



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

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>	<b>Constituency</b>
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 member from Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to all members of this honoured Assembly, I'd like to introduce two gentlemen from my constituency. Seated in your gallery are Bernie Collins and Dick Willows. And, Mr. Speaker, these are constituents of mine from Estevan. And at one time, I was a constituent of Bernie Collins, as he was the Member of Parliament for Souris-Moose Mountain. I ask all members to join me in welcoming these gentlemen to their legislature.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — To you and through you I'd like to introduce a number of people in both the Speaker's gallery and the west gallery, too many to name individually, but members of the group, SCN Matters. They came here today to try to illustrate to the government how important it is both for film and television producers, and viewers and people in Saskatchewan.

So I'd like for us to all welcome them to their legislature today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following my colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale, I would like to highlight one person who's a part of the group here in the legislature today who have come to hear some answers from the government on the issue of the proposed closure of SCN [Saskatchewan Communications Network]. And that individual is Melanie Jackson.

Melanie lives just a stone's throw outside of Saskatoon Massey Place, and she's the producer of *Wapos Bay*, a very successful program that is produced here in Saskatchewan. She tells me that last year alone the program brought in \$1.2 million into the province. It employs 45 full-time employees, and when you include cast members, it actually, the number goes up to 90.

Eight episodes were produced last season for a total of 34 in total. So I think it's another great example of a program here in Saskatchewan that has direct ties to SCN as evidence of the economic growth and stimulus that can be created through the work of SCN. So I would ask all members in the Assembly to join me in welcoming Melanie as well as the other individuals who have come here today. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — Member from Regina Coronation Park.

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today

to introduce an individual in the east gallery. This individual is one of the newly elected vice-presidents of the New Democratic Party, elected at the convention in Prince Albert that we recently had. A great convention it was, and we elected some very fine people to be part of the New Democratic Party organization.

I'm referring of course to Kent Peterson who originally hails from the Nipawin area and is at the University of Regina right now pursuing his studies. This is a gentleman that has a great future in Saskatchewan or wherever he winds up being, but I predict it'll be in Saskatchewan. Please join me in welcoming Kent to the legislature.

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

**Mr. Bradshaw:** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with the member opposite on welcoming Mr. Kent Peterson. He's originally from White Fox area which is right close at the constituency of Carrot River Valley. And I'd like everybody in the Assembly to thank him for showing up.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with the member from Massey Place in welcoming Melanie to the legislature this afternoon. The member from Saskatoon Riversdale and the Leader of the Opposition and myself had a opportunity to tour the *Wapos Bay* set last week during the Easter break from the Assembly. We had a chance to interact and meet with many of the people that work for *Wapos Bay*, and they were able to show us exactly how they make these puppets that they use on their sets.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is a children's program. It's a very famous children's program. And it's absolutely amazing the numbers of young people that have come out of film school, animation school and design school that are employed here in Saskatoon, city of Saskatoon, in our province, contributing to the film and video industry. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Melanie, who is one of the producers and creators of this very successful children's series, for hiring all of these young people in the province of Saskatchewan. These are jobs that mean that people can buy homes, can build their lives here. And I think we owe a great deal of tribute to the *Wapos Bay* producers for the work that they have brought to our province and the jobs and the economic development that has certainly been evident in the city of Saskatoon. So thanks for coming down.

**The Speaker:** — I'd like to as well join the members in extending an invitation. My youngest brother Jack and his wife Collette are seated in the Speaker's gallery. Jack was the speaker at the Saskatchewan Prayer Breakfast this morning. I must say that he did a commendable job. I guess only a brother can only do that, but I want to thank him for taking the time to come and join us. Jack's involved with the Impact Society and a program called Heroes, reaching out to youth across our land. So I would ask the members to join me in welcoming my brother and his wife to this Assembly.

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to arise today to present a petition on behalf of concerned citizens of Saskatchewan who are concerned about the safety of our highways. This particular petition applies to the No. 10 Highway between Fort Qu'Appelle and the junction of No. 1. This portion of this highway is the main artery of travel to year-round tourist destinations as well as this highway serves three major inland grain terminals. So the traffic flow on this road is very heavy, and at times it's believed to be quite dangerous for the motoring public. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government of Saskatchewan to construct passing lanes on Highway 10 between Fort Qu'Appelle and the junction of No. 1 in order to improve the safety for Saskatchewan's motoring public.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by the good folks from Ituna, Wynyard, and Balcarres, Saskatchewan. I so submit.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today it's my pleasure to again present a petition on behalf of the Saskatchewan Student Coalition. This petition is in support of the implementation of the Saskatchewan scholarship fund, that being the same scholarship fund that was promised in the 2007 general election by the Sask Party. The prayer of the petition 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, today's signatures are from Regina, from White City, and from Saskatoon. I so submit.

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

**Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition that speaks to the issue of protecting renters from unreasonable rent increases. And, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of months, there are many communities in Saskatchewan where renters have seen rents close to doubling in one increase, and it's been very difficult for some residents to be able to maintain that cost of rent. And, Mr. Speaker, it also touches on a number of other provinces that have rent control guidelines in provinces right across Canada and that, that should be something that the government should address here in

Saskatchewan.

And we, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectfully request that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take the following action: to cause the government to consider enacting some form of rent control with a view to protecting Saskatchewan renters from unreasonable increases in rent.

And, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Saskatchewan residents, I so present.

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

**Ms. Junor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise with a petition in support of people with autism. And the growing number of children diagnosed with autism has left parents and guardians becoming educators, advocates, caregivers, and financiers. And the majority of Canadians now do live in provinces that have adequate autism spectrum disorder strategies and funding. So the petition reads, the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the Sask Party government to commit to providing a comprehensive provincial autism spectrum strategy that is based on proven best-practice, evidence-based research treatments and programming; and given the complexity of the disorder and its treatments, that individualized funding concept be adapted for parents and guardians of autistic individuals.

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

The petition is signed by residents from Regina, Saskatoon, P.A. [Prince Albert], and Wilkie. I so present.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition in support of maintaining educational assistants in the province of Saskatchewan. And as the public will know, the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education introduced a document where they propose to replace a large number of educational assistants with a small number of professionals like speech-language therapists and psychologists. And this is not practical, particularly for those living in rural Saskatchewan. 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.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by people in rural Saskatchewan, people from Buena Vista, Craven, Esterhazy, and Gerald.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Saskatoon

Centre.

**Mr. Forbes:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition calling for the reinstatement of the domestic abuse outreach program in Saskatoon. And we know the domestic abuse outreach program provided a number of valuable services to women victims of domestic violence and their children, including helping women find emergency shelter, accompanying women to their homes, courts, hospitals, or the police station as needed. It was cut without consultation December 31st, 2009. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read the prayer:

We, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectfully request the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan to 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 Saskatchewan.

And this is signed by concerned citizens in the city of Saskatoon. I do so present. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition in support of repairing Highway 123 that goes to the community of Cumberland and to commit the money that was previously committed on behalf of the NDP [New Democratic Party] government. The petition is signed by the leadership and First Nations of Cumberland House. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners will humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to commit to maintaining and repairing this highway.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

It is signed by the good people of Cumberland House and area.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition that has been circulated by the Saskatchewan Student Coalition, a petition in support of affordable undergraduate tuition costs and a request that the Sask Party government 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 again today to present a petition in support of the expansion of the graduate retention program. The petition is being circulated by citizens of the province because the Saskatchewan Party government specifically amended the retention program to exclude master's and Ph.D. [Doctor of Philosophy] graduates and graduates from schools outside the province of Saskatchewan. And the prayer reads:

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by folks from the city of Regina. I so present.

[13:45]

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

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this petition is with respect to Sask Party's lack of action with respect to climate change:

We, the prayer reads as follows, respectfully request that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take the following action:

To cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, acknowledge and recognize that climate change is occurring and that the impacts of climate change are escalating and worsening;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to undertake immediate actions to mitigate climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, actions which will serve to protect Saskatchewan people from the significant costs to our economy, global security, and quality of life which climate change threatens to bring about, and to also protect Saskatchewan people from longer and more frequent droughts, reduced river flows as the glaciers which feed our rivers shrink, erratic rainfall with more frequent and more serious flooding, and loss of at least the southern part of Saskatchewan's valuable boreal forest which is treasured by so many in our province;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, begin the process of creating a meaningful, significant, comprehensive, and broad-based strategy including enacting substantial and meaningful legislation and substantial and meaningful regulations to meet the commitment solemnly pledged repeatedly in October and November of 2007 during the last provincial election by the Premier, the current member from Swift Current, who at the time of the last provincial election when he made this serious and significant commitment

was serving as the leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to reduce our province's greenhouse gas emissions by 32 per cent from the levels of greenhouse gas emissions which our province produced in the year 2007 and to meet said 32 per cent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by the year of Our Lord 2020, 10 years from now or one short decade away;

And in so doing, to cause the Premier to instruct his Minister of Environment, the current member from Martensville, to recognize the importance of honouring the Premier's solemnly pledged commitment and to set about the important task of developing a substantial and meaningful plan to seek a reduction of our province's levels of greenhouse gas emissions rather than continuing to evade all responsibility in her duties to actually address this critically important issue which will directly affect our province's economy and the quality of life for all of our residents;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, reject the intensity-based reduction targets which the provincial Sask Party government has shamefully followed the federal Conservative government in adopting, in favour of absolute reduction targets, and to immediately enact said absolute reduction targets in the new management and reduction of greenhouse gases Act;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, reverse its ill-advised decision to cut all funding to the Prairie Adaptation Research Collaborative and to recognize that the Prairie Adaptation Research Collaborative is a valuable and much-needed organization in that it generates practical options to help Saskatchewan adapt to the current and future impacts of climate change and fosters the development of new professionals in the emerging science of climate change impacts and adaptation;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, restore the full amount of funding which it recently cut to the Prairie Adaptation Research Collaborative.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by the good residents of Saskatoon. I so present.

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

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition on behalf of Saskatchewan residents that are concerned about the privatization of our Crown corporations. And, Mr. Speaker, the prayer reads as follows:

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 immediately, without delay, acknowledge and recognize that for more than 100 years Saskatchewan has thrived on the

affordable and accessible services offered by our Crown corporations, such as but not limited to SaskPower, which provides electrification to rural residents and continues to do so today. SaskTel, which provides access to telephone, cellular, and Internet services. Saskatchewan Transportation Company or STC, which provides transportation to and from many of rural communities. The Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan, which provides loans to our agricultural producers. The Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation, which provides protection to agricultural producers from natural conditions beyond their control.

The Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan, which establishes the strategic directions for subsidiary Crown corporations through effective governance and performance management and enhances Saskatchewan's long-term economic growth and diversification through Crown corporations. Enterprise Saskatchewan, which was designed to foster economic growth but has produced minimal results thus far. Information Services Corporation of Saskatchewan, which is responsible for the administration of land titles, vital statistics, survey and personal property registries, as well as related geographic information and mapping systems. The Municipal Financing Corporation of Saskatchewan, which assists in making capital funds available for the financing of sewer and water, school, hospital, and other essential construction and local improvement projects by municipalities, school divisions, and health districts.

The Saskatchewan Communications Network which the government recently pulled all funding to, effectively killing its future operations. Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation, which offers casino entertainment in a socially responsible way. The Saskatchewan Government Growth Fund Management Corporation, which creates and manages investment funds. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance, which is known more commonly to Saskatchewan people as SGI, and provides home and auto insurance. The Saskatchewan Grain Corporation which manages the government's fleet of rail hopper cars.

Saskatchewan's Health Information Network, which manages the development of a province-wide health information network, which also had its funding drastically reduced in the recent budget. Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, which promotes self-sufficiency and independence by providing housing and housing services for families, seniors, persons with disabilities, and others who could not otherwise afford safe, secure shelter. The Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, which is responsible for the distribution, sale, and regulation of alcohol and gaming in the province. The Saskatchewan Municipal Board, which ensures financial credibility for cities, towns, villages, northern and rural municipalities and school divisions and ensures appeals respecting planning, assessment, fire prevention, municipal boundaries, and conservation and development are heard and decided.

Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation, which supports the growth and success of Saskatchewan's technology

sector through the development and operations of research parks on the campuses of the province's universities in Saskatoon and Regina and at the forest centre in Prince Albert. Saskatchewan Research Council, which provides research, development, and the transfer of innovative, scientific, and technological solutions and applications and services to the province. Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, which leads the management of the province's water resources to ensure safe drinking water sources and reliable water supplies for economic, environmental, and social benefits of Saskatchewan people. SaskEnergy Incorporated, which provides heat and energy to the homes and businesses across our province; and SaskWater, which provides quality water and waste water services.

And in doing so, to cause the provincial government to immediately, without delay, commit to retaining the full public ownership of these valuable institutions that provide us with services such as power generation, telephone and Internet services, transportation, insurance, agricultural credit, health information, affordable housing facilities, research in energy, crop insurance, and quality drinking water access;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to recognize that Crown corporations have been providing the people of Saskatchewan with affordable, accessible services for more than 100 years;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to recognize that Saskatchewan residents in both urban and rural centres in all corners of our province continue to benefit from the manner in which our Crown corporations are investing millions of dollars back into our towns, cities, schools, charity organizations, and community events, institutions, and groups which ensure the continued prosperity and vitality of our urban and rural centres;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to recognize that thousands of people and families in Saskatchewan prosper directly from employment and benefits provided by our Crowns, and if we want to retain these benefits, it is vital to keep these organizations 100 per cent publicly owned;

And in doing so, to cause the provincial government to cease their growing trend of piecemeal privatization, selling off profitable parts of Crown corporations for political reasons, most recently exhibited with the Wall government's announcement of a 20-year, \$700 million purchase agreement with Northland Power of Toronto to supply 261 megawatts of power from a new plant here in North Battleford, forcing the Saskatchewan taxpayers to pay yet another backdoor tax through increased power rates in order to protect this private, out-of-province company from fluctuating natural gas rates despite the fact that SaskPower has not only the capacity but also the expertise to develop this facility within their existing power generation capability;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to

reverse their decision to privatize hospitality networks which provides operator services in hospitals and long-term care facilities;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to reverse their decision to outsource SaskTel services such as email services, Max TV, video conferencing, SecurTek, and directory assistance;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to condemn the actions of the previous Devine administration, their actions upon taking office to privatize our valuable, publicly owned Crown corporations such as selling off most of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, as well as splitting the natural gas division from SaskPower and proposing its privatization, selling off controlling interest in the Prince Albert pulp mill, and privatizing Sask Minerals despite the fact that many of these operations were some of the most important institutions to Saskatchewan people and many of these operations were profitable operations year after year;

And in so doing, to cause the provincial government to commit their unfaltering support for full public ownership in our provincial Crown corporations and to commit to a complete cessation of their continued erosion of these Crown corporations through backdoor privatization.

I so submit on behalf of constituents of Regina, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Iwanchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition in support of maintaining quality health care services in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan must recognize the value of health care providers by having a commitment to adequate funding and the installation of good-faith bargaining in a provincial bargaining process. And, Mr. Speaker, the government so far has used a heavy hand with its essential services legislation and making a mockery of the collective bargaining process in the province. And the petition reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative 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.

This petition is signed by residents of Regina, and I so submit.

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

**Mr. Quennell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition signed by residents in Saskatchewan concerned about the government's veto of the non-partisan choice of a bipartisan committee at the legislature of the Chief Electoral Officer. And the prayer reads as follows:

We, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectfully request the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take the following action:

Cause the government to recognize the fundamental role that democracy plays in our province and that in order for democracy to be delivered to its full potential we must have the best candidate in these positions of responsibility;

And in so doing, to uphold the mandate of the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, which is an independent office of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly and respect its mandate as posted publicly:

To ensure the right of the people of Saskatchewan to participate freely in honest, open, and fair electoral events and to encourage the involvement of political parties, candidates, and electors by raising their awareness and understanding of electoral processes that are transparent, efficient, and accessible.

And in so doing to uphold the values of Elections Saskatchewan, which are:

To be independent and non-partisan, ensuring public confidence in the independence of the office and its activities by treating all stakeholders equally and without preference;

To have integrity, making certain that every decision and every action enhances the democratic rights of all electors by interpreting and applying policy and legislation fairly and consistently;

To be open and transparent in all activities through consistency of action, regular and public reporting, broad communications and information sharing between and during electoral events;

To be accountable to electors and the members of the Legislative Assembly through statutory reporting of activity and performance against published standards and open discussion of the legislation and regulatory framework of electoral events and election finances;

To be efficient in designing processes and ensuring financial accountability through the development, management, and deployment of up-to-date and cost-effective technology, processes, access channels, and tools that encourage maximum participation and facilitate maximum compliance with financial reporting obligations;

[14:00]

To be effective in electoral event delivery procedures and operations, reducing barriers to compliance, participation, and access to the process for electors, candidates, and parties, ensuring that workers are well prepared, processes are well designed, and measurement systems are in place;

To be innovative, creative, and flexible in delivering the present and preparing for the future, looking broadly for opportunities and partnerships while considering electoral process needs and adopting optimal solutions;

To be consultative with our stakeholders, using advisory committees to evaluate legislative, regulatory, and operational frameworks to ensure that they are current and relevant, regularly reviewing all stakeholder perspectives and needs and by sharing evaluations of Election Saskatchewan's performance;

To be professional in all our activities by bringing to Saskatchewan the best practices of electoral administration across Canada and in democracies across the world;

To create a co-operative working environment and to encourage all members of the election team to work together and to work with their stakeholders and partners to better serve the electorate of Saskatchewan.

And in so doing, to recognize the Chief Electoral Officer plays an integral role, delivering many democratic processes in a fair and impartial manner and therefore must hold the trust, confidence, and respect of not only the elected members of this Assembly but also of all political parties in the province and, by extension, all members of the public;

And in so doing, to recognize that the person who is hired to become the next permanent Chief Electoral Officer will deal with two provincial elections, including the upcoming election 2011 as well as the following election in 2015;

And the Chief Electoral Officer will also deal with the redistribution of the provincial electoral map, which may result in shifting electoral boundaries to reflect demographic and population changes and therefore alter the composition of the provincial constituencies elected members of the Assembly currently represent;

And the Chief Electoral Officer will also conduct a review of the provincial election Act which sets out the guidelines by which we all must follow for the administration of provincial elections, by-elections, enumerations other than during the writ of the election, and provincial election finances, all of which will have implications on future election results;

And in so doing, recognize that the current Acting Chief Electoral Officer has been recommended as the best candidate for the permanent job by a bipartisan committee and by a majority of the leaders of the major political parties to this job on a permanent basis and that a recommendation of this nature should be accepted by the government;

And in so doing, to Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan appoint the chosen candidate, the current Acting Chief Electoral Officer, on this job on a permanent



basis.

I so submit. This is signed by residents of Regina. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Indeed it's my pleasure 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 government. They allude to the two consecutive years of \$1 billion deficits and the \$1 billion of debt growth that's under way within this province under the Sask Party government. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your 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 Regina. I so submit.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present a petition again today in support of the Saskatchewan film industry and the Saskatchewan Communications Network. This petition is signed by concerned citizens who have watched the film and television industry languish here in this province for the last couple of years without support from the government, and now feel it's been kicked to the curb with the closure of SCN. The prayer reads as follows:

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 immediately and without delay recognize the substantial economic contribution that the Saskatchewan film and television industry has contributed to our provincial economy;

And in doing so, to recognize that more than 1,200 jobs in the film industry were created in 2007-2008, providing quality employment to highly skilled and talented people in this industry which keeps many young people and their families in our province while also recruiting people from outside Saskatchewan borders to come here to pursue their career, yet this government's failure to address critical issues to the film industry is actively driving many of these individuals and jobs out of the province;

And in doing so, to recognize that other provinces provide

higher maximum tax credits for the industry, with many providing film companies with the option of tax credits based on either production costs incurred or labour costs, yet because of the inaction of this government, film companies are not choosing to film in Saskatchewan but are now actively choosing other jurisdictions to invest their time, money, and job prospects;

And in doing so, to recognize that because of this government's inaction, production in the film industry has declined by 70 per cent in the last two years and businesses associated with the film industry have begun to close their doors, most recently William F. White and PS Production Services;

And in doing so, to listen to the film industry and its calls for changes to the film employment tax credit that will allow the Saskatchewan film industry to be more competitive with other provinces;

And in doing so, to recognize the irreplaceable role that Saskatchewan Communications Network or SCN plays in fostering the film industry in Saskatchewan, yet this government's short-sighted decision to shut down SCN will cost Saskatchewan filmmakers an important vehicle for showcasing their work and therefore impact their future career possibilities;

And in doing so, to recognize that SCN's benefits are enjoyed not only by the Saskatchewan film industry, but also to large audiences spanning the province, especially in rural Saskatchewan, since many programs are filmed in rural Saskatchewan, bringing economic and cultural benefits, and many programs tell stories about experiences specific to rural Saskatchewan and SCN is broadcast on channels that are available in rural areas without access to SaskTel Max;

And in doing so, to recognize that SCN's benefits also apply directly to Saskatchewan's best and brightest young people through initiatives like *15 Minutes of Fame*, investing in projects created by emerging filmmakers and supporting educational programming for young people such as *Drug Class* and *Wapos Bay*;

And in doing so, to recognize that the void left if SCN is to close will not be filled by a comparable company since SCN tells Saskatchewan stories to Saskatchewan people, building a sense of community and pride in the province, allowing Saskatchewan to have a voice on the Canadian and international cultural landscape by supporting award-winning programming, and provides culturally and socially significant programming that cannot be found anywhere else;

And in doing so, to recognize the positive contributions that SCN has generated for the provincial economy: for example, in 2007, SCN spent \$1.6 million that triggered \$17 million in production; in 2008, SCN spent \$1 million that triggered \$11 million in production; and in 2009, SCN spent \$780,000 that triggered 3.3 million in production and therefore provides an excellent return on investment to our provincial economy;

And in doing so, recognize that shutting down this valuable network will deal an irreparable blow to the cultural, economic, and social landscape of our province;

And in doing so, to immediately and without delay reverse its decision to shut down Saskatchewan Communications Network.

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

This petition is signed by residents of Regina. I so submit.

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Melfort, the Minister of Finance.

#### National Parkinson's Disease Month

**Hon. Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. April is National Parkinson's Disease Month. Parkinson's disease affects the nervous system and causes people to have less control over their muscles. About one in every 250 people over the age of 40 and about one in every 100 people age 65 or older are affected by this disease. Although the average age of onset is 57, occasionally it appears in childhood. Men are more likely to develop Parkinson's than women. Although the cause is not yet clear, scientists believe a combination of genetic and environmental factors are involved.

At this time, there's no known prevention for Parkinson's disease, and treatments only help to manage symptoms. The first sign in most people is a trembling hand. Later the arms and legs may be affected. There is no cure, but by raising awareness we can help raise funds for those searching for a cure and for urgently needed support programs.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the efforts of the Parkinson Society of Canada, which is the national voice of Canadians living with Parkinson's disease. Their purpose is to ease the burden and find a cure through advocacy, education, research, and support services.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that everyone in this Assembly recognize April as National Parkinson's Disease Month. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Prince Albert Students Win Law Day Competition

**Mr. Furber:** — On March 27th, law students from my alma mater, St. Mary High School, competed and came in first place in the provincial Law Day competition in Saskatoon.

At this competition, students from schools from across the province act as witnesses, prosecution, defence, and they participate much as if they were in a real court. Law Day was set up to give people, and in this case students, a better understanding of how the legal system works, and to empower the public.

At this year's event, the mock case involved Reggie from the *Archie Comics* on trial for theft over \$5,000 and possession of stolen goods. The mock trial ended with Reggie being found not guilty on the first count, but guilty on the second count. But more importantly, in this case, Mr. Speaker, it gave St. Mary students first place.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Mary law team was made up of Amanda Hayduk, Julie Mills, Matthew Derworiz, Brenner Holash, and Danielle Mitchell. The team was guided by local lawyer, Neil Raas. Beginning in February, he worked with the students once a week to prepare them for the trial.

All students felt that they learned a great deal about the justice system through this exercise. It might also have served as a reminder to the students to walk on the right side of the law. As Matthew Derworiz told the P.A. *Herald*, it "... showed the importance of staying out of trouble with the law if even Archie [comic] characters can be found guilty."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all members join with me in congratulating St. Mary High School law students on their victory at the provincial Law Day competition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Child Abuse Prevention Month

**Mr. LeClerc:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. April is Child Abuse Prevention Month in Canada. Mr. Speaker, our children are our pride and joy. They are the best representation of ourselves. We must do everything in our power to ensure that the next generation is loved and protected. We want our children to have every advantage we did not have.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, I was sent to St. John's Training School at the age of eight, one of the most violent and brutal reform schools in Canadian history.

Mr. Speaker, child abuse is an atrocity that unfortunately persists till this day. The term child abuse refers to the violence, mistreatment, or neglect that a child or adolescent may experience while in the care of someone they either trust or depend on. There are multiple forms of child abuse.

Physical abuse involves deliberately using force against a child in such a way that the child is either injured or is at risk of being injured. Sexual abuse and exploitation involves using a child for sexual purposes.

Neglect is often chronic and it usually involves repeated incidents. It involves failing to provide what the child needs for his or her physical, psychological, or emotional development and well-being.

Emotional abuse involves harming a child's sense of self and includes acts or omissions that result in or place the child at risk of serious behavioural, cognitive, emotional, or mental health problems.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we all move together to be a

province that honours all of our children as God's precious creations.

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

#### Rosemont/Mount Royal Family Fun Day

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to extend recognition and thanks to the Rosemont/Mount Royal Community Association for their continued leadership in our community. As just one example of their many meaningful contributions, I reference the Rosemont/Mount Royal Family Fun Day on February 6th at Martin Collegiate. I was pleased to attend.

The event was well attended by children and adults, providing a great opportunity for the community to come together. The event featured an exceptional strawberry social. Activities included oversized board games, a craft table, face painting, a draw for two beautiful gift baskets, a giant jumper, a Dino Bouncer slide that even my wife couldn't resist, Mr. Speaker. They were a hit with children and adults. Overall it was a great success and very well organized.

I'd like to extend sincere thanks to Chairperson Jim Emmons, to all the executive members too numerous to mention here today, to community organizer Theresa Baumgartner, and to the many volunteers that came out to make the family fun day successful. I know that the community appreciated this event very much, as well as the numerous ongoing activities that the association is engaged with.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of this Assembly to join with me in extending our sincere thanks to the Rosemont/Mount Royal Community Association for their enrichment of our community. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook.

[14:15]

#### Terry Fox's Marathon of Hope

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of Terry Fox's Marathon of Hope. At a very young age, Terry was diagnosed with osteosarcoma, but because cancer treatment was still in its infant stages, the doctors were forced to amputate his leg.

Terry soon adjusted to life as an amputee and found inspiration in Dick Traum, the first amputee to compete and complete the New York Marathon. Not satisfied with the amount of attention and funding for cancer research, Terry sought to run across the country in hopes of receiving just a single dollar from each Canadian citizen for cancer research. Terry named this endeavour the Marathon of Hope. Even though Terry faced considerable challenges in running from coast to coast on a prosthetic leg, Terry's spirit won over. Soon his Marathon of Hope began to attract international attention and donations kept pouring in.

Mr. Speaker, the rest is history. Since Terry's vision came to light, over half a billion dollars has been raised for cancer research through the Marathon of Hope. Terry has become a Canadian icon throughout the world and his name has become synonymous with hope. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of this House and Assembly to join me in honouring Terry Fox and his Marathon of Hope. Terry Fox truly was, and remains, the greatest Canadian ever. Thank you.

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

#### Legislative Assembly Members

**Ms. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, the *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary* defines hypocrisy as "the act of persistently professing beliefs or actions that are inconsistent with one's actions. Hypocrisy is thus a kind of lie." This behaviour certainly fits with the Sask Party government.

For example, they criticize the Leader of the Opposition for working outside the province. Yes, the Leader of the Opposition worked in Alberta for 9 years; a fact that we are proud of. He was a top-level executive in a large and successful company working with governments from around the globe. He travelled the world, gaining perspective and expertise that he has brought back to our caucus.

Now the hypocrisy of the members on that side of the House though, if they would examine the work experience of their leader, they would realize that the Premier spent several years working outside the province as well. The only difference, Mr. Speaker, was that while our leader was a well-respected businessman, the Premier was nothing but a low-level hack working for the Mulroney Tories.

But the hypocrisy continues. The Sask Party also criticized our leader for donating the entire taxpayer-funded portion of his pension to charity, ignoring the fact that at least two Sask Party MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly] are happily raking in thousands of taxpayer dollars every year. It is purely hypocritical for the Sask Party to criticize our leader while their members are collecting, keeping 100 per cent of their pensions.

So before this government's pointing fingers, they should remember that three are pointing back, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Before I recognize the next member I just want to remind members that they're not to refer to other member's character, either directly or indirectly, or to speak unbecomingly of members. We've mentioned that on many occasions, whether in statements or any other comment. Final statement.

I recognize the member from Moose Jaw North.

#### 76th Annual TheatreFest

**Mr. Michelson:** — Mr. Speaker, since 1932 Theatre Saskatchewan has been performing live theatre in the province through volunteer-based membership groups. In fact it's the oldest and largest community theatre organization in Canada. In Saskatchewan, there's an impressive array of talent performing

in live theatre and we, the people of Saskatchewan, are indeed fortunate to be able to have an engaging experience by taking in some of these live theatre performances.

Last week from April 4th to 10th, Saskatchewan Theatre held its 76th Annual TheatreFest in Moose Jaw. Performances took place in the Mae Wilson Theatre, one of the most exquisite restored theatres in all of Saskatchewan. TheatreFest promotes the very culture of live theatre. It improves the quality of life, builds pride in our communities as well as supporting economic growth.

This annual competition of live theatre production comes from communities throughout Saskatchewan including Strasbourg and Melfort, Kerrobert, Regina, Prince Albert, The Battlefords, and of course the pride of culture, my hometown of Moose Jaw. There were over 100 participants at TheatreFest and about 1,000 spectators who attended the variety of theatrical performances throughout the week.

I'd like to extend congratulations to the actors, the directors, the writers, the crew, the volunteers, and everyone involved in TheatreFest 2010 on the success of this great theatre competition. Thank you.

#### STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

##### Rulings on Points of Order

**The Speaker:** — Before we move to question period, I want to speak to the two points of order that were raised yesterday.

Yesterday the Government House Leader raised a point of order regarding questions raised by the Opposition House Leader during question period. The Government House Leader contends that the questions impugned the motives of government members by accusing them of fixing the 2007 election. In response to the point of order, the Opposition House Leader said the point of order was based on quotes he made from a legal judgment.

Upon review of the questions asked by the Opposition House Leader, there were three questions on page 4763 of *Hansard* where he asked if certain members conspired to fix the outcome of the 2007 general election. This part of the question was not part of the material quoted by the member. Even though the question was direct and not couched in the quote, I want to remind members of a principle: one cannot do indirectly what cannot be done directly.

Speaker Hagel made this point on March 31st, 1999 when stated and I quote, "Although he's quoting directly, that still does not permit members to engage in the use of unparliamentary words when engaging in debate." In this case, the accusation was made directly.

A similar accusation was ruled out of order on March 26, 2001 when a group of members was associated with the contravention of election laws. In this ruling, Speaker Kowalsky stated, and I quote:

I remind members that the proceedings of this Assembly are based on a long-standing tradition of respect for the

integrity of all members. The integrity or motives of members, whether individually or collectively, should not be questioned indirectly in debate.

This was also expressed in Speaker Osika's ruling made May 12, 2000 when a series of statements made in debate attempted to connect members of the opposition with criminal convictions. These comments were also ruled out of order.

It is well substantiated by the parliamentary authorities and our own rules and practices that such accusations are well beyond the bounds permitted by parliamentary debate. I have found it necessary to rule on this a number of times in the last number of months. Using the device of a question to ask a member if he or she participated in an impropriety is doing indirectly what one cannot do directly.

Asking a member to admit that he conspired to fix an election is the equivalent of an accusation of wrongdoing. There is little difference between this and the incidents earlier this session when questions and comments left the impression that certain members are under investigation. I repeat the words of Speaker Kowalsky: "The integrity or motives of members, whether individually or collectively, should not be questioned indirectly in debate."

I find that the comments made by the Opposition House Leader are out of order. I ask him to withdraw the remarks and apologize to the Assembly. I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Yates:** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remarks and apologize.

**The Speaker:** — In the second point of order, I would like to deal with that was raised yesterday, the Opposition House Leader raised the point of order that touched on the role of the Chair in dealing with his line of questions related to party political functions, which he contends were relevant to responsibilities of the Premier and the Attorney General.

In response to the point of order, the Government Deputy House Leader contended that it is inappropriate for the Minister of Justice to comment on matters that are before the courts. I committed to review the whole matter to ensure that the rules are being appropriately and fairly applied.

During the spring of 2007, Speaker Kowalsky found it necessary to repeatedly caution members about the impropriety of a line of questioning about a caucus matter. That led to a point of order which was ruled on April 26th, 2007. With respect to the propriety of the line of questioning Speaker Kowalsky made these two points: "... questions must be posed in a manner that clearly connects the issue to the responsibility of a minister or the government as a whole." And "... when a question is put that is not directly connected to a government responsibility, the Speaker shall rule the question out of order but provide the government with the option to respond."

Speaker Kowalsky also reiterated the Assembly's practice to allow questions related to political parties when they are posed in terms of statutes or the administration of law.

I wanted to point out that our present rule 19(2) came into existence partly in response to the subject of the ruling I have just quoted. Even though the rules specifically prohibit such questions, it has been my practice to follow the guidelines established by my predecessor.

Specifically in regard to the line of questioning by the member for Regina Dewdney, I have reviewed the verbatim record. The first question asked did not relate to a ministerial responsibility, and it was difficult to see a clear connection in the questions that followed. It was only through the Opposition House Leader's point of order that he sought to clarify the connection by stating that the trust money falls within the purview and responsibility of the Minister of Justice.

In the questions asked yesterday, a certain level of nuance was applied which was not discernable to the Speaker. I repeat what Speaker Kowalsky stated, "... questions must be posed in a manner that clearly connects the issue to the responsibility of a minister." Further compounding the issue is the fact that it is not always possible for the Speaker to have a complete knowledge of what falls under the purview of a minister.

I provided with the minister with an opportunity to respond. In the future, if a matter questioned is not part of that responsibility, it would be appreciated if the minister could say so. Until recent events, I can find no other examples of a minister simply not responding to a question. Rule 19(3) anticipates a minister will provide a response even if it is to decline or to take notice.

Henceforth in similar circumstances, for the record, I request that ministers orally decline the question. The minister may decline with or without reason. In the meantime though, I will continue to intervene to provide caution where it is deemed necessary and provide ministers an opportunity to voluntarily answer in accordance with the guidelines established by Speaker Kowalsky.

On this last point I want to relate a relevant precedent on the topic of interventions by the Speaker. On March 23rd, 1994, the Opposition House Leader of the day complained in a point of order that the Speaker was precipitously intervening in question period about a line of questions. In making the point of order, the Opposition House Leader stated that it is not up to the Speaker to decide if the question should be answered but, and I quote, "... the responsibility of the minister to make a decision to answer or not to answer ..."

Speaker Rolfes ruled that his interventions were to warn the members to an irregular proceeding, as he is bound to do as outlined by paragraph 323 of Beauchesne's, 6th Edition. This ruling further enforces the responsibility of the Speaker to intervene when it is deemed necessary.

I now want to address the comments made by the Deputy Government House Leader in response to the point of order. The member is correct in his assumption that matters before the court should not be discussed or debated by members. In my review of precedents on *sub judice*, I find numerous rulings over the years that have defined Saskatchewan practice as follows. *Sub judice*:

[sub judice] is not a rule in the sense of being a standing order, but rather a long-standing practice or convention that has been applied fairly strictly in this Assembly to motions, questions, and returns.

It is applied more rigidly here than in any other jurisdiction. Given the Deputy Government House Leader's assertion that the matter is before the courts, I inquired with the Registrars of both the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal. The Registrar of the Court of Appeal indicated that the matter is scheduled to be heard before the Court of Appeal on Thursday, April 15th in Saskatoon.

For the benefit of members I want to take a few moments to explain the principle of *sub judice*. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, in hearing the New Brunswick Broadcasting Company versus Nova Scotia (Speaker of the House of Assembly) case in 1993, stated the following:

Our democratic government consists of several branches: the Crown, as represented by the Governor General; the legislative body; the executive; and the courts. It is fundamental to the working of government as a whole that all these parts play their proper role. It is equally fundamental that no one of them overstep its bounds, that each show proper deference to the legitimate sphere of activity of the other.

The passage appears on page 319 of Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, Second Edition. Maingot further states, "The legislative bodies in turn exercise deference by their rules of sub judice, no matter awaiting or under adjudication by a court of law should be brought before it."

On April the 18th, 1978, Speaker Brockelbank made the following ruling dealing with a point order that asserted that certain oral questions were *sub judice*, and I quote:

The *sub judice* rule is based on two principles. The first is that the Legislative Assembly should take no action which might prejudice the rights of citizens before the courts. The second principle is that the Assembly should not set itself up as a second or alternative forum of debate of matters already before another judicial body.

[14:30]

On March 23rd, 1994, after checking with the court registrar as to the status of a matter before the courts, Speaker Rolfes ruled, and I quote:

It has long been the practice of this Assembly that matters before the courts are not to be discussed or [to be] debated by members. The purpose of this convention is to protect the parties involved in the court action and to maintain respect between the legislative and judicial branches of government.

As I have stated, this Assembly has taken a strict interpretation of the application of *sub judice*. Because the matter is before the courts, I rule any questions related to this matter are out of order.

Before closing, I want to comment on the timing of the point of order which is the subject of the ruling. It was made in the midst of an unrelated proceeding. In the future, I ask that points of order unrelated to the matter under debate be held until the question before the Assembly is either concluded or adjourned. I thank members for their co-operation.

### QUESTION PERIOD

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

#### Personal Health Information

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health, and it deals with a report received today from the Information and Privacy Commissioner, a report that dealt with a pharmacist in the Sunrise Health Region where they had been investigated for a breach of privacy of a former patient. And my question to the minister relates to a comment made by the investigator in this case, where he says, and I quote, “The investigation focuses on the misuse of the pharmaceutical information program, or PIP, for an illegal purpose.”

In the report that the minister will have received and other members will have received, there are recommendations. My question to the minister is: based on this report from the Privacy Commissioner, what has the minister done and what has the government done to rectify this matter of misuse of information that is to be kept confidential by pharmacists in the province?

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

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the pharmaceutical information program has been in place . . . It’s one of the first portions of an electronic health record. It’s been in place in the province for a number of years, and has been serving the province very well.

It is a great concern of our government, especially, and I’m sure all individuals in the province, if there is a breach in security of a program such as PIP, the pharmaceutical information program. We know that has taken place. The Privacy Commissioner has looked into it. He has made a number of recommendations. Those recommendations we are looking at, Mr. Speaker, because our first priority is to make sure the security of personal information, in this situation pharmaceutical information, is paramount, Mr. Speaker. We’ll be looking at those recommendations and implementing the ones that we feel will help secure that information into the future.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister indicates or tells us that the program, the PIP program, is working well. In his report, the commissioner says, and I quote:

Given the weaknesses in PIP exposed by this investigation, I recommend that Saskatchewan Health take immediate remedial action that would involve both a technical solution and revised policy.

My question to the minister is this: based on this recommendation that it isn’t working, contrary to what he says here in the Assembly, what steps have been taken and what steps will be taken to protect information of health care users in this province?

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

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I had mentioned before, the pharmaceutical information program has been set up in the province a number of years ago, and has been functioning in the province for a number of years, supplying excellent service for the practitioners that have access to the program, Mr. Speaker. It is a program that really absolutely has to be delivered in the province, and I think has been delivered quite well. It is disconcerting though when there is breaches of security, Mr. Speaker.

It has been up and running for a number of years. This is the first major breach of security that we know of, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of that breach of security, the Privacy Commissioner has looked into it, made some recommendations. As I said in my previous answer, we’re looking at those recommendations, recommendations that we can follow through on, that will secure personal information, in this case prescription information, we’ll be moving on, Mr. Speaker, because again number one priority is the security of patients’ information.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the Privacy Commissioner is talking about firming up health records in the province and is worried and concerned, as many individual citizens are in the province, about their health records. At the very time when this discussion is going on, I have here an order in council dated March 31st, signed by the President of the Executive Council, the Premier, which opens up information of health patients across the province when they use the health services.

My question to the minister is this: why, at a time when across Canada citizens are worried about their health records, would we choose now to open up the files and give out information that belongs to the patient to anyone? Why are we doing that? And when will you realize that the people of the province don’t want this action? And when will you reverse your decision?

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

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said in the case of the PIP program, any time there’s a breach of security, a program that’s been set up to ensure that the security is in place, Mr. Speaker, we are going to look into it — a totally different issue than what he finished with the question, Mr. Speaker, the issue around patient information. Name and address, Mr. Speaker, will be given out through health regions.

Once the health region has reached a contract with a foundation, Mr. Speaker, that is totally different than what the Opposition Leader just finished saying, that the patients’ information will be opened up. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. That is misinformation. It is simply a name and an address. Patients have all the opportunity through their stay, whether it’s through

entrance, discharge, and for a couple of months after, to opt out of the program, Mr. Speaker, at any time. They will be well informed of that, that they can opt out at any time through the process.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. The fact of the matter is that patients in this province don't want any of their information given out to anyone. And they don't want it given out for any reason. That's the fact. In fact the commissioner states in his report, and I quote, "It is critically important that all persons involved in our health care system recognize that motive is largely irrelevant when some patient's privacy is violated." It doesn't matter whether it's for a good reason or a bad reason.

The commissioner says that is the property of the individual, not of the Minister of Health, not of the Premier, who is busy talking to someone else to divert from the question. The fact is, this is the property of the individual. And, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is, when is he going to come to his senses and realize the people of this province don't want this information released?

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

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, it's interesting. For a number of years, for decades actually, this information was released from health regions to foundations, Mr. Speaker, in the . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I ask members to give the Minister of Health the same opportunity to respond as was given the Leader of the Opposition to place the question. Order. The Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, we have a province of Ontario that has changed their regulations to fit this. We have a province of Manitoba that's changed their regulations. Mr. Speaker, we have Alberta is now looking into it. It's in front of a committee that, after talking to a number of their members, feel that they're going to be moving in that direction, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this simply . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. The member from Saskatoon Fairview will allow the response. Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, this is simply allowing health regions that so choose. There will be a number of health regions that won't enter into an agreement with a foundation. Some will. I believe Regina and Saskatoon are already working with their foundations to make sure that the proper protocol is in place.

We as the Ministry of Health are setting up a template contract that will allow that to work and, Mr. Speaker, we will be allowing patients to opt out at any time, at any time through the process, Mr. Speaker.

And as I said, it is a decision that our government has made as

well as other provinces in this country, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, in the order in council that was signed on March 31st by the Premier, in the regs it states, under subsection (2):

A designated trustee may, in accordance with this section:

(a) use client information for fundraising purposes [we understand that]; or

(b) disclose client information to a fundraising agency for fundraising purposes.

The question that many citizens in this province have when they look at this document is who those other fundraisers are, who the fundraising purposes, the client information under the trustee, who can they release that information to. Because it says right here, "disclose client information to a fundraising agency for fundraising purposes."

Mr. Speaker, this is why the public is concerned. They don't understand why any information is being released and who it's going to be released to. The question is, why don't we just withdraw this order in council? We'd support to do it today and get rid of this misguided idea and purpose for it.

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

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, we have been through this. As I said that the Ministry of Health is working on a template contract to work with the health regions, the couple, two or three, that are going to enter into agreements with the health foundations in their area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all commend the absolute marvellous work that foundations have conducted over the number of years throughout this province in every constituency in this province, Mr. Speaker. Foundations have done a marvellous, marvellous job. Mr. Speaker . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, foundations have done a marvellous job throughout the province. They have donated to hospitals for equipment. They have in some cases built hospitals, under the previous government. I think of the community of Redvers, for example. A hospital that was built in that community, 100 per cent raised through a foundation, Mr. Speaker. No money from the government opposite, Mr. Speaker. Foundations do wonderful work in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, and health regions and foundations have worked very closely and will continue to work very closely, Mr. Speaker, to ensure the best care that we can offer in Saskatchewan.

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

### Finance and Electoral Issues

**Mr. Yates:** — Mr. Speaker, section 9(b) of *The Department of Justice Act* states, and I quote, “The minister shall . . . see that the administration of public affairs is in accordance with the law.” Surely the Minister of Justice would agree that part of his role is therefore to ensure that elections in this province are conducted fairly and impartially and in accordance with the law.

To the Minister of Justice: does the minister agree that he has an obligation to ensure that elections in this province are conducted fairly and impartially?

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. The question would be more appropriately put to the Board of Internal Economy. But at the same time, the member, the member may wish to respond. I recognize the Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, the members across are well aware that this matter is . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. You wanted a response. Listen. The Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, this matter is . . . The members opposite are well aware that this matter is before the courts. Within their caucus, they have two members in good standing of the Law Society of Saskatchewan. What I’d like to ask the member from Regina Dewdney to do is ask those lawyers how appropriate it would be for any member of the House to comment on a matter that is going to court within the next two or three days.

Mr. Speaker, that is directly where those members are trying to go with this line of questioning. It would be inappropriate for me or for any member in this House to speculate on what is going to take place on a matter that is currently before the court. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite know full well what’s taking place later this week. I’d ask them just to wait comfortably and see what happens when their matter goes before the court. They’ll get a response from the court and it would be highly inappropriate for any member of this House to comment on what our judiciary, members of the judiciary might do, Mr. Speaker.

[14:45]

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

**Mr. Yates:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the Premier’s special adviser, Mr. Downs, handed out a court document pertaining to a case before the courts to reporters in the legislative rotunda. Mr. Downs is an employee of the Premier’s office. He was doing this during working hours and he was doing it in his capacity as an employee of the Executive Council.

To the Premier: since he now agrees that this case is relevant to

his responsibilities as President of the Executive Council, can he tell us will he be asking the Deputy Premier, Mr. Downs, and . . . [inaudible] . . . to make themselves available to the court at their earliest opportunity?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, if documents are provided that are . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Morgan:** — Documents are provided that are matters of public record. That’s certainly the prerogative of individuals to provide information and background information that would be available anywhere. But what would be inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, is for any member of the Legislative Assembly to comment in the Chamber or outside the Chamber on any matter that’s currently before the court. Mr. Speaker, I would go one step further and urge all of the members in this Assembly not to make any comment on a matter that will be before the Court of Appeal later this week.

And what I’d like to do, Mr. Speaker, is invite the members opposite to have consultation with the two members that are in their caucus that are members in good standing of the Law Society, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, members that in their practices that before they were elected, enjoyed a good reputation. And what I do is ask those members to have consultation with those members of the Law Society and to determine, make an appropriate decision that they should wait and see what is going to happen when the matter goes to court, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member from Regina Dewdney.

**Mr. Yates:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Premier won’t . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Premier won’t stand to answer these questions, then he must be saying that Reg Downs handed out these documents without his authority and that he conducted Sask Party business on government time.

To the Premier: will he be disciplining Mr. Downs for conducting party business on government time or was Mr. Downs operating with his full knowledge and agreement? Which is it?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand what Mr. Downs was passing out was a copy of Justice Kyle’s decision, a document that is in fact public record, because there was some issue as to what was quoted or not quoted.

What I’d like to do is ask the member from Dewdney and all the members opposite just to wait and see what takes place when the matter goes to the Court of Appeal. I’d like to urge them just to exercise a little bit of restraint, and wait and see what kind of a decision comes out of the Court of Appeal. I’ve indicated before and, Mr. Speaker, in your ruling you’ve indicated before how prejudicial it could be, not just to the



members in this House but also, Mr. Speaker, and more importantly, to the litigants who have a matter before the Court of Appeal.

It would be totally inappropriate for anybody in this House to make any kind of a comment on a matter that is currently before the courts. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the members on this side are not going to be doing that, nor should the members on that side.

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

### Support for Film and Television Industry

**Ms. Chartier:** — Mr. Speaker, SCN has brought millions of dollars of out-of-province investment into our economy and provides a vehicle to ensure Saskatchewan people have a chance to tell Saskatchewan stories. SCN viewers and those involved in the film and television industry came here today to their legislature looking for the answer to a very simple question.

To the minister: why is this government shutting down SCN?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the member for her question. Mr. Speaker, when the decision was made in this budget to wind down the operations of SCN, it certainly wasn't a decision that I as minister made lightly.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly want to see the broadcaster continue in another form. That is why we, Mr. Speaker, that is why we are in the coming days going to be moving towards the expression-of-interest stage in this matter, Mr. Speaker. That's a more formal process to see if there are interested parties that want to come forward to operate the broadcast licence, Mr. Speaker.

But in the interim I can inform the members opposite that there has been interest on an informal basis of individuals and different groups that are looking to continue on with the operations, and we are working towards hopefully a successful conclusion over the coming months, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Mr. Speaker, this government is shutting down SCN — or winding down, the euphemism we use here — without due process or a plan and in an awfully big hurry. And Saskatchewan taxpayers will pay the price. We know for example the government will have to spend money settling contracts with independent producers, many of whom spent money, made decisions, and secured outside financing based on SCN's broadcast licence.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister: how much is it going to cost Saskatchewan taxpayers to settle SCN's contracts with independent producers?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Mr. Speaker, the member will know and the member can refer to the budget. Mr. Speaker, we have provided funding in this budget for SCN to wind down their operations, and including in that is making sure that all the producers and all the production companies that we had contractual obligations with under SCN, all of their contracts will remain whole, Mr. Speaker. We will ensure that that takes place, Mr. Speaker.

We've been in very close contact with the CRTC [Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission], Mr. Speaker, and the Canadian Media Fund to ensure that those contracts are fulfilled, whether that be on the remaining time that SCN continues to operate the channel, Mr. Speaker, or through other sources that are available including video on demand through SaskTel, Mr. Speaker. And we will ensure that all of those contracts remain whole, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — The question was actually, how much? Does this government even know how much? Mr. Speaker, it's becoming increasingly clear that this government has no comprehension of the critical role that SCN plays in our province's film and television industry. People wanting to tell Saskatchewan stories are able to leverage the broadcast agreement with SCN to secure other broadcast licences and outside financing.

SCN broadcast licences have been a critical component in growing our film and television industry here. One of the sources of out-of-province funding is the Canadian Media Fund. Without SCN, our province will lose \$1 million this year alone in investment from this fund.

To the minister: what is his plan for helping filmmakers leverage financing from the Canadian Media Fund without SCN?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to again say to the member that we are undergoing a process right now where we are looking to see what interested parties there are in continuing the broadcast operations, in continuing with the CRTC licence within the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

It is our hope — and the work that is being done right now — that that licence continues in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And we know that there are under \$1 million, about \$940,000, Mr. Speaker, that are in an envelope of funding for SCN through the Canadian Media Fund, Mr. Speaker. According to the Canadian Media Fund policy, Mr. Speaker, and the discussions that the management team has had with the Canadian Media Fund, those funds are eligible to be transferred over to a new entity once we have gone through this transition process and a new operator is found for the CRTC licence, Mr.

Speaker.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that support remains for the film and television industry in the province whether that be through the film employment tax credit, Mr. Speaker, through funding to SaskFilm which is higher than it has been under the NDP in previous governments, and the sound stage, Mr. Speaker, here in Regina.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely appalling that these discussions are going on now after the fact rather than making the cut. But this is typical of this government.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's film and television industry is in crisis. It's in absolute dire straits right now. Next week PS Production Services will close its doors. This comes on the heels of the recent closing of William F. White just a few weeks ago. The minister just said that he supports the film and television industry, yet in the middle of this crisis the government is rushing to sell off one of the key mechanisms producers have used for years to secure outside financing for telling Saskatchewan stories.

To the minister: what's the government's plan to ensure Saskatchewan stories get told and that Saskatchewan producers are able to secure their first trigger broadcast licences without SCN?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Mr. Speaker, as I've already said in the House, Mr. Speaker, what is happening now is we are looking at interested parties. We'll be entering a formal process where we'll be having parties that are interested in continuing on with the CRTC licence and continuing the broadcast operations that SCN has done up until this point, Mr. Speaker. We have had a number of discussions as a ministry and with stakeholders, Mr. Speaker, in the past. There is going to be a larger working group that is going to be put together that will be made up of industry stakeholders, Mr. Speaker, SaskFilm, the ministry. That's going to be taking place in the coming days.

Mr. Speaker, but I want to assure the member that this is something that we are taking a very hard look at, Mr. Speaker. We know that the success in the past, Mr. Speaker, of the industry, in large part, has been because of major productions, Mr. Speaker. We're looking . . . I know SaskFilm is looking at bringing a major production to the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to hopefully some good news on that front.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — I've just drawn a complete blank, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: I'm wondering how the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I ask members in the gallery not to participate. Member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

**Ms. Chartier:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering how the closure of SCN, how this minister can reconcile the closure of SCN with the cultural policy that he just released three weeks ago about reconciling community, culture, and commerce.

**The Speaker:** — Member responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to talk about the cultural policy in this province that was introduced by this government, Mr. Speaker. We hadn't had a cultural policy or a cultural statement by any former government for over 25 years in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can talk about a number of things that this government has done for the culture of this province, Mr. Speaker, whether it be the Building Pride program that helps communities celebrate the pride that they have in their province, Mr. Speaker, the new five-year agreement with Sask Sport, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to lottery funding, any number of other programs that this government has put in place, Mr. Speaker.

We're going to be working with the industry going forward when it comes to the film and television industry, Mr. Speaker. There's going to be a larger working group that is going to come together in the next couple of days to look how we move the industry forward despite this transitional period. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

**The Speaker:** — I'd ask the Government House Leader to state his point of order.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, during member statements, the member from Regina Walsh Acres used words that had been designated as unparliamentarily in Beauchesne's, Mr. Speaker, when she referred to the government and members as hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker — Beauchesne's, page 148, October 25, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite also referred to the Premier as nothing but a low-level hack, Mr. Speaker, as a derogatory term in an attempt to demean, denigrate, and to dishonour the Premier. The member from Regina Walsh Acres continuously insults and impugns the honour of members of the government, Mr. Speaker, even after apologizing for her previous actions. I ask that she withdraw her remarks and apologize unequivocally without restating her offending remarks, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The member from Regina Walsh Acres in her member statement today made a statement about actions of the minister and the

government in acting in a way that has been inconsistent with the integrity of this House, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to watch and read the statement very carefully, watch on tape, Mr. Speaker, and review the *Hansard* very carefully of the statement and bring back your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

[15:00]

**The Speaker:** — I believe . . . Order, order. I believe earlier today, following the statement, I asked the members to be cautious as to how they present their statements and the words they use. Given the point of order that's been raised, we will look at the statement to ensure that indeed the proper action was followed.

Why is the Opposition House Leader on his feet?

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

**The Speaker:** — The Opposition House Leader may state his point of order.

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today on a point of order.

This Assembly and Houses, assemblies across the country, Mr. Speaker, work on co-operation and the parties working together. Mr. Speaker, on May the 15th, 2006, the Standing Committee on House Services appointed a subcommittee whose purpose it was to study and make recommendations on the adoption of a legislative calendar and revisions to sitting times. The subcommittee was made up of the Speaker, the Government House Leader, the Opposition House Leader. It was a joint, co-operative, collaborative effort between the government and the opposition to make this House work better. The subcommittee returned to the standing committee with recommendations on rule changes which were unanimously adopted on October the 16th, 2006.

Despite agreeing to these rules in 2006, the current government is going against both the letter and the spirit of these rules by convening standing committees outside the regular hours of the Assembly to deal with Bills and estimates. Bills and estimates were previously dealt with in the House in the Committee of the Whole and the Committee of Finance respectively.

The rule changes adopted in 2006 were intended to assist members in dealing with the work previously dealt with, with the Committee of the Whole and the Committee of Finance, more efficiently. But within the hours of the Assembly, the rule changes were not intended to permit the majority to subvert due process and force its will upon the minority, Mr. Speaker.

Rule 6(1) specifies the sitting times of the Legislative Assembly as follows: Monday, 1:30 to 10:30, with a recess between 5 and 7; Tuesday 1:30 to 10:30, with a recess between 5 and 7; Wednesday 1:30 to 5 p.m.; Thursday 10 a.m. till 1 p.m.

Rule 6(5) then states, "Committees of the Whole Assembly shall follow the Assembly's recess and adjournment times."

And finally, rule 123 states, "The procedures of the Committee of the Whole Assembly shall apply to all standing committees

unless otherwise specified in the rules." The sitting hours of the whole Assembly are specified in the rules and the rules of the whole Assembly apply to committees, Mr. Speaker.

While the official opposition recognizes there may be from time to time a need for standing committees to meet outside of the specified sitting hours — and it has happened many times — in order to properly consult on public or important matters, such instances should occur by mutual agreement of the parties. This amounts to the majority . . . The current actions by the government, in setting committee times outside the sitting hours without any consultation with the opposition, Mr. Speaker, amounts to the majority forcing its will upon the minority in violation of the rules of the Assembly and the intent of the changes made by this Assembly.

The official opposition therefore requests that you rule on this matter in accordance with the *Rules and Procedures* of our Assembly, the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. And we would further request that we would have that ruling by 5 o'clock today, Mr. Speaker, because of the request by . . . or not the request but the motion to meet this evening by the government. And, Mr. Speaker, we received no notice this morning. The announcements came this morning, Mr. Speaker, less than 24 hours prior to a committee meeting, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you consider this point of order.

**The Speaker:** — . . . speak to the point of order.

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. The Opposition House Leader had the opportunity to place his point of order without interference. I ask the opposition members to allow the Government House Leader to respond.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, two points on this particular issue. First point, Mr. Speaker, is if the member has an issue with the operation of the rules of the House . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Government House Leader.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Opposition House Leader has a concern about the operation of the rules of this House, a better place to deal with that is through a point of privilege.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the Assembly clearly lay out that committee hearings outside of regular sittings are contemplated, planned for, and done, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Government House Leader.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — The Opposition House Leader says that there was no notice. Mr. Speaker, our House Services office contacted their House Services office at 5 o'clock yesterday

afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to inform them of committee hearings today. That was 24 hours, actually 27 hours in advance, Mr. Speaker. Further that there would be committee hearings being held on Thursday afternoon, so another 24 hours on top of that, Mr. Speaker. So notice has been provided to the members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

The rules before this Assembly clearly outline and allow for committee hearings to be held outside of the House's regular hours. And it happens all the time, Mr. Speaker, with the scrutiny committees, Mr. Speaker, and other committees as well now that we have gone to the policy field committees.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I've listened to the point of order and I'll certainly take the time to review the point of order. I will not give a commitment to a response by five. But also the point of order is more a debate between the two House leaders in organizing the time, which has normally happened in the past and the House rules committee. I will look at . . . I will review the point of order.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**The Speaker:** — Order. I ask members to have the courtesy to allow the Clerk to place the question before us. I recognize the Government Whip.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to order the answers to question 1,350 through 1,437.

**The Speaker:** — 1,350 through 1,437 are ordered.

### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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

### Hours of Sitting

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At the end of my remarks I will move the motion to extend the sitting times of the Assembly and the sitting times for standing committees for the remainder of the spring session.

Mr. Speaker, why would a motion of this nature, a motion to extend the hours this Assembly will sit each day, be necessary? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a quote from the member for Saskatoon Meewasin stated in this House on March the 15th:

In the British parliamentary [system] . . . A majority has a right to pass its legislative agenda. A majority has a right to pass its budget . . . But the minority has the right to hold the majority to account, to ask questions, and to get answers.

And, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't agree more. The rules of this Assembly afford the opposition the opportunity to debate each specified Bill for a total of 20 hours.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. The member from Athabasca will allow the Deputy Government House Leader to

speak.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — The rules of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, afford the opposition the opportunity to debate each specified Bill for a total of 20 hours. Furthermore, the rules state that the cumulative time for debating budget estimates is no less than 75 hours. Mr. Speaker, in order that all of these critical hours of debate be realized, and in order that the government can move its legislative agenda forward as the member from Saskatoon Meewasin reminded us is the tradition of the British parliamentary system, our government is ready and willing to sit in this Chamber from early morning until well into the night. That is why we are proposing that, for the remainder of this spring session, that this House sit from 8:00 a.m. until midnight, Monday to Thursday, with time allotted for two recesses each day in order that the opposition has ample time to debate this government's legislation and get the answers that they claim they are seeking.

Traditionally this Assembly has been an often combative and adversarial setting wherein vigorous but reasoned debate on the government's agenda is conducted. However, Mr. Speaker, the spirited and confrontational discourse within this Assembly has historically been conducted with a modicum of decorum, respect, and co-operation between parties. But the New Democrats in opposition have refused to show any willingness to be reasonable or even slightly co-operative in advancing the business of this Assembly through the process.

Case in point, Mr. Speaker, currently before this Assembly is a piece of legislation, Bill 117, *The Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Heritage Act*. This is indeed a short piece of legislation whose purpose is to enact in law the recognition of the proud tradition of hunting and trapping in our great province. It's a piece of legislation that the opposition have described as "low-hanging fruit," "thin gruel," "superfluous," "redundant," "puffery," "meaningless." And yet the opposition has seen fit to filibuster Bill 117 for over eight hours thus far — a Bill they describe as meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, the primary rationale provided by the opposition for holding up Bill 117, for spending over eight hours filibustering this Bill, the reason articulated once again by the member from Saskatoon Meewasin is that Bill 117, *The Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Heritage Act*, is meaningless because of its length and because all it accomplishes, according to the opposition, is to declare a day.

Well that's interesting rationale, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps it's more than just a little bit hypocritical. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, the then NDP government introduced a Bill in the spring sitting, Bill 49, *The Police and Peace Officers' Memorial Day Act*. Mr. Speaker, that Bill was half a page long, and about half the content of the Bill was a preamble. The intent of this Bill established the last Sunday in September each year as Police and Peace Officers' Memorial Day in Saskatchewan. I think we can all agree, or at least those of us on this side of the House would agree that the merit of that piece of legislation, Bill 49, *The Police and Peace Officers' Memorial Day Act*, despite its length, was of significant importance to the people of Saskatchewan, particularly those in law enforcement.

And, Mr. Speaker, when in opposition, members on this side of

the House did agree. When a second reading on the Bill was moved, did the Saskatchewan Party obstruct the Bill? Did we filibuster for eight hours on a one-page Bill? No we didn't, Mr. Speaker. The approach of the Saskatchewan Party was one of co-operation and courtesy, recognizing the intent of the Bill for what it was, to acknowledge the selfless contributions of fallen police and peace officers who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our great province. To quote the member from Saskatoon Southeast, the current Minister of Justice:

... we want to ensure that this Bill is passed in a timely manner so that memorial day can take place in the year 2006. We want to commit to the members opposite and to the members in the gallery that we want to ensure that this Bill has speedy passage and that we will do everything that we can so that it passes during this session.

Fast forward four years to the present day, Mr. Speaker, and we see none of that spirit of co-operation from members opposite, no reasonable approach to conducting the business of this Assembly.

As another example of this, Mr. Speaker, the practice of this Assembly in regards to the Speech from the Throne and budget debates has long seen co-operation between the government and opposition on a speaking order to allow all members to speak. This year, however, when the whips met to organize a speaking order, the opposition NDP refused to co-operate, stating that they would take as much time as they all wanted, thereby preventing some members the opportunity to participate in this year's budget debate and express the wishes of their constituencies.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the government would prefer to conduct the business of the Assembly within the agreed-upon hours set out in the rules, it's become abundantly clear that once we wade through the empty rhetoric and feigned indignation of members opposite, that their honest intention is simply to obstruct the traditional process of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition claims they're seeking further explanation and further clarification on the purpose and intent of each respective Bill before the Assembly, explanation that they and the people of the province absolutely have a right to hear. But if it's answers they seek from cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker, and if it's a genuine debate they desire, why won't they move legislation to committee?

I believe the answer's a simple one because those opposition members are taking their cues from their new leader who is intent on making the province ungovernable. The opposition's tactic is not about giving careful review and ample debate to the legislation before this House, it's about obstructing the process and traditions of this Assembly.

[15:15]

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in 1996 the then NDP government introduced a similar motion to extend the sitting hours in order to obtain the required hours on their own legislation and budget estimates. When they received push back from the Liberals, who were the official opposition at the time, the Economic Development minister of the day, who is today

the Leader of the Opposition said, "The public of Saskatchewan, who are basically paying for the operation of the Assembly, would wonder why Liberals don't want to work longer hours."

So we should expect that NDP's opposition, under that member's leadership today, will be just as ready and willing as those of us on government benches are to work longer hours and in order to fulfill the required hours of debate for legislation and budget estimates that the rules of this Assembly rightly afford.

I'd like to read another quote, Mr. Speaker, from April 16th, 1993 by a member of this Assembly. And I'll read:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, I just want to make the comment very briefly that under the point that we are at in the agenda of the Assembly, we have seen the opposition members move adjournment motions. What we are doing here in terms of procedure might seem to be very similar; that is, moving a motion to extend the hours.

I would make the argument, a much more legitimate argument if you're worried about getting the work of the people done, to extend the hours in order to accomplish the will of the government which is duly elected by the people of the province. That's a fundamental principle that should be allowed in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, that quote was by the Leader of the Opposition. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I will move the following motion:

That the *Rules and Procedures* for the sitting times of the Assembly and the sitting times for standing committees shall be varied on an interim basis for the remainder of the spring period of the third session of the twenty-sixth legislature as follows:

1. Notwithstanding Rule 6(1), the ordinary times for the daily meetings and adjournment of the sittings of the Assembly on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 12 noon to 1:30 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.;
2. Notwithstanding Rule 6(1), the ordinary times for the daily meetings and adjournment of the sittings of the Assembly on Thursdays shall be at 8:00 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.;
3. Notwithstanding Rule 14, the order of business conducted by the Assembly on Thursdays shall be as follows:

(a) Government orders from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m.;

(b) Routine proceedings commencing at 10 a.m. to be followed by private members' public bills and orders and private bills in order of precedence specified by Rule 14(3) concluding at 1 p.m.;

(c) Government orders resuming at 2 p.m. until the

adjournment of the sitting;

4. Standing committees shall meet and adjourn at the following times when convened:

(a) Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 12 noon to 1:30 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.;

(b) On Thursday shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.;

5. Standing committees may convene and meet at other times in accordance with the regular provisions of the *Rules and Procedures*;

6. By order, the Assembly and standing committees may adjourn earlier than the adjournment times specified by the Sessional order; and further

That the provisions of this sessional order shall come into effect the sitting day of its adoption and shall expire upon the adjournment of the Assembly on the sitting day preceding the completion day of the third session of the twenty-sixth legislature.

I so move.

**The Speaker:** — The motion before the Assembly is the motion presented by the Deputy Government House Leader. Will the members take it as read?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No.

**The Speaker:** — Then I shall read the motion:

That the *Rules and Procedures* for the sitting times of the Assembly and the sitting times for standing committees shall be varied on an interim basis for the remainder of the spring period of the third session of the twenty-sixth legislature as follows:

1. Notwithstanding Rule 6(1), the ordinary times for the daily meetings and adjournment of the sittings of the Assembly on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 12 noon to 1:30 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.;

2. Notwithstanding Rule 6(1), the ordinary times for the daily meetings and adjournment of the sittings of the Assembly on Thursdays shall be at 8:00 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.;

3. Notwithstanding Rule 14, the order of business considered by the Assembly on Thursdays shall be as follows:

(a) Government orders from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m.;

(b) Routine proceedings commencing at 10 a.m. to be followed by private members' public bills and

orders and private bills in order of precedence specified by Rule 14(3) concluding at 1 p.m.;

(c) Government orders resuming at 2 p.m. until the adjournment of the sitting;

4. Standing committees shall meet and adjourn at the following times when convened:

(a) Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 12 noon to 1:30 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.;

(b) On Thursday shall be at 8 a.m. and adjourn at 12 midnight, with a recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.;

5. Standing committees may convene and meet at other times in accordance with the regular provisions of the *Rules and Procedures*;

6. By order, the Assembly and standing committees may adjourn earlier than the adjournment times specified by the Sessional order; and further

That the provisions of this sessional order shall come into effect the sitting day of its adoption and shall expire upon the adjournment of the Assembly on the sitting day preceding the completion day of the third session of the twenty-sixth legislature.

Is the Assembly ready for the question? I recognize the member from The Battlefords.

**Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's another sad day in the Chamber today when the government acknowledges that it again has failed to be able to live within the rules established not only by this House, Mr. Speaker, but by Commonwealth parliamentary Houses all around the world, Mr. Speaker.

Rules are meant to apply to everyone, Mr. Speaker. Rules are developed to ensure that everyone works well together. Only those who cannot abide by the rules, who don't like the rules, Mr. Speaker, push to change the rules and do it unilaterally in a way, Mr. Speaker, that in fact disadvantages the minority. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that one can say — and maybe I will say them — about the majority and the minority, Mr. Speaker. But I will get to that in a little while.

Mr. Speaker, the minister who just made the motion spent about five minutes outlining why this motion needs to be made, why these rules need to be changed. Mr. Speaker, he did not make a case for the change. Mr. Speaker, he could not make a case for the change because, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for this change to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a number of things to say about the motion in front of the House today. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to use whatever time is allocated to me, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the public understands the circumstances that we find ourselves in today and, Mr. Speaker, understands the total incompetence of the government opposite, not just in their

budgeting process, Mr. Speaker, not just in the way they manage the affairs of the province but, Mr. Speaker, in this case, the way they manage the affairs of the Legislative Assembly, the body that represents and respects the values of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, at the privilege of the Saskatchewan public. Mr. Speaker, I respect this place like I respect no other because, Mr. Speaker, this place represents the people of the province. And each member of this Assembly were sent here by a majority of the people voting and taking decisions about the future of this province within each of the constituencies, Mr. Speaker. We still believe, we still believe in one person, one vote. We still believe in representation by population. We still believe that every voice in this Chamber represents many voices throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the government is doing by putting this motion forward, Mr. Speaker, is disrespecting this whole process that says everyone here is equal and the rules apply to all equally. Now, Mr. Speaker, a simple point which I will also come back to later, a very simple point, Mr. Speaker. If the government feels that they cannot achieve the goals that they have set for themselves, the rules allow for an extension of the time available to us, Mr. Speaker.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, without compromising the public's ability to participate —because the rule says we're going to have meetings at 10 o'clock on a Friday night, 11 o'clock on a Friday night, at midnight on a Friday night, Mr. Speaker — the public's going to be very excited to know that if they want to participate and understand what's going on, they are going to have to be up at 11 o'clock on a Friday night to make sure they know what we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of that happening, Mr. Speaker, the rules already allow us to go beyond the end date on the calendar, Mr. Speaker. Currently the end date is May the 20th. The government has between now and the end of the day of May the 20th to conclude its business. But if they can't conclude their business within that period of time, Mr. Speaker, the rules — agreed to by all members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and previous Assemblies — the rules allow for an extension of the days. So we could be sitting for an extra five days if necessary, Mr. Speaker, to allow the government to complete its business.

But no. Will the government consider that, Mr. Speaker? No. They didn't today in presenting this motion, and they did not previously when they moved a similar motion, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader has said we will not extend the days because it allows the opposition more question period time.

In other words, he doesn't want to be accountable to the public of Saskatchewan. He doesn't want the representatives of the people asking questions of the members of the cabinet, of the executive of the government, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't want, he doesn't want the people of Saskatchewan to know what this government is doing. He'd rather get out of here quickly, discuss matters in the middle of the night, keep information from the public, Mr. Speaker, so they don't know what's going on. Because they don't understand accountability; they don't understand transparency; and, Mr. Speaker, more importantly,

they disrespect the whole principle of democracy, Mr. Speaker, which is what motivated every one of us to be here in the first place.

Think about it, Mr. Speaker. Why are we here? It's not to do what the Premier thinks we should do. It's not to do what the Minister of Finance thinks we should do or the Minister of Agriculture. It's to do the will of the people of the province, Mr. Speaker. And the will of the people can sometimes take some time, Mr. Speaker, to get it done right.

This government has a history already in a very short period of time of acting first and consulting second, ignoring the whole concept that the public view is important. It's all about them. It's all about us in government. It's all about power. And this motion, Mr. Speaker, is an expression of power. It's about us. It's about what we want. It's not about what the public thinks or wants or needs to know.

The public does need to know, Mr. Speaker. But more importantly, the public wants to participate. Every one of us in this Chamber, and the members opposite can't say they don't hear, but every one of us, Mr. Speaker, gets phone calls from members of the public. They tune in, Mr. Speaker, at 1:30 every afternoon: Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, and 10:30 on Friday mornings or 10 o'clock to listen to question period. And they phone us, Mr. Speaker. They phone us after question period and they say, good question or not so good question, maybe you should think about something else; or what kind of an answer was that you got today; or more importantly, Mr. Speaker, that was useful information. I'm glad to have heard that. I'm glad to have got that.

When this government moved the same motion earlier, Mr. Speaker, and changed the rules for a couple of days before they decided it wasn't necessary, Mr. Speaker, they had question period as it is indicated in the rule change, Mr. Speaker, at 10 o'clock in the morning, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. The public, the media, and others, Mr. Speaker, were out of sorts. This was unusual. This was not the practice. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, you had people feeling uninformed, out of the loop, unable to participate in the process, Mr. Speaker. The bottom line is when we change the rules there are consequences that occur to those rule changes, Mr. Speaker, and almost always they fall out to the public. They go to where the public is interested in what their government is doing.

[15:30]

And, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that to a very large extent there are many members of the public who do not distinguish government members from opposition members. These are our members of the Legislative Assembly. These are individuals who have been elected to represent the views of the Saskatchewan public. And broader parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker — Canadian public, British public, Mr. Speaker, Australian public — the Commonwealth parliamentary democracy is a large family. And we have a great history, Mr. Speaker, of respecting the views of individuals, respecting the need for public to participate in the democratic process.

The democratic process, we all must remember, Mr. Speaker, does not stop after the ballot has been stuffed in the box. The

democratic process continues 365 days a year. We get the letters. We get the phone calls. We get people providing us with advice, asking for information from us so that they can indeed evaluate what's taking place.

Mr. Speaker, over the last two years and a bit since the election in late 2007, the public has been seeing a practice that they aren't very pleased with, Mr. Speaker — this act first, consult later.

This motion clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader and the Deputy House Leader who moved the motion today, Mr. Speaker, have not even consulted seriously with the members of the opposition. Just for example, Mr. Speaker — and I'll make some comments on a number of the Bills in front of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker — but the Deputy House Leader in his very short remarks, that did not explain why this motion is necessary, cited the Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Heritage Day Act, Mr. Speaker. And he referenced the fact that opposition members were stalling this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I was in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I have to assume the members opposite were in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That's the respectful practice. I listened to the speeches that were made on the Hunting, Fishing, Trapping Heritage Day Act, Mr. Speaker. I listened very carefully because, of course as a former Member of Parliament, I represented a large part of Saskatchewan where hunting, fishing, and trapping were a vocation, a way of life, and supported a quality of life, Mr. Speaker, that many other Saskatchewan people could only dream of having.

But, Mr. Speaker, those speeches were very relevant to the Act in front of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, because northern hunters, fishers, and trappers had indicated — to not just to members from the northern constituencies, but to all members of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker — that in fact their way of life was under the attack by the actions of this government. And in fact while we all would like to ensure that we recognize and respect hunting, fishing, and trapping, Mr. Speaker — which is what the Act does — the speeches were indicating to government you have to respect those who hunt, those who fish, those who trap 365 days a year, that northern people, Mr. Speaker, have to be thought of as more than just people who hunt, fish, and trap on a given day, that this is a way of life. It's a quality of life, Mr. Speaker. It's the way people feed their families, clothe their families. And we can talk about that, Mr. Speaker, in terms of one day a year, but that actions of government speak 365 days a year. So the speeches, Mr. Speaker, were very relevant to the circumstances that our constituents were asking us to convey to the government.

And obviously, Mr. Speaker, we didn't speak enough about the Bill because just this week the member from Cumberland asked questions of the Minister Responsible for First Nations and Métis Relations about activities specifically relating to trappers in the province of Saskatchewan. The member from Cumberland asked four questions in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, after having attended meetings of the Trappers Association in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations did not mention the word trapping once in his four answers, not once. He didn't give any indication that he even understood the

question, let alone understood the way of life of people in the North, Mr. Speaker. So when the member from Meadow Lake, who represents people who hunt, fish, trap, and — I might add — gather, when the member from Meadow Lake stands up and says we were stalling debate on that particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, he failed miserably, failed miserably to understand the point of view that the public was making through the members of this Legislative Assembly.

And no way ever should a member of government be telling another member of the Legislative Assembly, members of the opposition, members who are elected to be here, Mr. Speaker, what message they should bring from their constituents into this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. They cannot tell us what we can and what we cannot say when it is relevant to the legislation in front of us.

We support hunters, fishers, trappers, Mr. Speaker, and gatherers, not just throughout northern Saskatchewan, all across Canada, Mr. Speaker. We support those people and what they've done and the way of life and the way they work and the way they live their lives, Mr. Speaker. And when the government demonstrates they don't understand, we are going to tell the government, the members of the Saskatchewan Party, Mr. Speaker, we're going to tell them what they need to know. That's how you govern a country, Mr. Speaker. That's how you govern a province. That's how you respect the people who elected you to be in this place.

And instead, instead, Mr. Speaker, of saying you might have a point, members of the public, you might have a point, we've got to think about this a little bit more . . . No, instead of doing that, they say we've heard enough of you. We've heard enough. You spoke too much on this Bill. We don't want to hear. We don't want to hear anything more. We don't agree with you, Mr. Speaker, so what we're going to do is, we're going to extend the hours. We're going to get you to speak at 8 o'clock in the morning. We're going to get you to speak at midnight. And we're going to keep that information from the public, Mr. Speaker, because they know that, you know, the public is not fully engaged through all of this process, Mr. Speaker, and it gets them out of this place earlier than they would like to get out of here, Mr. Speaker.

And as a result of all of that, it's the majority imposing its will upon the minority, Mr. Speaker, something that is frowned upon worldwide, Mr. Speaker, and it has been forever. The majority, the majority in a democracy, Mr. Speaker, does get its way. The majority does get its way, Mr. Speaker. We all understand that, but we have rules to ensure that the minority is protected while the majority is getting its way, Mr. Speaker. We've had this debate throughout the Commonwealth for generations, Mr. Speaker, and the members opposite have to understand we are here today because of what has gone before us. And that principle, Mr. Speaker, of the minority acting in the interests of the minority, the majority acting in the interests of the minority, Mr. Speaker, goes back even before the Commonwealth existed. And maybe if I have time I might even provide a bit of a history lesson to some of the members opposite who don't seem to know exactly what it is that I'm talking about here.

But, Mr. Speaker, the argument that the Saskatchewan Party is



making today — not well articulated by the member from Meadow Lake, the Deputy House Leader, Mr. Speaker — the argument that the government is making today highlights the fact that this government cannot manage the business of this House. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, when you take into account the management of last year's budget, what appears to be the management of this year's budget, the management of some programs, Mr. Speaker . . . Well just use the management of the . . . what happened this week, Dutch elm disease, Mr. Speaker. They took it out of the budget one day, couple of questions in the legislature from the opposition, and they put some money back into the Dutch elm disease program, Mr. Speaker.

They hadn't thought this thing out. They still haven't done the right thing on Dutch elm disease, Mr. Speaker, but they acknowledge they made a mistake. Something as simple, Mr. Speaker, as trying to protect, trying to protect living trees in the province of Saskatchewan — elm trees, American elm trees, Mr. Speaker — something as simple as that, they couldn't get right.

But, Mr. Speaker, they cannot manage the business of this House. They failed on budgets. They failed in programs. Now they are demonstrating that they're failing in managing this House, Mr. Speaker. And while we acknowledge and understand there's not a lot of history across the way in the government benches in terms of managing government, Mr. Speaker, there is some history there in terms of understanding how governments manage.

The Government House Leader for example, Mr. Speaker, has been here for quite a number of years — in fact one of the longest-serving members of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader has sat through many meetings where rules have been discussed, where rules have been changed by mutual agreement, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader understands this place works best, is at its most efficient when there are agreements between the parties, those representing the majority and those representing the minority.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government House Leader and the Deputy House Leader bring forward this motion, they are acknowledging that they have failed in their capacity to manage the business of government.

This is almost unprecedented, Mr. Speaker. There have been cases in the past where extraordinary measures have had to be taken in extraordinary circumstances. Mr. Speaker, when you examine the legislative agenda of the members opposite, you wonder what's extraordinary there. What is it that is so important that we have to extend the hours and move ourselves, Mr. Speaker, into a rule change that has been pushed on to the Legislative Assembly by the government?

I think one thing that the public needs to be aware, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the legislation that is currently before the government, or before the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I think one thing the public needs to be aware of is that this legislative agenda that the government has brought forward includes Bills that no one in the Assembly has yet seen.

The government is saying you're stalling things, you're slowing things down, you won't move Bills forward when in fact, Mr.

Speaker, that isn't the case at all. And I'll demonstrate that in a couple of minutes. That's not the case. Bills have been moving. They've gone to Committee. In fact a couple of Bills have even been passed in this Assembly in this session already, Mr. Speaker. So the government's argument that Bills aren't moving through here quickly enough is not only bogus, Mr. Speaker, but it highlights the fact that the government is still trying to get a legislative agenda through that they haven't fully disclosed yet.

Disclosure is an important part of trust. And, Mr. Speaker, if you want agreements, you need to have trust. This government is losing trust on the financial front. It's losing trust on the management front. And it has lost trust, Mr. Speaker, from members of the Assembly in terms of managing the business of this place.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has indicated that, coming out of the budget, there are at least six budget Bills coming forward. None of those Bills, Mr. Speaker, have yet been disclosed to the members of the Legislative Assembly or to the public. And yet the minister, the Government House Leader, is asking the members of the opposition to agree to pass this whole package of legislation without knowing what that whole package looks like, Mr. Speaker.

[15:45]

So when you're sitting in the chairs over here elected to represent people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan have said to you, represent me to the best of your ability, Mr. Speaker, we carry an awful lot of responsibility on our shoulders, Mr. Speaker, representing those individuals.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when the government says, we're not going to tell you what we got but we want your agreement to pass these Bills or, my golly, we're going to just impose our will upon you, we'll change the rules to make you do this — we say, very clearly, the people of Saskatchewan are being disrespected when this sort of activity happens.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's just not, not acceptable for any member on the opposition benches to acknowledge or accept or agree with the motion that's been put forward here to change the rules unilaterally, change the rules without any reference whatsoever to the public.

So, Mr. Speaker, the government failed to establish why this motion is needed. It failed to provide the public with an understanding of what its legislative agenda really is. Mr. Speaker, it failed to recognize that in this Chamber there are rules that allow them more time if they want it, but as I said earlier, they are choosing not to follow the rules that exist because they don't want to be accountable to the public of Saskatchewan. Instead they are choosing to change the rules so that they can remain unaccountable.

We have no idea, Mr. Speaker, what's yet to be brought forward by this government. And I think the public needs to be aware, I think the news media is already aware, that this is a direct result, Mr. Speaker, of the opposition refusing to sign an agreement that the minister, the member from Cannington, the Government House Leader, brought forward to the opposition

an agreement that he drafted that asked the members of the opposition to sign off on all Bills by May the 20th without having seen them, Mr. Speaker.

We wouldn't do that. We respect our constituents too much, Mr. Speaker. We want the public to trust the members of the Legislative Assembly. They learned to trust members of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. They are not trusting members of the Saskatchewan Party, and, Mr. Speaker, with materials, motions, and actions like this, Mr. Speaker, there will be no new trust earned by the members of the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to help the public to better understand this issue. The member from Meadow Lake, in raising this motion, used one example about how this government was stalling legislation and he used Bill No. 117, *The Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Heritage Act* as his example, Mr. Speaker.

Well there are a number of pieces of legislation before this Chamber, and as the public . . . or the public may not know this, but on Monday I believe it was — today is Wednesday — on Monday, members of the opposition passed through second readings seven Bills, sent them off to committee for study. The committees are ready to take those Bills and move through them. Before that, Mr. Speaker, a couple of other Bills had been dealt with at second reading, had gone to committee and in fact have actually passed this Assembly.

And, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition were prepared yesterday, before the government approached with this ridiculous idea about changing the rules to suit their purposes, Mr. Speaker. The members of the opposition were prepared yesterday to move a number of other Bills forward. But, Mr. Speaker, with this type of bullying that the members of government are imposing upon the rules of this Chamber and the opposition members here, Mr. Speaker, it's simply unacceptable to follow along the lines of what they are putting forward.

Mr. Speaker, I want the public to understand what is before us. I'm going to go through some of the legislative matters that we have in front of us. I won't describe in great detail what the legislation is, Mr. Speaker, but I may come back and do some of that before my time expires today.

But for example, Mr. Speaker, let's just have a quick look at what is before the Chamber. We have *The Agri-Food Amendment Act*. That's Bill No. 97. As of yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the total time debating that Bill was 4 hours and 51 minutes.

The Bill No. 98, *The Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, a Bill that the member from Meadow Lake knows very well, municipal financing corporation amendment Act, that Bill so far, Mr. Speaker, has had 32 minutes of debate. Certainly there's no stalling going on here, Mr. Speaker. We've barely got an understanding of what that Bill's even all about.

In fact let me tell the public that the minister, in moving the Bill No. 98, municipal financing corporation amendment Act, spoke for a total of four minutes. Mr. Speaker, that four-minute

introduction hardly gave members of the Legislative Assembly or the public any time whatsoever to understand what was in that piece of legislation. In fact it raised many questions in the minds of the public, Mr. Speaker, and as a result there's still more time needed on this.

But that's a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that I could say is one that could move to committee very quickly after a couple of members have had their say, Mr. Speaker. And there will be questions raised in committee because that's our responsibility.

Bill No. 100, the Doukhobors of Canada trust fund amendment Act, for a lot of people might not be considered the most important Act in the world. But for members of the Doukhobor community, Mr. Speaker, this is an important Act. There have been many phone calls and discussions that have taken place outside this Chamber on this Act. But, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation has had less than one hour — 59 minutes of debate in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. Certainly nobody is stalling that Bill, although there are a lot of answers that the members of the government have to provide to the Doukhobor community in Saskatchewan.

What about *The Credit Union Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 101? Two hours and 45 minutes. *The Personal Property Security Amendment Act*, Bill No. 102, 1 hour and 11 minutes, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 103, *The Miscellaneous Statutes (Professional Discipline) Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, 2 hours and 58 minutes. That's all of the debate that has occurred in here.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, the public has to recognize there are 58 members of the Legislative Assembly from 58 constituencies in this great province of ours, Mr. Speaker. People who have elected their members to help develop good laws and help administer good laws and discuss the distribution of financial resources throughout this province, Mr. Speaker — 58 members of the legislature.

You can imagine that if members wish to represent their constituencies and speak to good legislation, it's going to take some time for that to move through this Chamber. The government seems to believe that anything less than two hours is quite appropriate, Mr. Speaker. We have rules in this House that acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that most Bills need 20 hours of debate. We have rules to that effect — 20 hours of debate before a Bill can actually just be deemed to be moving on.

There was a recognition when the rules were established, Mr. Speaker, that Bills need some time to work their way through the Chamber. No. 1, to ensure that the public is aware of them; no. 2, that the public can review them; no. 3, that the public can comment on them; no. 4, that those comments can be communicated to government; no. 5, that government can respond; no. 6, that the public can review the response; no. 7, that that response to the response can be communicated; and finally, Mr. Speaker, that there's an evaluation at the end of the day of, is this right? Is this wrong? Can we proceed, Mr. Speaker? So a number of steps.

The speeches in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, allow the public an opportunity to get to know what's in front of the Chamber, and when a minister speaks for two minutes like they did on the

agriculture food amendment Act, four minutes on *The Municipal Financing Corporation Act*, four minutes on *The Doukhobors of Canada Act*, seven minutes on the credit union amendment Act, seven minutes on *The Personal Property Security Act*, Mr. Speaker, the public doesn't know what's in the legislation.

A government that's now known for being unaccountable and non-transparent, Mr. Speaker, who speak as little as they possibly can on a piece of legislation, does not provide the public with an opportunity to have any trust in that process.

So members of the opposition communicate with members of the public and then communicate that, provide that feedback to the government. And that takes me back to the comments I made earlier about Bill 117 that the member from Meadow Lake referenced. If the public just listened to the comments made by the Minister of the Environment when she introduced the legislation . . . In fact, Mr. Speaker, according to the records compiled by the Clerks, the Minister of the Environment, in introducing Bill No. 117, spoke for one minute.

No member of the public, Mr. Speaker, fully understood what it was that this legislation meant to the people of northern Saskatchewan who were involved in hunting, fishing, and trapping, Mr. Speaker. Nobody knew what this meant to them. But on reflection, on communication, on discussions with members of the North, with people who are engaged in hunting, fishing, and trapping, members of this Assembly communicated to government very clearly that hunting, fishing, and trapping is important. Recognizing it is equally important, but recognizing the value of those individuals and the contributions to society that they make, Mr. Speaker, is a 365-day-a-year task, Mr. Speaker.

And this government didn't get it, didn't understand it. And even after that amount of time spent in this Chamber discussing that, the Minister from Meadow Lake proved today that he still doesn't get it. He doesn't understand the people of the North, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't understand the people who engage in northern and, more importantly, traditional lifestyles, Mr. Speaker. And one can argue — thank goodness — that we are allowed the opportunity to speak in this Chamber for a short period of time, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that members of the government recognize and understand what it is that the public of Saskatchewan really thinks.

Let me carry on. Bill No. 102, Mr. Speaker, *The Personal Property Security Amendment Act*, 1 hour and 11 minutes, Mr. Speaker. That's all that that debate has taken place in this Chamber. Hardly enough time to recognize the real value of personal property security throughout our province, Mr. Speaker.

The miscellaneous statutes (professional discipline), Bill 103, 2 hours and 58 minutes. *The Summary Offences Procedure Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, Bill 104, 2 hours and 24 minutes. *The SaskEnergy Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, Bill 105, the minister spoke for two minutes, Mr. Speaker. There's been a total debate in this House for 13 minutes so far on this important Bill, Bill 105.

How about *The Labour Market Commission Repeal Act*? The

Labour Market Commission, Mr. Speaker, was a body established to help to ensure that the Saskatchewan economy and the Saskatchewan labour force found a way to come together. When I talk to business in this province, Mr. Speaker, business tells me their single biggest challenge right now is finding an adequate supply of skilled labour — single biggest challenge that they have. What's one of the first Bills that this government has brought forward? A Bill that repeals the one body that's been working on trying to ensure that labour and business can find a way to come together, Mr. Speaker.

[16:00]

The minister, in introducing *The Labour Market Commission Repeal Act*, the Minister Responsible for Enterprise spoke for three minutes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the public felt very comfortable that the government was doing the right thing. But worse than that, Mr. Speaker, that Bill has only been called for debate for 11 minutes in total, Mr. Speaker, 11 minutes. Is the New Democratic Party stalling legislation in this House, Mr. Speaker?

This important Bill that brings business and labour together . . . unlike Bills 5 and 6 which pushed business and labour apart, Mr. Speaker, Bill 80, Bill 43 pushed business and labour apart, Mr. Speaker. My goodness, this Bill, which brings them together, being repealed, the implications of that are significant — 11 minutes of debate, Mr. Speaker. For the public to understand this and to put the words of the member from Meadow Lake in moving this motion together, Mr. Speaker, they just won't believe it.

How about *The Weed Control Act*? Obviously the Minister of Agriculture thought *The Weed Control Act* was important enough to bring it into the House. The public thought this was important enough to support. The Minister of Agriculture introduced *The Weed Control Act*. He spoke for two minutes, Mr. Speaker, this important piece of legislation — two minutes. No other member of government spoke to this important piece of legislation. But by golly, Mr. Speaker, the Bill has had 25 minutes of debate, 25 minutes in total, Mr. Speaker. You know, as important as it is, does the public fully understand what's happening with weed control? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, 25 minutes of debate does not do justice to that Bill.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, there's a Bill for weed control, but to protect American elms this government can't do anything. To protect American elm trees, Mr. Speaker, they pulled the money away. And to make matters worse, to make matters worse, they downloaded the costs of protecting American elm trees onto municipalities, Mr. Speaker.

Municipalities should pay attention to the answers the Minister of the Environment made in her answers to questions the other day, Mr. Speaker. Municipalities should know that she talked about the municipalities' unprecedented revenue, unprecedented revenues that now allow them to afford these downloaded costs. So the government can bring in a Bill on weed control, but it can't bring in anything that protects American elms, and in fact downloads new costs to municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, you put these things together. You try and think of them in the context of why does this government want to

change the rules to meet its legislative agenda. It's just bizarre, Mr. Speaker, as you try and put these things together, just bizarre.

How about *The Cities Amendment Act*? An important Bill, Mr. Speaker. We amend *The Cities Amendment Act* on a regular basis. The cities, through its provincial organization, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and individually as individual cities, Mr. Speaker, are always bringing forward suggestions for change to strengthen the abilities of municipalities to work on behalf of their taxpayers and their citizens.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this important piece of legislation, while there's still some consultation that's occurring, this is an important piece of legislation that the opposition takes seriously. And remember there are 20 members of the opposition, every one of them who comes from a municipality of one sort or another, Mr. Speaker, every one of them who is talking to the mayors or the reeves of their communities, Mr. Speaker, and may have something to say about the value of municipalities and the impact of this legislation on their municipalities. They may wish to communicate to the government what they're hearing in their communities.

This important piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, has had 2 hours and 47 minutes of debate time in the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, certainly the government can't say that's enough, that's enough time to move on; opposition members are stalling this legislation. Two hours and 47 minutes on an important Bill.

Mr. Speaker, if the Bill is good, if the Bill has the support of the public of Saskatchewan, on May the 20th, Mr. Speaker, those Bills will pass. That's what agreements do. That's how you manage the House. You present good legislation. You allow them to go through its normal process. And by the 20th of May, if they don't pass, the public passes judgment on the opposition. If they do pass, the public passes judgment on the government. It's a simple formula, Mr. Speaker.

This government has failed to understand that and failed to understand that when the opposition does its job, legislation will pass, Mr. Speaker. For some reason, this government doesn't feel that this opposition is working with the people of Saskatchewan to see that these things get done. Just the opposite is the case, Mr. Speaker. And by the phone calls we're getting, it's obvious the public trusts the opposition more than they trust the members of government. And it's motions like this, Mr. Speaker, that are only going to make matters worse.

Let me carry on with this. Bill 109, *The Municipalities Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker — similar to *The Cities Amendment Act* — 3 hours and 55 minutes. That Bill is just about ready, Mr. Speaker, to move on to committee for some discussion there, some questions that we've been asked to raise.

Bill No. 110, *The Northern Municipalities Act*, there are always issues in northern municipalities in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The northern mayors are very vocal in the support of their communities, Mr. Speaker, and it's important that we listen to, understand, and communicate the information that we are gathering from those communities. This Bill — Bill 110, *The Northern Municipalities Act* — Mr. Speaker, total time debated,

2 hours and 50 minutes, Mr. Speaker, certainly no abuse of the House schedules when we look at that. And then the consequential amendments to *The Northern Municipalities Act*, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 111, 1 hour and 54 minutes.

How about *The Justices of the Peace Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker? An Act that the minister thought was worthy of two minutes of introduction, Mr. Speaker. Well this justices of the peace amendment Act has received a total of 2 hours and 29 minutes of debate in the House. Again, Mr. Speaker, I can't say that's an abuse of the privileges that members have to speak to government legislation. And then there were consequential amendments: Bill No. 113, *The Justices of the Peace Consequential Amendments Act*, 1 hour and 24 minutes, Mr. Speaker. Again there's no abuse there on that piece of legislation.

Something that the public is very much aware of, we get complaints all the time, Mr. Speaker, the system relating to small claims in our province. The government brought in Bill No. 114, *The Small Claims Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, that Bill has had 33 minutes of debate. Ten per cent of that time or 3 minutes was what the minister took to explain the importance of this piece of legislation. Nobody in this province who wants to know what *The Small Claims Amendment Act* was all about would've understood it from the minister's description, Mr. Speaker, so it's important for members of the opposition to spend the time necessary to deal with that 33 minutes in time.

How about *The Queen's Bench Amendment Act*, Bill No. 115, 2 hours and 3 minutes? And then of course the famous, now famous Bill No. 117, *The Hunting, Fishing and Trapping Heritage Act* — Mr. Speaker, the member was absolutely right; there's been eight hours of debate on that Bill, Mr. Speaker. But as I indicated before, the minister, the House Leader, the Deputy House Leader and, by extension, the government didn't get it. Even after eight hours of debate, the government members still do not understand the arguments that are being made by people who lived their lives through hunting, fishing, and trapping, those who the Act is supposed to respect, acknowledge, and reverse, Mr. Speaker.

We've now sent Bill No. 118, *The Milk Control Repeal Act*, Mr. Speaker, to committee. That one had 2 hours and 34 minutes of debate. Another Bill, No. 119, *The Ticket Sales Act*, 2 hours and 43 minutes. Bill No. 120, *The Financial Administration Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker . . . *The Financial Administration Amendment Act*, I think any time the public hears those words they shake, Mr. Speaker. What's the government doing with our money? *The Financial Administration Amendment Act*. Well the minister took three minutes to explain that to us. Before the House adjourned because of the time of day, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party spoke for 15 minutes on that Bill. Mr. Speaker, it has never been brought back to the Chamber. Total time debating *The Financial Administration Amendment Act*, 18 minutes, Mr. Speaker. No way will anybody accept the argument that this opposition is wasting time, Mr. Speaker, or abusing the privileges of this House in terms of stalling.

The government has a number of environmental Bills, Mr. Speaker, and if government members think they're going to build trust with the people of Saskatchewan, which of course is sadly lacking, then of course they're going to have to do some

things on the environment, Mr. Speaker. *The Environmental Management and Protection Act* is Bill No. 121. It's an Act that should allow members of the government to express their desire to meet the needs of the public of Saskatchewan. And of course the public is going to want to respond to absolutely everything that's said on an environmental Bill. The Minister of the Environment, on *The Environmental Management and Protection Act*, Mr. Speaker, spoke for seven minutes. No other member of government chose to enter the debate on this Bill, for a total debating time, though, Mr. Speaker, of 2 hours and 30 minutes.

If the environment is a centrepiece of what the government wants to be recognized for or remembered for, fondly remembered perhaps, after they've been retired, Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness, two hours of debating time is insufficient. It's not an abuse, Mr. Speaker. It's insufficient to communicate the wishes of the public.

And there are a number of others. Let's take a look at *The Environmental Assessment Amendment Act*, something that's very significant in this province and the public wants to comment on — three hours of debate. That's all that the House has had so far from 58 members of the legislature, three hours of debate on something as substantial as *The Environmental Assessment Amendment Act*.

Bill No. 123, *The Forest Resources Management Act*, Mr. Speaker, a total debating time of 1 hour and 27 minutes. Now there are people in this province who are arguing — and rightly so, Mr. Speaker — that this government has messed up the management of the forestry in Saskatchewan, messed up royally, Mr. Speaker, to the point that we're not even making sawdust in Saskatchewan any more, let alone other product from the forest, Mr. Speaker. We've got trucking companies that aren't working in the forestry any more. We've got mills that aren't working any more. We've got promises, the famous promise from the minister from Prince Albert Carlton, Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign: "A vote for Darryl is a vote for the mill open." Well, Mr. Speaker, two and a half years later, the mill is going to be dismantled, Mr. Speaker — not opened, dismantled. I don't remember. I don't remember that being the promise on which he got elected, Mr. Speaker.

So when the public sees that the government is addressing forestry issues in legislation, they're going to want to know what is it that the government has to say on this. What activity is the government engaging in? Where's the government taking us next, Mr. Speaker? There's a piece of legislation. It doesn't matter what's in it at the beginning of the process, Mr. Speaker. The public sees the name *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act*, and the public wants to know.

[16:15]

Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister spoke for four minutes. The Bill's had a total of 1 hour and 27 minutes in total. The minister responsible for forestry didn't have a thing to say about this, Mr. Speaker. And more importantly, there just hasn't been enough time allocated so far, Mr. Speaker, to be able to adequately express the concerns and the interests of the public of Saskatchewan with regards to the public right to have its resources managed appropriately.

This government has failed on so many levels, Mr. Speaker. This government has failed on so many levels. And it is incredible that the minister from Meadow Lake — who also represents a forestry community, Mr. Speaker — it is incredible that the minister from Meadow Lake says to the public, by way of a motion, that the opposition is stalling the passage of legislation in this Chamber and therefore he needs to change the rules. He needs to impose his will on the members of the opposition and on the public, Mr. Speaker, so that indeed this piece of legislation will either be debated at midnight, when nobody's watching, Mr. Speaker, or just get sent off to committee for questions that could also be discussed on a Friday night at midnight, Mr. Speaker. It's just unacceptable. Completely unacceptable.

There's still more legislation, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 124, *The Legal Profession Amendment Act*, this Bill has received 45 minutes of debating time; Bill No. 125, *The Crown Minerals Amendment Act*, 2 hours and 31 minutes.

Bill No. 126 — oh boy, the public likes this one, Mr. Speaker, — *The Management and Reduction of Greenhouse Gases Act*. Greenhouse gases, Mr. Speaker, climate change. What is more important to the public in Saskatchewan than the subject of climate change, Mr. Speaker? Every member of the public is concerned in one way or another about climate change, Mr. Speaker.

This government does not have a very good record in responding to climate change issues or in fact managing greenhouse gas issues, Mr. Speaker. Here the government brings forward a Bill. Now let's think about this a little bit. The government had a Bill on greenhouse gases, withdrew it, other legislation was brought in, and then this legislation was brought back again, almost as an afterthought, Mr. Speaker.

They felt that they needed to get something on the record, Mr. Speaker. You listen to a couple of the speeches that have been made. Anybody that's listened to the speeches that have been made on Bill No. 126 recognizes the horrible record that this government has on climate change and greenhouse gas response, issue responses, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who listens to those speeches knows the failure of this government to act on that.

Well the public is responding to this, Mr. Speaker. They're phoning. They're writing letters. They're sending in petitions, Mr. Speaker. The public is engaged in this. But this government says the opposition is stalling this piece of legislation because how long have we spoke on this? One hour and 32 minutes, Mr. Speaker — hardly enough time for an individual member of the legislature to communicate to government the wishes of the Saskatchewan people, let alone 58 members of the legislature speaking to a Bill of this nature.

It is ludicrous, it is ludicrous for the member from Meadow Lake and the Government House Leader, the member from Cannington, to say that the opposition is stalling legislation in this House and not allowing the government to get its agenda passed. There are messages, Mr. Speaker, that the public needs, wants, wishes, and will send to members, to government, Mr. Speaker, and it'll be through the voices that the democratically elected members of this Assembly have.

How about *The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker? That's Bill No. 127. Remember, assessment management agency is what? It's the agency that determines how much property tax we pay. Property tax is an issue that gets people excited throughout this province, Mr. Speaker, and rightly so. How much time has been spent on *The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act*? Fifty-three minutes, Mr. Speaker. Not an abuse of the Legislative Assembly, not a stalling tactic on behalf of the opposition — 53 minutes on an Act that related to the setting of property tax in this province. The public has an interest. They need to know what's going on.

And how about the labour mobility amendment Bill, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 128, miscellaneous statutes? Well that's an interesting Bill, Mr. Speaker. Fifty-two minutes is all that was spoken on that.

How about Bill 129, *The Enforcement of Money Judgments Act*, enforcement of money judgments. People, Mr. Speaker, are interested in the enforcement of matters. Twenty-six minutes is all the debating time that we've had in this Chamber on that piece of Bill, Mr. Speaker. And its consequential amendments, Bill 130, the enforcement of money judgments, Mr. Speaker, 24 minutes. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's certainly no abuse or stalling going on there, is there? I can't think of a single person in Saskatchewan who would argue that 24 minutes on any Bill is unacceptable to the government. How about *The Conservation Easements Amendment Act*, Bill 131? Twenty-five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

And this is an interesting one, Mr. Speaker. It's one that I am getting a new appreciation for, thanks to the fact that members of the opposition caucus have been consulting across the province. I refer specifically, Mr. Speaker, to Bill No. 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection (Land Designation) Amendment Act*. Mr. Speaker, keep this in mind, the minister spoke for two minutes, and the public's supposed to know what's going on in this Bill. The minister spoke for two minutes. There's been a total of 1 hour and 5 minutes on this Bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, does the public care about habitat protection, lands that have been designated for habitat protection? Absolutely they do, Mr. Speaker. I've been around this province most of my life. I've sat in the living rooms of people who have dedicated lands to habitat, Mr. Speaker. After generations of taking care of that land — and they put it in the trust of the province, Mr. Speaker — those lands were designated habitat lands. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, because these lands are seen to be a provincial treasure, the lands were put, the description of those lands was put in legislation, put in legislation because if you wanted to remove the designation on that land, you would need to have a thoughtful discussion about the removal of those lands.

It would have to be public. It would have to be very transparent. There would have to be significant consultation, Mr. Speaker. And when you need to change legislation, it requires thought. You have your first, second, and third readings of a Bill. You have public disclosure. You have committee process. You have media scrutiny, Mr. Speaker. If you're going to amend a Bill to take lands out of habitat protection, you need to do it in a careful, thoughtful manner.

Well we are now learning, and you wouldn't know this from the minister's speech on Bill 132, the habitat protection, land designation, amendment . . . If you listen to the minister's speech, you heard her say, we believe in the protection of habitat lands, but we're going to manage it differently. You had no idea, Mr. Speaker, from listening to that speech that what the legislation actually does is it takes the protection out of legislation and puts it into regulation.

How easy is a regulatory change, Mr. Speaker? I think even, I think even the most ordinary of public members know that a regulation change is something that happens very quickly, very easily. In this situation, in the Saskatchewan context, Mr. Speaker, a regulation is changed by cabinet. It's changed at a cabinet meeting behind closed doors. It's changed at a cabinet meeting where the minutes are not published. It's changed at a meeting, Mr. Speaker, that is completely silent. One day the regulation reads, these lands are protected. The next day the regulation reads, oh, those lands aren't there any more. What was the criteria that cabinet used for the discussion of the removal of those lands? Don't know; wasn't put forward in the legislation. Certainly the minister's speech contained no information to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, the public is starting — thanks to speeches in the House and others now reading the Bill — the public is starting to understand what this legislation is all about, and they're asking members of this Assembly to communicate to government the folly of their ways. If we believe in the protection of habitat, then consultation with Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation and Ducks Unlimited and the Nature Conservancy, Mr. Speaker, is paramount.

And while discussions did take place, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a full disclosure of what was going to take place here. The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation says their response wasn't even listened to in the drawing up of this new piece of legislation. And now they are responding, Mr. Speaker, in a public way. Their voice can only be heard in this Assembly by members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

Even that having been said, Bill 132, the wildlife habitat protection, land designation Act has had a total debating time of 1 hour and 5 minutes. Mr. Speaker, no one who cares about habitat in this country will say that the New Democratic Party is abusing their privileges as members of the legislature — no one, Mr. Speaker. But the member from Meadow Lake says we are. The member from Meadow Lake says in this motion that we are abusing our privileges as spokespeople for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We are abusing our privileges, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Meadow Lake is saying, we've got to change the rules because the opposition is stalling us passing this Bill. Well on a piece of legislation like this, Mr. Speaker, the public doesn't want the Bill passed. The public says to the government, don't do it. The government wouldn't listen to begin with.

There are members over there who have a lot of Wildlife Federation members in their constituencies, who have members of Ducks Unlimited in their constituencies, Mr. Speaker. Every one of them is getting a phone call, but are they speaking, Mr.

Speaker? Not one member of government has spoken to the wildlife habitat protection land designation Act, Mr. Speaker. And we have a total of 52 . . . No, just a minute. I lost my place here, Mr. Speaker. There it is. It's right at the top of the page: 1 hour and 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite have to understand — and that's why debate is so important in this Legislature — have to understand what the public is saying about this legislation and about other pieces of legislation.

This is one of those examples that I referred to at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. This government tends to act first and consult second. And sometimes, and it's turning out to be more times than not, sometimes they get it wrong when they act, and changes need to occur. The Minister of the Environment already acknowledged that once this week, Mr. Speaker, on the Dutch elm disease issue. Mr. Speaker, she needs to understand that on the issue of the wildlife habitat.

How about *The Opticians Act*, Mr. Speaker? An important Bill. It's going to introduce some new programs into the province. We need to fully understand what's happening with regards to the optician. The minister spoke for three minutes to give us an idea of what's there. A number of consultations have taken place. But this Bill, Mr. Speaker? The debate time in this Assembly so far, 57 minutes, Mr. Speaker. Compare that to the government's actions on chiropractic care; not a single Bill in this House to this point. Maybe there'll be one coming. We don't know.

[16:30]

But on chiropractors there was an agreement, Mr. Speaker, negotiated. There was a program in place. There was funding in place. There was additional money put into the health care budget, Mr. Speaker. The government has unprecedented revenues — 10 billion this year, Mr. Speaker, compared to 7 billion just three years ago, an extra \$3 billion of revenue — but not a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, not an opportunity for debate outside of question period. And they cut the chiropractic program from our health insurance plan in the province of Saskatchewan.

Chiropractors, Mr. Speaker, and more importantly chiropractic patients, Mr. Speaker, are paying the price for this government's mismanagement and incompetence on the financial end of things, Mr. Speaker. Now we're seeing the public paying a price for the mismanagement and incompetence on the legislative management schedule.

While we're on health, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 135, *The Prescription Drugs Amendment Act*, Mr. Speaker, 43 minutes have been taken up to debate this Bill so far, 43 minutes. Hardly enough time to help the public to understand what's in this legislation and, more importantly, not enough time, Mr. Speaker, to express the will of the public back to the government.

Bill No. 607, *The Public Safety, Security and Protection Act*, this was a private member's Bill. It's had 1 hour and 33 minutes of debate, Mr. Speaker. Other private member's Bill 609, *The Whistleblower Protection Act*, has had 18 minutes of debate. And there are other private members' Bills on the order paper, Mr. Speaker, that have not yet come to the House for debate at

all, Mr. Speaker.

The motion in front of this Chamber does something that most members should find unconscionable, Mr. Speaker. The motion removes the ability of this Chamber to discuss private members' Bills at all. Thursdays have always been designated as an opportunity for private members to bring forward matters that are separate and apart from government legislation. And we've had great success, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years with private members actually influencing the legislative agenda and the quality of life for people in this province.

I remember a couple of years ago the member from . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Lloydminster.

**Mr. Taylor:** — No, not . . . I'll get to Lloydminster. But the Deputy Speaker . . . Arm River. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the member from Arm River bringing forward a private member's Bill in recognition of a John Diefenbaker day, Mr. Speaker — debated, passed, became law in the province of Saskatchewan. I remember the member from Wood River bringing forward a piece of legislation that recognizes the service of cadets in our communities and in our country, Mr. Speaker. A private member's Bill introduced, debated, and passed, Mr. Speaker. I remember just a few weeks ago the member from Lloydminster bringing forward a piece of legislation to protect ponies in the Bronson Forest, Mr. Speaker — brought forward, debated, and passed, Mr. Speaker.

And I have to admit I've had some success myself. I introduced a motion to recognize UN [United Nations] peacekeepers and the value that UN peacekeepers have provided to not only the people of this province but across Canada. That Bill was presented, debated, and passed by this legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Well the opportunity of individual members to influence the legislative agenda and change the circumstances for some people in this province, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for members to do that is being removed by this change in the rules.

Unintended consequence? Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, or intended. The bullies on the other side, the government members who wish to impose their will upon this House, Mr. Speaker, are saying for all intents and purposes, it's only what we want to bring forward, not what anybody else wants to bring forward that's important. We don't want any more question periods. We don't want to be held accountable any longer than we have to be. We don't want any private members bringing forward legislation or motions that might be relevant to issues of the day. And more importantly, we don't want members of the public to participate or even know what's going on here, because we're going to just tighten this schedule up. We're going to push it off into the middle of the night and we're going to do this, Mr. Speaker, without any consensus whatsoever.

In fact there isn't even consensus on the government benches on this issue, Mr. Speaker. There are members opposite I know who have argued with the Government House Leader about the efficacy of this motion that's in front of us, Mr. Speaker.

I've gone through a little bit about the legislative agenda of this

government. Just a small point I should make, Mr. Speaker. Anybody that is reading this in *Hansard* will be able to go back and take a look at the legislation that I mentioned. You know, all the names of the legislation are there and some discussion.

While there are some important Bills, while there are some important issues raised in that legislation, and while there are some important issues that the public would like to communicate, Mr. Speaker, by and large, this is not a terribly ambitious legislative agenda from a government that's in their third year of a four-year mandate. Not a very ambitious agenda at all, Mr. Speaker.

We are seeing a government that is lacking in vision for what this province should look like. For most of the first two years their vision came from the strings attached to the pompoms that were being raised in congratulations of the hardworking people of Saskatchewan who have built a booming economy. All of the graphs that we see presented by economists, Mr. Speaker, all of the graphs that take a look at what has happened in the Saskatchewan economy show all the upward trends starting prior to November of 2007 when this government got elected.

But every word of vision that the Sask Party government has emitted during its first year, little short of two years in office, Mr. Speaker, has been to cheer on this economy that they had nothing to do with building but, Mr. Speaker, that they believed that by simply cheering it on, all will be well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the pompoms seem to be down. Still proud of the province, Mr. Speaker, but by golly, it's hard to be supportive of a booming economy when your own budget is in the tank. They have failed to manage increased resources to the benefit of Saskatchewan people, and as a result of that failure, individuals are having to pay more.

And there are numerous examples of this throughout the province in the last few weeks since the budget came down, Mr. Speaker. Something as simple as Dutch elm disease, Mr. Speaker. Because this government mismanaged the resources available to it, we could see an expansion of Dutch elm disease in the province attacking and killing living trees throughout Saskatchewan. Some people think that's not important. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker. I think my colleagues think it's important.

What about West Nile disease, Mr. Speaker, West Nile disease? A couple of years ago in 2007, Saskatchewan had over 1,000 cases of West Nile disease. The numbers the last couple of years have fallen off a little bit, but West Nile is still a concern to Saskatchewan people. In order to manage its mismanaged budget, this government has chosen to cancel the mosquito control program in the province of Saskatchewan. Did they . . . [inaudible] . . . a link between the health of the Saskatchewan public and the life of a mosquito? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I don't think they put these two things together.

The mosquito control program has been effective, Mr. Speaker, in managing not just mosquitoes but managing incidents of West Nile disease. The public wants its government to protect them from all sorts of things, Mr. Speaker. And West Nile disease is something that this government can actually impact and protect members of the public through a simple budgetary

matter. Not important to this government, Mr. Speaker.

In the interests of saving face on a poorly managed budget, the cancellation of the mosquito control program could actually see the increase in the number of West Nile cases in the province of Saskatchewan. Or if the controls are going to be there, they're going to be there because of the municipalities, municipalities who are using local tax revenues to protect their citizens, Mr. Speaker. Like Dutch elm disease, a downloading to the municipal sector, something that should not be happening at a time when revenues for the government's use are at the second highest level in the history of the province of Saskatchewan. The mosquito control program was in place when the government had \$7 billion in revenue. Why can it not be in place when the government has \$10 billion of revenue?

Same as chiropractic care in our province, Mr. Speaker. It was in place. It was in the budget. It was funded and financed when the government had \$7 billion in revenue. Why can it not be there when the government has \$10 billion of revenue? Why not?

It's fiscal financial mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, and the public will only know about this as debate occurs. And debate happens on the floor of this legislature, and it happens during hours, during times that are defined and set out by agreements reached through discussions by representatives of the government and the opposition parties.

Mr. Speaker, when we equate the inherent need for this motion with the activities that government has shown so far, it's pretty easy for the public to conclude that the inability to manage has become a trait of this government. And we can almost by extension think back over, why would that be happening? To a certain extent, it's inexperience. To a certain extent, it's the fact that members who are now sitting in the seats of government have not spent a lot of time in those seats on that side of the House. But the Premier, the Government House Leader, even the Deputy House Leader, and certainly the Deputy Premier have a lot of experience in rules of procedure, rules of procedure.

And there's no reason whatsoever for those individuals in a position of leadership in government, no reason whatsoever for those members to feel that the agenda of the majority has to be bullied into place as opposed to being coaxed into place through the normal processes of legislative procedure.

You know, we first saw this motion, this motion that's in front of us on the change of hours, Mr. Speaker . . . I forget what day we're at now. Where's my, where's my daily here? Yes. I forget how many days we've been sitting now since we came back from time in our constituency to begin this session. Back on March the 8th, I believe is when we opened up.

[16:45]

Just five days into the opening of this spring session, Mr. Speaker, this motion was put on the order paper. This isn't new today to the members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. This government had made the decision before the first week of sitting had concluded that they needed to push their legislative agenda on to the members of the opposition. This was not



something that has just developed over the last few days because, oh my goodness, members of the opposition are actually debating the legislation in front of us.

We are asked to debate it by the public, by the way, Mr. Speaker. We are asked to debate because the public brings information for us, and they need that information communicated to the public.

But for some reason this government, the Government House Leader felt it necessary before the first week of debate had concluded, before the budget was brought in, Mr. Speaker, before debate on the budget or even most of these pieces of legislation had begun, the Government House Leader felt it necessary to bring forward this rule to ensure that there was less transparency, less accountability, less scrutiny, Mr. Speaker. And in order to keep track of what's going on here, Mr. Speaker — not just for the members that are here but for the public, Mr. Speaker — a great deal of more effort is required to understand what's going on in this place.

If members of the Assembly are only given a few hours notice as to what's going to be debated in committees, how are members of the public supposed to know what's going on and can respond to it? If somebody in North Battleford, Mr. Speaker, wants to attend one of the committee meetings that's being held tomorrow, they can't be here, Mr. Speaker. They can't. They can't be here for that because, number one, this information won't even be communicated out to them unless I get on the phone and call them, which you know I'm more than happy to do if I have a couple days to phone the thousands of people who live in the constituency. But we're going to debate, actually even tonight, Mr. Speaker, *The Milk Control Act*, one of the first Bills I referred to earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker.

We are going to go into committee tonight to deal with *The Milk Control Repeal Act*. I have a lot of dairy producers in northwest Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, dairy producers who are interested in this piece of legislation. Now I got notice this morning that that's what's being called tonight. I admit the Government House Leader said earlier there was some not specific notice but an indication that committees would be called on Wednesday night, outside of normal hours. But I didn't know what was on the agenda, Mr. Speaker.

And I didn't — standing here — I didn't know how to prepare for that. Now members of the public have no opportunity to prepare whatsoever. This government is trying to keep the public in the dark about what is taking place within the walls of this building and by doing so, Mr. Speaker, are making this place less accountable to the public, less accessible to the public, is restricting the ability of the public to participate in this process.

And by extension, Mr. Speaker, are ensuring that members of this Legislative Assembly, 58 members elected to serve their constituents, Mr. Speaker — 58 members — are in fact being denied the opportunity, therefore, to speak for and on behalf of the people who elected them, us, to be here. This is an affront on democracy, Mr. Speaker. There's just no two ways of looking at this. There's no other way to look at this process, Mr. Speaker.

It's an affront on democracy. It's the government saying we've failed to understand what we need to do to achieve our legislative agenda. We've failed to recognize the public's need, in fact their right, to participate in this process. It represents a massive misunderstanding of what it means to provide good government on behalf of the people who elected us here.

We have members elected to this Chamber who seem to have forgotten that they are here to represent the interests of their communities and their constituencies and not just represent the interests of their government. We have members who are quietly supporting this affront on democracy, Mr. Speaker, members who will have a hard time explaining why this is necessary to the public that they represent.

And I'm hoping that every single member representing a government constituency, Mr. Speaker, when they are asked by members of their constituency why, why these rules had to be changed unilaterally, will copy the remarks that I'm making tonight and hand them over to their constituents, Mr. Speaker, because the remarks that were made by the member from Meadow Lake do not demonstrate any understanding of what it is that this motion has done to us.

Just for a refresher before the time allotted to me in this regard expires, Mr. Speaker, the public has to know that what this motion does. It changes the hours that we sit in this place and debate the interests of Saskatchewan people, when in fact that was completely unnecessary. The rules previously agreed to by both sides . . . and the Government House Leader was part of that change, Mr. Speaker, that happened years ago by agreement. The current rules allow the government agenda to go beyond the agreed-upon calendar.

The calendar says we will adjourn on May the 20th, and on May the 20th all matters in front of us that have gone through that certain process will be dealt with. So in other words, on May the 20th the government can assume that the majority of . . . or the way they've managed their agenda, the majority of their legislative agenda will be passed. But if that fails, Mr. Speaker, the rules allow for an extra five days for this legislature to sit. And there's no disagreement on this side of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

If we need more time to ensure that good legislation is reviewed and dealt with in a good way, we're happy to provide the extra time. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to shy away from continuing to do what needs to be done, i.e., debate the legislation in the legislature and in committee.

With the extended hours, Mr. Speaker, if anyone watches — this is an interesting point, and the public's got to understand this — anyone who watches the proceedings of the legislature will know that when a Bill is presented in the Chamber, and the stats prove it out, it's primarily members of the opposition who debate it. When the matter goes to committee, it is primarily members of the opposition who ask the questions. Mr. Speaker, that responsibility that the members of the opposition have will continue, whether these hours are till midnight or around the clock. So we're not shying away from our responsibilities. We will debate the legislation. We will ask the proper questions. We will hold the government to account.

But the fact that the public's participation or ability to participate in it changes with these hours . . . and the onus is on the government, not the opposition, Mr. Speaker. The onus is on the government to achieve what they wish to achieve with full public participation at the end of the day. And the opposition is standing today in opposition to this motion to ensure that the public understands exactly what it is that has taken place here today.

This government concluded on the first week of this session that they were going to bully their way through, that they were going to make sure that their agenda passed, no matter what. And this opposition is as committed today as it was at the beginning of the session to ensure that the public's voice is heard in this Chamber and in the committee rooms, regardless of where they are, Mr. Speaker.

We were there when the rules changed before. We have agreed to rule changes in the past. We aren't adverse to rule changes. We do it in consultation, and ultimately we do it in agreement. This motion does everything unilaterally. It does it in a manner in which the rule of the majority takes advantage of those who sit in the minority.

But lest the government think that it has this figured out, let them not forget that because they enjoyed the majority in 2007 that because of their actions they will still enjoy the majority in 2011. Don't let . . . Members opposite should not make that assumption. The actions that they are taking today will have an influence over the actions of the public in 2011. And when the public sees mismanagement of finances, mismanagement of programs and policy, and mismanagement of the legislative agenda, Mr. Speaker, the public has less of a desire to trust the members elected in '07 and — one would assume — have a greater trust in those who are defending the interests of the general public.

Whether those members of the general public are represented by municipal leaders or visit chiropractors or support heritage designation for habitats or are concerned about West Nile disease or are concerned that they can't find housing or, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, those communities right across this province who have been told on several occasions that seniors living in those communities in long-term care homes that need to be replaced will see those facilities replaced . . . On two occasions now, Mr. Speaker, this government has announced 13 new long-term care facilities. And on two occasions, Mr. Speaker, the public has been told, well don't trust us on that; it'll get done when it gets done or when there's money available.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government has unprecedented revenues. It has unprecedented . . .

## STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

### Ruling on a Point of Order

**The Speaker:** — Order. Being near the hour of adjournment and prior to the hour of adjournment in order to respond to the point of order that was raised earlier this afternoon, I would like to respond to the point of order that was raised earlier today by the Opposition House Leader concerning the operation of the

standing committee of the Assembly.

At the heart of the member's argument is that the present rules governing the operation of committees did not contemplate the meeting of committees outside regular Assembly hours to conduct business on estimates and Bills.

Under regular circumstances, standing committees conform to the regular Assembly sitting hours to conduct business on Bills and estimates. This is prescribed by rule 125(2) of this Assembly's rules. The rule reads as follows: "On days when the Assembly is sitting, standing committees shall follow the Assembly's recess and adjournment times, except as otherwise ordered by the committee." I want to emphasize the last clause of the rule which I repeat: ". . . except otherwise ordered by the committee."

[17:00]

If the rule had a full stop, period before this last clause, the member would have raised a valid point of order. The interpretation of the rule is that committees are able to sit outside of the Assembly hours if they so decide by order. What is meant by order is the adoption of a motion by the committee to meet on a specific date and time. This is something for the committee to decide, not the Speaker.

Committees are masters of their own procedures. It is a longstanding practice of this Assembly and Speakers have consistently ruled that Speakers do not exercise procedural control over committees. Procedural difficulties which arise in committees are settled in the committees and not in the Assembly. Speakers have not intervened to settle disputes that arise in the committees, and this is stated explicitly in paragraph 822 of Beauchesne's, 6th Edition.

The sitting hours of a committee are a procedural issue that each committee can decide for itself. Only the Assembly can override this, not the Speaker. For this reason, the point of order is not well taken.

Being now past the time of adjournment, the Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 17:01.]

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Eagles .....	4817
Chartier .....	4817
Brotten .....	4817
Trew .....	4817
Bradshaw .....	4817
Atkinson .....	4817
The Speaker .....	4817

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

Harper .....	4818
Trew .....	4818
Higgins .....	4818
Junor .....	4818
Atkinson .....	4818
Forbes .....	4819
Vermette .....	4819
Brotten .....	4819
Furber .....	4819
Morin .....	4819
Yates .....	4820
Iwanchuk .....	4821
Quennell .....	4821
Wotherspoon .....	4823
Chartier .....	4823

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>National Parkinson's Disease Month</b>	
Gantfoer .....	4824
<b>Prince Albert Students Win Law Day Competition</b>	
Furber .....	4824
<b>Child Abuse Prevention Month</b>	
LeClerc .....	4824
<b>Rosemont/Mount Royal Family Fun Day</b>	
Wotherspoon .....	4825
<b>Terry Fox's Marathon of Hope</b>	
Allchurch .....	4825
<b>Legislative Assembly Members</b>	
Morin .....	4825
<b>76th Annual TheatreFest</b>	
Michelson .....	4825

### STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

<b>Rulings on Points of Order</b>	
The Speaker .....	4826, 4848
Yates .....	4826

### QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Personal Health Information</b>	
Lingenfelter .....	4828
McMorris .....	4828
<b>Finance and Electoral Issues</b>	
Yates .....	4830
Morgan .....	4830
<b>Support for Film and Television Industry</b>	
Chartier .....	4831
Duncan .....	4831

### POINT OF ORDER

D'Autremont .....	4832
Yates .....	4832

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Weekes .....	4834
--------------	------

#### GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

<b>Hours of Sitting</b>	
Harrison .....	4834
Taylor .....	4836

# 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