



THIRD 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 — Dwain Lingenfelter

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
Chartier, Danielle	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Hon. Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, 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, Hon. Jeremy	SP	Meadow Lake
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Hon. Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Darryl	SP	Prince Albert Carlton
Higgins, Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Hutchinson, Hon. Bill	SP	Regina South
Huyghebaert, Hon. D.F. (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
Lingenfelter, Dwain	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
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, Hon. Jim	SP	Rosetown-Elrose
Ross, Laura	SP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Schriemer, Joceline	SP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Stewart, 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
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 Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I request leave to make an extended introduction.

The Speaker: — The Premier has requested leave for an extended introduction. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. I recognize the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you to colleagues in the legislature for the chance to make a very special and an extended introduction. Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery, it's a pleasure for me to introduce through you and to you to all members of the Assembly, Saskatchewan's participants in this year's Jeux du Commerce West in Prince George, BC [British Columbia].

JDC [Jeux du Commerce] West is a prestigious annual business competition featuring the top schools and the top business students from across Western Canada. This particular group of students, Mr. Speaker — and they're accompanied by some coaches — are students from the University of Regina. The university sent a team consisting of 53 students, 15 faculty coaches, 19 alumni and business community coaches. And the competition was held in January, Mr. Speaker. And to no one's surprise, the University of Regina, the Paul J. Hill school of business students did very, very well. They finished in second place, Mr. Speaker. In fact they missed first place by a mere point three five percentage points.

I know all members of the Assembly will want to join with me in welcoming these students. And just before they do that, I wonder if I could indulge members of the Assembly by introducing these students. And I'm going to call their names, and if they're here maybe they'd give us a wave or even stand. And I'm going to introduce the faculty and coaches that are also in attendance. And if I miss some, I apologize, but I think we have the complete list.

So, Mr. Speaker, in no particular order, we want to welcome Lisa McIntyre, Trevor Knox, Mikkail Sigov, Riley Meloche, Steven Comaniuk, Megan Armstead, Sarah Bultitude, Michael Truong, Tianna Yaskow, Alexandra Fox, Ally Pilkey, Kathleen Ing, Katherine Simaluk, Laura Fahlman, Carli Brundige, Megan Slinn, Karen Webb, Lucy Quach-Parker, Eric Moser, April Flaman, Pat Sirois, Devin Sembaluk, David Ma, and faculty and coaches in attendance. We have the dean, Mr. Speaker — we're happy to welcome Anne Lavack to the Assembly — Lisa Watson, Bruce Anderson, Ernest Johnson, Tatiana Levit, and Megan Costiuk.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that I asked these students, when I had a chance to meet with them, how many plan to stay in the province of Saskatchewan if there were opportunities here for them to pursue. And I think all but just a few put up their hands, and we'll go to work on the other ones.

But, Mr. Speaker, we're very, very grateful to have them in the Assembly today. We want to congratulate them on an amazing achievement. We understand in this Assembly that the future of the province of Saskatchewan is bright indeed as we continue to build on some pretty amazing growth because of students like we welcome today in your gallery. Will all members join me in welcoming them to their Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome this team with their advisers who have done so well, not only this year, but in the previous years in this business competition. It's also a real pleasure to welcome them because I know many of them personally. In fact I think it might be close to half of them were at my daughter's 21st birthday party just two weeks ago. And then with the faculty members, I have a special welcome for Anne Lavack, and especially Ernest Johnson, who has moved to Saskatchewan a few years ago from Acadia University and he was somebody who was recruited, I would say, by my family to come to Saskatchewan along with his wife.

And we're very pleased to have all of these people who serve Saskatchewan well and who are getting excellent training here and showing that the kinds of people that we train in Saskatchewan can compete against anybody in the world. And I want all members to welcome them here today.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Kelvington-Wadena, the Minister Responsible for Crown Investments.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you I'd like to join with the Premier and the member opposite in welcoming the students from JDC West. And I'm very pleased also with their good luck in Prince George. I know they did a good job.

Today I want to especially pick out two people. I want to thank Anne Lavack for not only her work with the students but also her work with the FASD [fetal alcohol spectrum disorder] network and I appreciate all your enthusiasm. I'm fortunate to have one of the students now working in my office. I have an enthusiastic, energetic young lady who is staying in our province. Please help me welcome Megan Armstead to her Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Silver Springs, the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly a good friend of mine, a good friend of our province, sitting in the west gallery, Dave Dutchak.

Dave is part of the Dutchak family that's synonymous with excellence in health care in our province. They are one of the private sector providers that provide the health care and do it in a way that is just, just excellent. Dave and I go back to our Blaine Lake days; we grew up together. In fact our fathers served on town council together. So, Dave, I'd like to welcome you to your Legislative Assembly.

Dave also, from an economic point of view, has been the president of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and contributed greatly to his province in many ways. He's also, Mr. Speaker, a Toronto Maple Leaf fan. And I'm sure he's engaged in what all Leaf fans do in April, Mr. Speaker — they get together and they talk about next year. So, Dave, welcome to your Legislative Assembly. I'm sure the Deputy Premier would want to meet with you sometime to talk about that. But I'd ask all members to welcome Dave.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

Mr. Harper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise today to present a petition on behalf of concerned citizens of Saskatchewan concerned over the condition of Highway 310. The petition goes on to state that the condition of Highway 310 is a potential safety hazard for those residents who have to drive on this highway each and every day. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the Sask Party government to commit to providing the repairs to Highway 310 that the people of Saskatchewan need.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And this petition is signed by the good folks from Ituna, Saskatchewan. I so submit.

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

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have today a petition from the Saskatchewan Student Coalition in support of the implementation of the Saskatchewan scholarship fund. That would be the same scholarship fund promised by the Sask Party in the 2007 provincial election. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to implement the promised Saskatchewan scholarship fund.

Mr. Speaker, the signatures on this petition are from Regina and Saskatoon. I so submit.

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

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition in

support of maintaining educational assistants in the province. As people know, the Ministry of Education released a document that would dramatically reduce the number of educational assistants in the province and replace them with a smaller number of professionals. And in the view of the petitioners, this would result in a substantial loss of in-class support. And the prayer reads as follows:

Cause the government to provide funding for the required number of educational assistants to provide special needs students with the support they need and maintain a positive learning environment for all Saskatchewan students.

This petition is signed by people from Battleford, North Battleford, Meadow Lake, Turtleford, and Saskatoon. I so present.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition to the legislature calling for the reinstatement of the domestic abuse outreach program. And we know that the domestic abuse program provided a number of valuable services to women victims of domestic violence including helping them find emergency shelter, accompanying to their homes, court, and hospital or police station as needed. I'd like to read the prayer:

We, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectfully request that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take the following action: to cause the provincial government to reinstate the domestic abuse outreach program as a provincial government service and make it available in all parts of the Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, the signature signers come from the good city of Saskatoon and Regina. Thank you very much.

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. With a waiting list of almost one full year, I don't believe there's any other community that has a waiting period and a waiting time like this. The prayer reads as follows:

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

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed by the good people of Pinehouse, Air Ronge, and La Ronge. I so present.

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

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition that's been circulated by the Saskatchewan

Student Coalition, a petition in support of affordable education and a call on the Sask Party government to have its actions match its rhetoric. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to implement a long-term tuition management strategy in which tuition is increased by an average of 2 per cent or the most recent increase to the consumer price index.

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

Mr. Speaker, I so present.

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

Mr. Furber: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition to support the expansion of the graduate retention program. The petition is being circulated because the Saskatchewan Party government amended the retention program specifically to exclude master's, Ph.D. [Doctor of Philosophy] graduates, and graduates from outside the province of Saskatchewan. And the petition reads:

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by folks from the three largest cities in the province: Prince Albert, Regina, and Saskatoon. I so present.

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

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition in support of maintaining quality health care services. The petitioners note that the Government of Saskatchewan needs to recognize the integral role of all health care providers as valued members of the health care team and that the Government of Saskatchewan must recognize the value of all health care providers by having a commitment to adequate funding and the installation of good faith in the provincial collective bargaining process. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to commit to negotiating a fair and just collective bargaining agreement with health care workers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by residents of The Battlefords and surrounding area. I so present.

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

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again to

present a petition signed by residents of Saskatchewan concerned about this government's disregard for constitutional, legal, and human rights. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to direct marriage commissioners to uphold the law and the equality rights of all Saskatchewan couples and to withdraw the reference to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal that would allow marriage commissioners to opt out of their legal obligation to provide all couples with civil marriage services.

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

Today the petition is signed by residents of Duval, Saskatoon, Biggar, and Langham. And I so submit.

[13:45]

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to present petitions on behalf of concerned residents from across Saskatchewan as it relates to the unprecedented mismanagement of our finances by the Sask Party. They allude to the two consecutive \$1 billion deficits and they reference the huge \$1 billion debt growth that's under way within this province. The prayers reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the honourable Legislative Assembly condemn the Sask Party government for its damaging financial mismanagement since taking office, a reckless fiscal record that is denying Saskatchewan people, organizations, municipalities, institutions, taxpayers, and businesses the responsible and trustworthy fiscal management that they so deserve.

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

These petitions are signed by concerned citizens of La Ronge, Creighton, and Muenster, Mr. Speaker. I so submit.

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again today to present a petition in support of the Saskatchewan film and television industry. This petition is signed by concerned residents who aren't sure why this government seems to want to kill the film and television industry here in this province. The prayer reads as follows:

To cause the provincial government to make changes to the film employment tax credit that will allow the Saskatchewan film industry to be more competitive with other provinces, to reverse its decision to shut down Saskatchewan Communications Network, and to work with the industry to reverse the decline in film production.

This petition is signed by residents of Saskatoon and Regina. I so present.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

World Health Day

Ms. Junor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. April 7th marked World Health Day. This year's theme is dedicated to urbanization and health, highlighting the impact of urban living on human health and encouraging efforts to make cities healthier places for people to live.

In Saskatchewan we are seeing what it means to have a growing homeless population in our cities and to understand what the health implications of this will be. We have a significant difference in the health of inner-city or core neighbourhood residents. Yet the Sask Party government has done little to address this growing problem.

Nearly all of the global population growth over the next 30 years will occur in cities. Shockingly one in three urban dwellers live in slums amounting to more than 1 billion people worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, in response, leaders around the world are focusing on improving health care. In the United States, President Obama recently introduced long overdue health care reforms. But here in Saskatchewan, the Sask Party is decreasing seniors' access to drug plans, selling off surgeries, de-insuring chiropractic care, and now talking about user fees in the home province of medicare. This is a dire contradiction to what should be the focus of developing healthy populations.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate World Health Day this year, we should demand a sustained public health strategy for Saskatchewan that will strengthen and improve our publicly provided medicare.

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

Accomplishments of Constituents

Ms. Schriemer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is always my pleasure to draw attention to the accomplishments of Saskatoon Sutherland constituents.

I rise in the House today to tell you about Arlene and Robin Karpan. The Karpans are photographers and writers. They own Parkland Publishing and have authored and published nine incredible books with a 10th to come out in April. I have two of their books on my shelf. The photography is stunning. The text is interesting. And they sure know a lot about Saskatchewan.

Their most recent book, *Northern Saskatchewan Canoe Country*, has been featured in newspapers across the country from Vancouver to Montreal. They have contributed to over 100 publications worldwide and they sell stock photography as well. They recently won the North American Travel Journalists Association 2009 award in landscape and seascape category for their photography of Saskatchewan's own Athabasca Sand Dunes which was published in the *Canadian Geographic*

Travel magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members — including the opposition members so rudely interrupting me — to congratulate Arlene and Robin for this most recent award and thanking them for the contribution to our province. Thank you.

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

Frontier Mall Wall of Fame

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again The Battlefords have celebrated individuals who have contributed greatly to our community's and our country's quality of life.

On Saturday, March the 20th, at the induction ceremony of the Frontier Mall Wall of Fame, the 11th and largest such ceremony in the history of the event, five wonderful people were honoured with a place in the Wall of Fame. This year's inductees include Pearl Balych, M. Junice Headley, Ginny Gendall, and Marguerite and Floyd Hawley.

One of the inductees, during her acceptance speech, really spoke for the many current and past Battlefords and area citizens who have been honoured by their community. Pearl Balych simply said, "I am what I am. I do what I can with as much as I can, for as long as I can."

The Wall of Fame is a highly visible tribute in a very high-traffic location in a community with a great deal of high-level spirit. So I ask all members to join me in congratulating the inductees into the Frontier Mall Wall of Fame for 2010, and congratulating the staff and businesses at the mall, especially special events coordinator, Rachel Magnus, who brought it all together for this memorable afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cannington.

Agri-Tourism in Saskatchewan and Quebec

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This past weekend a delegation from Saskatchewan travelled to the Charlevoix region of Quebec. The region, which is just over an hour's drive east of Quebec City, is known for its very successful agri-tourism industry.

Their success is based on the local production and branding of high-quality products and a unique cultural blend which are then integrated into an agri-tourism strategy that seeks to boost the fortunes of all partners through both local sales and the exports of these value-added products to new markets.

The Charlevoix region of Quebec has had significant success in reinvigorating its local economy through this strategy which emphasizes economic strengths and success. They have also been collaborating closely with the ACF [L'Assemblée communautaire francosaskoise], Saskatchewan's francophone community, to share best practices and lessons learned throughout this region in the past 20 years.

Our delegation met with local mayors, tourism entrepreneurs, producers, and food processors in the Charlevoix region. Their

main purpose was to witness and learn from the different successful private and municipal sector initiatives in this region of Quebec. This trip provided an opportunity to showcase Saskatchewan's products in a region that has a thriving hospitality and food sector. These efforts could lead to additional partnerships between both provinces.

Mr. Speaker, as Saskatchewan takes its place as a leader in the new West, our rural areas will continue to add strength and vitality to our province's economy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

2010 First Nations Winter Games

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, another successful Saskatchewan First Nations Winter Games wrapped up this past Friday. Athletes from First Nations throughout the province gathered in Saskatoon to play their hearts out and to make their communities proud. A remarkable 3,500 athletes competed in the games — 1,000 more athletes than the Vancouver Olympics. Yet while this government spent \$8 million on its Vancouver presence, its presence at the First Nations Winter Games was negligible in comparison.

I was honoured to take part in the opening ceremonies with First Nations leaders including AFN [Assembly of First Nations] Chief Atleo, FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] Chief Lonechild, and Saskatoon Tribal Council Chief Thomas, among others — and, just as important, the young athletes who were eager and excited about this amazing experience. It was virtually impossible not to catch their contagious enthusiasm. It is clear to see that these young people will go on to become leaders in community, business, and perhaps even in government. But the Sask Party government chose not to take part in this event.

The discipline, pride, and overwhelming community spirit displayed by these future leaders is even more impressive in the face of this government's treatment of First Nations and Métis people — more than two years of disrespect, funding cuts, and zero consultation — yet these games showed their spirit and strength will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join with me in congratulating Chief Felix Thomas of the Saskatoon Tribal Council for hosting these successful games and wishing our congratulations to all the athletes, organizers, and volunteers at the First Nations Winter Games.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Carrot River Valley.

Tri-Town Thunder Hockey Team Wins Championship

Mr. Bradshaw: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again great news from Carrot River Valley constituency. This past weekend saw the Tri-Town Thunder Junior B hockey team win the provincial championships. It didn't come easy as the Pilot Butte Storm took it right to the seventh and deciding game, which was held in Carrot River.

Mr. Speaker, both teams had outstanding seasons. The Pilot Butte Storm lost only six games through the regular season, and the Tri-Town Thunder only lost three. This set up a great playoff.

Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Town Thunder is made up of three communities: Carrot River, Arborfield, and Zenon Park. These towns are all based in the Carrot River Valley constituency, and many of the players come from the local area. This is a great example of how the people and communities of Saskatchewan get along, especially the Northeast.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, it was a full barn Saturday night with 1,137 people showing up. The 50/50 was \$3,300 which, by the way, I didn't win. The Tri-Town Thunder won 4-1, but the score wasn't indicative of the game as we were on the edge of our seats all night.

Mr. Speaker, the Thunder now heads to Kamloops for the Western Canadian playoffs. I would like all members of this Assembly to wish them the best of luck. Thank you.

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

Saskatchewan Resource Statistics

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, we thought we'd seen it all when it comes to the Sask Party's inability to accurately estimate anything. But then, the Minister of CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] jetted off to Montreal to speak to the consular corps. She went there to proudly proclaim that a whopping 20 per cent of the entire world's natural resources come from right here in Saskatchewan — 20 per cent. Who knew, Mr. Speaker?

According to the minister, out of all of the potash, uranium, oil, gas, minerals, forestry, animals, and water covering the entire globe, one-fifth of all of that comes from here in Saskatchewan.

Now there's no doubt that Saskatchewan has a lot of resources, but the fact that the minister's estimate was completely off base was obvious to just about everyone. Here's what *The Financial Post* had to say about the minister's estimate: "Twenty per cent of the world's natural resources? That's a lot, considering all the natural resources the province is not awash in, like tin, zinc, nickel and others."

Clearly the minister has been taking lessons in resource revenue projections from her colleague from Kindersley, but surely even this estimate is beyond his wildest imagination. Under pressure from the media, the minister realized her estimate was grossly inaccurate, and she issued a correction stating that she was misquoted by her own news release, written by her own staff and approved by her. Isn't this typical of the Sask Party? Wild-eyed cheerleading, completely inaccurate numbers, and off-loading responsibility every chance they get.

QUESTION PERIOD

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

Kidney Transplants

Ms. Junor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In July of 2009, it was announced that Saskatchewan's kidney transplant program would be suspended. To the minister: what's the status of the kidney transplant program in Saskatoon now?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as of now, the kidney transplant program in Saskatoon is not in operation. We are short of a few cardiovascular surgeons that would work on this program, Mr. Speaker, and when we are able to recruit those, that program will be up and running.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan need to know that if they are in need of a kidney transplant, that our province, if they are medically fit, that our province will be paying for those transplants out of province. We have had 12 just in the past year that have received that very service outside the province, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, as of March 2010 there were three transplant nephrologists in Saskatchewan, and there are 106 patients waiting for a kidney transplant. There have been 12 patients sent to Edmonton between July 28th of '09 and March of 2010 for transplants, cost unknown. The transplant specialists are frustrated and wondering why the minister is not reopening Saskatoon for kidney transplants.

To the minister: we do have the specialists, and there is a need for the service. Why is he dragging his feet and choosing to send patients to Edmonton instead of reopening Saskatoon for transplants?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the Saskatoon Health Region, we are working to make sure that we have the proper complement of specialists in the various areas, whether it's here in Regina with the gynecology oncologist, Mr. Speaker, or transplant surgeons, Mr. Speaker, or various specialties around the province that are hard to recruit. We are working to recruit those, and that is exactly why our government has moved forward and put a physician recruitment strategy and agency in place, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately for many years under the NDP [New Democratic Party], we saw 1,160 health care professionals leave this province, Mr. Speaker. We are starting in a deficit position, but in the first two and a half years, we've made great gains. There's more work to do.

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

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, that rhetoric just does not fly with people who are watching this and needing the service. Sandi Pochay is in the gallery today while her husband Dion lays in Royal University Hospital in Saskatoon waiting for a kidney

transplant. Dion was told in February in Saskatoon that he was a candidate for kidney transplant surgery, but he can't get the surgery in Saskatchewan because the minister won't reopen the Saskatoon kidney transplant unit.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister: if Dion doesn't get a transplant, his wife says he will die. What is the minister going to do to save Dion's life?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, I will not be commenting on individual cases in this House, but what I will comment on is the delivery of health care in the province. And what I will also say is that if a patient is medically stable who requires a kidney transplant, they will be looked after if it's out of province, Mr. Speaker. Our government will pay for that service out of province if they're medically stable. I will not comment on a case-by-case situation. That is the process that has been conducted in this province over the last number of months, and it's obvious when we see 12 people, who are medically stable that needed a transplant, were sent out of the province to receive that service.

[14:00]

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

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, 12 people out of 106. What about the others? Who is going to save them? This family needs an answer now. The transplant program was cut without any notice. Patients are being sent out of the province at unknown additional cost to the health system, the patients, and their families. The minister does have the authority to reinstate the program. Mr. Speaker, will the minister commit today to reinstate the kidney transplant program in Saskatoon and save the lives of people like Dion Pochay?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we have a physician recruitment agency now that will be looking around the world to try and attract more physicians to our province. In the first two and a half years, I think that we have done quite well in attracting 164 more physicians — 72 specialists, 92 GPs [general practitioner] — to our province which is a far cry from the record of the previous government, Mr. Speaker. We're moving in the right direction. Absolutely there's more to do, and we would like to see this transplant program up and running in the province. And when we can guarantee that there are the proper complement of specialists, highly trained specialists in the province, the program will be up and running again.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, our government has been there for patients when they are medically stable to go out of province, Mr. Speaker, and receive that treatment. That has been the case in the past number of months, and it will be the case as we move forward, Mr. Speaker.

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

Finance and Electoral Issues

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have in my hand a Court of Queen's Bench judgment. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 2008, Justice Kyle said, and I quote:

... the plaintiff said the specific persons involved are Brad Wall, Doug Emsley, Ken Krawetz, Reg Downs and caucus members who discussed the withholding of the Progressive Conservative trust money.

Mr. Speaker, that's a direct quote. My question is to the Premier: did the Premier, his Deputy Premier, or any member of his caucus ever conspire to take the Progressive Conservative trust money to fix the outcome of the 2007 general election?

The Speaker: — I remind the member of the rules, the rules that were brought into place in 2005 and prior to, that questions relating to political parties or Board of Internal Economy are not directly related to ministerial responsibility. The ministers may or may not choose to answer the questions. I recognize the member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier in his role as the Chair of the Executive Council. Has the Premier and the Deputy Premier or any member of his caucus ever attended a meeting with the trustees of the Progressive Conservative Party trust to conspire to take the money and fix the outcome of the 2007 general election?

The Speaker: — Again I remind the House of the rules implemented by the members of the fact that questions are to be directed toward ministerial responsibility. Anything related to party or board may or may not be responded to. Member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The role of the government and the role of the Executive Council is to act on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan in a manner which is in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan. My question to the Premier is this: how many of the Progressive Conservative trust trustees named in the judgment from the Court of Queen's Bench were or are members or supporters of the Saskatchewan Party?

The Speaker: — I again remind members of rule 19(2), and the fact that questions should be directly related to ministerial duties and responsibilities. I recognize the member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll move my questions then to the Minister of Justice who has a responsibility under law to represent the rule of law. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Justice the following question: since he has been appointed, since he has been appointed Minister of Justice, has he ever met with, talked to, or been aware of any meetings or discussions between the Premier, the Deputy Premier, any caucus member, or any senior staff member with the trustees of the PC [Progressive Conservative] trust fund over the future of the PC trust fund and fixing the fund?

The Speaker: — Just to remind members that questions should

be directly related to a ministerial responsibility, ministerial responsibility. And anything ... The rules are very ... The rules are ...

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. The rules are very clear about anything regarding party, Board of Internal Economy, 19(2). Read the rules. Read the rules. Read the rules. Next question. Next question. Member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that ministers of the Crown don't follow their own legislation. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the Court of Queen's Bench judgment. And I'm going to quote again from Justice Kyle. It says:

It also said that between 2003 and December 2008, the P.C. Party trustees, represented by Douglas Emsley, met with Saskatchewan Party Caucus, Brad Wall and Ken Krawetz. As a result of these meetings, the Saskatchewan Party caucus was informed that the P.C. Party of Saskatchewan would not receive any money from its trust until after the 2007 general election.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Premier: will the Premier admit that he conspired to fix the outcome of the 2007 general election?

The Speaker: — Again I'm not exactly sure where the member from Regina Dewdney is going with the questions, bringing into the Assembly judicial rulings. And in regards to the rules before the Assembly, ministers feel it's their responsibility, they may or may not respond to the question.

I recognize the member from Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to state again that the integrity of a government and the members of Executive Council are paramount to the people's confidence in their government.

Mr. Speaker, this was appealed by the Saskatchewan Party. And I want to read the final quote from Justice Kyle, and I quote:

Clearly, the action against the Saskatchewan Party would not be allowed to proceed if it were just a publicity stunt or an exercise in paranoia but the dual roles of the trustees and the questioned changes in the trust agreement by the trustees raise enough questions that the matter is not plain and obvious and beyond doubt as the precedents require. In the result, therefore, I find that the application fails to meet the established test and it is therefore dismissed with costs in the cause to the plaintiff.

Mr. Speaker, so I ask the Minister of Justice once again: has he ever been part of any meeting, any discussions, or is he aware of any meeting or discussions between the Premier or the Deputy Premier or any member of his caucus with members of the PC trust fund over fixing the trust fund to not allow the Conservative Party to obtain their money?

The Speaker: — I just remind the members of the rules that were implemented, by the rules of the Assembly we've been

operating under for years. And as we have already noted before, the questions should be related directly to ministerial responsibility. Anything with regards to party or Board of Internal Economy, a minister or any one minister of the Crown may choose to respond.

I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Health Care Negotiations

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, on March 8th the Minister of Health told this legislature with respect to health care sector negotiations that, and I quote: “. . . I believe an agreement can be reached and I believe it will be a fair agreement for not only the health care workers but the people of Saskatchewan.”

To the minister: what is the current status of negotiations with health care workers?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I've said before, you know, the status of the negotiations is between the provider unions and SAHO [Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations]. I've been following it through the papers and through media conversations like everybody else has. A final offer has been put forward to the provider unions. It's up to the provider unions to decide whether they want to take that to their membership and allow the membership to vote on it, Mr. Speaker. That is where I believe the negotiations are at right now. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly hoping — as I think many of the providers are, many of the employers are — that an agreement can be reached in very near future.

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, these health care providers look after us, our partners, our parents, our grandparents, our friends, and our loved ones during the most vulnerable moments of our lives. They are special care aides; licensed practical nurses; food service workers; laundry, housekeeping, and activity personnel; maintenance and clerical staff; emergency medical personnel; therapeutic and diagnostic technologists; recreation workers. They are the backbone of the health care system, and this government has refused to bargain with them for nearly three months since late January.

To the minister: how does refusing to negotiate with health care workers improve patient care?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to all the provider unions and all the providers throughout the province, that our government absolutely respects the work that they do day in and day out, whether it's in acute care settings, Mr. Speaker, whether it's in home care, whether it's in long-term care in every one of the constituencies that we represent through rural Saskatchewan as well as urban Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I always, you know, watched negotiations for many years, and it always is a time when it's close to an

agreement that it becomes quite tense. Mr. Speaker, I hope that that's ripening right now. I certainly hope that the provider unions can see fit to take this final offer from SAHO out to their membership and see what their membership has to say about it, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is in the best interest of all, not only the providers but the employers, as well as most importantly the patients, that we get an agreement — an agreement that is good and fair for both.

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard the minister say that he was urging people to take this out to their members to vote on. I'm not sure how that squares with not getting involved. But, Mr. Speaker, health care sector unions wrote to SAHO on March 5th asking them to come back to the bargaining table, but SAHO has not replied.

Now as the minister just did, and the minister will try to hide behind SAHO if he wants, but everyone knows the government is directing contract negotiations. They've injected themselves directly into these talks by instructing SAHO to refuse to negotiate with unions, and now nobody believes this minister when he claims otherwise.

To the minister: if he's really interested in a negotiated settlement and not just getting his own way as he earlier mentioned here, why doesn't he order SAHO back to the bargaining table?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said, in the two and a half years that I've been the minister, I will not get involved in the negotiations between the employer and the provider unions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that SAHO has put together what they feel is a final offer to the provider unions. That was a couple of months ago. It's up to those provider unions to decide as to whether they want to take job action if they so choose or move it out and have their membership vote on it. I think that SAHO is waiting for that decision to be made, Mr. Speaker. And until that decision is made, we will I guess remain in this holding pattern because a final offer has been made by SAHO.

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the minister tries to backtrack, he has said he wanted that offer to go out for a vote. And we heard that in here first. So I think you should accept this responsibility. He should also, Mr. Speaker . . . that this government, it's quite clear, won't negotiate with health care workers. But instead, even though they've mismanaged the finances, they want to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars advertising its so-called final offer.

[14:15]

It's a final offer, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that forces home care workers to be available for 12 hours while getting paid for

eight. It ties the reclassifications of licensed practical nurses to acceptance of the final offer, despite the fact that this is a right that has already been won previously, Mr. Speaker. It's a short-sighted agreement that creates working conditions that'll make it harder to recruit and retain health care workers. But this government refuses to negotiate changes with the workers, believing that it knows best.

To the minister: why is this government so determined to pursue this final offer? Why won't it return to the bargaining table and negotiate with health care workers?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said, that SAHO has put together a final offer, and it is in the hands now of the provider unions to decide in which direction they want to go.

I would think that, you know, when you look at what other provinces are doing, there are a number of other provinces that have settled agreements, as well as even within our province with the SGEU [Saskatchewan Government & General Employees' Union] and government workers, the agreements have been settled. It's amazing to see how those numbers have adjusted over the last year or so, kind of reflecting some of the situation that economies are finding themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say the SAHO offer is fair or not fair. I think it offers a positive offer to the provider unions, Mr. Speaker, especially in respect to what you're seeing in other provinces.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Support for Northerners

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, I was at the Northern Saskatchewan Trappers' Association convention in La Ronge this last weekend. The government's own budget document says the Trappers' Association funding will be eliminated. The trappers need to know the truth today.

To the Minister: since he was nowhere to be seen at the convention this weekend, can he tell the trappers today how much this Sask Party government is cutting from their budget?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for First Nations and Métis Relations.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the members of the opposition would spend as much time looking in the budget to see what is there instead of concentrating on what's not there, they would understand the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the real question is what are we doing to build the economy of northern Saskatchewan? A 70 per cent increase to the Clarence Campeau Development Fund, Mr. Speaker, \$1.4 million in order to build three brand new enterprise regions to drive the northern economy. And certainly, Mr. Speaker . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we're finally prepared to continue our answer. \$1.3 million to build new enterprise regions to drive economic development in the northern economy, Mr. Speaker, a 70 per cent increase to the Clarence Campeau Development

Fund, money for the fishery industry, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, more on the way. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of the Sask Party government's making hurtful cuts without having any idea what they're actually cutting. In their desperate attempt to cover up their incompetence, their reckless financial mismanagement, the government makes hasty cuts without even thinking of the consequences that the people are being affected by those consequences.

To the Minister: when will he set aside his scripted answers and admit that these short-sighted cuts are simply a cover-up for the government's fiscal mismanagement?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for First Nations and Métis Relations.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Mr. Speaker, the only prescriptive answers that I'm hearing are from the opposition. The only thing that I can see, the way desperation is from the opposition. They're desperately trying to cover up the fact that they did nothing for 16 years to build the northern economy.

Mr. Speaker, we're helping the fishery industry. We're helping the mining industry, the forest industry, money for Clarence Campeau, brand new \$3 million fund for First Nations economic development, Mr. Speaker, and \$1.3 million to build the enterprise regions. Who could ask for more? Only these people. Why are they asking? Because they don't know what's in the budget, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party government clearly has no understanding of the importance of the Saskatchewan trapping industry. The industry generates two and a half million dollars of revenue through fur sales alone. Not only millions . . . And also to note, millions are generated with spinoff benefits to local economies.

To the minister: why is he forcing the trapping industry, the northern Saskatchewan, to suffer because of his government's mismanagement?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for First Nations and Métis Relations.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous opportunity to debate the issue. If we want to talk about suffering in the northern economy, how about 16 years of mismanagement and neglect on the part of that former government with respect to the fishing industry, an industry which is in decline, whose very viability is suspect. They did absolutely nothing for 16 years and watched the thing go down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, we've done more to invigorate the fishing industry in two years than they did in 16. I'll be happy to talk with the Trappers' Association any time about their specific needs. If they have a particular program they'd to apply to, a particular

function, we will be happy to address that, Mr. Speaker, in the fullness of time.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Mr. Vermette: — Mr. Speaker, the northern enterprise regions are this minister's answers for everything related to northern Saskatchewan. But he's been talking about these enterprise regions since he became a minister, and northern Saskatchewan has had nothing to show for it. To the minister: when will the people of northern Saskatchewan expect more just rhetoric and hurtful cuts from the Sask Party government?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for First Nations and Métis Relations.

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I dare say that you know half of the communities that our consultants have been to, the member opposite couldn't even find on the map.

Mr. Speaker, our consultants have gone to every single community in northern Saskatchewan where economic development is under way in order to talk about the start-up of these three brand new enterprise regions. When will it happen, the member asks, his colleagues asked. It's happening as we speak. An entire year of consultation led to a request for \$1.3 million in the budget to activate these regions. That actually is on the table today. I welcome these individuals to join us in supporting the budget so this good work can continue in the future. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Why is the Government House Leader on his feet?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I ask the member, Government House Leader to state his point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you review the comments in question period by the Opposition House Leader. He was impugning the honour of a number of members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, including the Premier, in accusing the members of fixing the 2007 election and fraud, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that you review those, that you ask . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I ask the members to allow the member to put his point of order. They can . . . Order. They can respond to the point of order when their opportunity arises. Government House Leader.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That the Opposition House Leader withdraw those remarks and apologize unequivocally.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The

member opposite is making a point of order based on quotes, Mr. Speaker, and quotations from a legal judgment from the Court of Queen's Bench, Mr. Speaker, from Justice Kyle on June the 18th, 2008. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again read this into the record. It says, "... the plaintiff said the specific persons involved are Brad Wall, Doug Emsley, Ken Krawetz, Reg Downs and caucus members who discussed the withholding of the Progressive Conservative trust money."

The second quote I used, Mr. Speaker, said:

It also said that between 2003 and December 2008, the P.C. Party trustees, represented by Douglas Emsley, met with Saskatchewan Party Caucus, Brad Wall and Ken Krawetz. As a result of these meetings, the Saskatchewan Party caucus was informed that the P.C. Party of Saskatchewan would not receive any money from its trust until after the 2007 general election.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many other quotes in this document as well. Mr. Speaker, those were direct quotations from a legal document, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I've heard the points of order, and to ensure that I come back with a fair ruling, I will review the *Hansard* and return with the ruling tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government Whip.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to order the answers to questions 1235 through 1349.

The Speaker: — Questions 1235 through 1349 are ordered.

An Hon. Member: — Leave to introduce guests.

The Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Fairview has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, to you and through you, to introduce a number of guests that have joined us in the east gallery, members of SEIU [Service Employees International Union] West, and I ask all members here to welcome these hard-working health care workers to their legislature.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 132

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Heppner that **Bill No. 132 — *The Wildlife Habitat Protection (Land Designation) Amendment Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

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

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to rise and speak to Bill No. 132, an Act to amend *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* and to make consequential amendments to the Acts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this Bill is full of some areas that concern us. One, it is saying that what they're going to do is find a new way to sell Crown land that is protected under *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. They're going to find three new ways actually of selling off wildlife protected land.

Mr. Speaker, this from a government that has a terrible track record, especially when it comes to environment. This is a government that campaigned in the 2007 general election campaign saying they were going to reduce CO₂ emissions by some 32 per cent based on the 1996 base year, which was the same promise that New Democrats were making in the election. They said us too. That's what the Sask Party said then. Well what do they say now, Mr. Speaker? Now they say we're going to reduce that. No longer is it going to be 32 per cent reduction in CO₂ based on '96. It's now a 20 per cent reduction based on two years earlier — 1994 — so they have a lower start and a much lower reduction in CO₂.

It's a government that can't be trusted when it comes to environmental promises, and we are very concerned about wildlife habitat protection from especially when that Sask Party government decides it's going to make some changes in *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. We're very concerned. The track record is dismal when it comes to the Sask Party government and environment, and we're concerned for wildlife. We're concerned for the entire future of Saskatchewan lands.

You know, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, Mr. Speaker, has come into play over a huge number of years. Frankly I won't pretend that New Democrats invented it. That just would, I think, belie the reality of the situation. Wildlife protection is something that all Saskatchewan people share in and should properly share in. But we have always . . . in the 24 years I've been a member of this legislature, every step, virtually every step that's been taken in wildlife habitat protection has been a strengthening of protected area. It's been a step forward in looking after wildlife and in enhancing protected areas, every step for the relatively short period of time I've been here; it's only two dozen years.

And now we have this which is, it outlines three separate ways that Crown land can be sold. In the explanation to Bill 132, *An Act to amend The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*, it says, "This amendment repeals the Schedule listing designated lands." So those designations are gone. It goes on, "The province is positioned to adopt a new strategic approach to evaluate and

manage ecological, social and economic values on Crown land in the surveyed area of Saskatchewan and ensure protection of critical features while enabling sale of the land."

[14:30]

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, with the track record . . . I've talked about CO₂. We've talked over the time of this, just this spring session, we've talked about many things that the Sask Party government and environment have . . . It just doesn't square. And we frankly have huge concerns when we hear the Sask Party government saying they're going to find new ways of evaluating social and economic values on Crown land. Just what does that mean? You know, without casting too deep an aspersion, it feels a bit akin to me of putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop, with the track record that the government has with respect to environment. So Bill 132 causes us concern.

We want, certainly on this side of the legislature, we want to get the legislation right. We want, we want to enhance wildlife protection. We want to leave our Saskatchewan a better province, not only for my children but for my grandchildren and yours and everybody. We want this province to be a place that we can hold our heads up high and be proud to call it home and to know, Mr. Speaker, that we've done the right thing, to know that we've done the things that we could in wildlife protection, to know that we've done the things that are appropriate, particularly once the Crown gets Crown land for environmental reasons.

There's a reason that the environmentally sensitive land came into Crown hands with respect to much of it, Mr. Speaker. And we want to make sure that we're taking steps forward to enhance that protection, not steps backward, not saying, oh well we'll sell this land under certain conditions. Well what's the certain condition? More money? Too much money? I mean we only left two and a half billion dollars for them to spend, I guess. That was our mistake. We didn't leave a big enough slush fund, a big enough amount of money in the General Revenue Fund for the Sask Party to burn up because they've turned an over \$2 billion surplus into a . . . now it's — what? — a \$1.4 billion deficit.

They've stripped all of the Crowns of its equity. We saw reports . . . I got home last night, saw a report where SaskTel . . . They've stripped all of the retained earnings from last year and this year. And what a shame that is because those retained earnings go into the General Revenue Fund to support the wild, exorbitant expenditures of the Sask Party government. But it's money that belongs to all of the people of Saskatchewan. And it's forcing — in that case last night — that decision is forcing SaskTel to borrow money and that's going to drive up costs of our telephone and our Max services and our Internet services and the things that SaskTel provides.

I predict that we're going to see a 911 increase, an increase in rate that they charge us for the 911 fee, and all it is, is just going to be a hidden tax to try and grab a bit of money because how could anyone be opposed to providing 911 service? It's just a revenue grab, and we're seeing it at virtually every turn from the Sask Party government.

And I think that this sale of designated Crown land that is

designated as wildlife habitat protection Act, this move to enable this sale of some of that land under, they say, certain undefined conditions. But forgive us for thinking that this is nothing but a dollar grab on behalf of the Sask Party which can't seem to find enough money to meet its spending needs.

The Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — With leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The Minister of Agriculture has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, in the west gallery, introduce Chad MacPherson who is general manager of the Stock Growers Association in the province.

Mr. Speaker, with great interest, he's taking in the debate this afternoon. As we know, the stock growers are in support of this Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act that's before the House today and, as I said, are taking great interest in how the debate is going today, and hoping that this Bill proceeds forward. So I would ask all members to welcome Chad to his legislature today.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 132 — *The Wildlife Habitat Protection (Land Designation) Amendment Act, 2009* (continued)

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back to Bill 132, *An Act to amend The Wildlife Habitation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a 14-clause-long Bill. I say that merely to point out that it's not merely housekeeping. This is a Bill that makes a fundamental change to *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*.

This is a Bill that allows the Sask Party government to decide when they're going to sell Crown land. It allows the government to set new social and economic values on the Crown land and without any explanation of what these social and economic values are. So it leaves us to question whether the economic value might simply be the highest bidder.

You know if . . . Not to pick on anybody. I'll take a fairly safe sounding Canadian name. If Canadian Tire wants to buy some land that's protected under *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, is it simply a matter of them making a big enough offer for the land, and then they can set up a Canadian Tire store or whatever

else they might want to do there? And I want to make this crystal clear. I utilize Canadian Tire myself. I think it's a fine company. I'm in no way trying to cast any aspersions. It's a good Canadian-sounding name, and it's a fairly decent sized company. That's the only reason that I named them, but it could . . . You can substitute the name of any individual or any company.

And is the question simply, how deep is your wallet? How much money are you prepared to pay for this Crown land that is protected under *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* under the old rules?

But under the new rules, well there's the question of social and economic values on the Crown land. And what are those social values? Does scrub brush or a bog have social value? I don't have the answer to that, Mr. Speaker. But there's no answer in this Bill either. Nor is there an attempt at explaining what it is about, Mr. Speaker.

But what we do know is that we are being asked to buy, by the Sask Party government, being asked to buy that this is a step forward in wildlife habitat protection Act. And we're very skeptical. The reason we're skeptical, you don't have to look very far. You can cast yourself back 15 minutes ago when questions weren't being answered in question period.

Again I've not ever, I've never seen that in the 24 years I've been here. I've never seen it where you can't have an opposition ask questions and the government respond. I just have never seen it. And it was repeated questions. I could scarcely believe what was happening today. And this after the same, similar questions asked yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, we're being asked to pass a wildlife habitat protection Act Bill and we're not . . . I read the minister's introductory remarks when he introduced the Bill. There's nothing there that reassures me on the question that I have here. There's nothing in it that assures me that there's been anything even remotely close to adequate consultation taken place with respect to this Bill.

Certainly we have seen at every turn inadequate consultation on virtually every Bill that I've had the pleasure of speaking to in the House. And I've been listening to some great speeches from colleagues of mine. None as good as my seatmate's speeches, but I've listened to some very good speeches here . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Top-notch speeches, as the member for Regina Rosemont says. And he gives top-notch speeches as well.

But the reason that we're able to, on this side, give decent speeches is it's so easy to find the holes in the legislation. It's so easy to wonder about what the desire of the government is. It's so easy because they're so transparent. They simply need money.

For example they strip all of the money from the Crown corporations, the retained earnings now, strip it all with one exception — SaskPower. Every nickel. And the reason is they stripped SaskPower last year of its retained earnings. But this is a pattern that the last time we saw it was when the Premier was a ministerial assistant in the Grant Devine government. That's the last time we saw this pattern.

We kind of hoped that — or I'd certainly hoped that — right wing parties like the Sask Party would have learned from the history which isn't ancient history, Mr. Speaker. It's not ancient history. And I understand that there would be a philosophical difference between left and right wing people and parties on the left and parties on the right, but my goodness, surely we have an obligation to learn from our own mistakes. Surely we're not doomed to this endless, endless cycle of repeating the same mistakes ad nauseam. Surely mankind is capable of better than that, and I know that Saskatchewan people are capable of much more than that and much better than that.

And frankly, Mr. Speaker, that's why I'm real optimistic about the future for Saskatchewan. I am really optimistic on a whole host of fronts. I'm optimistic for the first time in quite a while. I'm optimistic politically. I'm optimistic that we're going to do very well — New Democrats — in the next general election. I'm optimistic that we're going to have a premier from Regina after the 2011 election. And it's just an awesome feeling for me to see that having turned.

I say that, and I take you back to my very first speech after the Sask Party was elected where I wished the Premier and Sask Party members well. I hoped that they could honour their election commitments and be deserving of a second time. Election commitments like in the environment where they promised to reduce CO₂ emissions by 32 per cent based on the 1996 level. This is an environmental issue that they've now slid, and they've gone from the '96 to '94, two years earlier where there was lower CO₂ emissions. And the reduction is now 20 per cent from 1994, so it's about half the commitment that was made as recently as two and a half years ago in the general election.

And CO₂ and the environment are incredibly important, and it's the same file. When we look at how the Sask Party is managing the environment file and we see how they're managing the wildlife habitat protection file, and we're very, very, very, very skeptical. I just can't begin to explain the concerns I have, and the lack, the fact that the consultation doesn't seem to have taken place. There's no appearance of conservation organizations, wildlife groups being consulted in any meaningful way about whether this is a step forward or not.

In the absence of third party validators, what I'm reduced to believing is this is nothing but a cash grab by a desperate Sask Party government that is grabbing cash from every place that they can. I mean every nook and cranny. It's all of the Crowns being stripped of their money. You look at municipal, municipalities where there was a promise to implement a 1 per cent, equivalent of 1 per cent of the PST [provincial sales tax], and that's been held for the second — held off, fell through — for the second year in a row, with a promise of, well wait until next year. And frankly, we'll see what next year brings.

You know, from 2 billion in the bank to desperation and wondering how are we going to get through this year, never mind next year, how are we going to get through this year — this is a cause for concern. We know that there was very close to 200 million pulled back from long-term health care facilities, most of them in Sask Party members . . . but 200, 200 million in 13 different long-term care homes that the funding was cut to build.

[14:45]

So there's a backlog of need for capital, and I'm wondering if this isn't going to fund 1 or 2 or 3 or 13 of those long-term care homes. I'm wondering if it'll fund the children's hospital that was so long promised and touted by the Sask Party and now, now that is just so far on hold. But it just looks like nothing more than a desperate attempt to get a few million dollars. That's just what it looks like. I mean you look at this from a government that pulled back, and pulled back \$12 million just from chiropractors alone in the budget; did a whole number of things.

I don't want to get too deep into the budget, Mr. Speaker, because I know that what we're dealing with is Bill No. 132, the Act to amend *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* and make consequential amendments to the Act. In some ways, Mr. Speaker, some people would argue that this Bill is really about the very future of, not to put too fine a point on it, but the very future of the world.

I don't mean that Saskatchewan alone bears the full responsibility, but I do mean that Saskatchewan is responsible for our area, our land mass and species on that land mass. And if we act as good stewards, if we do the job in Saskatchewan, we can count on our neighbours in North Dakota, in Montana, in South Dakota, and everywhere else to do their part. And then we have real hope for wildlife right around the world. We can't affect what goes on directly in New Zealand, what they might or might not do respecting wildlife habitat protection, but we can affect what goes on in Saskatchewan and, to a lesser extent, in jurisdictions around us.

If we do nothing or if we take steps backwards that this Act seems to be guilty of, if we do nothing or take steps backwards, that just encourages neighbouring jurisdictions to also reduce their standards when it comes to wildlife habitat protection. And that's just all so wrong-headed on so many levels. In 2010 we cannot go in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

In 2010 we have an obligation to present people and to the future, and we have an obligation certainly to enhance wildlife habitat protection. We have those obligations that are part of what we're about. And we live in a time of so much opportunity, and we're blessed. We have more material wealth today than at any time in Saskatchewan's history or in the history of the world.

We surely can't claim that we lack resources to do what we can to look after critical wildlife habitat. Surely that's not the argument that we're using. And yet, and yet in this very Act we are finding three different ways that Crown land can be sold. Crown land that is covered under the wildlife protection Act today, when we change this, that some of that very Crown land is going to be assessed by the Sask Party for its value. Social and economic value will be assessed and some of it will be sold. If it wasn't going to be sold, there would be no reason for this Act. There'd be zero reason for Bill No. 132 if the intention wasn't to sell off some of that critical wildlife protected land.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I was instrumental in helping to — I don't want to take too much of the credit for it — but I was instrumental in helping recruit Lorne Scott to this . . . [inaudible]

interjection] . . . I need all the credit I can get; you're right. But getting Lorne Scott to this very legislature.

Lorne Scott who was very, very early on, he was one of the founding members of the whooping crane organization that saved whooping cranes. Lorne Scott, who if you ever have the opportunity to get into his relatively humble home, you'll find on the wall pictures and scrolls and letters from royalty around the world. Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II has written him, has given him awards for his work in wildlife habitat protection and in wildlife protection. He is known literally around the world.

That's sort of the thing that makes me hold my head up proudly and say, you know, I'm a New Democrat and I want to do the things that Lorne Scott would have me do. I want to do the things that not only Lorne Scott but many, many other people in Saskatchewan and indeed around the world want to do with respect to wildlife habitat protection.

I am nervous as can be when I hear the Sask Party government say they want to sell off some of this Crown land. I am nervous that Lorne Scott was probably not consulted by the government. I am nervous that the pattern of introduce legislation, grab the money, and oh, we'll maybe be able to explain it later. I'm nervous that that's the pattern I'm seeing with this Bill, *An Act to amend The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts*. It is not a housekeeping Act. If it was housekeeping, there would be no significant question. There certainly wouldn't be a listing of how you could go about selling off protected Crown land.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have other colleagues that are going to want to engage in this discussion. I know that I've just scratched the surface of some of the problems that are potential problems with this Act. I've not seen any good purpose in this Act in my perusal. I hope I've missed something. I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, that this Act is doing something positive.

An Hon. Member: — They don't call him eagle eye for nothing.

Mr. Trew: — They don't call him eagle eye for nothing was the side call. And it's the first time I knew I was called eagle eye, but thank you. Mr. Speaker, I hope, I hope, I hope that there is something good in this Act. I haven't found it. I know that I have colleagues that are going to be making calls to people that do care about wildlife.

I know that we're going to be asking some questions further to this, serious questions about how this is going to enhance the protection of a single species. How is this going to guarantee that wildlife is protected? This has to be about much more than commerce. This has to be about way more than the Sask Party's idea of how to move an economy forward. This has to be about protecting wildlife. This has to be about enhancing the protection, the lands that are protected. As I said earlier in my speech, Mr. Speaker, this has to be a step forward, not a step backward. This has to, this has to do something positive for wildlife in Saskatchewan and in a greater area than Saskatchewan because as we know, the waterfowl for example are migratory and there's all sorts of migratory birds.

And in fact, I saw in today's, maybe not in today's paper, but

recently I saw about a Canadian lynx that was captured near Banff, if I have it right, and taken down to Colorado. And it wound up as part of a species propagation system, but it had fathered, sired five of six, I think, lynx before it was trapped back in Canada. And it had actually worked its way all the way back, so we know now that Canadian lynx are migratory as well or at least capable of travelling.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have lots of questions around this Bill. And I know that I have other colleagues that are going to have questions as well. So I move that we adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The member from Regina Coronation Park has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 132. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

Bill No. 119

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 119 — *The Ticket Sales Act*** be now read a second time.]

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to weigh in on debate here today this afternoon with respect to Bill No. 119, *An Act respecting the Sale of Tickets*. It's a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that we've had some consultation with Saskatchewan people that certainly needs to have more consultation.

But it's a Bill that's come to this legislature unfortunately following the same path that so many pieces of legislation have taken under the Sask Party, and that's that they put together this legislation and laws in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker, and the Sask Party doesn't consult with anybody through that process. And then they put forward legislation and need to all of a sudden be chasing their tails and doing this consultation afterwards to see how they can clean up their legislation.

And it comes from a government, the Sask Party that has broken the trust with Saskatchewan people as it relates to health care, cost of living, financial mismanagement, and a whole host of other issues, Mr. Speaker. It's a result of broken promises, Mr. Speaker. And Saskatchewan people are saying that they won't be taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, by the ways of the Sask Party and the damage of their decisions.

Now this Bill is not necessarily of great or significant consequence when you look at the big issues that we are facing in health care and cost of living and financial mismanagement. And we do think that that's where the primary debate within this House is best served, because these are major issues for Saskatchewan people, and where our focus and our attention as legislators needs to be. It's certainly where the opposition New Democrats are taking the debate on a daily basis here in this legislature, recognizing that the health care needs of our

communities and our families, Mr. Speaker, are not being met by the Sask Party. And in fact we're going backwards, Mr. Speaker, on so many of these fronts.

Yet we speak to Bill No. 119 here today, *An Act respecting the Sale of Tickets*. And we do have some comments as well specifically to that piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that again, like so many other pieces of legislation put forward by the Sask Party, has been created in a vacuum without relying on the stakeholders within our community, the businesses that are affected, the people who are affected. And as a result, we have many pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker, put forward by the Sask Party that have unintended consequences that are not desirable.

So we're pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we hear signals, Mr. Speaker, that the Sask Party has been willing to sort of clean up this legislation, put forward some amendments to fix their broken legislation on this front, as pushed and as advocated by the opposition New Democrats. And this is something important to our province and specifically to many of the businesses in our province that are affected by this legislation.

In principle, certainly we support the concept of stopping the large-scale ticket reselling by companies and automated systems, Mr. Speaker. We think that we want to make sure that we have an equitable opportunity for individuals to access entertainment in this province, and we want to make sure that individuals aren't exploited through this process. So we support that principle, Mr. Speaker, but the objective of the legislation needs to be fulfilled, Mr. Speaker, if it's to be good legislation that actually makes a change for the better. And that's where this current state of this legislation gets hung up, and where it's reflective of the ill-derived nature of how it arrived to this very legislature.

[15:00]

But we support the idea in principle. We do have some specific concerns, Mr. Speaker, and some of those would be that we believe that this Bill, this will be a Bill that will rely heavily on well-written regulations. And like so many pieces of legislation, this is something that is very important. It's the devil in the details, Mr. Speaker. And we need to have well-written regulations, something that the Sask Party has proven themselves huge failures with, Mr. Speaker, and we see that in health care, in cost of living, in financial mismanagement, and so many portfolios and pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

If the government messes up the regulations, then the people who should be allowed to transfer tickets, for example, will be blocked and others that should be stopped will not be. And we need to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that that's not the case. We want to make sure that we fulfill the objective of the legislation, the principle of it, and in fact don't put forward something that's ... create something that's not practical for Saskatchewan people.

In many, many meetings with respect to this legislation, it's been brought up that there could be significant challenges for communities and community events and junior sport. And we want to make sure that junior sport and rodeos, for example, all sorts of activities at the local levels within the heart of our

communities across Saskatchewan aren't affected by this legislation, Mr. Speaker. And that's something that the opposition New Democrats have driven home in the debate on this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

And there is a great deal of technical work that needs to be done to prevent automated systems from buying tickets to live up to the intent of this Bill.

And the minister has said in the media that this is a work-in-progress and that there is ... But there's no solution to date, Mr. Speaker. And that's the kind of information that we need to have at this level, Mr. Speaker, to be able to have the kind of worthy debate and discussion that should go on in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. It's the kind of discussion that we expect will occur at committee and by engaging the important stakeholders that this Bill affects.

We need to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, you know, that this Bill will do nothing, or we would need to recognize that this Bill will do nothing to prevent scalping at the individual level. And we wouldn't want that pretense to be there that this impacts that. It makes no change, Mr. Speaker, on that front. And that's something that maybe could be discussed at the committee level.

And we want to compare, and it should be compared, to what other provinces are doing, Mr. Speaker, what other jurisdictions are doing on this front, Mr. Speaker. Because many times when you're looking at legislation, that's where many of the best lessons can be learned, to see where best practice is being employed in other jurisdictions and what can be learned from the experience of other jurisdictions that have gone at what will be a challenge for many, many, many jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker.

So what we see is a government that has dug their head into the sand on this important legislation, as they have on so many pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker. And instead of consulting with Saskatchewan people, they've in fact neglected to consult, Mr. Speaker, and that's problematic. And we see the kind of changes that need to be made here. We don't know yet what those amendments are going to be, Mr. Speaker, but we need to make sure that those amendments address the concerns of Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan businesses. And we speak specifically through groups such as tour operators, Mr. Speaker.

And I would point out that we shouldn't necessarily be doing this kind of cleanup at this point in time, Mr. Speaker. We should be doing this before legislation gets to the very Assembly. That being said, New Democrats are proud to play the important role that we do of providing the kind of oversight and scrutiny to clean up the Bills that the Sask Party puts forward in an ill-derived fashion, Mr. Speaker, in many ways that are harmful and not going to fulfill the objectives that they've set out, Mr. Speaker. So we're pleased to play that role and assist the Sask Party to get that legislation right. We need to be doing some of this at the committee level. And we need to make sure we're fully understanding what those amendments are going to be, Mr. Speaker.

But I don't want to take too much time in this Assembly to be talking about Bill No. 119 because the issues that we know, Mr.

Speaker, that are most important to Saskatchewan people is the huge failure and broken trust as it relates to health care, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to cost of living, and as it relates to the financial mismanagement of the Sask Party government, Mr. Speaker.

We need to give huge priority and huge time, Mr. Speaker, and the significant priority that that debate should be provided within this legislature. And certainly we can assist in cleaning up legislation that was put together poorly and recklessly by the Sask Party, such as this legislation as it relates to the reselling of tickets, a principle that we support or a piece of legislation that we support in stopping the reselling of tickets in a circumstance of exploiting individuals and consumers and putting forward that kind of consumer protection. But we need to make sure we get it right, Mr. Speaker.

And I should say that, you know, of course this government puts forward a piece of legislation, exemplified here today, without any consultation. And we see this on so many fronts. We see it in agriculture, Mr. Speaker. And with so many meetings last week when we were away from this Legislative Building, we had so many circumstances where we talked about the lack of consultation in agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly we see it in groups such as labour and the mismanagement . . .

The Speaker: — Why is the member from Regina Dewdney on his feet?

Mr. Yates: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The member from Regina Dewdney may state his point of order.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to raise my point of order at the earliest opportunity after some further research and consideration of questions put before the Assembly today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I asked several questions of both the Premier and the Minister of Justice. Mr. Speaker, at any time under rule 19(2), a member has the authority or has the right not to answer a question. The minister has a right, pardon me, not to answer a question.

But Mr. Speaker, when questions are asked relevant to their responsibilities as a member of the Executive Council, it should be incumbent upon the minister to answer that question or refuse to answer that question, not necessarily intervened by the Speaker.

I'd like to make this point in regards to the questions asked of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice, by virtue of his office, is the member of the Executive Council that is considered the legal member of the Executive Council, and that's so stated in the legislation, Mr. Speaker. And it is the responsibility for the Minister of Justice to both see that the administration of public affairs is in accordance with the law and the trusts that we were talking about, Mr. Speaker, are within the purview and accordance within the ministerial authority of the Minister of Justice.

Now the Minister of Justice at any time may choose not to answer questions, I indicate in 19(2). But there are serious concerns, raises serious concerns when it's pointed out he doesn't have to answer a question when in fact the question being put does fall within the authority . . . If you look at the legislation responsible for the Department of Justice, Mr. Speaker, and it does clearly state that he is the legal member of the Executive Council and has a responsibility for the administration of public affairs in accordance with the law, which would include those trust funds, Mr. Speaker.

So in asking those questions, Mr. Speaker, it should be appropriate for the Minister of Justice to in fact answer on behalf of the Executive Council because he has the duty and responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to oversee the legislation, oversee the legal parameters of those trusts, Mr. Speaker, and to ensure that those trusts are upheld within the manner of the law.

Mr. Speaker, in fact as indicated in the judgment by Justice Kyle as I had quoted earlier, it talked about, and I'm quoting exactly:

. . . the plaintiff said [that] the specific persons involved are Brad Wall, Doug Emsley, Ken Krawetz, Reg Downs and caucus members who discussed the withholding of the Progressive Conservative trust money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's talking about the trust money, and that trust falls within the purview and responsibility of the Minister of Justice in the province of Saskatchewan. He controls the legislation and oversees those trusts and has a responsibility to maintain the integrity of those trusts under the rule of law in our province, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to review carefully the responsibilities of the Minister of Justice in regards to trusts which fall within the law and under legislation of this province regarding those trusts and to determine whether or not it would have been appropriate or should be appropriate for the Minister of Justice to answer those questions. Thank you.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government Deputy House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Harrison: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order raised by the member opposite, I'm not sure where my learned friend attended law school, Mr. Speaker, but I have a feeling he probably didn't do very well if he did. Mr. Speaker, as a principle of law and as a principle of how this institution works, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is not responsible for commenting on . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I'd ask the opposition leader, come to order and allow the member to at least respond to the point of order in the same manner that the government members allowed the Opposition House Leader to place his point of order. I recognize the Deputy House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Harrison: — Well I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I was attempting to indicate, the Minister of Justice has no responsibility to be commenting on every court decision

made in the courts of this province, Mr. Speaker. I think the assertion by . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I recognize the Deputy House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Harrison: — I think the assertion by members opposite that the Minister of Justice has a responsibility to be commenting on court decisions and matters that are still before the courts, Mr. Speaker, shows a fundamental lack of understanding as to how this institution works and as to how the court system works, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice does not have that responsibility, and frankly it would be very inappropriate for the Minister of Justice to be commenting on matters that are before the courts in this legislature. And I think the arguments put forward by the members opposite are ludicrous.

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I have listened to the point of order. I've listened to the response to the point of order. I have already determined in my own mind that I am going to take a look and review the whole process even before we got to the point of order to ensure that the rules are being appropriately and fairly applied and I will do so. I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where our friend opposite learned his arrogance, Mr. Speaker. I know he's asking where somebody learned their law, but I wonder where that arrogance was learned, Mr. Speaker. And I don't know . . . friendship, maybe at his . . . maybe in his time in schooling. But anyways, Mr. Speaker, I won't focus on the heavy atmosphere of arrogance coming from the member opposite, I'll focus on the . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I would just ask the member to move directly to the debate on 119. Thank you.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, it's the kind of arrogance that we recognize when we see a government that is not willing to consult on pieces of legislation, Mr. Speaker, time and time again. It's that kind of arrogance that we see that derived Bill No. 119 and it's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that put forward a Bill that has consequences, Mr. Speaker, for Saskatchewan businesses that aren't appropriate, Mr. Speaker. It's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that is allowing this government to go out and to shake their pompoms and fail Saskatchewan people on the important issues of health care, cost of living, financial mismanagements within Saskatchewan that are affecting people's lives and communities, Mr. Speaker.

It's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that allows day after day for ministers opposite to not answer questions or be accountable to the public of Saskatchewan who ask those ministers questions, Mr. Speaker. I suspect it's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that allows this government to go about deriving legislation, as it relates to agriculture or First Nations

and Métis or trappers or finances, without any consultation, Mr. Speaker, to the detriment of Saskatchewan people.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that allows even when they do consult — such as in the case of the releasing of their new changes to release private information, health information to health foundations — that they actually reject the wise, independent counsel of the Privacy Commissioner, Mr. Speaker. So I suspect that it's that kind of rich and thick arrogance that comes from the Sask Party, Mr. Speaker, that's much to do with their failures, Mr. Speaker. Much to do with their broken promises.

[15:15]

And I should note it's probably that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that allows the very minister opposite that stands there in his tiny Tory arrogance, Mr. Speaker, and to purport himself as something that he's not in big ways, Mr. Speaker, and then to sign agreements with municipalities and then to go back in front of those very municipalities, Mr. Speaker, to show them just how meaningless, just how meaningless the Sask Party signature is on documents, Mr. Speaker. I suspect it's that kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that's causing the Sask Party all sorts of challenges.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's not what the specific focus is right now. The focus of this legislature needs to be focused primarily on health care and the failures of the Sask Party on that front. It needs to be focused on cost of living and the financial mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, that is going to cost generations to come with the kind of continued trend that we see from this government, Mr. Speaker.

So we not only see arrogance but we see a failure to consult that I believe is representative of their arrogance, Mr. Speaker. And we see them putting forward ill-derived legislation that has consequences, Mr. Speaker, that are negative for Saskatchewan people and that do not fulfill the objective that they set out to do. Now we support the principle of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. But the point is they've put forward legislation that is not practical, that does not actually fulfill that. And that's an embarrassment for a government, Mr. Speaker.

But the Saskatchewan New Democrats have been and will continue to consult with Saskatchewan people, the stakeholders affected by this legislation, Mr. Speaker. We will continue to urge, continue to urge this government to put forward the kind of changes as it relates to amendments to make this legislation work, Mr. Speaker. Because we certainly believe, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan consumers should not be exploited, Mr. Speaker, should not be exploited in the purchase of their entertainment.

But we need to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time we're not hampering our community sports, our community events, and our local activities. We need to make sure that the rodeos across this province that many of the preparations are under way for — many meetings right now planning those very fine events — we need to make sure that we're not in the way, making a practice that has been important and has been custom, to make that impractical and no longer possible, Mr. Speaker.

We need to make sure that the Sask Party can pull their head out of the clouds of arrogance that crowds their cabinet table, Mr. Speaker, and that they can listen to Saskatchewan people, communities, and businesses to make sure they understand how pieces of legislation affect them, Mr. Speaker.

Bill No. 119, we support the principle of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, what we don't support is its ill-derived nature, the way that it arrived at this legislative building without any consultation and the fact that it contains aspects that are negative to Saskatchewan people. We need to make sure we fulfill the objective of this legislation. And that's where the New Democrats are going to stand up for Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan businesses, and make sure we get this legislation right.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up any more time in this Chamber right now because we need to drill down on the important aspects of the failure of the Sask Party on health care, on cost of living, on financial mismanagement. And we'll continue to do that, Mr. Speaker. So at this point in time, with much more consultation to do and many more questions to occur, we'll conduct that at the committee level, and at this point in time I'd like to refer Bill No. 119, an Act respecting the sale of tickets, to committee, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: — Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the Bill . . . The motion brought before the Assembly by the Minister of Justice, that Bill No. 119, *The Ticket Sales Act*, be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried.

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

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

Hon. Mr. Harrison: — I designate that Bill No. 119, *The Ticket Sales Act*, be referred to the Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice Committee.

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

Bill No. 135

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McMorris that **Bill No. 135 — *The Prescription Drugs Amendment Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

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

Mr. Broten: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure this afternoon to join into the discussion on Bill 135, *An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act*, Mr. Speaker, legislation that's been brought forward into this Assembly for our consideration.

The Bill No. 135 is *An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act*. And, Mr. Speaker, it's clear as we as elected officials are out in the community visiting people in the province, among the issues that are always brought up for discussion, among the issues that are so often in question period, are issues to do with health care, issues to do with services that are available to Saskatchewan people from a variety of health care providers.

And here in Saskatchewan we have a very rich and proud history of the development of medicare in North America and the provision of health care services. And for many years, for many decades the people of Saskatchewan have been known as a group of people who look for innovative and positive ways to truly benefit and serve the health needs of Saskatchewan people.

And this is done through a variety of health care providers. I think maybe once upon a time in strictly . . . I won't say once upon a time. But traditionally when people thought of health care, they only thought of physicians and . . . or thought of physicians as paramount. And most certainly physicians have a truly vital, important, and central role to the delivery of health care.

But as our health care system has evolved and developed over the years, a variety of other health care providers have also gained prominence and serve a very important role in our health care system. So whether we're thinking of, in this piece of legislation that's dealing with pharmacists, whether that's the group of health care providers, whether it's other individuals like occupational therapists, physiotherapists, speech language pathologists, lab techs, people working the facilities in health regions, whether that's in roles of security or as maintenance, whether that's various types of nursing, whether that's in a RN [Registered Nurse] capacity or LPN [licensed practical nurse], whether it's someone who's a care aide, it's clear that a well-functioning health care system depends on a wide variety of people all working together, working towards a common goal of serving the health care needs of Saskatchewan people.

So it's a good opportunity when we as elected officials have the chance to look at a piece of legislation that can serve a positive role in improving the health care of Saskatchewan people as its goal and as the objective of the piece of legislation.

And when we're looking today at Bill No. 135, *An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act*, this is a piece of legislation that was brought forward by the Minister of Health to the Assembly to address some of the changes that he sees fit in order to enhance the quality of health care in the province by increasing the safety and some of the regulations and controls about the dispensing of medication.

I would like to state off the top that the role of pharmacists is very important in our health care system. We've seen in opinion polls done by various health professionals that pharmacists are ranked very, very high in the level of trust that people place in

them, in the respect they have for pharmacists, and the relationship between the pharmacist and the patient.

While it is not designed to replace the relationship with a family physician or another physician in a different specialty, it's clear that many people in the province have a very important and close relationship with their pharmacist. And physicians would recognize that the co-operation and the respect that the pharmacy profession has with that of medicine is a strong foundation of a relationship and one that is based on mutual respect and mutual co-operation and sharing a mutual goal of improving the health care of their patients.

And I think that's a very important point to make off the top, that through the professional code of conduct that pharmacists have, that physicians have, that other health care providers have, it's important to note that a primary goal is improving the health of their patients, improving the services that are provided, and doing so in an ethical, responsible, and well-thought-out manner.

And I want to give a huge amount of credit to all the pharmacists practising in the province in a variety of communities — some large communities, some small communities — and in a variety of settings. Sometimes it's a small-town pharmacy that's providing a wide array of services. Sometimes it's a pharmacy that only deals in the dispensing of medication and other over-the-counter medications available. Sometimes the pharmacy is placed within a larger store or business, whether that's a grocery store or a large convenience-type store.

There's a variety of venues that a pharmacist will practise, but whatever the venue, it's clear that the commitment of pharmacists as a profession to the well-being and the safety and the health of their patients is not in question. I think all members would agree with that and all members would thank the role of pharmacists in the province in leading a number of health initiatives, a number of projects to enhance the quality of care of individuals receiving medicine and prescriptions through their role as pharmacist.

The issue that is being brought forward in Bill No. 135 — I had a chance, Mr. Speaker, to read the introductory remarks by the Minister of Health — and it has to do with the reporting mechanism that is in place for the dispensing of codeine tablets. And it's a practice, as I understand in reading some of the background on this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that pharmacists are able to dispense a certain number of codeine tablets to patients, individuals requesting this, but that there hasn't been a reporting mechanism in place through a central electronic source that allows that information to be shared between locations, to ensure that there is not an inappropriate accessing of the drug that's being considered.

So what this piece of legislation is setting out to do, Mr. Speaker, is to allow that information to be plugged into the PIP, which is the pharmaceutical information program.

When we're looking at health care, Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at health care and looking at the delivery of health care services to individuals, a topic of great concern for patients and people in the province are electronic medical records. And this

is something that various health care professionals and people working within the health regions in our province have supported.

Electronic medical records hold a great deal of potential for gaining efficiencies in how health care is provided, for increasing the quality and increasing the safety for patients. Because it allows an individual electronic medical record that is being housed, for example, in a physician's office in a practice that may be anywhere in the province, allowing that electronic medical record to be plugged in to the electronic health record, the larger document that can be viewed and shared through various facilities throughout the province.

So that if an individual is visiting a different town or a different city and they come into a medical problem of some sort and show up in an emergency room, the idea as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is that the health care professionals in that emergency room could access the electronic health record to see what information is available on this patient. For example if there were considerations about certain drugs being given to the patient and there were allergies or complications, a history of allergies or complications. And if the patient was not able to speak for him or herself in the emergency room, the health care professionals in that setting would be able to access the information and ensure that good, quality care is provided.

And that's the idea, as I understand it at least. I don't pretend to be an expert on electronic health records or medical records. But I think most people in Saskatchewan would see the merit in principle in that type of approach and how health care can be enhanced, improved, made more safe through that kind of record and through the PIP, the pharmaceutical information program. If there is a similar ability for sharing that type of information between locations to ensure that individuals are not accessing more drugs than they are supposed to through the pharmacy, then in principle, efforts that are made, efforts that are made to make the system more safe enhance the quality of health care for patients. I think most people in this Assembly would agree that that is a positive thing.

And I can see the need for this type of situation, Mr. Speaker. In many of our communities throughout the province, there are individuals who struggle with addictions and have various challenges and demons that they're facing. And I don't also pretend to be an expert on addictions or on that issue, but I do know through talking to constituents and talking to agencies that are operating in my constituency and in my city of Saskatoon, that it is certainly a concern when there are instances where individuals are going, for example, going to a number of pharmacies and accessing medication or drugs, tablets, in ways that they shouldn't be.

[15:30]

The Speaker: — Why is the member from Saskatoon Northwest on his feet?

Mr. LeClerc: — Leave to introduce a guest, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Northwest has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. LeClerc: — I'd like to introduce to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, sitting in your gallery, Mr. Paul Merriman, the CEO [chief executive officer] of the Saskatoon Food Bank. I've had the privilege to work with Paul, serving Christmas dinners down in the food bank. His father is a good friend of mine, Mr. Ted Merriman, who I replaced as an MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] — attempting to, anyhow. And I would like to welcome him here today to his legislature.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Leave to introduce guests.

The Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Centre has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join the members opposite to welcome Paul Merriman from the Saskatoon Food Bank. I've had the opportunity to work with Paul, as well, and his staff. The food bank is in my riding, and so we get the opportunity to meet and talk about issues that face vulnerable citizens in our community.

And I want to welcome Paul to our legislature, to his legislature. I know he's deeply committed to making a difference to people in our city of Saskatoon and our province. So I ask all to join in welcoming him.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 135 — *The Prescription Drugs Amendment Act, 2009*
(continued)

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Always a pleasure to have guests in the Assembly, and it's always great that members are able to introduce.

Bill 135, *An Act to amend the Prescription Drugs Act*, as I was stating in my opening comments, Mr. Speaker, address changes put forward by the minister to how the dispensing of medication is recorded and how that information is shared among pharmacists in our province.

It was interesting. I was making some comments about having

limited familiarity or exposure to this issue as an MLA for Saskatoon Massey Place and in Saskatoon through exposure to constituents and groups working in my constituency and in the city. It was interesting. It leads me to think about the experience that we saw in question period, Mr. Speaker, where my seatmate, the member from Cumberland, was raising issues about his constituency, issues that I would suggest he's quite familiar with given that he's the MLA for the area, given that he lives in the community of La Ronge, given that he's travelled extensively throughout northern Saskatchewan as a board member of the school boards, as a very active and proud Métis man, and active in the Métis Nation of Saskatchewan.

For the minister to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Cumberland has not travelled to the communities where trappers might be living is quite comical, especially coming from the minister, Mr. Speaker, who represents Regina South, the capital city of our province in southern Saskatchewan.

It was as though, Mr. Speaker, the minister was being tutored by his seatmates, other cabinet colleagues, some from rural Saskatchewan. And I think the advice would be something along the lines, well if you're having trouble in question period, just say, you're not from rural Saskatchewan. You're not from the area. You can't know what you're talking about. Well that was the mantra. But when the member is actually from Cumberland, when the member is actually from the constituency that's being discussed, I think there's a bit of a problem there in the approach.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at Bill No. 135, in addressing the role of the pharmaceutical information program and the changes that are being proposed by the government . . . You see, Mr. Speaker, members opposite, they have this problem where instead of recognizing that they've made an error, instead of recognizing there's a weakness in a certain area, we have the member from Wood River, Mr. Speaker, yelling from his seat, taking on an opposition member for doing his job, for standing up for the constituents in his constituency, standing up for the individuals that have concerns with the hurtful cuts that they're experiencing from the Sask Party government. So for members opposite to have a problem with that is shocking to all people in the province, especially the good people in the constituency of Cumberland.

In looking at . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well the member's anxious for me to get back to Bill 135, Mr. Speaker, and nothing has more relevance to 135 than the approach of the Sask Party government and how they treat the people of Saskatchewan. My colleague from Regina Rosemont clearly stated how we've seen a consistent approach of arrogance in how the government, Sask Party government, has handled constituents, handled concerns of Saskatchewan people. Whether that's health care, whether that's their horrible management of the provincial resources and finances, we've seen the arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

We've also seen a weakness when it comes to the area of consultation. And I know when bringing forward legislation like Bill 135, *The Prescription Drugs Act*, it's necessary when bringing forward this type of legislation that has such a great effect on how a profession operates within the province, it's important to get it right and ensure that the appropriate

consultation has occurred.

And it is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that in this case, in addressing Bill No. 135, that proper consultation has taken place. Because we've seen a number of very troubling instances in dealing with health care providers in the province, such as pharmacists, where the consultation has been so horribly lacking, the consultation has been inadequate, or the consultation has been late. It's been after a decision has been made or a decision has been advertised in the broader public.

One example, Mr. Speaker — and I would imagine if I was a pharmacist working in Saskatchewan, I would be concerned about this — is how the province has so recently treated chiropractors. How the province took the time, stated that they were bargaining, negotiating in good faith, coming to an agreement on how chiropractic services would be covered by the province and chiropractic care would be delivered to Saskatchewan people. They went through negotiations telling the chiropractors, the professional association representing chiropractors working in the province that they were bargaining and negotiating in good faith.

What did we see, Mr. Speaker, when it came time to actually carry through on their public commitment to negotiate in good faith and come to an arrangement? What did we see? Well we saw the minister going AWOL [absent without leave]. We saw the minister not showing up, not signing the deal, and instead, instead being secretive and not clearly stating to the Saskatchewan people what their intention is around the issue of chiropractic care. So I know if we've seen that kind of interaction, that kind of disrespect, Mr. Speaker, to a group of health care professionals here in the province, I can only imagine, Mr. Speaker, the worry that this causes for other health care providers in the province.

So the examples are many, whether it's physicians, whether it's the SMA [Saskatchewan Medical Association] negotiating an agreement for physicians here in the province.

Today in question period, we had some very interesting discussions, some very important and timely questions poised to the Minister of Health about the provision of transplant services for individuals needing a kidney transplant. And so there's physicians, Mr. Speaker.

But if the government can't live through . . . if the government can't be believed when it comes to what they state around the area of negotiations for chiropractors, why should their word be believed when it comes to nurses bargaining or any other profession in Saskatchewan outside of health care? Why should teachers in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, enter into negotiations in good faith with this government when it so easily and so willingly breaks the trust with those organizations? And to me, Mr. Speaker, that is a question . . . I know it's a question that many professional organizations are worried about.

In my introductory comments, Mr. Speaker, I talked about how health care is provided in Saskatchewan through a team approach. And it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that in Saskatchewan's health care system many individuals are involved and required to deliver services. We've seen on this issue of weak consultation and not being able to trust the statements that are

made by government when it comes to negotiations, based on the way they so poorly treated the chiropractors in the last couple of months, we can think of many other organizations of working men and women here in the province that have such an important role to the health care system. We can think of the absence of consultation that occurred on Bills 5 and 6, Mr. Speaker, how consultation did not occur in any way with the organizations.

In fact another very clear example of breaking the trust with the Saskatchewan people was when the Premier before the election spoke about the nature of Bill 5 and about it not being required. But then sure enough, as soon as they're elected, it's very soon introduced, weeks after coming into office, Mr. Speaker.

So it's clear when we're looking to the interaction of the Sask Party government with health care providers in Saskatchewan — whether that's chiropractors, whether that's physicians, whether that's nurses, whether that's any of the other members of the Health Sciences Association of Saskatchewan, or SEIU or CUPE [Canadian Union of Public Employees] or SEIU — when this government states things about negotiations, when this government states that it is being open and transparent with the people of Saskatchewan, in my opinion, based on the horrible track record we've seen with the way they've so poorly treated the chiropractors in this province, I think I would have some serious concerns if I was a member of that organization, if I was a professional working in any of those areas. And, Mr. Speaker, if I was a teacher, I would have many of the same concerns.

We've seen it through the budget trickery in many areas with the changing of accounting practices midstream in the term, how funds needed for the wage settlements with various groups have not been included in the budget. Another example, Mr. Speaker, where the government, the Sask Party government, is not being upfront, open, clear, and transparent with the people of Saskatchewan, with the people delivering health care services, and I know that is a concern for many, many people.

We also have the concern, Mr. Speaker, with the changes brought forward in Bill 135. If information is being obtained, information is being obtained and recorded electronically and then shared with other pharmacies as it would suggest in this piece of legislation, it very soon . . . I think the conversation turns to one about a concern of privacy. And based on my earlier comments where I stated I support the principle of electronic medical records and how that can increase safety and the quality of service given to individuals in the province, I see the merit in that. And in my initial reading and understanding of Bill 135, I see the merit in pharmacists recording the information of what amount of drugs they are dispensing to whom and the location. I see why it's important for that to be shared in various locations.

But whenever we are recording information as suggested in this legislation, especially in the issue of health care, it's also very important to ensure that we have a full discussion about the privacy needs of Saskatchewan people. I think probably all members in this Assembly can think of experiences we've had in our constituency offices where individuals who've accessed health care services have come into our offices, and they've had a concern about privacy and about the sharing of information.

I know I've had a number of discussions in my short time as an MLA representing the people of Saskatoon Massey Place. So I know the protection of privacy, the protection of information is certainly an important one for Saskatchewan people. And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have HIPA [*The Health Information Protection Act*], health information legislation that ensures the protection of health information, Mr. Speaker.

The concern I have, Mr. Speaker, on this issue of privacy and the protection of information . . . Once again I gave an example from question period with the Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations, how there were some serious shortcomings in his answers to questions raised by the member from Cumberland.

But the issue when it comes to privacy, I would take us back to question period a couple of days ago where the official opposition was bringing forward questions about recent changes that had been discussed in the media about the sharing of patients' personal information who have visited hospitals, who have received medical services, and the availability, the accessibility to that information by hospital foundations.

[15:45]

And one of the very important questions that was raised by, I believe the critic was asking the questions on that, one of the very important questions was, what consultation has occurred with the Privacy Commissioner? What has the Privacy Commissioner said about the sharing of this type of information? And the answers, Mr. Speaker, to that question were less than clear.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think the approach that we've seen by this Sask Party government to dealing with concerns of the protection of privacy, especially sensitive information like health information, the approach that we've seen by the Sask Party government is one that I don't think allows Saskatchewan people to feel safe and secure when they're sharing information with individuals in the health care system.

And we've seen this, Mr. Speaker, by the Sask Party government's willingness to plow ahead with changes despite the outcry we've heard from Saskatchewan people about the concerns around privacy, despite some of the warnings and concerns that have been voiced by the Privacy Commissioner. And when we see that flagrant disrespect — similar to the disrespect that we saw with how the Sask Party government treated chiropractors, similar to the disrespect we've seen the Sask Party demonstrate with health care providers belonging to CUPE, SEIU, and SGEU — when we see this approach of it's my way or the highway, my approach of full steam ahead, my approach, one that can be characterized by arrogance as so appropriately stated by the member from Rosemont, when we see that approach on so many issues and then when we look at this issue of sharing information about patients accessing drug services in Bill No. 135, I know many Saskatchewan people are worried about the government's statements that they will in fact take the privacy of information seriously, statements that they will safeguard the health information of Saskatchewan people.

Because the evidence that we've seen just very recently, in the last week or so, evidence in the news, evidence discussed in

question period, the sharing of information would not, I know does not, sit well with many of my constituents. And I can safely assume it doesn't sit well with many, many people in Saskatchewan.

So when we get into a discussion of HIPA and the Sask Party government's willingness to follow the rules around HIPA, based on the approach of disrespect that we've seen with many health organizations, based on the actions that we've seen around the sharing of health information, sensitive health information about when people are accessing health services here in the province, I think there are some major concerns.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up my comments on Bill No. 135, *An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act*, I want to state, at least for myself as an individual, in principle I can see the merit in this type of legislation, this type of change because I think it does hold the potential, it does hold the possibility of enhancing the level of health care provided to Saskatchewan people. It can do so by ensuring that we have higher levels of safety for individuals accessing drugs.

And I think it has the potential to make positive change because it works with the pharmacists of the province, a group of individuals who are very committed to the health care of their patients, of their clients, a group that has high standards for ethical behaviour, high standards for the type of health care service that they provide to individuals in their home communities. So I know if there are additional tools, if there are additional abilities that we can provide to pharmacists in doing their work in our community, I see the merit in that, and I think that is a good thing.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that this is legislation being brought forward by the Sask Party government. And I think, based on the evidence we've seen in recent weeks, when the Sask Party government says something, I don't think we can put a lot of trust in those words. I think there are many, many examples where the Sask Party has said one thing and done another.

The examples that I provided in this speech, Mr. Speaker, were around the negotiations that occurred with chiropractors in the province — how chiropractors negotiated in good faith, how chiropractors came to the table, how they heard from the minister that officials were there to bargain in good faith, that they were there to work on a deal — chiropractors that spent a great amount of time discussing the deal, discussing what the provision of their services might look like in Saskatchewan, who negotiated in good faith only to have the Sask Party walk away from the agreement once all the hard work was done.

And they did that, Mr. Speaker, because of the hurtful cuts that they had to make throughout the province based on their own inability to manage the provincial chequebook, their own inability to manage the provincial finances, their own inability to manage a surplus of billions of dollars and somehow to take us to a deficit of over \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker.

So I think whenever we're looking at any piece of legislation, whether it's a very large, far-reaching piece of legislation with huge implications for Saskatchewan people or whether it's more of a focused piece of legislation addressing issues more of

a housekeeping nature, addressing issues of a smaller focus, we need to always look through it, Mr. Speaker, through the lens of a Sask Party government that says one thing and does another, a Sask Party government that said they could be trusted to manage the provincial finances.

Well we've seen the complete opposite. We've seen pie in the sky fantasyland budget projections. And then we've seen, Mr. Speaker, trickery when it comes to the accounting practices in the province. We've seen trickery when it comes to the reporting of debt. We've seen trickery, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the reporting of projected expenditures to do with wage settlements for health care workers, for teachers.

So when we have that track record, Mr. Speaker, of saying one thing, doing another, when we have that track record of taking a surplus of billions of dollars and taking us to the situation we're in a deficit and because of that deficit that's been created by the Sask Party government, Mr. Speaker, having to make hurtful cuts through a number of areas, that colours and that influences every piece of legislation. That colours and that influences every area where the Sask Party government is bringing in decisions that affect Saskatchewan people.

Another perfect example that we saw yesterday in question period was the issue of Dutch elm disease. And we saw, Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party government because of their own inability to manage the budget, their own inability to manage the huge surplus that they inherited, their own inability to be good stewards of the financial resources had to engage in a series of hurtful cuts, short-sighted cuts. And no better example, Mr. Speaker, of a short-sighted cut than the cutting of funding for Dutch elm disease.

Well now individuals may say well what's the big deal? It's half a million dollars for cutting down diseased trees. How is that a big deal? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest in communities like Regina South and communities like my community, the neighbourhood I live in, Caswell in Saskatoon, people care about trees. People in urban centres care about trees. And so, Mr. Speaker, the urban forest to Saskatchewan people is very important.

So whenever we're looking at any piece of legislation, whether it's Bill 135 . . . And some people might say well that's just one type of drug, and it's one small group in society, and it's just one profession, and it's just one aspect of the health care system. Well, Mr. Speaker, those types of excuses, that type of rationale doesn't cut it. It doesn't hold water with Saskatchewan people because they know that the hurtful cuts will be experienced, Mr. Speaker, very often at the local level in small ways, very often at the local level in small ways.

So when I look at Bill 135, I ask myself — based on the incompetence that we've seen from the Sask Party government, based on their inability to take a surplus of billions of dollars and manage it responsibly, based on their inability to do what is best for Saskatchewan people — why should Saskatchewan people trust them on Bill 135, *An Act to amend The Prescription Drugs Act*? When we've seen them go wrong in so many areas in the area of health care — whether that's consultation with health care workers, whether that's consultation with chiropractors, whether it's other services in

the community, Mr. Speaker, like the killing of the program that provides CVAs [central vehicle agency], government vehicles to community agencies, agencies that provide services to women who are victims of domestic abuse — when we see those types of cuts going on, when we see cuts to programs that fight Dutch elm disease in our cities, in our towns, in our RMs [rural municipality], when we see those types of short-sighted, hurtful cuts, why, Mr. Speaker, why would Saskatchewan people have any confidence that the changes brought forward in Bill No. 135, *The Prescription Drugs Act*, would be in the best interests of Saskatchewan people?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will provide a caveat to those comments. And, as I stated earlier, when looking at Bill 135, in principle I see the merit of this legislation, and I support this legislation. And if this legislation, Mr. Speaker, has gone through the proper consultation with pharmacists, with other health care providers in the province, with other groups that have a vested interest and a stake and a role in the daily delivery of the health care services talked about in Bill 135, if that proper consultation has occurred, it's possible that the good advice provided by all those organizations, that good advice has been provided by the people that are on the front lines delivering medications involved with individuals in the community, it's possible that the information received from those groups would be able to make the legislation proposed in Bill 135 good legislation and sound legislation, Mr. Speaker.

But I think it would be in spite of the Sask Party's ability to actually bring forward this legislation in any sort of responsible, well-thought-out manner because, based on the track record that we've seen from the Sask Party government when it comes to dealing with health care groups in the province, when it comes to dealing with communities — whether the issue is one of health care or whether it's one of municipal needs, whether it's the issue of chiropractic care for the person who has injured their back on a workplace, whether it is the issue of educational assistants, Mr. Speaker, and the many, many families that rely on educational assistants to provide services to their children, Mr. Speaker, whatever the issue is — we've seen short-sighted, poorly thought-out cuts.

And it's all been because of, Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party's inability to take a surplus of billions of dollars and manage it responsibly. Instead we've seen a horrible, horrible example of financial stewardship. Mr. Speaker, we've seen pie-in-the-sky, fantasyland budget projections suggesting we would get \$3 billion, \$3 billion in potash revenue from the member from Kindersley.

And then this year, Mr. Speaker, compounding the damage done by the horrible ability to project revenue in the budget, we've seen financial trickery when it comes to the issue of accounting in an open, transparent, and clear way. It's always puzzling, Mr. Speaker. Why would the Sask Party government choose at this time to change the accounting practices, to change the way that accounting occurs within the province's finances? Why would they do that mid-term, Mr. Speaker?

Well to me, it would suggest that they are trying to hide something from Saskatchewan people. The member from Spiritwood suggests that they're trying to improve the situation. Mr. Speaker, the only thing, the only thing they are trying to

improve is the perception by Saskatchewan people that they are not completely incompetent in managing the finances of the province. And the only way they're doing that, Mr. Speaker, is through financial trickery. It's through changing the rules halfway through a term, an election term, through changing the way that they operate business.

So when we see that approach, we see that track record in the area of our finances, why should we have confidence? Why should we trust the government on a Bill like 135 — a Bill that affects the health care of Saskatchewan people, a Bill that speaks to the concerns that many people in Saskatchewan here hold so near and dear to their hearts?

So it's my hope, Mr. Speaker, it's my hope that proper consultation has occurred on this Bill because on so many other Bills, on so many issues here in the province, we've seen a complete absence of consultation. We've seen consultation that has not existed. We've seen consultation that has been done after the fact. We've seen consultation after it's been advertised through the media that a change is occurring. And, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people expect more, and they deserve better than that type of consultation.

So it's my hope on Bill 135, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has engaged in the proper consultation. And I think if that proper consultation has occurred, I can be confident. If the proper consultation has occurred, if it's been listened to, and if it's been responded to appropriately, that many of the changes brought forward in Bill 135 could enhance the health care system here in the province, Mr. Speaker.

But, but, Mr. Speaker, if the approach of the Sask Party government and of the minister has been one that we've seen so far on the issue of financial stewardship, on the issue of health care services, on the issue of health care negotiations with health care providers, on the issues of environment, on the issues of things that affect us at the RM and local level like Dutch elm disease, that the consultation has been non-existent.

If the approach of members opposite is that of the Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations where he says, oh well you've never been to that community so you can't have a clue what you're talking about . . . ignoring the fact that the person asking the question is actually from that community, actually has been to those communities, actually speaks to the trappers and the people being affected on a daily basis, to use these canned answers, Mr. Speaker, it's typical of the canned approach we've seen from the Sask Party government when it comes to managing the finances and managing the programs and the affairs of government.

[16:00]

Whether it's a large-scale program like the reporting of accounting and financial matters of the province or whether it's a more narrow program that might affect pharmacists, might affect individuals that love trees, that want to save the elm trees in Saskatchewan, we've seen time and time again examples where this government has failed to consult, failed to listen, and has instead simply worked to cover their tracks — their tracks of fiscal incompetence, their tracks of an absence of consultation, and their track record of complete inability to

manage the province's finances. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a track record that can be trusted. And when we look at every piece of legislation, I think we need to remember that larger picture. This is coming from a government who has said one thing and done another.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I know many other of my colleagues want to speak on Bill 135 and share their experience that they've had in talking with community groups about this piece of legislation, sharing their experience about how they've heard from Saskatchewan people that this is a Sask Party government whose record can't be trusted because they've said one thing and done another, because they've taken the province from having billions in surplus to over \$1 billion deficit, and because they are now engaged in a series of hurtful cuts. We have to remember that when we're looking at every piece of legislation, especially pieces of legislation like Bill 135.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks, and I would move that we adjourn debate on this piece of legislation. Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Massey Place has moved to adjourn debate on Bill No. 135, *The Prescription Drugs Amendment Act, 2009*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion? Carried.

Bill No. 103

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 103 — *The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is an honour again to stand in the House, the legislature, and join in the debate. It's always interesting to hear people's different points of view, and this is one that I find particularly interesting, Bill 103, *An Act to amend certain Statutes with respect to matters concerning Professional Discipline*.

And as a teacher I read this with interest, and I do have some comments to make. I think that it's important. And also one as a critic for Social Services, I have some comments to make in regard to that because I see *The Social Workers Act* is part of this. But I see that the teachers' Act, the STF [Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation] Act is not.

But I understand that the minister, in his comments introducing this, talked about that there were six professional organizations, self-regulating organizations who already have the intentions of this Act which really . . . And the intentions really speak to, meaning that a person can pursue disciplinary actions against someone in a profession even after they resign. And they do give a limitation for up to two years after they resign, and this seems appropriate and the fact that if they're moving or if there is a concern that they can't run from it by simply resigning and then that's the end of the story.

So we find this very interesting. We understand this Act affects

some 40 self-regulated groups from around the province doing very important work here in Saskatchewan and in fact probably right across the country, but their home base is here in Saskatchewan. And of course we will definitely want to hear from these groups.

The member before me spent some time, and I think quite rightly, talking about the concerns we have when it comes to the consultations, and whether it's the Dutch elm disease that we've been hearing about over the last couple of days, or the domestic abuse outreach program that was cut in Saskatoon in the fall without any consultation from the community groups and that was hoisted on another community group. And the result of that was a letter from many of the community groups saying, hey, what about the consultations? And of course it's somewhat ironic that this was the government that talked a lot about its new way of doing things that included consultations. And we've got many, many examples, and we can go through them.

Today we saw a minister in question period who couldn't even mention the word trappers. He did everything he could except mention those words, those trappers. I didn't think that was such a hard word to say, but from somebody from the south end of Regina maybe they have no idea what it is to be on a trapline. And here he is. He's got this responsibility. I just couldn't fathom his answer. It was tragic; it was something else.

But anyways, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government that takes a lot of pride — and I think it's misplaced pride, extremely misplaced pride — in their consultation process. When you have 40 self-regulated groups from around the province, we have some questions about, did they do an appropriate amount of consultation? It is something that I do need to . . . And I know that we'll be asking in committee when this gets moved to committee that what is their intention? How can we be assured that the groups are fully behind this?

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just do want to say that we can relate, we can understand, and we think that this is an important issue to address, that it can be very frustrating for both the person who's been wronged or the group that's been wronged, but even more than that that the public have confidence in these groups that they are doing what they've been set up to do.

It's an important, and it's a huge responsibility for an organization to be set up to be self-regulating. There is a public trust that's put into these organizations that they will look after the public interest. They do have a board, a governing board that will ensure that this happens. And many of them in fact have a public member, a public representative. But if they're stymied by the fact that a person has resigned quickly, abruptly, and that's the end of it, something needs to be done, and surely this may be the answer.

So we are thinking that this is important. And we understand there are implications that, if this person moves out of province, that there's no record because there's been no process, no due diligence, no process and so there's no record, and so this person can be moving around the country. And it's hugely unfortunate that the public pays yet again for issues that should have been looked after in due process, a sufficient disciplinary process. And so we think that this would be a good way to work

through this. And as I say, we are largely in favour of this idea.

And in fact this government did bring this forward earlier, and I understand that when the legislation came forward, in many ways very similar, but it was focused solely on judges. And when we were speaking to it we thought, well that's an interesting thing that you limit it only to judges. Why are you limiting to judges when there are many, many self-regulating organizations that could benefit from this?

And so when this is taken back, now we see it brought forward with 40 of the organizations. And I do want to thank the member from Saskatoon Meewasin for pointing this out. My question though around this though really is when we have, you know, there are 40 that we know of that are in this Act, and I won't go through all of them. In fact it's quite, it's interesting that it has many pages, but really it's only two or three paragraphs for each Act. But they're repeated throughout, and that's how you do the business.

Are there only 40? Are there more? And I think that would be the question we'd have in committee. What is the complete list of self-regulating organizations that could have benefited from this? Now we know there are six that do have. And I've pointed out that the one I belong to — the STF, the Teachers' Federation — isn't part of the 40. Now it may be because they do have the power amply to proceed with disciplinary action after two years. I don't know if that's the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We would ask that.

And if there are more than these 46, the 40 that are going to be getting the power and the six that already have it, are there others out there that have refused it? And why have they refused it? And I think we need to know that and get that on record. There may only be a handful. There may only be one or two. But who are those that are refusing? And why are they refusing it? And is it something that we could all benefit from because maybe perhaps they are thinking that the legislation is flawed? And if it is flawed, then we need to hear from those who are refusing to have it incorporated into their mandate or their regulations.

So I think this is an incomplete picture. And we also know . . . And I see that there has been some questions. For example the police aren't part of this, but I don't think the police are self-regulating. I would imagine that they're not, but I'm not sure. People may think they are. But we have to have that questioned too because I think the public may have some ideas about which are the professions . . . And it's interesting as we talk about what does it mean to be professional. And I know when you're in undergraduate school, I remember back in my days, going through, and I would say teacher training but that's not a very professional way of referring to yourself because you're not trained these days. But we had a lot of discussions about what it means to be in a profession, and your accountability and the transparency.

Not all of the major occupations that we look towards are actually professions. They may be quasi-professions. But I'm thinking of the police may be one that straddle that line because we do look to police officers to behave and to hold themselves in a very professional manner. We often use that kind of language. But are they, do they belong to a self-regulating

organization? I'm not sure.

And of course we have the trades, and we see this. And I do have to make some comments when we have this government's attack on the trades, through Bill 80, that clearly we have some questions because here is a way of establishing occupations.

And many people would look at these as professions, whether you're an electrician or a carpenter or a millwright, that you've actually learned an awful lot and you have huge standards and accountability that you have to hold up to because you have people's lives in your hands. And we talked about not only their own, not only their workers that they're working beside, but when they complete a project that people will believe that it's built to the standards, the building codes that we all appreciate.

So I think it's interesting that this would be a question that we would have. Who are these groups? What do they make up? Because when you're holding people to account in their work, we don't want to be leaving somebody out and finding out later that it wasn't well thought out. It wasn't well thought out. And I can tell you that this government does have a track record of not doing all their homework all the time.

And as I've said, this is the second time we've revisited this Bill. First it came with the judges. Now it's come back with 40, 39 more. Are there others that should be included? And we don't know, and we think that's unfortunate. And so we will be asking about these exceptions in committee.

I do want to take a moment though, particularly to talk about some of the groups. And I know that one group that's in here that has caught my attention, of course, are the social workers. And I find this very interesting. And I think that this is one that where we have seen some concerns, some very extremely inappropriate activity. And of course some of the social workers have been disciplined, whether it's for things that have happened within the department . . . You know, I'm thinking particularly of a case of fraud and that person was a member of the professional organization and was brought forward that way.

But ironically I've come to appreciate that many of the people who do the work of social work in the Department of Social Services are not registered social workers. In fact a very low percentage of people in the Ministry of Social Services actually belong to their professional organization.

And I was surprised at that, coming from the teaching profession where every teacher must belong to the STF. You know, you do your training; you've got your degree; you get your certificate, your professional certificate. All these steps happen along the way, and you belong to the STF. That's just the way it is in a public school system. And then to find out that the Government of Saskatchewan has a practice of hiring or not following that kind of professional standard is kind of shocking to me.

[16:15]

And I understand this has gone on for a long time, but I think that if we're doing this kind of thing, let's do it right. Let's take a look at this. Because I think that a lot of the problems that

we're talking about here in terms of why people would be . . . And it would create a false expectation in the public that, for example, that you might be able to take social workers, hold them account through their professional organization, only to find out that they don't belong to their professional organization and that they weren't really doing social work but it sure looked like social work. It did everything, you know, it looked like social work. It was the kind of thing that the public would expect was social work, and you find out, no they don't have to belong to social work.

And in fact I understand — and if I'm wrong I could be corrected but I don't think I am — that in fact there are more social workers who are registered with the professional organization working for the Ministry of Health than for the Ministry of Social Services. I think this is something that needs to be addressed if we're talking about accountability.

And we know particularly this ministry is now wrestling with a major issue around vulnerable children, foster children. This is an important issue and we're looking forward to seeing the work come out of this.

And I do hope, I do hope that they have an opportunity to take a look at the professional organizations that should be representing those people who are working with our most vulnerable, and those are our families and our children. And are they belonging to a professional organization? I find it just so odd that they don't have to.

And so here you are creating an expectation by passing a Bill that these 40 groups are, will be, if you are a member of these, or somebody might think that you're a member of this group, and they find out that you're not actually a member of the group, so it really didn't matter if you passed this Bill. This is really problematic. So we should be looking at these 40 groups and saying, are you required to belong to the group, the organization, when you do the work?

I think that we create a false hope that there will be more accountability in our society. We know teachers are. We know that many organizations . . . We know doctors are. We know nurses are. But, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I was shocked. I was really quite shocked when I found out that social workers don't.

And I know, I know their professional organization, the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers, would really like to see this addressed. But it's a tough one, but it's one I think that this government needs to take head-on because if you're creating this expectation that there will be more discipline, more accountability within the professional organizations . . .

The Speaker: — Why is the member from Cumberland on his feet?

Mr. Vermette: — Ask for leave to introduce guests.

The Speaker: — The member from Cumberland has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Vermette: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Sitting in your gallery is a member from my community, La Ronge. His name is Mark Williment. He's the superintendent of education with Northern Lights School Division and he's here for meetings and I'm pleased to see him in the gallery. And I would just like to take this minute because La Ronge is such a far northern community from our beautiful Regina, the city, I would just like to make sure he knows that he is welcome in his legislature and I would just like all members to join me in welcoming him to his legislature. Thank you.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 103 — *The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act, 2009*
(continued)

Mr. Forbes: — So to continue, and I'll be wrapping up in just a few minutes. But I do want to say that I will be looking for, I will be looking for some answers to these questions. And I know that, as I said, the question around the social workers is a huge one because we are facing an issue, a crisis in our foster care system and people are looking for accountability.

And it's not just about how you mete out punishment. But how do you ensure that there is due process when it comes to discipline and that it's not just overlooked? And not only can you escape it from when you resign, but you escape it right off the bat by not having to join. How does that work? How does it work that you're not required to join?

And so of these 40 organizations, I'd like to know, within the province of Saskatchewan, are these folks required to join? And I look at someone that the province would hire. And I'm thinking about the forestry folks. Are they required to belong to them? There's an example. And many others that you would wonder, are they required to belong? Because if you are creating the expectation that something can be done, it better be done. And it better be looked after from the beginning to the end.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think this is important. And as I said, I'll just make sure that the notes are taken well, that I'm curious about all the self-regulating groups. We talked about three groups. We know that there are 40 in this list. We know that there are six that do have them. What about the others? Are there others that are refusing to sign on? Why and why not?

You know, we talked many times about unintended consequences and this government in many ways have demonstrated over and over again. You know, they're kind of blind to unintended consequences, especially when you see the kind of work on their budgets. And they go headstrong right into it, and we have to be more careful, have to be more careful.

So I think that this is important that we look at this in a very

careful way, and so we'll be asking these kind of questions. And of course we are, as I said earlier, largely in favour of this idea, but we do have some questions.

And I know that many of my colleagues have spoken to this, but I think that we are prepared at this moment to move this to committee. So I would move that we move Bill 103, *An Act to amend certain Statutes with respect to matters concerning Professional Discipline*, to committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

The Speaker: — The question before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 103, *The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

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

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

Hon. Mr. Harrison: — I designate Bill No. 103, *The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act, 2009* be referred to the Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice Committee.

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

Bill No. 124

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 124** — *The Legal Profession Amendment Act, 2009* be now read a second time.]

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to make a few comments on *An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act*. And, Mr. Speaker, just an overview on this piece of legislation, the legislation put forward by the minister to address some streamlining and some . . . in terms of the sentencing process of serious misconduct of lawyers in the legal profession. Mr. Speaker, this deals with the public, in most cases, who make the complaints. And the lawyers in those, facing those complaints deserve an attempt to have them have some certainty and resolution in a timely fashion, Mr. Speaker.

This is good legislation. We see this as a positive step, any time we can have public complaints make their way through a system in an orderly and streamlined fashion, Mr. Speaker.

Now also similarly this legislation would allow the Law Society

to appeal a finding of the conduct of an investigation committee. And that again, Mr. Speaker, along with the timely fashion of dealing with these concerns, seems to be a positive move.

The thing about this whole exercise though, and in terms of where the minister in his opening remarks said that this would meet the Law Society's dues and objectives as they were to reflect them clearly in legislation, it is when we get these kind of pieces of legislation that we wonder how that government can go so off the rails when it comes to other pieces of legislation that they attempt to bring forward, be it in the environment legislation or in the labour law legislation. It's quite telling in those areas in terms of where you have consultation, where you have people expressing needs, and then the government moving to try and address those, as opposed to where they simply go forward and put in legislation without consultation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, and again legislation, we've had many examples of legislation or actions by this government of, for example, dealing with bodies not unlike the Law Society body. The Labour Relations Board, where in that instance the government simply fired members of that board and the signal that it sent and the criticism that that has drawn now from various parts, most notably the ILO [International Labour Organization] commenting on that situation, an unfortunate situation that causes people to question the objectivity of something as important as the Labour Relations Board.

Now again here we have the Law Society putting forward and having quite clearly some objectives, and the government moving on those and listening to those, Mr. Speaker, and saying, you know, we need to change this Act. We need to do some things to streamline this to make this more effective, to make this work, so quite the situation that we have occurring here. On one instance, when it comes to dealing with lawyers, we seem to take the approach, much like earlier on today where the Deputy House Leader got up and says, I'm a lawyer. He said he was a lawyer and that somehow we should do this, that because he was a lawyer, we wanted to jump through hoops, and that it would be a . . . But maybe that's what's telling, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe that's telling, that that kind of arrogance can exist when it comes to dealing with peoples' issues in the province, as opposed to when they come to dealing with something like *The Legal Profession Amendment Act* in Bill 124 where we see that government . . . It's quite telling in terms of what their views are, in terms of coming forward and saying, when we deal with the working people of this province, we will simply go and tell them this is the way it will be, be it in bargaining, sort of a take it or leave it.

And when it comes to the legal profession, is it any wonder then that the Deputy House Leader would come and make comments, and arrogant comments, you know, indicating that I'm a lawyer, and somehow that sets him above other people in the province. Now I think I would want to remind that member that you earn that kind of respect. It's not automatic that you get that. And I'm certain that perhaps over the years he will learn that, and that arrogance hopefully will fade, Mr. Speaker, and we won't have to listen to that sort of nonsense in here

anymore.

So even though we see this and see that the Law Society's concerns hopefully are being addressed, we still have more work to do here to consult. But it is at least an appropriate, I would say, move. But even though somewhat . . . I guess there's just a little bit of irony here in terms of when we see the way some legislation is handled, the way for example we deal with the Law Society, or for example as I'd mentioned when we deal with the Labour Relations Board.

Now again, in the Labour Relations Board, many times in that where the Premier injected himself into that by saying that the board shall, you know, certainly follow the Sask Party line, follow the Sask Party philosophy. And, Mr. Speaker, that's a concern because we often, most of us wonder what that actually means. And to put themselves in such a role to interfere in the quasi-judicial boards or in societies that govern themselves and set their own standards . . . And should be perceived, because it's important that not only that there's a perception that there is fairness and equality and justice, or that justice is being done, but the perception has to be there. So not only that, I guess, that it is being done. And when you break that trust, when you break that trust with people, they don't really forget that too soon, Mr. Speaker.

[16:30]

Mr. Speaker, there is a statement in there that the minister made and that is that in effect, that the legal profession exists to serve the public interest. And no more, Mr. Speaker, could we on this side agree with that. And in terms of that, and I think a few of that, some of that is coming forward in terms of the rule of law that we must, in a democratic society, we must have faith in our system. We must have faith that the people who uphold our laws are going to uphold them. Otherwise, and it's a delicate balance, and we see many places in the world that in fact that doesn't happen, and we see the outcomes of that with the destabilization of governments and people not having their rights protected, human rights abuses.

So it is important when people at first would simply say we're in government and we get to, we will do what we want. There is more to government than simply doing what we want, Mr. Speaker, and I guess that is of concern. And I think we also, earlier in the day, witnessed the Health minister as well in question period, we were talking about the health care workers and the bargaining, and the Health minister entered saying that he was not being involved, respecting arm's length SAHO, but then inserting himself and saying that he was, inserting himself and saying that in fact that the union should go out and take the offer to their members.

Now I don't know if he knows, in having said that, whether that the unions have taken that offer out to the field. I'm not certain if he does. But again these are some of the ironies I see in the government's statement that the legal profession is there to serve the public interest. And they should not only, I think, be telling other people that another . . . someone like the Law Society that that is what is happening, but they should themselves, that they should themselves live up to that standard and live with that, that not only that we as legislators are here to serve the public interest.

And again I would just say that the Law Society, the Law Society operates, is attempting here to operate in an open and transparent fashion. And I think that is another thing that I think that the members opposite should probably — in putting forward and doing legislation like this — that that would be something that they would be well served to acknowledge and practise.

And so if you have on that, Mr. Speaker, as I was talking about the perception of equality before something like the Labour Relations Board, the Human Rights Commission, and in fact the Law Society being able to deal in an appropriate manner to carry out their business, and that is so that the public, the public who complains, who has complaints, and the lawyers facing those complaints, both parties deserve the certainty and timely resolution of their disputes, Mr. Speaker. And that is important. So the parties to all boards, all boards that come and where people have to appear to argue their disputes, the parties must have, must feel that they have a sense of certainty, not only in the timely resolutions of their disputes, but they have to have a confidence, a perceived confidence that they will be dealt with fairly, that they will be dealt with fairly.

So again as I mentioned, the good, admirable qualities of the Law Society agree to the open and transparent way in which they deal with that. The Law Society posts any findings of misconduct on its website, Mr. Speaker. There is all sorts of times that they would try and look for a place to be transparent because that is important.

And I think it somewhat puts questions into our ability and into the things that we have to do as our job, when in fact there is any attempt to block information and attempts to not provide information. These are not good days when we do that. Now again we find this government may talk about transparency for other . . . the Law Society or whatever. But it would be, it would be, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite the thing if they in fact, they practised, they themselves practised the transparency as the legal profession, perhaps is that they want the legal profession to do.

But again, I think what we see is a government obsessed with secrecy, Mr. Speaker, and we notice daily the spin that they attempt to put on the difficulties. The obvious, Mr. Speaker, the obvious thing is the budget that we had where, quite unlike what they are asking of the Law Society to hopefully that they're trying to accomplish, here we have a government that goes and spends money, the Sask Party spends money on billboards and tells the public that the debt is going down, that they have paid down the debt, when we hear daily now in the newspapers that the debt is going up, that the . . . I guess this is the kind of thing that people wonder as to what would be occurring, what is meant by that.

It causes a great deal of confusion when we have those sorts of statements and we have Professor Howe from the University of Saskatchewan saying that this definitely is a deficit. It puts into question the work that we do here.

So I think the intent, the things that I see happening in this Bill that they are trying to do to meet the things that the Law Society's objectives, where they clearly have some objectives that they want met and wherever there is some work to do, work

that has been done to do this. And again just to make the . . . to streamline, to streamline this process, the sentencing process for serious misconduct and again that is a, that is a positive, positive step that we have happening here.

So again on one hand we have legislation where the government quite . . . It leads us to wonder why it is that they would act in this way, why they would say in one hand because we've got some lawyers and again as the House Leader, the assistant House Leader, perhaps a little insight into the thinking about why this might be good about having us think that somehow because he holds a law degree that that puts him in some way different than the rest of the members in this House.

And that's a sad, it's a sad day here, Mr. Speaker, because we come here from all walks of life. We bring things that are . . . Saskatchewan is a diverse province. We bring with that to represent our members. We come from . . . That is our democracy. To have somebody in here in this place attempt to say that somehow they should deserve some extra respect because of their profession is a sad day. It's a sad day for us and it's not the way I would think or see us doing business here.

Mr. Speaker, we have our differences, as you no doubt daily are aware of, but that sort of attitude I don't think we need in the House here. I don't think it has any positive. I think there are different ways to make an argument without somehow impugning some lack of knowledge on the other part because of whether we hold a law degree or not. I guess that's something that that member, that insight is really, I guess, unfortunate. I was going to say disturbing but it's, I guess, it's basically unfortunate.

Now again and it also comes just as I look back over the last session and this session, it's their reactions in terms of how they react to different situations, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Here we have the Law Society promoting certain concerns that they have, and the government reacting to that, the Sask Party looking at that. Yet when we asked questions about an unsafe crane on a construction site, what did the Minister of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour have to say? Where did you get the information? Where did you get the information was the first thing they came back.

An unsafe crane on a work site, and the first thing that they would be concerned about is not safety of people, but where did you get the information. And it was similar with the corrections, where we had . . . And that is definitely where there's an offender mistakenly released. And what was that that we went through? Numerous things about threats from police. The member has made it into the *Parliamentary Review* — very unfortunate. And this is very telling about what we have sitting, the arrogance that we have on that side. And that's just from actions, and we haven't even gotten to the part about the arrogance of just the feeling of the right to govern, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, a sad day in some ways for us all. Every once in a while we see this type of legislation which addresses concerns and is important. We will still continue to also, as well, consult with the legal profession to ensure that these changes meet their needs and that they are serving the public. Because as soon as you have new legislation, one thing we all know for sure, Mr. Speaker, is that no legislation is static, that

there are continuously improvements, continuously we strive to do better, and it is the way we do that.

So my concerns are still those is that will we see that the objectives that on the surface may look to have been met, the objectives of streamlining the sentencing process regarding serious misconduct. Have they been met or will someone come forward with a suggestion without having to question whether the other, whether those members . . . And I would imagine that the complaints here made or suggestions made by the public, which attempts to deal with the public, I am certain that they were not met with.

At least for the members of the Law Society who sit there, and is not their first thing to say, where did you get your law degree from, in a popcorn box or whatever. I wouldn't think that that would be the way they would . . . [inaudible] . . . They would probably sit down and listen carefully to the arguments that were being made so that they could make necessary changes. And I think that would be the appropriate way to deal with that. And I can see in some ways that that has been done here other than for the unfortunate remark we heard earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker.

So we have the Law Society needing to find, to appeal the finding of conduct investigation in the Court of Appeal. And again that the Law Society's ability to appeal the finding of a conduct to the appeal court again seems to be, under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, an appropriate move.

[16:45]

Mr. Speaker, the Bill has many changes that we will be going through. There is also the issue of trust accounts and in closing down trust accounts, some of the rules that will need to be looked at. And there are some amendments. We'll still be having questions around that.

Another interesting section, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is 35.1. Again:

“Conduct investigation committee

35.1(1) The conduct investigation committee [and this is the following section is added after section 35, 35.1] is established consisting of a minimum of six persons appointed by the president of the society.

(2) The conduct investigation committee appointed pursuant to subsection (1) shall consist of benchers, members or former benchers, but a majority of members of the committee must be benchers.

(3) [Again] The president shall appoint a bencher as chairperson of the conduct investigation committee and may appoint one or more benchers as vice-chairpersons.

(4) For the purposes of subsection 36(1.1), a member of the conduct investigation committee whose appointment pursuant to subsection (1) has ended, and who is investigating or has investigated the conduct of a member pursuant to subclause 42(2)(b)(i), continues as a member of the conduct investigation committee for all purposes relating to that investigation, but [again] is

eligible to be a member of the discipline committee for all . . . purposes.

And:

(5) Subject to this Act and the rules, the conduct investigation committee shall:

(a) determine all matters necessary to convening, holding and adjournment of its meetings;

(b) determine its procedure;

(c) establish a method by which it shall decide questions; and

(d) determine [generally the transaction and management of its business”].

Again there will be things that we need to address. We need to look at that. There are many different amendments in here. The numbers, we definitely would have to go through and have some serious questions. And again, the move regarding the ability of the Law Society to appeal a finding of the conduct investigation committee to the Court of Appeal, I would venture to say is a positive, a positive step.

But as all things, Mr. Speaker, we'll have to watch that work its way through as people come forward. We wish all the best. It seems there has been some good work done here in terms of consultation and perhaps somebody over there has determined that the right to consult is important. The ability to consult, which is so sorely lacking in so many other areas that I could begin listing here where people have, on an ongoing basis, had to come forward.

Now the latest, I suppose, really alarming, most alarming is the Bill 80, the construction labour relations Act, amendments where people are called in on the morning — on the morning. And it's interesting that the Premier was at the building trades convention earlier on. They had his picture in their convention booklet and he came there and was asked certain questions, whether there would be changes and he said no. And this is an interesting sort of pattern that we have here because there's, on record, the Premier also saying that there would be, that essential services legislation was not required. So none of these things are required. We can go back and see a track record here of things that are hidden.

The lack of transparency again that this Act, these amendments try to address and the unfortunate situation we have occurring now with the matter before the courts and the \$3 million PC trust account which does bring a lot . . . And a lot of people are talking about that, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what that means for our province. Have we let the fox back in the henhouse again and we're up to the same old tricks, Mr. Speaker?

Are we creating more problems? And people ask, the members opposite ask, well when we bring forward issues around the Premier bringing alcohol, delivering alcohol to the legislature, whether this is important, I think it is important. People have the right to know that. This is an important position to hold in this province, and I think people have the right to know that.

So again the issue is directly to transparency, transparency and openness, and openness in dealing with these sort of issues. And we should be upfront about those because, when we ask other people to do what we cannot do ourselves, it is hardly, it just doesn't carry the moral weight that we certainly could in these kind of situations.

So, Mr. Speaker, just the important points here, around here . . . the minister has said that this legislation was requested by the legal profession. He has reacted to that. And again it's so hard, as I mentioned earlier, when we have a Premier asking others to do what he so flippantly himself perhaps would not do and that is in the whole areas of transparency and the whole areas of consultation . . . and the feeling that must exist when in fact we have to have international bodies comment and say that we have to redo our legislation that we have spent innumerable hours. I personally have gone through — I can't count — perhaps 60 hours of questioning before various committees on various Bills 5, 6, 80, Mr. Speaker, and to what avail, to what avail? We've heard answers from everything about dark trees casting shadows over Saskatchewan.

And you know what is the interesting thing that they should understand is that the material, that the questions that we asked in committees could be submitted to a body like the ILO or the Supreme Court. And so I can wonder what the judges or the people at the ILO were doing when they were reading and what they would do with the statement like dead trees casting shadows across Saskatchewan in an answer to a labour question.

Now we will have many of those. And I'm wondering if they were scratching their heads and thinking that perhaps there are more problems here than just the consultation that isn't happening on the Bills. Perhaps this goes a little deeper in terms of the seriousness that they take, the attitude that is displayed with some of the Bills compared to what we have here when we have the Law Society saying, you know, we need some things done. We'd like the right to appeal a finding of the conduct investigation committee. We think we need a timely resolution so the complaints can go through.

And yet we look at other, the treatment in other areas, and it is an all-out attack. It's an all-out attack just like the attack which the Premier himself has said, you know, he's going to go to war with unions. And that's the way he launches his career as Premier of this province. And people wonder why we have the turmoil that is on a daily basis growing outside of these walls where people are continually having to shake their head in wonderment and wonder whether the Sask Party's governing for the people of Saskatchewan.

And we often hear that this place is for the people, though, because when we introduce people we say welcome to your legislature. But those words on a more daily basis are sounding hollow to a good portion of the residents of Saskatchewan. They're sounding very hollow to a large number of people in our province because they simply are not ringing true and that there's in fact an abuse of process happening. And I think we are seeing where those members are getting caught with their hands in the cookie jar, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunate, unfortunate situations arising where we are finding

ourselves with certain Bills being dealt with, with appropriate consultation, with people coming forward, with asking people in the province what should be done, as opposed to an ideological agenda that is bent on destroying rights and human rights and all sorts of rights, international law rights that are trampled on in . . . with this government, head bent, just simply moving forward without any consultation, thinking that they have all the answers and that they are above any sort of reproach or that they would have to listen.

And again I would just say that the Deputy House Leader probably best captured that earlier today about saying, you know, I am a lawyer and somehow that my arguments will be based on that. Not basing it on arguments that he might have to make which were — as I listened to him — very weak arguments, but in fact that somehow the weight of his profession would carry him through. Now that's a sad, very sad day that you'd have to reach into that kind of bag of tricks but anyways, I guess, to each his own.

So again, Mr. Speaker, the important statements that the minister made that the legal profession exists to serve the public interest, I think a good message for some members opposite. I won't mention any in particular but that they should take that to heart. And again New Democrats on this side, we agree with that sort of statement. And also we agree very strongly with any attempts at more transparency and to give people the feeling that justice is being done for them, that if you have a complaint, it doesn't go through two steps. We're bringing this down into one step, that in fact that there is a concern for people that their complaints are heard, that they're dealt with in a timely manner, and that we will move forward and everybody will have a faith and a belief restored in the system that is here for us.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the admirable qualities which I have stated about this, the thing about the Law Society's objectives, that the Law Society again — and I believe I mentioned this before — the things that they put up on their website and not . . . I wouldn't say that it is just the Law Society that attempts to do that. Any number of groups of any of our professions that operate in this province strive for that because they strive for that, Mr. Speaker, because they want to achieve the highest degree of excellence, and I think we all try and do that.

We try and do that for all the people and because that's what we should be here for. But we find that not occurring on a number of fronts. It then becomes, when something positive is done, we look at it and wonder what it is that they are doing because it becomes questionable. And a different sort of light shines on anything that, any legislation, that comes forward that has some positive, positive things in it because it then appears that in some ways that this government is picking favourites, picking people that they think they need to curry favour with.

And I would hope that they're not simply doing this just because it is the Law Society because those are the kinds of questions now that come forward because you think, well now this is simply because it's the Law Society. And so the Law Society . . . One of the things the Premier did not say was that I am going to war with the Law Society in any way . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Okay. That was one thing that was not said, that I am going to war with the Law Society. He said that to unions, but not here.

So again I think of . . . And we've had some incidents that we can all look at, again lack of consultation. And so therefore we wonder why the different treatment. Why the different treatment that we would have in terms of Law Society versus unions in our province or the Labour Relations Board in terms of the government's attempt to put forward their position or the government's attempt to say here's what we will have done. So, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — It being now 5 p.m., the Assembly will recess until tonight at 7 p.m.

[The Assembly recessed until 19:00.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Wall	4757
Nilson	4757
Draude	4757
Cheveldayoff	4757
Iwanchuk	4766
Bjornerud	4768
LeClerc	4776
Forbes	4776
Vermette	4783

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Harper	4758
Trew	4758
Atkinson	4758
Forbes	4758
Vermette	4758
Brotten	4758
Furber	4759
Taylor	4759
Quennell	4759
Wotherspoon	4759
Chartier	4759

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

World Health Day	
Junor	4760
Accomplishments of Constituents	
Schriemer	4760
Frontier Mall Wall of Fame	
Taylor	4760
Agri-Tourism in Saskatchewan and Quebec	
D'Autremont	4760
2010 First Nations Winter Games	
Chartier	4761
Tri-Town Thunder Hockey Team Wins Championship	
Bradshaw	4761
Saskatchewan Resource Statistics	
Brotten	4761

QUESTION PERIOD

Kidney Transplants	
Junor	4762
McMorris	4762
Finance and Electoral Issues	
Yates	4763
Health Care Negotiations	
Iwanchuk	4764
McMorris	4764
Support for Northerners	
Vermette	4765
Hutchinson	4765

POINT OF ORDER

D'Autremont	4766
Yates	4766

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Weekes	4766
--------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 132 — <i>The Wildlife Habitat Protection (Land Designation) Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Trew	4767
Bill No. 119 — <i>The Ticket Sales Act</i>	
Wotherspoon	4770

Yates (point of order)	4772
Harrison (point of order)	4772
Harrison (referral to committee)	4774
Bill No. 135 — <i>The Prescription Drugs Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Brotten	4774
Bill No. 103 — <i>The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Forbes	4780
Harrison (referral to committee)	4783
Bill No. 124 — <i>The Legal Profession Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Iwanchuk	4783

GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN CABINET MINISTERS

Hon. Brad Wall
Premier of Saskatchewan
President of the Executive Council

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

Hon. Bill Boyd
Minister of Energy and Resources
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Power Corporation
Minister Responsible for Uranium
Development Partnership
Minister Responsible for Innovation Saskatchewan
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Research Council

Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff
Minister of Enterprise
Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated
Minister Responsible for Trade

Hon. June Draude
Minister Responsible for Crown Investments
Corporation
Provincial Secretary
Minister Responsible for Information Technology Office
Minister Responsible for Information
Services Corporation
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Government Insurance
Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission

Hon. Dustin Duncan
Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport

Hon. Rod Gantfoer
Minister of Finance

Hon. Donna Harpauer
Minister of Social Services

Hon. Jeremy Harrison
Minister of Municipal Affairs

Hon. Nancy Heppner
Minister of Environment
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Water Corporation

Hon. Bill Hutchinson
Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations
Minister Responsible for Northern Affairs
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Gaming Corporation

Hon. D.F. (Yogi) Huyghebaert
Minister of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing

Hon. Ken Krawetz
Deputy Premier
Minister of Education

Hon. Don McMorris
Minister of Health

Hon. Don Morgan
Minister of Justice and Attorney General
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Telecommunications

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

Hon. Jim Reiter
Minister of Highways and Infrastructure
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan
Transportation Company

Hon. Christine Tell
Minister of Government Services
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan
Liquor and Gaming Authority
Minister Responsible for the Capital Commission