, the company that began when the Foam Lake Marketing Club investigated the possibility of finding a non-food use for distressed oilseed crops.

In 1996, Milligan biodiesel demonstrated the usefulness of biodiesel in agricultural equipment. That same year, Milligan Bio-Tech Inc. was incorporated. In 1998, there was a pre-pilot canola oil crushing plant built at the seed plant in Foam Lake. In 2001, after investing financially in continuous research and testing, Milligan met the North American and the European biodiesel standards and the first sale of biodiesel happened.

Over the years, Milligan Bio worked with the federal and provincial governments and departments and researchers on many successful pilot projects. They have proven that canola is the top feedstock for the biodiesel use in cold weather.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce that in the last year, Milligan Bio-Tech has increased their staff from 16 to 25. They will soon be beginning the local production of biodiesel in their new 10-million-litre biodiesel optimization plant. This company is truly a story of innovation and success.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the members of this House to join with me in congratulating Milligan Bio-Tech, their vision, hard work, and optimism in their area of expertise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Riffel High School H₂O Our Life Fundraiser

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the great privilege of attending an event at Riffel High School in Regina entitled H₂O Our Life. The event was hosted by seven students of the grade 11 advanced placement art class — in partnership with the Canadian Wildlife Federation — who were challenged to research the water crisis in the world. Their goal was to increase awareness, raise at least \$300 to provide a family in India with a shower and a toilet.

The organization which they have chosen to work through is Charity: Water. Mr. Speaker, 100 per cent of the proceeds provided to Charity: Water goes directly to building new wells, rehabilitating wells, constructing water towers, and other related projects. This activity takes place in places such as Kenya, Ethiopia, India, Bangladesh, Liberia, and Tanzania.

In the words of one of the students, "The most important job is to inform people that there is a water crisis. Before this project, none of us in this class even knew that there was a water crisis."

The students used their creative talents to paint amazing pieces

to display their feelings about the world water crisis, accompanied by oral presentations. "Art has no limits and no boundaries. There are no language barriers."

The message that these students conveyed was very powerful. "The perception of water as a commodity started with the privatization of municipal water and then was encouraged when water was defined as a good in trade agreements." "I believe water should be a human right. When water is privatized, communities and individuals lose their freedom to food, health, and basic survival."

Mr. Speaker, these students raised \$1,300 last evening and, much more than that, educated all of the guests who were present. I would like to ask of my colleagues to congratulate them on their effort to date and wish them the best with their future endeavours. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Member Wins Woman of Excellence Award

Mr. LeClerc: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in this Assembly to offer my sincere congratulations to a fellow MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] and 18 other Saskatoon women. These women were recognized as women of excellence at the Saskatoon Mayor's Prayer Breakfast where I was fortunate to bring greetings on behalf of the government this past Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon Sutherland is certainly deserving of this recognition. Years ago as a young woman, she aspired to be a paramedic. She was told, we do not hire women. Eventually she found an ambulance service that agreed to hire a woman, but only on the condition that she work part-time and was not allowed to drive the ambulance.

The member was one of the first women to graduate as an emergency medical technician, and as an EMT [emergency medical technician] she became Saskatoon airport's first female air crash rescue firefighter.

Longing for more personal contact in her profession, she joined the Saskatoon Police Service and was one of only 10 female officers at the time. The member was one of many female pioneers in our province who entered the field of emergency services.

Wanting to become more involved with positive change and to have the ability to affect social policy, she entered provincial politics and is serving her first term as an MLA for the Sask Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would ... [inaudible] ... our MLA from Saskatoon Sutherland as definitely a woman of excellence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Athabasca.

Northern Hockey Star a Machine on Ice

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Like many youth from the North, Jordan Iron left his home to do what for many is but a dream. For Jordan, his dream began with a three-hour trip to Prince Albert from his home in Meadow Lake. From this point on, Jordan would be away from his family every winter.

At age of 14, Jordan left home to play hockey for the Beardsy's triple A Blackhawks. Since this time, Jordan has excelled in hockey. His scoring record was consistently amongst the league's top 25. At 17 years old, with one year left to play in triple A, Jordan was recruited by the junior A hockey league's La Ronge Ice Wolves.

Today Jordan, now 18 years old, is a strong, fast, and intelligent player. Mr. Speaker, he has to be; he's 5 feet 8 inches tall. But, Mr. Speaker, Jordan is like a machine on ice — always pushing forward — and this makes Jordan an irresistible force. So much so that his brother, Brian, who is also a hockey player, will ask his parents to take him to watch Jordan play rather than play his own game back home.

It has always been hard to stand in the way of Jordan and hockey. When he was five, he came home and said he was going to play. Since that time, Jordan's parents, Shelly and Gordon, have worked hard to support both Jordan and his younger brother, Brian, to achieve their dreams — in hockey and in life.

The Werminsky family and Iron family and myself are very proud of Jordan and as they say in Cree, Ahkamiyimo which means be strong and determined. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION PERIOD

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

Support for Graduate Students

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'd like to share some stories that explain how the so-called grad retention program is harming Saskatchewan's ability to attract and retain the talented people that are so critical to a modern, knowledge-based economy.

Many students chose to live in Saskatchewan because of the NDP's [New Democratic Party] graduate tax exemption. One writes, and I quote:

I received my Ph.D. in 2007. At that time, I along with many others was approved for a five year tax exemption for 20,000 each year (not specific to past tuition costs but a complete exemption). The exemption was one of several factors that led me to choosing Regina over Idaho State which was also interested in hiring me.

To the minister, given that it was obviously working, why did the Sask Party change the graduate tax exemption program?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to talk about the significance of our graduate students here within Saskatchewan. We know that both the University of Saskatchewan and University of Regina play such important roles in helping to develop and refine the talent.

Professor Richard Florida, now at the University of Toronto, has said there are a number of variables that people look at when they are looking at communities. This is in his latest book, *Who's Your City?* Canadian edition. He can relate to the quality, the talent, the brains, the lifestyle.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I think what's important is we can look at the past track record of the previous government where 35,000 people left the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we can stand that in stark contrast with the 15,000-plus that have come to Saskatchewan over the last year, Mr. Speaker, and we can see which program is working better. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, the minister's penchant to oversell his flawed policy as opposed to fixing it is disappointed. Another student writes, and I quote:

I am a working resident of Saskatchewan who chose to return to university to upgrade my qualifications. When I started my program in 2006, it was with the understanding that I would qualify for the Graduate Tax exemption, which was in effect at the time. That consideration played a very real part in my decision to enrol in a program that ultimately cost me over \$10,000.

To the minister: why did the Sask Party decide to break something that didn't need fixing and replace it with a program that excludes and alienates master's and Ph.D. [Doctor of Philosophy] students?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, we have about 3,900 graduate students here in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, about half of these students continue to receive any number of types of supports, and those go from scholarships and fellowships and teaching assistantships — various forms of stipends, Mr. Speaker. Importantly, we have the third lowest graduate tuition in the country, Mr. Speaker. Very affordable, Mr. Speaker, which takes us to a broader theme, and that is our Finance minister today has released figures where over \$700 million in tax relief to the people of Saskatchewan for 2009, Mr. Speaker.

This is the type of fact and figure that people across the country are paying attention to as they're moving to Saskatchewan for the land of opportunity that it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, that minister's program is not fair and it doesn't make sense. Another story, Mr. Speaker — this one from a 30-something graduate student who feels that the Sask Party policy discourages relatively young people from staying in the province. I quote:

I was told that the program was aimed at "young people" for the retention of young people. As such, the province was not interested in retaining "older individuals." At the time, I was 31. I guess that is considered "old."

To the minister: why is the Sask Party not treating graduates fairly? Why are they discouraging educated people over 30 from settling, making their lives in our province?

[14:00]

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hyperbole is probably on the other side. With 15,000-plus people moving to Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, what's important is to begin to look at the actual dollars that are being invested: \$665 million, more than that, Mr. Speaker, invested in our institutions; 26.4 million in the booster shot to help ensure that infrastructure is being . . . there's progress on infrastructure; 25.1 million on facility maintenance for the U of R [University of Regina] and U of S [University of Saskatchewan] alone, Mr. Speaker; \$23.5 million, Mr. Speaker, for tuition management to help ensure that tuition stays reasonable, Mr. Speaker; \$2.2 million to help with students loans. Those haven't been moved since 1994, Mr. Speaker.

Hardly, hardly is there room for members opposite to be providing any lectures or advice on how to treat students, Mr. Speaker. Students, scholars, researchers, the institutions, and the fine communities within which they live — these are the priorities of the Saskatchewan Party government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Hyperbole, Mr. Speaker, that's what the minister says — hyperbole. These are real-life stories. Master's and Ph.D. students are frustrated, Mr. Speaker. Many have gone to school longer, paid more tuition, and gone without a salary longer than individuals currently covered under the minister's flawed programs.

The Premier boasts about these programs on his road trips to Ontario and BC [British Columbia], yet many recent graduates are unable to access them. The Sask Party is alienating the very professionals that it claims it wants to attract to our province: professors, business grads, speech-language pathologists, nurse practitioners, physiotherapists, social workers, and clinical psychologists, just to name a few.

To the minister: he suggested on Monday evening in committee that he was open to expanding the graduate retention program. Given the stories, the real stories you've heard today here in the House, are you willing to make an announcement here today?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to expand on the comments that I made on Monday night, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've met with both deans of graduate studies at the respective institutions. I met with, as well, graduate students representatives at both institutions.

I'll just say quite simply, Mr. Speaker, there is no consensus. There are a range of options and policy instruments about how to move forward. That's exactly right, Mr. Speaker, there is no consensus. What we're seeing, Mr. Speaker, is NDP politics. What we're doing, Mr. Speaker, is looking at sound public policy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

SaskPower Rates

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sask Party wants annual SaskPower rate increases. The utility rate review panel notes that SaskPower projects a 21 per cent increase in operations, maintenance, and administration costs in 2009 alone. On page 26 of the rate review panel's report, the consultants refer to "a disconcerting trend" to operating, maintenance, and administration costs.

To the minister: why is this government continually looking to SaskPower customers to pay for its inability to manage things at SaskPower?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the work that this government is doing to ensure that Saskatchewan residents pay the lowest possible cost on their utility rates.

Mr. Speaker, we have the fastest growing economy in the country. We have a responsibility, a responsibility on this side

of the House to ensure that we have safe, reliable, and sustainable power going forward to serve as the engine for that economy going forward, Mr. Speaker. That's indeed what this government will be doing. We'll be providing that at the lowest possible cost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know the government's got a real poor record when it comes to openness and accountability. According to the panel on page 10, I quote, "... information gaps exacerbated the challenges involved in conducting the rate review." And the panel continues on, saying, "An additional concern arising from the review process was the amount of material SaskPower was not prepared to make available to the public . . ."

The Sask Party is hiding from the rate review panel, and it's hiding from the Saskatchewan public. To the minister: what is this government so not prepared to share with the rate review panel?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Mr. Speaker, you want to hear about poor records? I'll tell you about poor records under that administration, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Member for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, about a government — the members opposite — who came to this legislature and talked about their support for the Crown corporations. At the same time, they did not put the capital necessary forward to ensure that there was not an infrastructure deficit in that corporation. They governed without 10-year plans, without a plan for a growing economy, Mr. Speaker. That's the poor record of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Going forward we will indeed have a plan. Today there is an article in *The Globe and Mail* talking about carbon capture; talking about, you better have a plan, Mr. Speaker. And that's indeed what this government has. We're leading, leading the way on carbon capture and sequestration. We're leading the way as far as the technology goes. That's what people can expect from this government, not the poor record from members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Trew: — The Sask Party's got a plan. Their plan is a 13 per cent rate hike to SaskPower right now, and rates coming fast and furious in the future. What a plan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, the rate review panel is crystal clear in their report. They say that a 13 per cent rate hike at SaskPower is "a legitimate cause [for grave concern] for public concern, given its potential to impact negatively on the province's economy."

To the minister: this government pursued a 13 per cent SaskPower rate increase. Did the Sask Party not know that this would negatively impact the economy? Or do they just don't care?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Here we go. We have the height of hypocrisy again. We have the member from Regina Walsh Acres talking about more intensive targets, higher targets. And we have the member from Regina Coronation Park saying, no, no, no, no, you can't do any of that. They can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. They can't have it both ways.

As I indicated earlier, the rate review panel has done some good work. They've made some recommendations. They've made several good recommendations — some which say, some of the good ideas that are being put forward should be deferred because now is not the right time to do it. We will look at those recommendations. We will give them the careful consideration that they deserve, and we will report back to the people of Saskatchewan in a responsible way. The people of Saskatchewan deserve no less, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party said a 13 per cent rate increase is needed to pay for new power generation and the booming economy. The panel reports that even an eight and a half per cent rate increase is disconcerting to business and consumers, due to a slowing and uncertain economy.

If you read a little deeper into the report, a consultant says SaskPower costs are out of control. Why does the Sask Party keep looking to SaskPower customers first to pay for its inability to manage effectively?

To the minister: what is SaskPower doing to manage resources at SaskPower?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would tell the hon. member what we are doing. We are doing not what the previous administration did. We are suspending the dividend from SaskPower. We ensure that they

have a strong balance sheet going forward. We ensure that they have the ability to have sustainable power going forward, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — And, Mr. Speaker, we are doing it in an open and transparent way, Mr. Speaker. And I call the attention of the members to the editorial that was in the Saskatoon *StarPhoenix*, the Saskatoon *Star Phoenix* this past Saturday and it says, and I quote, and I hope all members opposite are listening, “. . . an irony that can’t be lost on anyone . . . it’s a fool’s game to believe this province can reduce emissions without cost.” The NDP can’t have it both ways. They can’t demand status quo on SaskPower rates and higher climate change targets. Truer words were never written, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Profits from Crime and Victims’ Rights

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice has raised an ever-changing series of excuses as to why he cannot prevent criminals from profiting from the most notorious crimes committed in our province, but he has failed to provide reasons why the Manitoba’s profit of criminal notoriety Act cannot be used as a model. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba’s Act seems easily adaptable to accomplish what the minister believes or says is either impossible or undesirable.

The NDP opposition has agreed to fast-track a Bill through the House so it can be passed this session. Why is the minister dragging his feet?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite were in government for some 16 years. They had ample opportunity to do whatever they chose to do to deal with this particular issue during that period of time. Mr. Speaker, they chose to do nothing during that period of time. Mr. Speaker, my question to the member opposite is, if he feels strongly about it, does he wish to introduce a private member’s Bill? We can have some discussion. We can have some debate on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, our government has got a very strong and aggressive position with regard to victims’ rights. We have increased victim surcharges, we have helped victims enforce restitution orders, and we will continue to stand behind victims in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Quennell: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his history lesson. When the NDP was in government, we passed legislation protecting victims. When this government put forward legislation protecting victims, we supported it. If they thought they missed anything, Mr. Speaker, we will support them with further legislation. It is not either-or, Mr. Speaker. We can do both. We can pass legislation to stop criminals from profiting from their notorious crimes in this province, and we can protect victims in other cases, Mr. Speaker. Why won’t the minister do both?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon Meewasin was the minister of Justice for four years. Had he wanted to do something during that period of time to prevent people from profiting from crimes or anything else, he had ample opportunity to introduce Bills, pass legislation. We supported legislation during our time in opposition that enhanced victims’ rights.

We have actually, Mr. Speaker, we have taken it further. We are now at a point where we have increased victims’ rights substantially in our province. We have enabled victims to get restitution orders enforced. We are taking steps so the province will actually enforce restitution orders on behalf of victims, Mr. Speaker. I can’t imagine a province that’s doing more.

We’ve also undertaken to have a careful look at legislation in a variety of different jurisdictions to try and find out what better we can do and what more we can do to help victims.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Quennell: — Mr. Speaker, we know that the Minister of Justice has no problem intruding into the justice system in respect to sentencing in specific cases or commenting on freedom of the press in specific cases, Mr. Speaker. We also know that specific legislation exists, effective legislation exists in Manitoba and other jurisdictions that prevents criminals from profiting from their crimes. And the Justice minister knows that his officials are capable of solving whatever problems he will not detail to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition is willing to work with the government to pass legislation to stop criminals from profiting from the notorious crimes committed in our province. To the minister: will he commit today to working with the opposition to pass such legislation?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, I take strong exception to some of the language used by the member opposite. I have tried to maintain a strong, credible, ethical conduct throughout my career in this legislature, and I take strong exception to his

statements.

Mr. Speaker, we will not act in a knee-jerk or a spontaneous response to something merely for political grandstanding, unlike the members opposite. We will sit down; we will give careful due diligence; and we will come up with legislation that is appropriate, meaningful, and capable of offering some real support to victims in this province, Mr. Speaker. That is the direction that this government is going to go.

We're not going to go off on some ill-conceived . . . [inaudible] . . . because that member opposite wants it. If he wants to introduce a Bill, we'll look at his Bill, and we'll give it some careful consideration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[14:15]

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

Gender Equity Issues

Ms. Higgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, last week the minister responsible for women's issues replied to a pay equity question by acknowledging that the wage gap was severe when it comes to Aboriginal women. And we agree, Mr. Speaker. Stats show that for every dollar earned by an Aboriginal woman, a non-Aboriginal man earns \$2.34. But the question was never answered by the minister — and it still stands — where the Saskatchewan Party is on the question of pay equity legislation for Saskatchewan women.

To the minister: will the Saskatchewan Party recognize the contribution that women make to Saskatchewan's economy and introduce pay equity legislation?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to talk about wages in Saskatchewan because, Mr. Speaker, while we know we're not immune from what's going around us, just today, Mr. Speaker, the latest statistics, average weekly earnings are up by 3.5 per cent over February 2008, Mr. Speaker. Here in Saskatchewan the average weekly earnings: \$804 per week, second largest growth in wages in Canada, third highest average weekly earnings across the country. Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan are enjoying increased opportunities to earn more money and there are still thousands of jobs to fill right here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Higgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister hasn't got quite got the hang of what gender-based analysis is or pay equity, and I know that employers often argue that they are

better equipped to make decisions than what governments are.

But let's put this theory to the test and look at how the Saskatchewan Party stacks up as an employer. The Saskatchewan Party has direct responsibility for the salaries of approximately 150 people working in this building, either in ministers' offices or Executive Council, and the government's own figures show that there are twice as many women working in Sask Party offices as men. So to the minister: what steps have they taken to ensure that women working for the Saskatchewan Party enjoy wage parity with their male colleagues?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — You know, Mr. Speaker, at the Fourth World Conference on Women in the mid-1990s, that was a UN [United Nations] conference, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, at the Fourth World Conference on Women, that was a UN conference in the mid-1990s, there was some debate and discussion about the need for mutual responsibility. And I'll read a quote: "It will not be possible" . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Actually in my office I would be happy to talk about any number of opportunities that we have regarding gender equality, but this is much broader than that, Mr. Speaker:

It will not be possible to attain sustainable development without cementing the partnership of women and men in all aspects of life. Women have all along struggled with their men-folk for the abolition of slavery, the liberation of countries from colonialism, the dismantling of apartheid and the struggle for peace. It is now the turn of men to join women in their struggle for equality.

It's a shared responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Higgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the average Saskatchewan woman is paid 84 cents for every dollar paid to the average Saskatchewan man. But figures provided by the government show that women working for the Sask Party are paid just 53 per cent of the median salary earned by men working for the Sask Party.

To the minister: how can the Sask Party justify a gender gap in their own offices that is far wider than the gender gap in the general population?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the member responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the opportunity. The gap that's most apparent is the gap between the previous government and the policies that were ill-advised and the policies that are in place now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for a family of four with a \$35,000 income, more than \$2,500 worth of tax savings. Mr. Speaker, a family of four with \$50,000, almost \$2,000 in tax savings. A family of four with \$60,000 or higher, almost \$1,700 of tax savings. And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker.

Just today the Minister of Finance has announced for the people of Saskatchewan . . .

The Speaker: — I recognize the minister.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Finance has come out and made an announcement of \$700 million in tax savings for the residents of this fine province, Mr. Speaker. That's a track record that we're happy to stand on, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Higgins: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when this minister can stand up and talk about gender-based analysis and pay equity by coming back with tax reductions and increased general wages across the province, he has no idea . . .

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

Ms. Higgins: — Mr. Speaker, this minister has no idea when it comes to women's issues, and the old boys' club is alive and well, I must say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Higgins: — Mr. Speaker, and no wonder that this government won't introduce pay equity legislation or restore the influence of the Status of Women office. To the minister: why would Saskatchewan women trust this Saskatchewan Party government to defend their interests when they can't even treat the women in their own party equally?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, on a personal basis, I take exception to the statement that's been made. Mr. Speaker, during my professional career at the University of Saskatchewan, I actually helped with a project, a CIDA [Canadian International Development Agency]-run project on gender issues in the former Soviet Union.

But, I think, to the question, Mr. Speaker, it was under the NDP in 2002 that the former government changed the Women's Secretariat from a stand-alone agency to a subset in what was

the former Ministry of Labour. At the time, it was significantly reduced in size and was renamed the Status of Women office.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that we're making progress. Is there more to do? Yes, Mr. Speaker, but it's your track record, the track record of the members opposite — that's the legacy, Mr. Speaker. We're moving out beyond that legacy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of the standing committee on Crown corporations.

Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies

Mr. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies to report Bill No. 54, *The Vital Statistics Act, 2008* with amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall the Bill be considered in Committee of the Whole? I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

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

The Speaker: — The Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations has requested leave to waive consideration . . . Just remind members if they want the House to extend for an extended period, the Speaker is willing to wait.

The Minister of Crown Corporations has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 54, *The Vital Statistics Act, 2008* and that the Bill and its amendments be now read the third time. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — When shall the amendments be read a first time? I recognize the minister.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS OF AMENDMENTS

Bill No. 54 — *The Vital Statistics Act, 2008/ Loi de 2008 sur les services de l'état civil*

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the minister that the amendments be now read a first and second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — First and second

readings of the amendments.

The Speaker: — The minister may proceed to move third reading. I recognize the minister.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 54 — *The Vital Statistics Act, 2008/* *Loi de 2008 sur les services de l'état civil*

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

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations that Bill No. 54, *The Vital Statistics Act, 2008* be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Third reading of this Bill.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies

Mr. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies to report Bill No. 55, *The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendments Act, 2008* without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall this Bill be considered in Committee of the Whole? I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

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

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 55, *The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendments Act, 2008* without amendment and that the Bill be now read the third time. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — The minister may proceed to third reading.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 55 — *The Vital Statistics Consequential* *Amendments Act, 2008*

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

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations that Bill No. 55, *The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendments 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: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Third reading of this Bill.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of the Standing Committee on the Economy.

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on the Economy to report Bill No. 47, *The Pipelines Amendment Act, 2008* without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall this Bill be considered in Committee of the Whole? I recognize the Minister Responsible for Energy and Resources.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, later this day if leave is granted.

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave to waive consideration of Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 47, *The Pipelines Amendment Act, 2008* without amendment and that the Bill be now read the third time. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 47 — *The Pipelines Amendment Act, 2008*

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 47.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister Responsible for Energy and Resources that Bill No. 47, *The*

Pipelines 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: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Third reading of this Bill.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Standing Committee on Private Bills to report private Bill No. 902, *The Stephen and Michelene Worobetz Foundation Amendment Act* without amendments and to present its fourth report. I move:

That the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills be now concurred in.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Chair:

That the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills be now concurred in.

Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I request leave to waive consideration of the Committee of the Whole on this Bill and ask that the Bill now be read for the third time.

The Speaker: — The Leader of the Opposition has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 902, *The Stephen and Michelene Worobetz Foundation Amendment Act* and that the Bill be now read the third time. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — The member may proceed to third reading. I

recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 902 — *The Stephen and Michelene Worobetz Foundation Amendment Act*

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill now be read for the third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition that Bill No. 902, *The Stephen and Michelene Worobetz Foundation Amendment Act* be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Third reading of this Bill.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government Whip.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker; 354 through 356 are ordered.

Although we have information available for public service employee severances, more time is required in order to compile the information on severances in the Crowns as requested. The rules of the Assembly include a provision that when more time is needed to compile the complete information requested, that the question be ordered and we wish to exercise this option. We commit to providing this information as soon as it is available.

The Speaker: — Questions 354 through 356 are ordered.

[14:30]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations.

Inquiry into Meeting Growing Demand for Electricity

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak on a motion before this Assembly. In terms of energy, these are exciting times in Saskatchewan, in Canada, and indeed around the world. More specifically, this is an exciting time in the history of our provincial electrical utility, SaskPower.

At home, at work or play, our lives are touched daily by electricity. Most of the time we take the services provided by SaskPower for granted. We expect the power to be there until it isn't, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the Government of Saskatchewan is leading a province-wide discussion on how we can best ensure an environmentally and economically sustainable supply of power is there for the future generations.

The work that begins today with this motion that stands before this House is a job that requires thoughtful consideration, a job that is well-suited to the Crown and Central Agencies Committee, that hon. members from both sides of the House are its members.

The work of this committee could not be more timely or necessary, Mr. Speaker. That's because a large portion of SaskPower's generation supply will reach a crucial decision point in the next 20 years due to several factors including new federal regulations on greenhouse gas emissions; planned facility retirements; the need for capital investment and facility life extensions; and the expiration of supply contracts with private sector suppliers — some of them entered into under the previous government and some under this government, Mr. Speaker. Decisions on whether to retrofit the existing generating units or to shut them down or renew private sector contracts will all be required.

Our government sees an opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to develop and deliver the power we need. We'll do this by using new and innovative technologies, while at the same time not ignoring our expertise in coal-fired generation or fuel sources like hydro power from our rivers that we have in abundance in our province, Mr. Speaker.

Because despite economic uncertainty elsewhere in Canada, in Saskatchewan we continue to see a strong demand for SaskPower services. Looking back in recent years, SaskPower has experienced low growth, averaging between 1.6 and 2.1 per cent annually from 2002-2007. That low growth, Mr. Speaker, is poised to more than double as we look ahead with the growth agenda, Mr. Speaker. Although SaskPower is seeing some project timelines slide on large industrial projects in the oilfield and mining sectors, what is important to note — and we see that and certainly on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker — that these projects are not being cancelled.

Having the electrical infrastructure in place for those large industrial projects is not a job that can be completed overnight, Mr. Speaker. Generation and transmission facilities can take anywhere from 2 to 10 years to complete, so our government needs to invest now to stay ahead of the curve. No longer can we go about running a \$1 billion corporation without having 10-year plans in place, Mr. Speaker, as was the case right up until this very year.

The work of this committee will inform those investment decisions in whatever final form they may take. SaskPower has already taken some steps to address this challenge. At the end of March, I announced that SaskPower will be investing nearly \$1 billion in 2009 in generation and transmission projects — a large number indeed, Mr. Speaker. Three times the five-year average that this corporation has expended, Mr. Speaker. That's the company's largest ever annual investment in the provincial

electrical system. And over the next 10 years, Mr. Speaker, SaskPower is projecting it will need to spend up to \$8 billion on capital renewal and replacement to address an infrastructure deficit. So you can see why this is the perfect time for the work of the legislative committee exploring electricity options.

What I would like to do over the next few minutes is highlight some of the existing work that's already under way at SaskPower, work the committee and the entire province will soon learn much more about. I will start with one of the most promising projects, clean coal initiative. Our government through our work with SaskPower is currently leading the development of one of the largest integrated carbon capture projects in the world. The Boundary dam integrated carbon capture and sequestration demonstration project would fully integrate and retrofit an aging unit 3 carbon capture and enhanced oil recovery operation.

Mr. Speaker, you don't have to look any farther than the front page of *The Globe and Mail* today when the federal government is saying provinces across the country, responsible utilities across the country do indeed need a plan, and that's why we have a plan, Mr. Speaker.

By 2015 this clean coal unit would produce more than 100 megawatts of clean baseload power while reducing SaskPower's annual greenhouse gas emissions by about 1 million tonnes. With an estimated 300-year supply of lignite coal in our province, this is an attractive energy option both now and into the future. Options like clean coal are gaining more traction because of the urgent need to manage greenhouse gas emissions. That's why other clean technologies like wind power are also under active investigation by SaskPower.

SaskPower established the wind power integration and development unit in 2007 to help resolve technical and operational issues that will emerge when we need to add more wind power generation to our mix. The corporation will release the strategy later this year, outlining exactly how it will tackle these problems in collaboration with the private sector, Mr. Speaker. The groundwork for more wind power has already been set with the imminent addition of new natural gas generation over the next two years.

In the short term, those natural gas turbines will supply new economic development, but over the longer term, those same turbines will provide backup for new wind power developments. Technology today regarding wind power needs gas backup, and that's indeed what we'll be doing to ensure that that peaking power takes place.

Another area of future supply where SaskPower is reaching out to the private sector, and particular Saskatchewan's First Nations, is hydroelectric generation. Preliminary talks are under way, with two possible hydro projects in the North. While hydro is appealing because of its zero emission generation source, in considering the potential of this option for our future, the committee and all Saskatchewan residents who participate in the hearings will also have to consider the impacts on land and traditional fishing areas that accompany hydro generation.

Mr. Speaker, I've said before, it's something that our province to the east, our neighbours to the east have done very well.

When we were more concerned about potash mines and who should own those mines in Saskatchewan, the Manitoba government was indeed looking at additional hydro generation. What I'm hoping is becoming abundantly clear to members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is that SaskPower's old model of building, owning, and operating generating facilities is not necessarily how the corporation will proceed into the future.

Let me share with you a couple of examples to prove my point. Demand-side management is another area that I will get into in a moment, Mr. Speaker. Last year SaskPower and NRGreen Power completed construction of four waste heat recovery units on Alliance Pipeline's natural gas pipeline in the province adding, Mr. Speaker, 20 megawatts of clean energy to Saskatchewan grid.

And I know I hear members opposite saying, great projects because I know members, I believe members on both sides of the House had an opportunity to examine these structures and to see them operate and to see them operate in a clean and responsible fashion in our province. And in September 2008, SaskPower finalized an agreement with the Red Lily Wind Power to purchase power from a 25 megawatt wind power facility that will be constructed northwest of Moosomin by 2011. And I know the Speaker is well aware of some of the work that's gone on there as well.

Demand-side management, Mr. Speaker, is another avenue where the private sector will help SaskPower meet our province's growing demand for power. By encouraging our customers, both residential and industrial, to use power more efficiently, we can actually help delay or even avoid the need to construct new generating facilities. SaskPower hopes to reduce the demand for electricity by 100 megawatts over the next 10 years through efficiency and conservation initiatives.

Of course no discussion of future generation options would be complete without the mention of nuclear power generation, something that will get a thorough hearing across this province, as we've heard of the explanation of the Uranium Development Partnership's province-wide, public meetings. I expect that the final report produced by Mr. Dan Perrins — and we've spoken about this individual before in this House, a person that's well respected by members on both sides of the House — will come forward with a final report that gives consideration to the Crown and Central Agencies Committee on a complete evaluation of the uranium cycle in our province and the prospects going forward.

As it completes the work of the proposal in the motion before us today, our committee will certainly examine each and every option. As I've said many times in this House, it's not an either/or situation, Mr. Speaker. What it is is an examination of every type of generation going forward.

The UDP [Uranium Development Partnership] was a case that needed special examination because it hadn't been done for 30 years in Saskatchewan. Indeed a complete analysis of nuclear power generation was never done in our province. It was long overdue and that's why the Uranium Development Partnership is doing its work.

In addition to that, SaskPower is looking at every other type of

generation going forward. And further to that, I've taken the opportunity to meet with governments — certainly in Western Canada, the Manitoba government — to talk about the possibility of importing electricity, and I think that's an important part that this committee has to look at as well.

Other options under consideration which the committee and the public will hear about in full detail include polygeneration, natural gas, biomass, and also imports from other jurisdictions, as I've just indicated.

SaskPower is also currently evaluating all feasibility supply alternatives and creating a new, long-term supply development plan, a document that the committee will no doubt closely review. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to talk about the lack of a long-term plan within SaskPower under previous administrations. That will no longer be the case going forward, because no matter what type of generation it is going forward, it's important to Saskatchewan for electrical generation. And in the case of the Uranium Development Partnership, as I said earlier, it expands well beyond power generation. It looks at things like medical isotopes and how we can have that excellence here in Saskatchewan.

As I said at the opening of my remarks, the work of the Crown and Central Agencies Committee on this topic could not be more timely or more urgently needed. The task ahead of SaskPower and the committee itself is monumental, Mr. Speaker. It represents nothing less than a once-in-a-generation opportunity to shape our province's future path, and I have every faith in this committee.

By investigating the many options to meet the growing need for electricity in the province, we will see that the best decisions get made, Mr. Speaker — members from both sides of the House will have that opportunity — decisions that not only help support new business growth, but also ensure the preservation of the environment and, most importantly, to secure the long-term prosperity of the men, women, and children who call Saskatchewan home.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to participate in the trade-related hearings that took place previously as a member, an opposition member at the time. I felt that I had ample opportunity to put my ideas forward and to be a contributing member of that committee. Certainly I didn't spend as much time as many other members did at that committee, but indeed I felt that I'd made a contribution. And I know members opposite through this committee, at the end of it, will feel that they've made a contribution to Saskatchewan as well.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Crown Corporations, I certainly look forward to participating in the hearings and to ensure that all voices in this legislature are heard through the committee process but, more importantly, that all voices throughout Saskatchewan are heard on this very, very important topic, Mr. Speaker.

So at this time I would like to move the motion, and I move:

That the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies, in accordance with rule 147(3) of *The Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of*

Saskatchewan, shall conduct an inquiry to determine how the province can best meet the growing demand for electricity in a manner that is safe, reliable, environmentally sustainable, and affordable for Saskatchewan residents; and

that the said committee shall conduct public hearings to receive representations from interested individuals and groups; and further,

that the said committee may, notwithstanding rule 147(4), report its recommendations to the Assembly at a date determined by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[14:45]

The Speaker: — The Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations has moved:

That the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies, in accordance with rule 147(3) of *The Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, shall conduct an inquiry to determine how the province can best meet the growing demand for electricity in a manner that is safe, reliable, environmentally sustainable, and affordable for Saskatchewan residents; and

that the said committee shall conduct public hearings to receive representations from interested individuals and groups; and further,

that the said committee may, notwithstanding rule 147(4), report its recommendations to the Assembly at a date determined by the committee.

Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from P.A. [Prince Albert] Carlton.

Mr. Furber: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and speak to the motion and propose an amendment to the motion. What the minister doesn't understand and what has been the problem from the outset was that he's part of the problem. He's part of the impetus for the motion. He's part of the impetus for the EDP [energy development partnership], and it stems from the duplicity that they've exhibited on this file from start to finish.

Now the EDP was created by the opposition and presented to the government because of consultation with Saskatchewan people. Now this is again where the government drops the ball. They drop it on the Uranium Development Partnership. They drop it on the uranium file at every stage. They drop it in labour legislation. Legislation that has to do with the education sector. Bills 84, 2, 5, 6 — the list goes on and on.

And so it's because they refuse to consult with Saskatchewan people that we created the EDP. And the EDP and the motion amendment was based on questions that were being asked of our members based on input that we got from community members, from people throughout the province, who said that they wanted more information, and it was information that the UDP and that the government wouldn't provide to them.

Now I've had many, many calls to my office and contact through email, phone calls, conversations. And 90 per cent of those calls and 90 per cent of that contact is from people who say, you know I'm neither for uranium development and I'm not against it, but what I am for and what I need is to have the full picture. And so I'm not against power created by uranium. I'm not against nuclear power. I'm not a big proponent of it, but what I want is more information.

And so when you have that many people contact your office and all they want is information that the government won't provide, it provides for you the impetus to put forward a different idea that the government might follow.

Now the government has said that the EDP had merit. Why don't they just adopt it? What part of the EDP didn't have merit? Stark silence, Mr. Speaker. So we had to propose it because people asked for it.

Now what is some more impetus for our proposal of the EDP and an amendment? I want to read a letter to the editor by Mr. Bert Pitzel, community coordinator of the Saskatchewan KAIROS Prairies North. And I'll quote:

An open letter to Brad Wall.

Editor: You stated that the people of Saskatchewan will be able to participate in the nuclear power question, but you've also said that the question of whether or not there will be nuclear power in the province is not on the table. It looks like the level of participation is only token, with citizen decision-making being reduced to when, how, and where, not if 'adding value to uranium' will come.

On Ash Wednesday, Feb. 25, three Bishops, representing the Anglican, Catholic and Lutheran Evangelical Traditions, who also spoke on behalf of four other Saskatchewan Bishops, released a joint statement calling on your government to listen to the voices of the citizens of Saskatchewan so they might participate meaningfully in the nuclear question before you act on recommendations that your nuclear panel will give you at the end of March. They also asked you to provide adequate forums so nuclear power generation and other renewable energy approaches could be studied in an unbiased and transparent way.

Additionally, the Bishops called upon their own Diocesan Church members to begin a process of critical examination of the issues surrounding 'added value' to our uranium resource so that when called upon, their participation would be intelligent, responsible and moral. I remind you that together the religious leaders who signed the statement represent about 250,000 people, fully a quarter of Saskatchewan's population.

The Bishops said it would be sinful to make a choice without careful consideration of the consequences that the decision would have on community and environment.

Quite significantly, the Bishops' statement calling for genuine participation has been endorsed by groups which are not Episcopal polities — the River Bend Presbytery of The United Church of Canada, the Saskatchewan Conference of the United Church of Canada and the Mennonite Central Committee.

CBC-TV news carried a portion of the Bishops' news conference, but the news piece ended with an interview of yourself so that you would have the opportunity to have the final say on the matter.

Mr. Premier, I was surprised at your response. As if by divine right, you dismissed them, failing to acknowledge that they offered a means for enriching the democratic process and an opportunity for you to show that wisdom and humility required you take their words to heart — you too might have something to learn. You deflected their comments by using your reading of the polls to try to trump their words. You said that the polls indicate a majority of citizens of Saskatchewan favour nuclear power.

Is that the truth? What preparatory work has been done to help citizens through this complex matter? Who framed the polling questions? Front page newspaper articles have only echoed pronuclear points of view. Crafting the decision making process in this way denies the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity to make an important moral choice for themselves. Is it ethical and wise to by-pass their discussions and discernment when it will be citizens and their grandchildren who will have to live with the consequences of expensive power generation, radioactivity and waste disposal for many, many lifetimes to come?

Mr. Premier, the Bishops call you to use the power vested in you to act responsibly. Show you respect the dignity of the people of the province by engaging them with the lesser questions of when, where and how without omitting the more telling question of if we should have nuclear power in our province at all. In the spirit of the Cluff Lake Inquiry and as you did with the Uranium Development Panel who now use our money to promote nuclear power, fund environmental and clean green groups so that they can begin a process of informing the public about the up and downside of every kind of power generation.

Extremely powerful words, Mr. Speaker, representing 250,000 people in this province, and all they're asking for is a direct comparison. All they're asking for is honesty and transparency from this government. And the reason that we brought forward the EDP was because they weren't getting it, clearly.

And so it's wholly unfortunate that the bishops of this province would have to write a letter like that, and we have to go to these extremes in this legislature to get change from this government.

Now, the member from Saskatoon Northwest calls it rhetoric. This is a letter from the bishops of Saskatchewan, and he calls it

rhetoric. What a shameful, shameful approach by that member.

Now some more of the impetus for us bringing forward the EDP and for the amendment that we made to the motion is as follows: more contact to my constituency via an email. And the email reads, and I quote:

Why is it all moving so fast? I feel like a customer on a used car lot — it's the best thing here; might be gone tomorrow; better buy now; this'll solve all your problems.

If the Sask Party thinks this is the answer, why don't they let everyone have some time to examine it further? If the economics are sound, the science is sound, then why all these high-pressure sales tactics? Something this good shouldn't need a big sales pitch. It should sell itself, really. Right?

It looks dishonest, dangerous, and irresponsible to push this hard so quickly. Why can't everyone have some time to get educated instead of simply indoctrinated? It takes much less time and effort to brainwash than it does to teach.

And so further evidence that the government has certainly dropped the ball and they need some help. And so we provided a change for them in their approach, and that was the EDP. And although they said that it had some merit, they wouldn't point out where it didn't have merit. But they also wouldn't adopt it. So again it's unfortunate that we've had to come to this stage.

Now in the way that they presented the motion, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate because it's obvious that they've learned nothing from the UDP process. So what did they do when they presented the motion? They sprung it on the Assembly at the last minute last week. They consulted with nobody. And it contained none of the relevant information that would enable a reasonable person to make a decision on whether to support it or not. Sound familiar? It's the exact same process that the UDP has used.

And so if I could quote from Abraham Maslow, he said, "If you only have a hammer, you tend to see everything else as if it were a nail." And so they only know one approach, Mr. Speaker, and it certainly has nothing to do with consultation. It has nothing to do with meeting the needs of Saskatchewan people.

Now they have huge inconsistencies in the entire process. They stacked the UDP. They've had continuous flip-flops on government funding, huge contradictions by front bench cabinet ministers and the Premier in terms of a timeline for a decision. They flip-flop in this legislature on a daily basis when it comes to nuclear waste storage. They haven't consulted anybody but their own private polls — which I've asked them to release — and they refused, flat out refused to release the polls that are driving this whole process. So much for transparency and accountability. And they've been as secretive as they could possibly be under current legislation when it comes to this process.

And so I'm going to outline, if I could, some of the inconsistencies that are also the impetus for the amendment to

the motion, and they were the impetus for the EDP that we proposed. I'd like to, if I could, read from a scrum — several different scrums actually over a short period of time — that the minister responsible for this whole process has had with reporters where he's not only contradicted other members of his own caucus, but he's contradicted himself.

So he can't get it straight with his colleagues, and he can't get it straight with himself in terms of what he believes would be the funding model for a nuclear reactor. And so the reporter says, "How about the nuclear industry, which is an established industry? How about putting money into a nuclear power plant?" December 12, 2008. I quote Minister Stewart: "All scenarios, or all possibilities are on the table as far as financing . . ."

We go back a short 11 days before that, and a reporter asks, "So you think once the public is informed about the risks the support won't be there?"

"I wouldn't say the support won't be there for the project. But the support won't be there for doing it with taxpayers money." So, a complete contradiction 11 days before that.

We go back to November 27. He's asked by a reporter this question:

In Ontario there has been an agreement that is allowing the cost overruns on the Bruce Power project there to be partly paid by the taxpayer. Would we be considering, you know, looking into some kind of partnership with Bruce Power if they did have cost overruns, or any other circumstances? The taxpayers there are maybe a little concerned about it.

And the answer is, from the minister responsible, and it is as follows. I quote Stewart:

We're certainly not considering anything like that . . . And I guess the options are all on the table. If indeed a power station is built it could be solely built, owned and operated by Bruce Power. It could be a partnership between SaskPower and Bruce Power. It could be a partnership between SaskPower and the Province of Saskatchewan and Bruce Power, any number of possibilities. Other private sector partners even. So we're not quite there yet . . .

So at one stage it's on the table. At the next stage it's off the table. This is from the same minister June 17, a few months before that. He says:

. . . the people of the province, zero . . . this is not going to be built with taxpayers dollars or SaskPower fees. This is going to be built with private funds.

And so again part of the impetus for our EDP proposal and part of the impetus for the amendment to the motion is the fact that they can't get it straight in terms of who's going to fund this project. They don't know who's going to fund grids. They don't know who's going to fund cost overruns. They don't know who's going to fund the actual project itself.

[15:00]

Additionally, they've had huge contradictions in terms of the timeline for a decision on this project. On one hand we have to get the UDP process out and done by June because the Premier says we have to have a decision made by the fall. Now that's the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan saying that we have to have a decision made by the fall. Now he says that, and some short days later the minister responsible says, oh no, no, no. It'll be a long, long time before we have to make a decision. So you can't trust them on the timeline.

So now you can't trust them on how it's going to be funded or who's going to fund it. You can't trust them on when they're going to make a decision. And on the very fundamental and important question to the people of Saskatchewan, and one that I would argue causes about the most controversy when it comes to this, is nuclear waste. And so you'd think as a government that you would have an idea of what you're going to do with nuclear waste in this province. If you're proposing a Uranium Development Partnership, you've worked with Bruce Power, and you want to build a nuclear reactor in this province, you'd think you'd have had that discussion as a government. But such is not the case.

We have the Premier himself saying to a business group in Saskatchewan that unequivocally we have a moral and ethical obligation to store spent fuel rods in this province, and that he's going to charge the universities in this province with the . . . He's going to charge them with the responsibility of finding a way for Saskatchewan to do it. And so very definitively the Premier says, not that we should store waste because it's got some economic value, not that we should store waste because it's going to increase the economy in one particular part of the province, not that we can use those funds for some things to fund government business, but that we have a moral and ethical obligation. Strong words.

And so you would assume that if the Premier of this province says it, that it's going to happen. It's his process. But what happens?

I asked the minister, the member from Thunder Creek, in committee, what's going to happen with nuclear waste? And he says unequivocally there will be no nuclear waste stored in Saskatchewan under this government. And so I find it hard to believe that the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan to say we have a moral and ethical obligation to store waste and he's going to charge the universities with finding a way to do it. And then you've got the minister saying that not only do we not have that moral and ethical responsibility, we've already decided we're not going to do it.

And so I found that curious. So I thought, you know, as an opposition we have a responsibility, and that responsibility is to make sure that the government's on the same page. And so I ask in this Assembly in question period: is nuclear waste going to be stored in Saskatchewan? And the minister, who I argued was part of the reason that we brought the EDP forward, has this to say: we're certainly going to study it.

And so now you've got the Premier who says that we have a moral and ethical obligation to store waste. You've got the

Minister of Enterprise and Innovation saying that there's no possible way it's going to be stored. And then you've got the CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] minister saying that of course it's on the table.

And you know where he got the information that it's on table? It's from the member from Thunder Creek's own process. It's his panel that's travelling the province that has it as a part of their consultation.

And so he doesn't think that it's duplicitous in any way that they would study waste as part of his process, and in the same breath say that there's no possible way we're going to do anything about it. How does that make any sense? It's his own process.

And so you've got the Premier saying we have an obligation to do it. You've got that member saying there's no possible way we're going to do it. And then you've got the Minister Responsible for CIC saying, well maybe we're going to do it. His own process says that we're going to do it, but he says we're not.

You know, Abbott and Costello did a skit that was called "Who's on First?" and it's apropos of what we're doing here today. Who's on first; what's on second; I don't know — third base.

And so another problem and another reason, the impetus for the EDP, was their lack of consultation. It's clear through some of the quotes I've read here today that they haven't consulted with anybody. Well they consulted with somebody, but they're not going to release the information. They've got their own poll that is deciding this whole process, but they won't release it to the public. So they're secretive, and it's unfortunate.

But they didn't consult, and they're not willing to consult, not in an appropriate fashion. I'll read again, the president of the Métis Nation of Saskatchewan Robert Doucette said this, and I'll quote, "You can talk all you want but you have to accommodate the interests of Métis people and that's the thing that I don't see or hear from the province right now."

And so the Métis Nation president says that they haven't been consulted and that they're not going to be allowed enough time to do a proper consultation. And the Minister Responsible for Enterprise and Innovation answered by saying, that's one more day than everybody else gets.

And I think it speaks volumes to the position that they've taken as it relates to First Nations and Métis people in this province. And I think it speaks volumes to the way that they've handled this entire process. And it's not enough for the people of Saskatchewan. And so we proposed the EDP, and we're proposing amendments here today.

Now in terms of the secrecy that they've used in this process, we've had a secret poll that was conducted that they won't release, that they say is driving this whole process. Why won't they store nuclear waste? Why won't they examine it? It's because the minister responsible says that they've got secret polling that they're not going to release that tells them that people don't want it. And so that's one of the reasons.

Additionally they conducted a study with Bruce Power, and they released the information late last year. But just after the information was released, we found out through an FOI [freedom of information] that some weeks earlier they already knew the outcome of the study. And it says, I quote:

The study will conclude that it is feasible to build a two unit, 2,000 megawatt nuclear power plant in Saskatchewan under certain conditions. The study will also identify as many as four potential locations . . .

The rest of the page was redacted.

And so they knew about the outcome of the study some three weeks before they released it. And when asked why, he said, well we didn't think it was a big deal. Not a big deal to release information in a timely fashion to the people in Saskatchewan while they drive headlong down this road.

Now in another FOI that was requested by a citizen of the province, they got this answer. The access to information request submitted to CIC in January asked for copies of any briefing notes and memorandums from August 1 to January 15 regarding or related to Bruce Power.

On March 9, the CIC released 11 pages of information, half of which are blacked out. The CIC listed the following reasons under *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* as justification for withholding information from the public, and it goes on to list several. It gave six reasons for the denial of information. And I'll quote again. The reasons given for denying access to certain information are itself revealing.

Two of them say it's because of contractual or other negotiations. What possible contracts and negotiations could be taking place that relate to Bruce Power? The public are repeatedly told that no decisions have been made, but obviously some kind of deal appears to be going on. The other thing to keep in mind is that the briefing notes are five or six months old. So who knows what has transpired since then? As usual the public will be the last to know.

Another reason cited for denying access is, quote, pending policy or budgetary items. Again what could possibly be in the works if no decision has been made? Or has the public been misled all these months?

Now they've got pages in this document that are half blacked out or all blacked out, several pages in a row in some cases . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . And so the member from Moose Jaw North asks me what I'm talking about, and I'm sad that he can't understand it. But I'm talking about secrecy, and it's plain that they've been secretive throughout this process. It's plain to everybody but them. So again I find that unfortunate.

Now additionally we've got a contradiction in terms of how much power's going to be produced and where we're going to send that power. On three different documents, it said that we have a need for 1000 megawatts of power. I read from a document that said we have a need for 2000 megawatts of power. And I've read very recently that if it's going to be done and going to be done economically, that we need 3000 megawatts, and it has to be exported.

Now what they're doing is taking this question to the people of Saskatchewan before they know themselves where the export market is, what it's going to look like, who's going to pay for the grids, or anything relevant to the question. So how do they expect the people of Saskatchewan to answer a question or to make a decision when they don't know the answer to their question? So again a massive failure in this process by this government. Now it's unbelievable. I could go on for hours and literally days about their flawed process.

But I want to talk about a good process, a proper process, and something that they've said is sound and has some merit. Now they said it's sound and has merit, but they certainly won't talk about where it doesn't have merit. And they won't adopt it because they're afraid to; they're afraid to take the question to the people.

Now we proposed an energy development partnership that will do a few things. One, it will initially ask the question of SaskPower, what is future demand growth going to look like? What are the infrastructure needs to meet that demand growth? What's the infrastructure necessary to accommodate export or import grids? And what are the rate increases required to meet future costs? No small questions, but vital if you're going to make a decision on power in this province. And so that's the first question you ask.

If you're going to decide how much power you're going to produce or how you're going to produce it, first you should find out whether or not you need it. And then you should make some decisions on whether you should export it and whether you can make some money on it.

Now we proposed this process, and in it are three different options to study energy. The first one is the nuclear option. Now we would charge that the UDP do some more work, and that they come back with answers to the relevant questions that people are asking, and the people who I quoted here today are asking on behalf of up to a quarter of a million people in this province. They want detailed information regarding those potential export markets. They want projected costs per kilowatt hour.

We proposed a mechanism and cost for transportation and storage of nuclear waste, and that the UDP should find out what the projected costs of the ultimate decommissioning of a nuclear reactor or two or three might be. That's the first option.

The second option is the carbon option. So we proposed a carbon development partnership. And we would charge them with developing realistic options and alternatives presented by carbon-based fuels in this province which are plentiful. We want a realistic description of the technology's potentials for clean coal, including in situ technology and coal bed generation.

We want a description of the role of natural gas in generation options. And we want a report on the potential role of polygeneration that's currently, as an example, is the one that's currently proposed by the Belle Plaine project.

We also proposed a renewable energy development partnership. Now this partnership would develop realistic options and options on capacity through wind, solar, hydro, cogen,

geothermal, and biomass sources. And I think it's a reasonable thing to ask.

[15:15]

People want an apples-to-apples comparison. They want to be able to compare nuclear power versus carbon-based source power versus a renewable energy option — in terms of the cost of kilowatt hour, in terms of the jobs generated, in terms of the impact on the environment, the impact on the economy, the impact socially for their community. And it's not too much to ask.

Now it's unfortunate that their demands had to be so strong. We had to ask the government to create an EDP, which they've refused. And we have to propose amendments to a flawed motion.

And so in closing, I'd like to say that it's obviously unfortunate that they've gone down this road. The impetus for the EDP and the amendment to the motion is clear. It comes from the people of Saskatchewan. It comes from questions that they've asked. It comes from contact and consultation with our members, and so we proposed it. And so this is a very short two-page amendment. And so I'm going to read it. I'll move:

That the motion be amended by adding the following word after the word "groups":

and for the purposes of this inquiry the said committee shall create four subcommittees with the following mandates:

(a) The first subcommittee shall identify the future electrical requirements of the province and that consultations on this matter shall include testimony from the appropriate experts at SaskPower and CIC, as well as with external expert witnesses.

(b) The second subcommittee shall examine the work done by the uranium development partnership, the UDP, and that the said examination shall include the testimony from the principles of the UDP, including the consultants who wrote any relevant reports: Bruce Power, Enterprise Saskatchewan, SaskPower, CIC, the Chair of the public consultation process, as well as any expert witnesses deemed appropriate for the review.

(c) The third subcommittee shall review any and all carbon-based options for energy production, and that consultations on this review shall include SaskPower, CIC, any government officials involved with carbon-based projects, such as the clean coal project, as well as external expert witnesses.

(d) The fourth subcommittee shall review any and all renewable energy options for power production, and that consultations on this review shall include SaskPower, CIC, and any other government agencies involved with renewable energy projects, such as the Saskatchewan Research Council, as well as external expert witnesses;

And that, pursuant to rule 148(1), the said committee shall temporarily expand its membership to accommodate the aforementioned subcommittees with the members to be named by the committee itself, and that any such expansion of membership shall be in accordance with the ratio of government to opposition that currently exists on the committee;

And that, pursuant to rule 147(6), as expeditiously as possible the Chair and Deputy Chair of the said committee shall present to the Board of Internal Economy a funding proposal for undertaking the inquiry, and the Chair and Deputy Chair of the said committee and the Board of Internal Economy shall reference the cost of the UDP as a starting point for the budget of the committee;

And that the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies shall, in accordance with rule 131(4), reimburse witnesses for all reasonable travel expenses;

And that the said committee shall hire consultants to help with the drafting of the committee's reports;

And that the work of the aforementioned subcommittees shall be compiled into an interim report which is to be submitted to the Legislative Assembly;

And that the interim report shall form the basis of extensive public consultation to be undertaken by the full committee before a final report is presented to the Legislative Assembly.

I so move.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — The amendment has been moved by the member of Prince Albert Northcote. Is the amendment taken as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McMillan): — Carried. I recognize the member for Wood River.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very pleased to stand today and talk about the motion and also talk about the amendment. The member opposite had talked about, some ramble about ill-conceived motion or something. Well I think he should look closely at his amendment because I think there's not much justification at all to the amendment that he put forward.

But I would like to talk just a little bit about some of the comments the member had made during his speech. He talked about trust, and he was trying to blame the Saskatchewan Party for a whole bunch of issues. But when he wants to talk about such things as trust, I have to remind members on the other side of the House that things come up, like SPUDCO [Saskatchewan Potato Utility Development Company]. And how much trust, how much trust was there? He talks about consultation. How much consultation was there with stuff like SPUDCO?

He talks about consultation. And from up in his own area that he talks about on occasion, about the forest industry and the

\$100 million, how much consultation was there with people of Saskatchewan on the \$100 million in the dying days of an election campaign or dying days of a government? How much trust did people have in that former government when they're looking at \$100 million? And he has the audacity to stand and talk about our party now with trust. But oh by the way, members, there was a vote on the \$100 million, and it was November 7, 2007.

The member also talks about secrecy; the Sask Party is cloaked in secrecy. I would remind the member there was 17 reports on the nuclear file held by that former government — 17, and I hope the member is listening — 17 that were held in secret until the Saskatchewan Party got elected. And those reports are available to the public. Seventeen reports over a period of 16 years that were held in secret files, and the member has the audacity to stand up and talk about the secrecy.

Sixteen years of dropping the ball, and he says the Saskatchewan Party has dropped the ball on this file. They dropped the ball for 16 years. But maybe they didn't because I don't think they were ever on the ball. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the way the NDP operate, I'm a firm believer if they were in power when fire was invented, they would still be in the dark with no heat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the member talked about cogen. Would we look at cogen? Golly, we looked at cogen. We were promoting cogen years ago. And what would they do? They were against it. They were against cogeneration. And now he has the audacity to stand up and say, well you should look at cogen.

But I do want to go through the motion as it is and talk a little bit about it point by point. The first one is the future electrical requirements. Expert witnesses, we already have recognized experts, and it's in SaskPower. Why would we want to be forming subcommittees? This information should be gathered by the all-party committee.

The UDP, the work of the UDP will continue to go on. These public consultations are about the future of the uranium industry and not just power generation. And as far as the nuclear industry, the members must realize on the other side that they all voted for it. They all voted for what we were doing in the nuclear industry. The UDP report will be available to the all-party committee to review, and the ongoing consultation process will be used to inform the all-party committee.

Carbon-based options, renewable energy options — why separate subcommittees on energy options? It creates an unnecessary bureaucracy. SaskPower is already working on both carbon-based and renewable energy resources, and there's no need to split them apart as Saskatchewan's future power needs will be met with a mix of options.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we also go to the point that one day in the House the other side is complaining about spending some money. And here today, here today they're putting an amendment in that wants to put a minimum, a minimum I mind you, of \$3 million investigating what our Crown corporations already know. They already have the information. Now they want to put \$3 million in to find out

what we already know.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to talk a little bit about SaskPower. For decades they have been producing carbon-based energy. They are internationally recognized experts in the field. We need look no further than to SaskPower officials as we chart the future.

For decades SaskPower's producing hydroelectricity and more recently has been investigating other forms of renewable energy — wind power. Why would we go and investigate wind power when we already know about wind power? The research and analysis already conducted by SaskPower can clearly outline Saskatchewan's future electrical requirements.

What group or organization would be better able to provide this information than SaskPower? Do members on the other side have an answer for that question? Who better to provide that information than SaskPower?

The only energy source that SaskPower has little experience is in nuclear energy, although there was reports done that the NDP kept secret. They kept them under wraps for 16 years, some of them. That's why we turned to the Uranium Development Partnership to add to our energy knowledge in Saskatchewan, the nuclear energy cycle. And we hear members opposite talk about all different sides of it. What is wrong with garnering information on the file?

Now to thoroughly consider how the province can best meet the growing demand for electricity in a manner that is safe, reliable, and environmentally sustainable and affordable, all options are under consideration. And they need to be reviewed at the same time by the same people — not by a number of subcommittees. To get a thorough understanding of all the potential electrical generation options under consideration, the same committee members need to hear the same information. This cannot be achieved in a piecemeal manner, as the opposition would like us to consider. That is why the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies is the best option to undertake this extremely important work.

I get the impression that the NDP feel that our committee system doesn't work. Why would they want to form subcommittees? And are they going to want to form subcommittees of the subcommittee and continue on and on? Again I go back to that's their history of inaction. You form a bureaucracy and then do nothing, and we know that they've done that for 16 years. And I think this is just a little play to make sure that nothing can go forward.

Mr. Speaker, armed with all this knowledge that we would garner, it would be time to act. It's time to share what we know with the people of Saskatchewan. It's time to hear their opinions on the path forward, and the way to do that is through the Crown and Central Agencies Committee. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support the amendment to the motion.

[15:30]

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

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a very few

comments to make before we can proceed to vote on this important amendment and on the motion of course that the government has brought forward.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, in terms of this debate, it has been the position of this opposition, and remains the position of this opposition, that as we consider the options available to Saskatchewan people to meet their electrical needs in the future, that the people of Saskatchewan should have as broad an opportunity and as studied an opportunity as is possible as we make these important decisions.

Now the government advanced us into a discussion about a nuclear reactor — not initially through the UDP's work but through their partnerships with Bruce Power and the invitation to Bruce Power to consider the feasibility of a reactor in Saskatchewan. That launched an important discussion.

The UDP has reported from their point of view a nuclear reactor should be part of the power mix in Saskatchewan. It has been the position and remains the position of this opposition, Mr. Speaker, that as the people of Saskatchewan are being asked in this way to consider a nuclear reactor or reactors as part of the power mix, that they should have an equal opportunity to be informed and consider the entire menu of options that exist for our province. And we have a luxury that many other peoples and jurisdictions on the globe will not have, and that is a full menu of options that may not exist for other nations or other jurisdictions but clearly exist for Saskatchewan.

Our argument has been from the start that the people of Saskatchewan should have this full menu and as much information as is possible before they are asked to make a decision, before they are asked to recommend to their government what government ought to do. That's point number one, Mr. Speaker.

Point number two. We believe this exercise should be an exercise, first of all, of informing and engaging the people of Saskatchewan. This is not an exercise particularly designed — or we think it shouldn't be particularly designed — to inform or allow members of the legislature to debate. It ought to be an exercise that engages and informs the public. Members of this House have much opportunity to debate and perhaps some greater measure to be informed. We would hope that this government would take seriously its commitment, or at least its stated commitment, to engage the people of Saskatchewan.

Now the member from Moose Jaw North shouts from his seat. I'd wish he'd stand on his feet and make a speech once in a while . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh it wasn't the member from Moose Jaw North this time. It was the member from Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

So now the government has recommitted here, by the comments from members from their seats, that they are truly interested in engaging the people of Saskatchewan in a debate or a discussion about electrical options. Now they weren't so interested in this several weeks ago. But as the debate ensued around the UDP and around the Bruce feasibility study, the government has come some ways in their position.

They weren't proposing a Crown corporation investigation of

these matters. They weren't proposing that the UDP be expanded. In fact they weren't doing any of that until this opposition and the people of Saskatchewan demanded it. Now they have moved some ways. They are now admitting from their seats today that it is their intention to engage the people of Saskatchewan in a full discussion.

An Hon. Member: — Absolutely.

Mr. Calvert: — Now because the member from Saskatoon just says absolutely, then I'm sure he will be very supportive of the amendment that my colleague from Prince Albert has just made to this motion. If he wants to be absolutely certain that the people of Saskatchewan can be fully informed and fully engaged in the process of the Crown Corporations Committee, then he will be 100 per cent supportive of this amendment.

It only is common sense. It's only common sense, Mr. Speaker. It's only common sense to have before the people of Saskatchewan opportunity to indulge in all of these discussions . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Now the Premier is shouting from his seat, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier from his seat is saying, well this is the NDP. You have a bunch of subcommittees. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't this party, when in government, that came up with Enterprise Saskatchewan which has got subcommittee after subcommittee after subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing in this amendment that the Crown Corporations Committee be equipped to, number one, have a solid discussion with the people of Saskatchewan regarding the actual electrical needs of our province going forward. That, Mr. Speaker, is a foundation piece that must be made available to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now the Premier and others will argue, well SaskPower can provide that. Well we're not certain of that, Mr. Speaker, after today's question period and after the rate review report yesterday. We learned that the rate review panel can't get information from the power corporation. So it's entirely appropriate, we believe, that a subcommittee be established of the legislative committee, a subcommittee be established to bring forward that information from Power, from other third party expertise, so that we could have that foundation piece.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we believe the legislative committee should have, through a subcommittee, the opportunity to ask and seek answers around the nuclear reactor proposals. There are many, many unanswered questions . . .

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

Mr. Calvert: — I understand, Mr. Speaker, the government really doesn't want to hear some of these arguments, but we will make them in any event. Mr. Speaker, we believe that there are many unanswered questions that still surround the concept of a reactor as part of our power supply, questions that the people of Saskatchewan deserve to have answers for if they're asked to make an informed decision.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we believe that with the carbon resource that does exist in our province, primarily coal, and new

opportunities in coal in some other areas of our province — as opposed to just in the South — that are there new technologies that we can seize? We have pioneered, we have pioneered in this province some of the technology around carbon dioxide sequestration, capture and sequestration. Are there yet other technologies that should be investigated and pursued for the carbon-based resource? We're saying that a subcommittee that has the power to draw in expertise be available for the committee and for the public to understand the reality of what might be possible in the carbon-based resource.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the people of Saskatchewan deserve a full review and full information when it comes to those variety of other sources, many of them described as renewable — wind, solar, hydro, geothermal, hydrogen. We believe that the people of Saskatchewan should be able to see and discuss the potential that might come from demand-side management, from conservation. We believe that the people of Saskatchewan should be well informed about what potential might exist to import clean electricity from Manitoba through a grid to Manitoba, the hydro resource of Manitoba. This too demands the work of this committee so that the public can be well informed.

Mr. Speaker, when government members from their bench today and in public and other circumstances have said they are sincere about desiring that the people of Saskatchewan have a full opportunity for information and debate, we would have argued and have argued that this should have been done simultaneously and would be better done simultaneously through an energy development partnership so that, as the discussion around the reactor goes on, this would be going on simultaneously. The government has rejected that.

Therefore if they are sincere today, if the Crown Corporations Committee and its work is a sincere, is a sincere effort to engage the people of Saskatchewan to fully inform the public of Saskatchewan, then the government members opposite will vote for this amendment. If they vote against this amendment, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the motivations are somewhat different, that in fact they are not, they are not interested in a real and broad public discussion. They are interested, they are interested in getting out of a political trap that they got themselves into over the reactor.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we'll see. We'll see how this government votes on what is truly a reasonable, common sense amendment — a reasonable, common sense approach that this opposition offers to government today. Mr. Speaker, I second the amendment made by the member from Prince Albert.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Will members take the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — Or the amendment, pardon me. The amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — Those in favour of the amendment say aye.

Some Hon. Members: — Aye.

The Speaker: — Those opposed say no.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — I believe the nos have it. The motion before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister Responsible for Crown Corporations. Will the members take the motion as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — Those in favour of the motion say aye.

Some Hon. Members: — Aye.

The Speaker: — Those opposed say no.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — I believe the ayes have it. The motion carries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 84

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Stewart that **Bill No. 84** — *The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Prince Albert Northcote.

Mr. Furber: — Well once again I'm pleased to enter debate this afternoon in the Legislative Assembly. I want to chat if I can a little bit about Bill 84, the labour-sponsored venture capital amendment Act, and I want to talk about the members opposite, the government Saskatchewan Party, and their past speeches that suggest that the Invest in Saskatchewan program

encourages Saskatchewan employees and individuals to invest in funds or in this case essentially a pool of capital.

We've heard that fund managers then make investments on behalf of contributors, investments in Saskatchewan-based, small- and medium-sized businesses. Effectively this provides much-needed capital, and at no time in Saskatchewan's history is there such a demand for capital in the business community. And it's capital that's required to grow a business, to grow it from a start-up to a larger business, to grow a medium-sized business to a large business. And it's capital that's lacking right now all over the world. Now we've had the collapse of financial markets around the world. And so in the words of the Minister for Enterprise and Innovation, his deputy, and the head of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, they all agree that capital markets currently are the number one inhibitor to growth in our province.

And so what does this Act do at a time when capital markets are at their lowest levels globally and at their greatest need in the province's history? What do they do? They introduce Bill 84 which effectively directs capital from Saskatchewan-based businesses to businesses outside our province. And so it seems, and I think most would agree, that it's wrong-headed at a time that Saskatchewan businesses need the capital the most, when it's the number one inhibitor to growth in our province as agreed by the minister himself, the head of the chamber of commerce in the province, that you would introduce a Bill that drives capital outside the province.

And so you question what the impetus for the Bill is, and again it goes to consultation. I spoke about that in a speech earlier today. They refuse to consult with people on anything. If they'd have talked to the folks at the chamber of commerce, they'd have found out that — you know what? — capital markets are at an all-time low in terms of the volume of funds that they have to invest. At that same time, it's the most needed in Saskatchewan in our province's history. And so it makes no sense at all. And they've agreed that at that time you would introduce a Bill that drives capital outside the province. But that's what they've done.

And so I've talked to a good number of the people who make investments on behalf of people in this province, both labour-sponsored venture capital funds and other investments, and I can't find one that they've spoken with on this Bill. And so who did they consult with? It's unclear. But what's clear is that they haven't consulted, or they wouldn't have put this Bill on the table that would drive capital, at the worst capital crunch in our province's history, outside of Saskatchewan. Now it's unanimous virtually with the folks that manage these funds, people in the business community, their own minister who introduced this very legislation, that capital markets are the biggest inhibitor to growth in the province right now. And they introduce a Bill that drives capital outside of the province.

[15:45]

Now initially, labour-sponsored venture capital funds were created to encourage capital for Saskatchewan small- to medium-sized businesses. And the effect of an influx of capital enables a small or medium-sized business to make investments in infrastructure or in additional employees. The net effect is an

increase in the employment of Saskatchewan people. It provides jobs for Saskatchewan families.

Another effect of the labour-sponsored venture capital funds is to encourage growth in our province, and it does this by investing in Saskatchewan-based businesses. Now what the fund will effectively do is take capital from a number of small sources, up to \$5,000 per investor, and pool that capital and enable a manager, a fund manager, to invest in small- to medium-sized businesses in this province.

Now it's the opposition's job to hold a critical eye to the government when they introduce legislation. And I didn't have to make too many calls to find people that were willing to speak negatively about this legislation. Nobody called for it that I could find, and they all agreed that it seemed wrong-headed, and it was introduced at precisely the worst possible time.

So what they've done effectively is allowed capital to flow outside of the province when it's most required. And my consultation with the different fund managers and the different investors in this province lead me to one conclusion. And virtually all of them said, you know what you could do with Bill 84? You could increase the limit for investment from 5,000 to \$10,000 per person. That would encourage more capital to flow in Saskatchewan. It would encourage investors to invest more so that you could pool more money to invest in our province, to grow the economy, to create jobs, and that it hasn't been done in some time. And they almost all agreed on this.

And so what did I do? Well I take my responsibility very seriously. And so I phoned the minister's office and asked to talk to the minister about Bill 84, that he might make a small amendment to increase the limit as has been done in other provinces. And you know what I got for an answer? No phone call. He refused to talk to me about it. And so it's unfortunate that when virtually everybody I talk to calls for an increase in the limit, hasn't been done for some time — it would increase capital to markets in Saskatchewan to create jobs in this province for Saskatchewan people and would help Saskatchewan businesses grow — and they won't return a phone call.

Now fundamentally, I and a number of the people that I talk to have huge concerns about this legislation, the impetus for it, and how wrong-headed it is in terms of its treatment of Saskatchewan business and investment. And so at this time, I move to send it to committee so that we can further scrutinize it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The question before the committee is the motion put forward by the Minister Responsible for Enterprise and Innovation that Bill No. 84, *The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Second reading of this Bill.

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

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

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

Bill No. 71

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Stewart that **Bill No. 71** — *The Innovation Saskatchewan Act* be now read a second time.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Prince Albert Northcote.

Mr. Furber: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I'm pleased to be on my feet today to discuss this legislation. I'm pleased to enter the debate on Bill 71, *The Innovation Saskatchewan Act*.

Now I've only got a few points to make on this piece of legislation, but I think they're important points. Previous speakers have raised and identified most of the points that I would want to raise. And I'd argue that there are really some good things in this Bill, and one of them is that it supports innovation in our province, and I think that we could all agree that that's a good thing. And as a government, we certainly demonstrated our support for innovation.

In fact, we presided over the greatest increase in innovation in Saskatchewan's history. We supported entities such as the Saskatchewan Research Council, SOCO [Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation], the synchrotron, the Petroleum Technology Research Centre, the Centre for Carbon Dioxide Capture at the U of R, the Saskatchewan forestry centre, centres for innovation in Saskatoon and Regina that have an economic impact of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars each year in this province. So we're certainly proud of our support for innovation, and we're pleased that the government is supportive as well.

But this Bill, of course, is not all extremely positive. There's certainly some aspects to this Bill that cause questions and raise some concerns. And I take my role as an opposition member very seriously, and thus we have to ask some questions. And those questions regard the transparency and accountability.

Now this Act removes much of the transparency and accountability that would have existed previously. They ran on accountability and transparency, but they haven't delivered. They've had a series of blacked-out reports — one from the Minister of Corrections — several FOIs that I talked about today, and reports that are kept from the public, polling that's kept from the public that they admit is driving a nuclear process.

And so how does this Act reduce transparency and accountability? Well it changes the reporting mechanisms in the legislature and to the Assembly. Instead of having a series of very detailed budget entries that are easily scrutinized by the members of the public, now there'll be a single-line item provided. And so it makes it more difficult to look into the doings and happenings as it relates to money expenditures on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

Now additionally there have been many quotes in committee that makes me think that there's some duplicity on this Bill that needs to be explained. Now they seem to have an investment strategy that contradicts itself at every turn. I've asked questions regarding Innovation Saskatchewan and who's going to be making decisions, the final decision on expenditures. It turns out it's the minister.

We had a situation last fall where they introduced legislation to nationalize a Saskatchewan-owned company that made investments at arm's-length in government. And so I've asked questions in committee, trying to nail down exactly what is their philosophy as it comes to making investments as a government on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan in the economy. And so what were the answers? Well I asked this question, and it was, what is the philosophy of this government? And the minister answered, from *Hansard*:

. . . I said that we didn't believe as a government in risking tens of millions . . . of taxpayers' hard-earned money, as risk capital and high-risk ventures. And we vowed that we wouldn't be doing that as government.

And so I asked a simple question. Then does this philosophy then apply to the government's Apex Investment Fund? And you know what the minister's answer was? I'm not familiar with the Apex Investment Fund.

So they've got a philosophy that's supposed to apply across government in terms of investment on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan as a government, and they don't even know whether or not it applies across their government. It applies in Enterprise and Innovation, but it doesn't apply for the Apex Fund. It applies for Victoria Park Capital, but it doesn't apply to SaskWorks Venture Fund. It applies again to Victoria Park Capital, but it doesn't apply to the Sask Entrepreneurial Fund. And so the duplicity is staggering yet again.

And so you have to question what this Act does exactly and why it was brought forward. If they have a philosophy of not investing in the economy and "using hard-earned money as risk capital in high-risk ventures," then what exactly is the innovation fund going to do and who's going to make the decisions?

Well the minister has admitted that he is going to be making decisions and that there will be some political influence in those decisions. So again it goes to trust. They say that they're not going to be risking taxpayers' dollars in high-risk ventures, and yet they do it on a number of fronts. And they agree that they do it on a number of fronts.

Now we have, as any good opposition would do, done a little bit of research on what other people think of the duplicity that

they have shown in terms of *The Innovation Saskatchewan Act*. And so in a speech given December 8, '05, the Premier says this, and I quote, "The terms of reference of Enterprise Saskatchewan also include the end of government picking winners and losers in the economy." That's what he said. So how does he square that with the minister deciding, and stating clearly, that politics will play a role in some of the decisions that are made? Obvious contradiction.

Additionally there's a quote from Don Black after they introduced this legislation, and the quote is: "Don Black, executive chair of Greystone Capital Management, said independence was vital when it comes to government investment 'to remove politics and any temptation of politics from the process.'"

This is just smoke and mirrors; shuffle men around the chessboard. I mean, why do you need to create a new agency? Why don't you just refocus Investment Saskatchewan? So another third party validator who believes that this is smoke and mirrors, it's wrong-headed, and it's not going to work.

Additionally the headline the day after they introduced this legislation said, quote, "Investment agency flip-flop." So apparently they had a position in opposition that they thought people wanted to hear. They were going to get out of picking winners and losers in the economy. But they create an agency. They create a Crown corporation that does exactly that. So certainly have some questions regarding that duplicity.

Now it says in my notes that the Saskatchewan Party claims that Innovation Saskatchewan will only invest in non-mature industries. Now this is the same Sask Party government that dismantled a \$320 million Green Future Fund, which would have encouraged green innovation. So innovation is fine as long as it doesn't affect the green economy or environmentalism.

Now interestingly, they introduced this legislation which makes decisions on investment in innovation in Saskatchewan. And where does this leave the folks at Enterprise Saskatchewan? They thought that when their entity was created that they would be the ones that had the ability to make investments and to make decisions based for economic reasons. And in discussions with some of the folks that belong to Enterprise Saskatchewan, they said they thought they'd be making decisions based on economics, that they'd have some influence.

But the only recommendations that they've put forward have been rejected. They weren't consulted on an economic stimulus package for the province. We have a forestry industry, and the minister is struggling and the minister has managed to have one meeting. They weren't consulted by the minister about the global financial meltdown. And so they feel ignored and used. They feel like they're political pawns in a game that the minister's playing. So they say that they're going to get out of picking winners and losers, but they admit to having politicized investment in this Innovation Saskatchewan. And so, if I could now, I'd like to move to send this to committee so that we might further scrutinize the Bill on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

[16:00]

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion put forward by the Minister Responsible for Enterprise and Innovation that Bill No. 71, *The Innovation Saskatchewan Act* be now read the second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Second reading of this Bill.

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

Hon. Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Standing Committee on the Economy.

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

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 92 — *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009/ Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine*

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act* be now read a second time.

An Hon. Member: — You don't want to do your speech?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I will do it if it comes to . . .

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009*. This amendment corresponds to a change in the federal *Income Tax Act* in 2008 that introduced tax-free savings account effective January 1, 2009.

The proposed amendments to *The Queen's Bench Act, 1998* allows the holder of a tax-free saving account to designate a beneficiary. Upon the account holder's death, the amount in the account would be paid to the designated person rather than being considered an asset of the holder's estate. If this legislative change is not made, the amount in the account would be distributed according to the account holder's will. If there's no will, the rules of intestacy would apply.

The tax-free savings account is a flexible savings mechanism that allows Canadians to make annual contribution and withdraw funds at any time to be used for any purpose.

Contributions are not deductible, but income earned within a tax-free savings account and the distributions are tax free.

This amendment allows beneficiaries to be appointed for tax-free savings account in the same way as is currently allowed for RSPs [retirement savings plan]. The account holder can ensure that the designated beneficiary can receive the tax-free savings account in the same way as the proceeds of an RRSP [registered retirement savings plan], that is, without having to be specified in a will.

Mr. Speaker, we received a number of requests for this legislation. The opposition members did as well, and they've written to us and made a request for us to complete this legislation. The legislation was under way when we received it and we're pleased to have their support in the speedy passage of this. And I thank them for that accommodation, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion put forward by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question? I recognize the member from Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, this is a piece of legislation that I think escaped the government in the larger sense. Not just the members of the government across the way, but the officials, the public service as well, Mr. Speaker, until relatively recently, which is why it is Bill 92 and doesn't have a lower number, Mr. Speaker.

The tax-free savings accounts are a new instrument created by the federal government but created with similar purposes in mind, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily to save for retirement but that's certainly one of the uses of the tax-free savings account. And the rules around those accounts are very similar to the rules around registered retirement savings plans.

A citizen of Saskatoon wrote one of my colleagues in Saskatoon a letter saying the treatment of these upon death in respect to designating a beneficiary should be the same as for registered retirement savings accounts. Because I am the Justice critic, my colleague forwarded the letter to me. I wrote a letter to the minister saying that this is a worthwhile suggestion, something that should be proceeded with; received a response from the minister saying that, yes it is, that the government will proceed with legislation.

What this legislation means of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the government will suffer some loss of prospective revenue because this money will not be included in estates, and therefore there won't be probate fees attached and there is some revenue loss to the government. But it treats fairly and equally money that's put into registered retirement savings plans and money that's put in tax-free savings account. We think that's appropriate. The government thinks that's appropriate.

I think this Bill and what's going to happen to it this afternoon is evidence that democracy in the province of Saskatchewan works very well. Citizen-initiated initiatives can proceed fairly quickly with bipartisan support through this House, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's a good representative of that. It's maybe ironic that it happens on this day when we weren't able

to achieve that kind of bipartisan support for something else that I think the people of Saskatchewan are calling for. But in this particular case, no pun intended, Mr. Speaker, where there's a will, there's a way.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I designate that Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* be committed to the Committee of the Whole, and request leave for the said Bill to be considered in the Committee of the Whole later this day.

The Speaker: — The Bill stands committed to the Committee of the Whole, and the minister has requested leave for Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* to be considered in Committee of the Whole later this day. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted.

Bill No. 93 — *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009*

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to move second reading of *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009*. This Act will facilitate the newest trend in condominium projects, multi-use developments. These are developments which contain both residential and commercial units.

The current legislation does not prohibit multi-use developments. However it does not specifically allow certain features common in such developments, including titled parking and the ability to have semi-autonomous areas called sectors within the project.

This Bill provides the legislative framework for titled parking while maintaining the consumer protection elements found in the Act today. We want to continue the requirement for one parking stall for each residential unit. This ensures that our streets are not clogged with parked cars, and people buying a condominium expect to have a parking stall available for their

use.

Across North America, newer condominium developments are integrating commercial and residential units within the same complex. This makes it possible for a condominium owner to, for example, buy their groceries or visit their dentist within the same complex. This is a convenience for the residential owner as well as a readily available market for the commercial units.

As you can imagine, these mixed-use developments may need to be governed differently from a development with only residences or only commercial enterprises. Mr. Speaker, these amendments will allow the condominium corporation to pass bylaws to allow the development to be divided into sectors for administrative and management purposes. This ensures that the residential owners have a greater say in how the residential sector is administered and the commercial sector could have different bylaws that fit its unique needs. Because there will always be matters of general concern for all owners within a mixed-use development, the amendments also allow bylaws to be passed to deal with interrelationship between sectors and matters of general concern.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further important addition to the condominium legislation in this Bill, namely the ability to create services units. Services units are owned by the condominium corporation and are intended for the use and enjoyment of all owners. Services include such amenities as laundry rooms, recreational facilities, landscaping, and hallways.

The ability to create services units will address a concern identified during consultation that there is no ability to create common property or common facilities when bare land units are redivided. Furthermore, because the facilities and services units are important to all owners, new regulation-making powers are being provided to allow any unique consumer protection requirements related to services units to be added in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the condominium community was consulted about proposed amendments for the purpose of titled parking and multi-use developments, and expressed strong support for legislation for this purpose. Mr. Speaker, I understand that consultation was also taken with the members of the opposition who consulted with officials from the city of Saskatoon among others. I am pleased to move second reading of *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009*.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question? I recognize the member from Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Relatively briefly — I don't know how long the members want to listen to remarks from either side of the House about condominiums, Mr. Speaker — but again I think this is another example, like the previous legislation that we are going to deal with later in Committee of the Whole this afternoon, an example of how nimble and flexible the legislature can be when

the legislature wants to be.

And the history for this legislation, for me, starts some time before the sitting when there was concern expressed in the press in Saskatoon by developers of certain condominium projects in that city as to whether legislation in our province allowed for the type of financing needed for the different kind of development that was going to be taking place in these projects. And when the legislature sat, I looked for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't there.

And in the Crown and Central Agencies Committee, there was land titles legislation for which I am the critic because it comes through Information Services Corporation, Mr. Speaker. And I asked the minister — and this is just before the Easter break — I asked the minister, what about this concern about financing, strata financing for these multi-condominium corporation developments, Mr. Speaker. And the minister said, well we're working on legislation but we don't have it ready. We hope to have it ready after the Easter break, and we would like the opposition's co-operation, Mr. Speaker. A little late in the day to ask for the opposition's co-operation with less now, less than three weeks — less than three weeks.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't raised the issue, I don't know when we would have been forewarned, Mr. Speaker. And that's not a criticism of the government. It's more of a commentary on this place, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes we get so adversarial — I expect, Mr. Speaker, that you've noticed this on occasion — so adversarial that it gets in the way of even doing what we might agree to do, Mr. Speaker, and this is an example. I think if the opposition had been taken by surprise by this legislation, we may not have had the happy result that we're going to have today which is to pass legislation that I think makes perfect sense. And we weren't taken by surprise only by the accident of me asking about the need for it in committee on unrelated legislation prior to the spring break.

Now this is an example, Mr. Speaker, of legislation modelled on another province's legislation — British Columbia, I believe, in this case, Mr. Speaker. So the government, realizing that there was a gap, found a model in another province — in this case British Columbia; it might have been Manitoba in another case, in this case British Columbia — modelled legislation on that legislation and is passing it, as we will see in this legislature, with the co-operation of the opposition freely offered because there's common agreement on the value of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, just to show that it can be done.

Now I believe that the government in its consultations on this — as hurried as they might have been, Mr. Speaker — on the consultations on this Bill became aware of consumer protection issues around condominiums, Mr. Speaker. And residential condominiums are now a much bigger part of the housing market in Saskatchewan than they were two years ago. That's had, in my view, very unhealthy effect on the rental market and rental accommodation in Saskatchewan. But that's a matter for another debate.

[16:15]

But issues are arising about people's protection who buy condominiums, which has been not as common a part of the

housing market as it has now become. I understand these concerns have been raised with the government when they're discussing this legislation. This is amendment to that legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Now we wouldn't have expected the government to deal with all those issues. These issues are urgent. And we want to help deal with these issues in an urgent way, and we are doing so. But we anticipate better consumer protection legislation around condominiums, arising from the consultations the government's had, concerns that we know that now have been raised with the government. We expect to see that legislation in the fall, now that the government's been put on notice and they have time to prepare for it, Mr. Speaker.

But on this matter again, a good sign of what the legislature can do when nonsense like, you had 17 years to do it and didn't do it, isn't thrown up, and instead we work on what should be common intentions, in common, and quickly and flexibly and efficiently. This is what can be accomplished, Mr. Speaker. I wish we could do it more often.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time.

Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — Second reading of this Bill.

The Speaker: — To which committee shall this Bill be committed? I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I designate that Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act* be committed to the Committee of the Whole, and request leave for the said Bill to be considered in the Committee of the Whole later this day.

The Speaker: — The Bill stands committed to the Committee of the Whole, and the minister has requested leave for Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* be considered in Committee of the Whole later this day. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted.

I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ASSEMBLY

**Bill No. 92 — *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009/*
Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la
*Cour du Banc de la Reine***

The Chair: — The item of business before the committee is Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009*. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009*. I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I move that the committee report the Bill without amendment.

The Chair: — It has been moved that the committee report Bill No. 92 without amendment. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**Bill No. 93 — *The Condominium Property*
*Amendment Act, 2009***

The Chair: — Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 25 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I move the committee report the Bill without amendment.

The Chair: — It has been moved that the committee report Bill No. 93 without amendment. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I recognize the Government Whip.

Mr. Weekes: — Mr. Chair, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

The Chair: — The Government Whip has asked leave to report progress and asked for leave to sit again. Is that carried?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. The committee now stands adjourned.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of committees.

Mr. Brkich: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall the Bill be read the third time? I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, by leave I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave for Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* to be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. The minister may move to third reading. I recognize the Minister of Justice.

THIRD READINGS

**Bill No. 92 — *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009/*
Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la
*Cour du Banc de la Reine***

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved that Bill No. 92, *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

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

The Speaker: — I recognize the Chair of committees.

Mr. Brkich: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

The Speaker: — When shall the Bill be read the third time? I recognize the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, by leave I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave for Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* to be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. The minister may report the Bill, move the Bill.

**Bill No. 93 — *The Condominium Property
Amendment Act, 2009***

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved that Bill No. 93, *The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

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

The Speaker: — When shall this committee sit again? I recognize the Government Whip.

Mr. Weekes: — Next sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Next sitting. I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Gantefoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today's agenda being completed, I move that 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: — This Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 16:30.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Chisholm.....	2877
Nilson.....	2877
Harpauer.....	2877
Forbes.....	2877
Reiter.....	2878
Morin.....	2878
Wotherspoon.....	2878

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Trew.....	2878
Higgins.....	2878
Iwanchuk.....	2879
Forbes.....	2879
Morin.....	2879
Wotherspoon.....	2879
Vermette.....	2879

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Avenue Community Centre for Gender & Sexual Diversity Annual Awards	
Forbes.....	2880
Spinal Cord Injury and Physical Disabilities Awareness Month	
Reiter.....	2880
Remembering Peter James Bear	
Vermette.....	2880
Foam Lake Company Active in Biodiesel Industry	
Draude.....	2881
Riffel High School H₂O Our Life Fundraiser	
Morin.....	2881
Member Wins Woman of Excellence Award	
LeClerc.....	2881
Northern Hockey Star a Machine on Ice	
Belanger.....	2882

QUESTION PERIOD

Support for Graduate Students	
Wotherspoon.....	2882
Norris.....	2882
SaskPower Rates	
Trew.....	2883
Cheveldayoff.....	2883
Profits from Crime and Victims' Rights	
Quennell.....	2885
Morgan.....	2885
Gender Equity Issues	
Higgins.....	2886
Norris.....	2886

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies	
Duncan.....	2887
Standing Committee on the Economy	
Huyghebaert.....	2888
Standing Committee on Private Bills	
Allchurch.....	2889

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS OF AMENDMENTS

Bill No. 54 — <i>The Vital Statistics Act, 2008/Loi de 2008 sur les services de l'état civil</i>	
Cheveldayoff.....	2887

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 54 — <i>The Vital Statistics Act, 2008/Loi de 2008 sur les services de l'état civil</i>	
Cheveldayoff.....	2888
Bill No. 55 — <i>The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendments Act, 2008</i>	
Cheveldayoff.....	2888
Bill No. 47 — <i>The Pipelines Amendment Act, 2008</i>	
Boyd.....	2888

Bill No. 902 — <i>The Stephen and Michelene Worobetz Foundation Amendment Act</i>	
Calvert	2889
Bill No. 92 — <i>The Queen’s Bench Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
<i>Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine</i>	
Morgan	2906
Bill No. 93 — <i>The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Morgan	2907
ORDERS OF THE DAY	
WRITTEN QUESTIONS	
Weekes	2889
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS	
Inquiry into Meeting Growing Demand for Electricity	
Cheveldayoff	2889
Furber	2892
Huyghebaert	2897
Calvert	2898
GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
ADJOURNED DEBATES	
SECOND READINGS	
Bill No. 84 — <i>The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Furber	2900
Gantfoer (referral to committee)	2901
Bill No. 71 — <i>The Innovation Saskatchewan Act</i>	
Furber	2901
Gantfoer (referral to committee)	2903
SECOND READINGS	
Bill No. 92 — <i>The Queen’s Bench Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
<i>Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine</i>	
Morgan	2903
Quennell	2903
Bill No. 93 — <i>The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Morgan	2904
Quennell	2904
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ASSEMBLY	
Bill No. 92 — <i>The Queen’s Bench Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
<i>Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine</i>	2906
Bill No. 93 — <i>The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 2009</i>	2906

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