



THIRD SESSION - TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(HANSARD)

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Don Toth
Speaker



MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Speaker — Hon. Don Toth
 Premier — Hon. Brad Wall
 Leader of the Opposition — Dwain Lingenfelter

Name of Member	Political Affiliation	Constituency
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Belanger, Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornerud, Hon. Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Boyd, Hon. Bill	SP	Kindersley
Bradshaw, Fred	SP	Carrot River Valley
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Brotten, Cam	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Chartier, Danielle	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Hon. Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Furber, Darcy	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
Gantfoer, Hon. Rod	SP	Melfort
Harpauer, Hon. Donna	SP	Humboldt
Harper, Ron	NDP	Regina Northeast
Harrison, Hon. Jeremy	SP	Meadow Lake
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Hon. Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Darryl	SP	Prince Albert Carlton
Higgins, Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Hutchinson, Hon. Bill	SP	Regina South
Huyghebaert, Hon. D.F. (Yogi)	SP	Wood River
Iwanchuk, Andy	NDP	Saskatoon Fairview
Junor, Judy	NDP	Saskatoon Eastview
Kirsch, Delbert	SP	Batoche
Krawetz, Hon. Ken	SP	Canora-Pelly
LeClerc, Serge	Ind.	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]

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Principal Clerk Celebrates 25 Years of Service

The Speaker: — Before I call for introduction of guests, members, I would like to draw your attention to a significant milestone that is being marked today by a member of our Legislative Assembly Service. Today Iris Lang, our Principal Clerk, celebrates 25 years of service to the Assembly.

Twenty-five years ago today, Iris began her career at the Assembly as a security enforcement officer. In the span of the time since her early career with the Sergeant-at-Arms office, Iris has gone back to school and earned two university degrees which made possible her taking on new roles within the administration of the Assembly Service.

In 1997, Iris was appointed supervisor of administrative operations and then in 1998, human resource advisor. In 2003, Iris changed her career path again when she applied for and won a competition to become a Committee Clerk and Table Officer. Members please join me in congratulating Iris on 25 years of service to this Legislative Assembly.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

Hon. Mr. Hutchinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a great privilege for me to introduce to you and all members of this Assembly a man who has worked with the Saskatchewan government for nearly 40 years. I'm talking of course about none other than Mr. John Reid, or JR as most people call him, with his colleagues in your gallery today. I want to introduce you to him today because it's important for us to honour the many years he has spent serving the people of Saskatchewan.

Now he's just retired last month from his position as the special advisor to the deputy minister of First Nations and Métis Relations. But this was only one of his many roles. He has influenced many different government ministries over four decades of service.

Early in his career, he worked in the addictions field and then steadily worked his way up to the top levels of the First Nations and Métis Relations Ministry. Always affable, J.R. has developed many strong friendships with people across the province, and he has nurtured long-standing and trusting relationships with First Nations and Métis people. A devoted family man, he always made time for home and home life. He often speaks fondly of his son Ian and daughter Heather and their numerous pets.

Whether he was a policy analyst or acting deputy minister, he worked tirelessly to make life better for First Nation and Métis

citizens of our province. I would ask that all members of the House join me in thanking John for his long and distinguished service to the province of Saskatchewan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre.

Mr. McCall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join, on behalf of the official opposition, the words of congratulations to John Reid. We had estimates last week and, John, it just wasn't the same without you here. I'm sure you were following at home.

But John of course is one of those public servants that for which the Saskatchewan public service has a tremendous reputation across this country. Forty years is a tremendous contribution to the life of a province. And again I'd echo the sentiments around the fine relationships that John has built up, relationships of trust and respect that John had built up over the years with First Nations and Métis people in this province in particular. So on behalf of the official opposition, I'd like to add our congratulations to John for reaching this milestone, and I'm sure it's not the last adventure for this fine citizen of the province, Mr. Speaker. Congratulations, John.

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

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with great pleasure that I introduce to you and through you four members in your gallery representing the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. Joining us today are vice-president, Saskatchewan and agri-business, Ms. Marilyn Braun-Pollon; Virginia Labbie, policy analyst, Saskatchewan and agri-business; Faris Sadden, district manager and winner of CFIB's [Canadian Federation of Independent Business] Big Voice contest. Now he had the highest response rate from all members in southwestern Saskatchewan; I know that people in southwest tend to have a big voice in the legislature here, and they do in the CFIB as well. And also Marc Taillon. Marc is the CFIB legislative intern. Marc, do you want to give us a wave?

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business, Mr. Speaker, is a non-partisan, non-profit organization that represents 105,000 people, 5,250 here in Saskatchewan. They're funded entirely by members and take directions through surveys on various challenges facing their firms. I might indicate that one of their latest studies shows that Saskatchewan business people are the most optimistic in the country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome them to their Legislative Assembly, thank them for their good work that they do with Enterprise Saskatchewan, and the interaction they have with cabinet ministers. The Minister of Finance and I met with them. I know they meet with the Leader of the Opposition as well. So through you, I'd ask all members to thank them for the work they do and congratulate them and welcome them to their Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would want to join with the minister in welcoming the members of CFIB to the Legislative Assembly. We had a great meeting this morning with Marilyn and her team. And I just want to say a special welcome to Virginia, Marc, and also to say to Faris Sadden, a good friend from down in that Cadillac area of southwest Saskatchewan. Welcome as well, and as the minister mentioned, winning that award.

I want to say that the research that you've done recently, as it relates to agriculture in Canada and across the country but here in Saskatchewan as well, I think will be very helpful to the Minister of Agriculture and myself as we go forward and plan for the future, especially as it relates to AgStability and its effect here in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you it's my pleasure to introduce in the west gallery 21 grade 8 students from Turtleford School. I had the opportunity a couple weeks ago to visit the grade 4 class in Turtleford at their school. And I can assure you the grade 4 class had some very good and very tough questions, so I would expect it with the grade 8 class, it could be twice as tough this afternoon.

Accompanying the grade 8 class are their teachers, Christie Milne, Lorna Macnab, and Laurel Derenoski; and their chaperones, Marianne Little, Dean Domes, Garth Edwards, Reg Bellanger, and Joanne Bannerman. I would ask that all members of the Assembly welcome our visitors to their Assembly.

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

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, an individual from Prince Albert, Ted Zurakowski, who is a city councillor. Ted is also a teacher in the Catholic school division and is newly nominated as our candidate for Prince Albert Carlton, and I just want to welcome Ted here today. And I know that it will be one of the many stops you make here in coming years. So welcome to the Assembly.

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

Mr. Furber: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my great pleasure today to rise and introduce my constituency assistant, Rose Rothenburger, who is heavily involved in the constituency in a number of ways. One of which is in support of our organization, the NDP [New Democratic Party], but she also does many, many hours of work on behalf of other residents in Prince Albert and certainly related to women's groups and support of their activities, so certainly proud that she's here today. It's a rare occasion when I get to introduce somebody from Prince Albert. I'm certainly glad that Rose is here.

And beside Rose is Nicole Rancourt, who is a proud mother, resident of Prince Albert as well, works in the constituency

association and does tremendous work on behalf of disadvantaged people in Prince Albert. So I'd like to ask that all members welcome them to their legislature here today.

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you in your gallery, I'd like to welcome, introduce two individuals, Kelvin Goebel and Kerry Westcott. They are here today to observe proceedings in their House, and both have a long history with trade unions in our province.

And they are very concerned with the proposed Bill 80 legislation and its impact on the construction industry. Mr. Speaker, specifically their concerns with the legislation are that it will end the rights of workers to choose unions along trade specific lines. Mr. Speaker, it'll be the end of province-wide collective bargaining, and it will lower wages for Saskatchewan families and, Mr. Speaker, there'll be a general destabilization of the construction industry. Simply, Mr. Speaker, as I've read somewhere, if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Mr. Speaker, Kelvin Goebel is the executive secretary-treasurer and Kerry Westcott is the recruiter, organizer of the Saskatchewan Regional Council of Carpenters, Drywall, Millwrights and Allied Workers. And they have asked me today to table over 1,600 signed cards for residents of this province with the Premier. These cards are all in opposition to Bill 80. Thank you.

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

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce some friends seated in your gallery, introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly. Seated in the front row, Mr. Speaker, are some friends and constituents from Saskatoon Massey Place. From left to right we have Ruben Peters, John Crawford, Margaret Crawford, Lois Schrader, and Donna Rederburg. I know these individuals hardly miss a question period on TV, so they wanted to come to the Assembly and see it in first-hand.

I should also note, Mr. Speaker, I know all members rise and say that they have the best constituency assistant in the Assembly. I'm sorry to inform all members that they're wrong. Donna Rederburg is my constituency assistant who also served the people of Saskatoon Massey Place with Eric Cline for a number of years. So I'm very pleased that she's here. As well, Ruben Peters works as a casual constituency assistant. So I'm very pleased that they're both able to be here, and I would ask all members to welcome them to the Legislative Assembly.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce some guests also seated in your gallery, about 10 individuals, Mr. Speaker, that have come to the legislature today because of their questions and concerns about the Sask Party government's approach to the merger of Carlton Trail Regional College and St. Peter's College. In the gallery, Mr. Speaker, a group of people, about 10, from the communities of Watrous, Imperial, Raymore, and Muenster. I would ask all members to also welcome them to the Assembly.

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

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Also in your gallery are three people from Saskatoon Nutana that I'd like to introduce to the Assembly. Joining us this afternoon is Martha Robbins. Martha was named by *Maclean's* magazine one of the 100 young people to watch in Canada. And she's a constituent of Saskatoon Nutana, and we're extremely pleased with the activity that Martha is involved in, particularly with the Buena Vista Community Association.

Joining Martha is Cathy Sproule. Cathy Sproule is a lawyer in Saskatoon, but she's also heavily involved with the Ness Creek Festival that takes place at Big River in July, and I'd like to welcome her.

And joining Cathy and Martha is Trevor McKenzie-Smith who has just got back from graduating from the University of Toronto with a master's in geography, and his research is extremely interesting. Trevor is also involved with the Buena Vista Community Association. So I'd like to welcome these three citizens from Saskatoon Nutana to the Legislative Assembly.

Also while I'm on my feet, I want to again welcome Kerry Westcott who is in the Assembly. He also is a resident of Saskatoon Nutana. And Kerry has a very long history of advocating on behalf of working people, particularly carpenters in the province, but he has a real interest in making sure that we have a lot of apprentices that are involved in the industry and ensuring that the journeymen that are on sites have apprentices that they are training, Mr. Speaker. So I'd like to welcome Kerry Westcott to the Assembly as well.

[13:45]

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to all members of the Legislative Assembly, I am pleased to introduce in the west gallery, Heather Malek, who is a member of SCN [Saskatchewan Communications Network] Matters, a group that's concerned with this government's privatization of the Saskatchewan Communications Network and the manner in which they've gone about doing it.

And just a bit of a side note, SCN Matters had the opportunity to spend the day in Swift Current on Saturday. And they spoke to about 80 people at the Bank of Montreal Square, did some great chalk drawings, and heard from about 80 people who were also concerned about the closure of SCN and who know the Premier well and don't understand this decision at all.

With that, I'd like us all to welcome Heather to her Legislative Assembly. Thank you.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

Mr. Harper: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of citizens of Saskatchewan who are concerned over the condition and the safety of our highways of our great province. This petition pertains to Highway 35 and the portion that runs through Pelican Narrows, which is currently a gravel road, but an upgrade to this highway would be an excellent investment in the safety and the well-being of the people of Pelican Narrows.

And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to pave the 7 kilometres of Highway 135 through the community of Pelican Narrows as committed on August the 24th, 2007.

And in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by the good folks from Pelican Narrows, Saskatchewan. 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 in support the protection of wildlife habitat lands. And, Mr. Speaker, the residents know that *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* protects 3.4 million acres of uplands and wetlands or one-third of all wildlife habitat lands in Saskatchewan in their natural state and that many citizens, many, many citizens are concerned that the government is currently looking to repeal the schedule listing of these designated lands with proposed amendments currently before the House. And, Mr. Speaker, the prayer reads:

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 importance of the protection of wildlife habitat lands and immediately withdraw proposed amendments that will negatively affect the protection of wildlife habitat lands;

And in so doing cause the provincial government to commit to meaningful and adequate consultation with all stakeholders that will be affected by future legislative changes to *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by residents of Moose Jaw and Regina. I so present.

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

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of citizens of Saskatchewan who are concerned that many senior citizens live on fixed incomes and are victims of physical, emotional, and financial abuse. And they also believe that seniors have a right to social and economic security and a right to live free from poverty. They also believe that seniors have a right to protection from abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

We, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectively request that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan to enact a Saskatchewan seniors' Bill of Rights which would provide Saskatchewan seniors with social and economic security and protection from abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

The petitions are signed from citizens from Marsden, Central Butte, Kinistino, Craik, and Aylesbury. I so present.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition in support of affordable rents and housing for Saskatoon. And we see, Mr. Speaker, too many times where tenants cannot simply afford rent increases, and yet they see fewer and fewer accommodations on the market. I'd like to read the prayer.

We, in the prayer that reads as follows, respectively request that the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take the following action: to call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to develop an affordable housing program that will result in a greater number of quality and affordable rental units to be made available to more people in Saskatoon and Saskatchewan, and that the government also implement a process of rent review or rent control to better protect tenants in a non-competitive housing environment.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people signing this come from the city of Saskatoon. I do so present.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

Mr. Vermette: — I rise today, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition in support of Highway 915. This petition addresses concerns of Saskatchewan people about the quality of Stanley Mission road. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to upgrade and repair Highway 915 as soon as possible.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This petition is signed and supported by the leadership and community members from Stanley Mission. I so present.

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

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to present a petition in support of SIAST [Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology] and the many students who are negatively affected by the recent cuts done by this government. The prayer reads:

To cause the Sask Party government to recognize the importance of the programs offered by SIAST campuses in ensuring that we develop a highly skilled and educated

workforce in Saskatchewan, and as in so doing to cause the Sask Party government to stop shortchanging SIAST which forces the institution to cut important programs, and instead to immediately increase funding to SIAST to allow for the reinstatement of programs affected by recent budget cuts.

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

Mr. Speaker, the individuals who signed this petition are from the city of Regina. 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 financial assistance for the town of Duck Lake water project. The petition is being circulated and signed by Saskatchewan residents because of the exorbitant amount of money that Duck Lake residents are forced to pay for safe, clean, drinking water. And it's causing them hardship and, in fact, forcing people out of their community. And the prayer reads:

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the petition today is signed by good folks from the Beardy's First Nation, the town of Wakaw, the town of Rosetown, and Duck Lake. I so present.

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

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present yet another petition from rural Saskatchewan regarding water issues. The government ministry has directed that the customers may no longer treat non-potable water using methods approved by Sask Health, although the Furdale residents, in dealing in good faith with SaskWater for over 30 years, have paid large amounts for their domestic systems and in-home treatment equipment. The alternative water supply referred to by the government ministry is a private operator offering treated, non-pressurized water at great cost with no guarantee of quality, quantity, or availability of water. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to withdraw its order to cut off non-potable water to the residents of the hamlet of Furdale, causing great hardship with no suitable alternatives; to exempt the hamlet of Furdale from further water service cut-offs by granting a grandfather clause under *The Environmental Management and Protection Act, 2002* and *The Water Regulations, 2002*; and that this

government fulfills its promises to rural Saskatchewan.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

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

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition in the support of the withdrawal of Bill 80. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the members of the building trade unions have a proud history of craft union certification in Saskatchewan, and that the existing construction industry labour relations Act, 1992 has provided a stable environment for labour relations. And, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the results of a stable labour relations environment provide for quality work and safe construction sites that benefit all of us in Saskatchewan. The existing building trades contracts, Mr. Speaker, also support an apprenticeship system of training which results in a highly skilled workforce. And the petition reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to withdraw its ill-conceived Bill 80, *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2009* which dismantles the proud history of the building trades in this province, creates instability in the labour market, and impacts the quality of training required of workers before entering the workforce.

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

And the petition is signed by residents of Moose Jaw and Pilot Butte. I so present.

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

Mr. Taylor: — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise to present a petition in support of maintaining quality health care services in Saskatchewan. The petitioners note that CUPE [Canadian Union of Public Employees] members employed within the health regions provide valuable care, compassion, and quality health care services to the citizens of Saskatchewan in acute care, community care, long-term care, and the public health sector. Mr. Speaker, the petitioners pray:

That the 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.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by residents of Meadow Lake. I so present.

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once again here today to present petitions on behalf of 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 \$1 billion deficits tabled by this Sask Party, and they reference the billions of dollars of debt growth projected underneath the Sask Party. The prayer, Mr. Speaker, 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 from concerned citizens are signed by individuals from Saskatoon. I so submit.

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise again today to present a petition in support of midwifery here in Saskatchewan.

This petition is signed by residents concerned that despite the fact *The Midwifery Act* was proclaimed more than two years ago, that there's only seven registered midwives here in Saskatchewan, most of them concentrated in Saskatoon so there's a disparity of services between urban and rural women. I'd like to read the prayer.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to keep its promise to broaden the options for women and their families and recognize that presently this promise remains unfulfilled, as many communities in Saskatchewan still do not have midwives employed by their respective health regions;

And in doing so, your petitioners pray the honourable Legislative Assembly cause the government to support midwifery in Saskatchewan by making funding available for additional midwife positions in Saskatchewan's health regions as well as independent positions;

And furthermore, the honourable Legislative Assembly cause the government to encourage an increase in the number of licensed midwives in Saskatchewan by extending liability insurance, thereby making it possible for prospective midwives to achieve the number of births required to successfully apply for a licence with the newly formed College of Midwives.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by residents in Regina and Moose Jaw. I so submit.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Estevan.

50th Anniversary of Boundary Dam Power Station

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Friday, May 14th, 2010 marked a very special day in Estevan. I had the pleasure of attending a dinner celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Boundary dam power station.

The Boundary dam power station had very modest beginnings on May 14th, 1960. The dam was a plant that was constructed to supply electricity for a community of barely a few hundred residents. With the expansion of the local community, the Boundary dam also grew. Now there are 300 employees at Boundary Dam, along with an additional 450 individuals working in either the mining industry or other dam-related activities.

Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the city of Estevan and the employees of the Boundary Dam power station has also grown over the past 50 years. These employees are active in the community. They volunteer their time, they donate to the local charities, and these are the people that contribute to what makes Estevan such a great city.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not personally acknowledge plant manager Mike Zeleny. Mr. Zeleny has been doing a terrific job in overseeing his 300 employees and making sure the plant runs at maximum efficiency.

I would like to acknowledge all of the past and present employees of the Boundary Dam and to thank them for helping to grow Estevan and move Saskatchewan forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

[14:00]

Norwegian Constitution Day

Mr. Nilson: — [The hon. member spoke for a time in Norwegian.]

Today is Norwegian constitution day, celebrating that day in 1814 when a number of the citizens of Norway got together at the time of the Napoleonic Wars and declared independence for Norway. What was clear about this particular event was that the farmers had an upper hand, and they actually drafted a constitution which put into place a special spot for all of the farmers.

And here in Saskatchewan, we have many Norwegian descendants. There are many Norwegian descendants all over North America. And it's always a pleasure to note this day because what it does do is reminds us of our roots. So with the member from Coronation Park, the member from The Battlefords, the member from Saskatoon Massey Place, the member from Saltcoats, the member from Saskatchewan Rivers, as well as with the spouse of Mr. Speaker, all of us look forward to celebrating the 17th of May, Syttende Mai, today. Thank you.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Regina

Qu'Appelle Valley.

Surgery Wait-List Times

Ms. Ross: — Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to rise and say that under this government people are spending less time on wait-lists for surgery. Mr. Speaker, the 18-month wait-lists are down 39 per cent, and the 12-month wait-lists are down 22 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to be done, but reduction in wait times over the past two years is a big step in the right direction. This progress is gaining recognition nationwide. These positive steps can largely be attributed to the hard work, dedication, and efficiency of individuals working in the new assessment and treatment clinics in Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Regina, and Moose Jaw. In the words of Michael Golbey, chairman of the Canadian Medical Association, we are seeing really good stuff in Saskatchewan. With very little increased costs, you can have a very large improvement in ways that are being done to shorten the waiting list.

Mr. Speaker, the entire health sector should be commended for supporting new approaches and the innovations that will improve the quality, the availability of health services for Saskatchewan people. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Enterprise Saskatchewan

Mr. Furber: — Star date, 5.7.2010. Mr. Speaker, captain's log. Communication channels are jammed aboard Enterprise Saskatchewan. Sensors detect few signs of life aboard this costly craft. But the Premier says that it's just an information flow and that the information flow is not in an optimum situation.

When he launched Enterprise Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's hopes were sky high. Its four-year mission was to seek out new opportunities, economic development, and to boldly go where the Premier had never gone before — success in business. An ambition prime directive, Mr. Speaker, travelling across 18 sectors including First Nations, local government, educators, and labour, but the Premier changed course, ignoring business, First Nations, and breaking the agreements to help local governments and educators. As for labour, Mr. Speaker, we know he declared war on their federation.

So instead of pushing the economy ahead at warp speed, the Premier's vessel has been sputtering despite an astronomical \$90 million worth of fuel. As Enterprise Saskatchewan drifts closer to the black hole of failure, Mr. Speaker, the crew are starting to abandon ship. Dale Botting beamed back to the private sector last month on an away mission costing taxpayers \$15,000 a month. The Premier calls such wasted dollars challenges to his new approach. But the people are so many light years ahead of him that they're just asking what planet he's on.

Communication channels may be jammed today, Mr. Speaker,

but the Premier will get the message loud and clear in 2010 when he crosses the final frontier — defeat at the polls. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Batoche.

Canadian Youth Against Impaired Driving Conference

Mr. Kirsch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the weekend, Regina hosted a successful Canadian . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. I'd ask the member from Athabasca to allow the members to make their statements without interference. I recognize the member from Batoche.

Mr. Kirsch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the weekend, Regina hosted a successful Canadian Youth Against Impaired Driving Conference. This conference brings together hundreds of young people determined to end impaired driving. They listened to keynote speakers and discussed topics related to this issue.

The Canadian Youth Against Impaired Driving Conference was put together by Saskatchewan's chapter of Students Against Drinking and Driving, better known as SADD. SADD is a youth-based organization devoted to eliminating impaired driving. Every year they deliver presentations and raise awareness about the impact of impaired driving. This is very important work, Mr. Speaker. Last year 44 people were killed in Saskatchewan and 786 were injured in collisions involving an impaired driver. Over 60 per cent of those injured and fatalities were caused by impaired drivers under the age of 30.

Mr. Speaker, events like this conference are essential to educating young people about the dangers of impaired driving. Education and awareness will help reduce the numbers of needless deaths and injuries. We congratulate SADD on hosting such a successful weekend event. I hope all of our young people learn to always plan for a safe ride home and that they share the message with everyone they know. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Government's Track Record

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, the Kentucky Derby's 135th anniversary of racing three-year-old horses is as good a day as any to examine the track record of this three-budget government. Now, the Premier calls it nagging when we mention his early adventures in horseback riding, Mr. Speaker, and besides he's out of country, rebranding the region with his western horse-trading teamsters.

So as this session comes down to the wire, Mr. Speaker, we look at some of the other horses running for government that's undecidedly unstable. The House Leader, Mr. Speaker, has been here 19 years — a bit long in the tooth — but he stumbled out of the gate to extend sitting hours, leading many to think the Premier had mistaken a gelding for a warhorse. And the

Enterprise minister is tripping out of the gates on our domed stadium; even after a Chevy chase, he couldn't get Ottawa to pony up the dough.

Then there's the Health minister, Mr. Speaker. The public are telling him to hold his horses, but he's still chomping at the bit to run roughshod over privacy rights. The Finance minister, Mr. Speaker, is known for a different Kentucky tradition than horse racing, but thanks to his unbridled spending and a risky bet on potash, he still managed to saddle this province with a \$1 billion deficit.

In 2011, Mr. Speaker, the Premier will ask voters to gamble on this team for four more laps. Given their track record though, we're betting voters have the horse sense to say nay, nay to the Sask Party.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Lloydminster.

New Democratic Party Leader's Dinner

Mr. McMillan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An old riddle asks: if a tree falls in the forest and no one is around to hear it, does it really make a sound? In Saskatchewan one might ask: if the NDP hosts a leader's dinner and hardly anybody attends, is there really a leader? Mr. Speaker, this was the case of its recent NDP leader's dinner. Free T-shirt night would have been a better incentive to attend. But the NDP went with an uninspiring title of Dinner with Dwain.

Dinner with Dwain might have packed the house during the dying days of disco when he was as popular as a rhinestone jean jacket. But this is 2010, and according to a North Battleford news report, at \$20 a person the NDP leader could only muster the support of 61 people. That adds up to a total of \$1,220 for the NDP coffers, only a few hundred more than the NDP membership scandal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer some free advice on how to coordinate a leader's dinner. First, your slogan should suit the cause. How about NDP aid? Might be a better slogan than leader's gala. Second, you should offer people something of value in exchange for their money, not a relic. And finally, Mr. Speaker, finally, if you want a successful event, don't associate your event with the NDP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION PERIOD

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

Arrangements Regarding Long-Term Care Facility

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the agreement between the Sask Party government and Amicus contains a provision which states, and I quote, "In the event that either Amicus or the region terminates this continuing care and service agreement . . ."

The Speaker: — I'd just ask the Assembly to give us a second.

I recognize the Government House Leader.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we take a 10-minute recess?

The Speaker: — Would the members agree to a 10-minute recess?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — The Assembly will reconvene in 10 minutes.

[The Assembly recessed for a period of time.]

The Speaker: — I'll call the session back to order. And first of all let me say thank you to the members for the co-operation as we dealt with this issue of a personal nature.

Oral questions, I recognize the member from Saskatoon Nutana.

Ms. Atkinson: — So, Mr. Speaker, the agreement between the Sask Party government and Amicus contains a provision which states, and I quote:

In the event that either Amicus or the region terminates the continuing care and service agreement before the expiry of the term of the agreement, or provides written notice to the other party that it does not intend to renew the continuing care and service agreement, Amicus, at its sole option, may require the region to acquire its assets and ongoing business operations; and the region agrees that it will pay to Amicus the amount required for Amicus to repay the outstanding balance owing to the mortgagee plus outstanding interest and charges for the mortgage referenced in clause 4(1).

To the minister: is that not a loan guarantee?

[14:45]

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the question. The Saskatoon Regional Health Authority has looked into this and had a legal opinion. That's not a loan guarantee . . . [inaudible] . . . Mr. Speaker, we have looked into it through the Ministry of Health and no, we don't look at this as a loan guarantee. This is a new financial arrangement with the Catholic Health Ministry that will offer 100 long-term care beds in Saskatoon — much needed long-term care beds, Mr. Speaker.

Under the previous government, we simply didn't have enough long-term care beds. We're moving on that, Mr. Speaker. We have anywhere from 60 or 70 residents living in an acute care centre, completely inappropriate for the care that they need, Mr. Speaker. This will move a project further along, Mr. Speaker, that will ensure that long-term care residents have the proper, appropriate care in the city that they so choose, Mr. Speaker. It allows them to age with dignity. It allows them to age with place, Mr. Speaker, in place, and it allows spouses to age together, Mr. Speaker. It would only be the NDP that would be against something like that.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatoon

Nutana.

Ms. Atkinson: — You know, Mr. Speaker, on May 10th, the minister stated, and I quote, "We are not guaranteeing any loan for Amicus, not whatsoever." But, Mr. Speaker, the government has entered into a continuing and service agreement with Amicus that guarantees that the mortgage will be paid off by the government if the agreement is terminated. That's something Amicus can take to the bank.

So to the minister: why did he claim that the government wasn't guaranteeing a loan to Amicus when they signed an agreement that does precisely that?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said in my previous answer, this is not a loan guarantee. We're not going to the bank and signing any sort of note for Amicus, Amicus, which is a subsidiary of the Catholic Health Ministry.

The Catholic Health Ministry operates nine long-term care facilities around the province, with agreements through health regions right now, Mr. Speaker. It operates St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon through an agreement with the Saskatoon Health Region. It operates a facility down in Estevan through the Sun Country Health Region, Mr. Speaker. It operates a number of health care facilities across the province and has done so for 100 or better years, Mr. Speaker, a very reputable partner, Mr. Speaker, to ensure long-term care residents in Saskatoon get the proper care they need.

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

Ms. Atkinson: — This is a Sask Party gift that just keeps on giving, Mr. Speaker. There is more, there is more to this. Brenda FitzGerald has been contracted by the Ministry of Health to conduct a review of the government's affiliation agreements with long-term care facilities. She's also the interim CEO [chief executive officer] of Amicus.

Now the minister will no doubt answer that Amicus is not an affiliate, it's a pilot project. But that would be like arguing how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. The minister has contracted someone to review the terms of agreements with long-term care facilities, which are affiliates, while the same person's employer is negotiating an agreement with the government, an agreement that apparently is a pilot project.

To the minister: how is that not a conflict of interest, and how much is she being paid or has she been paid, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, Ms. FitzGerald's contract, which is a contract with the government, is not to seek out contracts with other affiliates, Mr. Speaker. It's to improve relationships with RHAs [regional health authority] and affiliates.

Ms. FitzGerald has a long track record in health care in this province. She has been an assistant deputy minister in

Newfoundland. She has worked at St. Paul's Hospital, Mr. Speaker, for many, many years. Ms. FitzGerald is simply being . . . is volunteering time to Amicus right now, Mr. Speaker. She had no part in negotiations whatsoever. It was an assistant deputy minister who looked after the . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — I am having difficulty hearing the minister's response to the member's question. I ask the members to allow the minister to respond without interruption.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, it was an assistant deputy minister that worked directly with Amicus and their lawyers to seek out a memorandum of understanding.

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

Ms. Atkinson: — So, Mr. Speaker, the government has signed an agreement that guarantees Amicus's loan. The construction company whose president has donated \$18,000 to the Sask Party in the last four years and sits on the Sask Party appointed health board has received an untendered contract that is apparently worth up to 27 million, and the CEO of Amicus has a contract with the Ministry of Health to review the government's relationships with affiliates, a clear conflict of interest.

So to the minister: why is the Sask Party using taxpayers' money to reward its friends?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, that member is throwing out accusations . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, that member opposite is throwing out accusation left and right with no evidence to back it whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Okay. It would seem to me . . . Order. It would seem to me the opposition members would like to have an answer to the question. Order. I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, that opposition member likes to throw out accusations left and right and can't back it up, Mr. Speaker. It's absolutely wrong that the Government of Saskatchewan is building this without a tender. Amicus, the Catholic Health Ministry, is the one that's building it. I can't seem to get that through to that member. But Amicus has contracted whoever they want to contract to build the facility. We will be renting beds in that facility, Mr. Speaker, but, Mr. Speaker, after 16 years . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. The Minister of Health may wrap up his comments.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After 16 years of NDP government thinking it's perfectly okay if seniors live in acute care centres, Mr. Speaker, our government is taking action. We're going to ensure that seniors in this province have appropriate care when they deserve it, Mr. Speaker, not like the former government.

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

Relationship Between Colleges

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, the government's stories regarding the merger of Carlton Trail Regional College and St. Peter's College just don't add up. Last week the minister said repeatedly that Carlton Trail and St. Peter's are not being merged; rather they just have a strategic partnership. But his story is contradicted throughout many documents we received, including minutes from a board meeting on November 24th, 2009. Those minutes from last November say, "The tentative date to begin the formal merger is April 1st, 2010."

Will the minister stand today and correct his repeated statements that this is not a full-scale merger?

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

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to provide an update to the people of the province. Mr. Speaker, there are seven regional colleges, Mr. Speaker. What we've seen is that there have been over \$140 million invested in these colleges since we've come forward including, Mr. Speaker, including extensive investments in both Carlton Trail and St. Peter's, Mr. Speaker.

What I'm happy to report, Mr. Speaker, is that these two sides are certainly undertaking their own consultations. And what I'll do is quote, quote right out of a media story from last week, Mr. Speaker, from one of the officials within the ministry:

The provincial review [quote] is expected to take place over the next few months . . . the executive director of public institutions and infrastructure with the ministry [said]. "We have to do our due diligence to ensure that public policy and government objectives for post-secondary systems are going to be taken into account" . . .

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The institutions have undertaken their own consultations. We'll now be beginning ours shortly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister last week whether any legislation has been drafted to facilitate this merger. The minister replied, ". . . there's no legislation drafted on this." But his story is again contradicted by board meeting

minutes from July 28th, 2009, nearly a full year ago. Those minutes state the transition board reviewed "... a draft of an Act." The stories don't add up, Mr. Speaker.

To the minister: who's telling the truth, the minister or the college board?

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

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, from last week from the *Leader-Post*, here's the quote, Mr. Speaker: "Two of the province's colleges have decided to 'get serious' about a potential partnership," Mr. Speaker. And certainly we encourage this. That being said, we're also going to undertake our own due diligence.

The investments in these two institutions is well known, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that they want to explore opportunities for enhanced co-operation, Mr. Speaker, is going to be determined mostly by one criterion, and that is, does it serve the interests of the learners within that region, Mr. Speaker? That's what we're going to be taking a close focus on as we undertake our own due diligence in the coming months. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask the minister to reread a news release. I asked him to state who is telling the truth, the minister or the board. When talking about the plans for a comprehensive merger, board minutes from January 26th, 2010 say, "Direction has been given from Minister Norris to proceed."

Yet again the stories don't add up. Last week the minister pretended to know next to nothing about this, but now the documents reveal that the minister himself gave a direction for the merger to proceed.

To the minister: will he admit that he personally directed the board members whom he appointed to proceed with this merger?

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

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the significance of our investment in post-secondary education — \$1.6 billion, Mr. Speaker. As far as where we are, Mr. Speaker, it's quite simply — I'll repeat the May 12th, Mr. Speaker; this is an article that ran in the *Leader-Post* — quite simply: "There has been no legal merger, and should the change not go ahead Carlton Trail will seek another CEO." In fact the acting CEO has said, "It's a process, it's not a done deal."

Mr. Speaker, what they're doing, Mr. Speaker, is they're going back to press releases from last summer. That was July 10th, Mr. Speaker.

We've made an announcement with the Minister of Education about the new education centre in Humboldt, Mr. Speaker. If

they want to explore opportunities, of course we're not going to get in the way. That being said, Mr. Speaker, we will undertake our own due diligence to ensure community stakeholders and others are going to be served by this idea — at this stage, Mr. Speaker, simply an idea. Thank you, sir.

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

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, there's something about the stories coming from the last two ministers. When it comes to sketchy details involving boards and large amounts of money, the stories don't quite add up.

Mr. Speaker, there's been no consultation, and the minister is just now undertaking due diligence even though the documents show the merger process began almost a full year ago. All of that is concerning, but there are also significant implications for our broader post-secondary education system. The minister admitted in committee last week that he'd be open to dismantling any of the regional colleges in the same way he's dismantling Carlton Trail.

To the minister: is it the Sask Party's goal to have a fully privatized regional college system in Saskatchewan?

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

Hon. Mr. Norris: — Mr. Speaker, our track record in supporting public institutions, especially public sector sponsored and public post-secondary institutions, Mr. Speaker, is rock solid. In fact we were just at the University of Saskatchewan this morning, Mr. Speaker, for a \$30 million announcement. Mr. Speaker, quite simply the answer to that member's question, no.

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

Consultation with Ethanol Industry

Mr. Taylor: — Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. The Premier told the media in an interview on May the 7th, and I quote, "Industry is telling some things to Enterprise Saskatchewan and I'm not sure that message is getting to where it should go." Mr. Speaker, one group that doesn't feel heard by this government is the ethanol industry. They first learned of the government's intention to substantially reduce the ethanol fuel rebate program from 21 million to 8.8 million in the 2010-11 budget.

To the minister: did the biofuels sector team of Enterprise Saskatchewan or the Enterprise Saskatchewan board recommend this substantial change to the ethanol rebate program, or was it merely a budget decision?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Whether it's ethanol or any other part of the economy in Saskatchewan, Enterprise Saskatchewan takes great pride in conducting consultations and listening to those very people that need that work in this industry. That's why we have our sector

teams in place. That's why we have the Enterprise regions in place.

Mr. Speaker, the ethanol industry is a thriving industry in Saskatchewan. It began in 2002 with some 12 thousand million litres. The goal is to expand it to some 400 million litres. Right now it's at about 342 million. The ethanol industry can rest assured that this government will work with them to grow the economy, to expand the industry, and to make sure it happens.

[15:00]

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

Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well in committee the other night, the Minister of Enterprise said the decision to drastically reduce the rebate was a budget decision and that consultations on this matter were not as extensive as he would have liked them to be.

Given that it is very evident that the biofuels and bio-products sector team was not adequately consulted and given that the ethanol industry is just now being consulted on the matter that was already announced in the budget, can the Minister of Enterprise acknowledge that this lack of consultation was a mistake and that he's currently working with the industry to fix that mistake contained in the Finance minister's budget?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Mr. Speaker, Enterprise Saskatchewan consults with industry around the clock, around the calendar. They make sure that those consultations take place, Mr. Speaker, whether they're in the summertime, whether in the fall, whether in budget cycle or without budget cycle.

Naturally during budget cycle, less consultations can take place. But I can assure all members of the House that those consultations take place 24/7, 365. I'm on call. I'm almost about . . . give my phone number out, but not quite there, Mr. Speaker.

But no, in all seriousness, those consultations take place. That's why we have the sector teams. That's why we have that direct voice into our government. That's why Saskatchewan's economy is growing, leading the country, and that's why it'll continue to do that, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Taylor: — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. The minister has acknowledged that he's meeting behind closed doors with industry representatives saying that the budget process didn't get it right and that he's working to change that budget initiative. In committee, the minister said, "Well we have committed to the industry that we will undertake extensive consultations for as long as it takes."

Industry knows that before this decision was announced nobody — nobody, Mr. Speaker — was lobbying for a change; nobody in the industry was expecting a change. And only after the fact

is Enterprise Saskatchewan now taking a look at it.

My question, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the minister is telling the ethanol industry that his government got these measures wrong, will he also acknowledge that he can no longer support the Minister of Finance who, it appears, completely ignored Enterprise Saskatchewan and put small rural-based ethanol producers at risk?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Mr. Speaker, when you have a growing industry, the consultation process doesn't start at one particular time and it doesn't end at one particular time. It continues on. That's what's been happening. That's what we have is a growing industry. That's what Enterprise Saskatchewan is there to do.

Enterprise Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, was created to get rid of barriers to growth. On November the 7th, 2007, the Saskatchewan people embarked on the same process — to get rid of barriers to growth. That's what they did. There were 30 over there. They got rid of 10 of them. They're into 20. Mr. Speaker, that's . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. There's half a dozen members on the opposition side that are making it very difficult to hear the response from the minister. I recognize the minister and ask him to wrap up his response.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On November the 7th, 2011, Saskatchewan people will once again embark on a process of getting rid of barriers to growth. There's 20 left and I submit to you, they'll all be gone.

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

Mr. Taylor: — So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Enterprise acknowledges that he is holding consultations with the ethanol industry to fix a mistake in the Sask Party '10-11 budget. He acknowledges the sector team was not consulted realistically on any proposal to change the rebate program until the issue was already in front of cabinet. So the Minister of Enterprise says he recognizes the value of consultation and in fact, Mr. Speaker, he recognizes that that's the entire principle behind Enterprise Saskatchewan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister: if the government doesn't value true consultation, then what is the value of Enterprise Saskatchewan?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Mr. Speaker, I wish the member opposite would listen to the answers and not just read from the questions that are written there for him because we do consult. We consult around the year. We consulted with this industry when we became government, and we will continue to do so. We will continue to consult with them as the industry grows till it reaches its maturity.

Whether it's the small producers, the large producers, they're facing difficult challenges, Mr. Speaker, with the Canadian dollar, with the exchange rates. They can rest assured that they have a government on this side, a Saskatchewan Party government that continues to listen to the industry and continues to act when necessary — something that government, that NDP government failed to do, and that's why they're sitting where they are, Mr. Speaker.

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

Response to Allegations of Abuse

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth Wilkie is at the legislature today looking for help. Ms. Wilkie is a registered nurse who we saw in action in the gallery. She's documented how she was sexually harassed and physically violated and intimidated by a doctor she worked with.

For over two years, Ms. Wilkie has been writing letters to the Minister of Health and the Premier. Both have chosen to ignore her pleas for help, thereby allowing the documented abuse to continue.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Ms. Wilkie, I'm asking today: what is the Premier going to do to immediately investigate Ms. Wilkie's documented issues of abuse in the workplace?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, you know, as a government in Saskatchewan, we want to ensure that every person can exercise their duties at work in a safe manner. And we want to ensure that that is the case, Mr. Speaker, from corner to corner in every sort of . . . help every profession that there is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to comment on the particulars of this case here on the floor, but I do know that there is legislation in place to ensure that employers respect their workers, Mr. Speaker. I know there's legislation in place that protects the rights of workers. Mr. Speaker, we want to certainly ensure that that is being conducted in workplaces throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, because we truly do value the work that employees do throughout this province.

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

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure Ms. Wilkie is really reassured by that answer. She has not worked in two years. She's tried to apply for jobs but says she's been blacklisted. Ms. Wilkie has lost her savings and is losing her home. Ms. Wilkie followed all the right steps and procedures to have her case resolved. When all else failed, she wrote to the Premier, who made a conscious decision to allow the documented harassment to continue by not dealing with it appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, can the Premier explain to Ms. Wilkie why he failed to investigate the complaint of harassment and instead turned her back into a system that she says continues to victimize her?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not want to comment on the particulars here on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker.

But what I will say is that there is legislation in place that protects workers, Mr. Speaker. And we want to ensure that that legislation is being enforced, that the letter of the law is being enforced in workplaces. There's also legislation to protect employee abuse, Mr. Speaker, and we want to make sure that that is also enforced, Mr. Speaker.

We take this issue very seriously and I'd be certainly glad to look into it further, Mr. Speaker, but I will not be commenting on the particular case on the floor of the House.

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

Ms. Junor: — I don't think the minister could go wrong by saying, yes, he would help her; yes, he would go back and read the 13 binders she sent to him with documents of every single thing that has been said and done for her and to her. So Ms. Wilkie actually went to the Premier as a last stop when all else failed. She went to the Premier looking for help and he turned her back into the system. The Premier has had Ms. Wilkie's extensive, detailed information for over a year and has done nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the minister talk about a zero tolerance policy but failed to act when Ms. Wilkie came to him for help. He didn't even read, I'm sure, her binders. Obviously the Premier doesn't practise or the minister practise what they preach.

To the Premier, Mr. Speaker: how can Ms. Wilkie or anyone else in a similar situation in the workplace take the Premier seriously when he has failed to act to protect Ms. Wilkie?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, as I said in my previous answers, we want to ensure that every person in this province can go to work on a daily basis and be safe, Mr. Speaker, safe from many different dangers and especially if it becomes harassment, Mr. Speaker, that is . . .

[Interjections]

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. The member from Regina Walsh Acres has continued to interfere when the ministers have been trying to respond. I'd ask the member to allow the minister to complete his answer.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Especially, Mr. Speaker, if there are issues around harassment, we want to enforce a zero tolerance, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are working on that. There is legislation in place . . .

[Interjections]

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

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, we want to ensure that the safety can be guaranteed when people get to work until they get home, Mr. Speaker, especially if they're employed through health regions, through government, Mr. Speaker, that we have that responsibility, Mr. Speaker. And that's what we're working to ensure — zero tolerance.

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — With leave to introduce guests.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to all members of the legislature, I'd like to introduce a couple of visitors in the east gallery. Sitting there is Jason McLeod. Jason, give a wave to us. Jason is from Saskatoon and he is from the fine constituency of Saskatoon Fairview. And, Mr. Speaker, not oftentimes do we get people coming to watch, to watch us, other than concerned, so it's a great privilege that they're here to watch these proceedings.

Now Jason is a tireless worker and is on the executive of Saskatoon Fairview. And, Mr. Speaker, many times this MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] has had to lean on and take counsel from Jason. And Jason was the secretary treasurer of the Saskatoon Fairview constituency, but has recently moved up to take over the position of president.

Now Jason is, as I mentioned, a tireless worker, and that's not all that is new in Jason's life, Mr. Speaker. Saskatoon Fairview has gained a new member, and with Jason is his new partner, Anna Pontikis, who's now also a member of the NDP in Saskatoon Fairview. So I would ask all members here to welcome these fine people from Saskatoon to their legislature today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Hickie: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the Standing Committee on the Economy to present the seventh report. I move:

That the seventh report of the Standing Committee on the Economy be now concurred in.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Chair of the Economy Committee:

That the seventh report of the Standing Committee on the Economy be now concurred in.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried. I recognize the Chair of the Human Services Committee.

Standing Committee on Human Services

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Standing Committee on Human Services to present its eighth report. I move:

That the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Human Services now be concurred in.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Chair of the Standing Committee on Human Services:

That the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Human Services be now concurred in.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Agreed. Carried. I recognize the Chair of the Crown and Central Agencies Committee.

Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies

Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies to report Bill No. 105, *The SaskEnergy Amendment Act, 2009* without amendment.

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

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

The Speaker: — The Minister of Enterprise has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 105, *The SaskEnergy Amendment Act, 2009* and that the Bill be now read the third time. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

[15:15]

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 105 — *The SaskEnergy Amendment Act, 2009*

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move

that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister Responsible for Enterprise that Bill No. 105, *The SaskEnergy Amendment Act, 2009* be now read the third time and passed under its title. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: — Question.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 132

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

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I'm pleased to wade into the debate on Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*.

Actually, honestly it's not with a lot of pleasure that we're having this discussion here today. Many, many organizations have asked this government to slow down, to pull this Bill. We as an opposition have heard from many, many people and have been asked to ask the government to slow down. This government has been completely unwilling to do this, so here I am on my feet today to speak to Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* — quite unfortunately as we shouldn't be having this debate and discussion right now.

I want to give a little bit of information. What are we talking about here? *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. This is some information from a backgrounder written quite some time ago. But what was the purpose of *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*? Well in terms of the status of wildlife habitat in Saskatchewan, I'd like to read this here quote:

Saskatchewan contains one of the most modified landscapes in North America. Because of our extensive agricultural industry during the past century, we have seen over 75 per cent of our natural areas in the agricultural region disappear to cultivation and other

developments including roads, towns, and cities. Between 1976 and 1981, we lost two million acres of natural landscape. As more land is broken, natural habitat disappears, and it continues to shrink. This habitat provides basic necessities such as food, water and shelter for over 400 species of wildlife. Saskatchewan's wildlife populations must live on far less than one-quarter of their original habitat.

So this has been the status of wildlife habitat in Saskatchewan prior to this Bill, and this is why this Bill is in place — *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, Bill 132.

So what exactly is *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*? Well much of the . . . I'd just like to read from this backgrounder. So:

Much of the best remaining wildlife habitat is on Crown land. These natural areas are very important for maintaining existing wildlife populations as about two-thirds of the land base south of the forest fringe is privately owned.

In 1984, the provincial government initiated a conservation process by passing *The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, now known as *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act (WHPA)*.

Bill 132, which we're discussing today.

This legislation protects 3.4 million acres of uplands and wetlands, or one-third of all wildlife habitat in the agricultural region, in its natural state. Protection of these lands makes the Act the most cost-effective wildlife habitat conservation program in Saskatchewan. The Act prevents the government from selling designated Crown land, and lessees require permission before any clearing, breaking or drainage occurs. The philosophy of the Act is to conserve wildlife habitat while enabling compatible traditional uses to co-exist.

So this is why we have Bill 132. It's the co-existence of protecting the land, but still allowing responsible stewards to be able to use the land for grazing perhaps. So just a little bit more regarding this backgrounder and some information about the wildlife habitat . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Exactly. *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* “. . . recognizes and supports some agricultural uses and petroleum activities.”

So it's not you can't have one without the other. You can still have protected Crown land and still use the land for all kinds of things.

These lands are leased mainly to cattle producers who use them for grazing or haying. The WHPA [or *Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, Bill No. 132] designation has no effect on the lessee's rights to continue leasing their lands, or on the terms and conditions of their leases. Leases can be routinely renewed and transferred, as in the past. In fact, the Act has very little effect on daily operations at all. Routine developments such as fencing and dugout construction can also take place without question. Oil and gas companies can explore and drill, but must ensure they do very little damage to the surface.

So the minister in her remarks has talked about the need. When she introduced the Bill, she talked about, "This Act will allow the government to protect sensitive lands more efficiently, more effectively and more sustainably than ever before."

I don't quite understand how selling off protected habitat is a sustainable way to protect sensitive lands. I don't quite understand those remarks that selling off protected habitat is a sustainable method of protecting wildlife habitat. I'm not quite sure how that squares. I am not sure about that at all.

The one thing that has come out loud and clear from all kinds of stakeholders, Nature Saskatchewan, the first . . . Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, all kinds of groups feel like they have not been consulted on Bill 132 at all, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. And consultation is absolutely critical when you're in government. Consultation can tend to be a bit of a buzzword, but real and meaningful consultation is critical for citizens to have confidence in their government and in the democracy in which we live.

And I think this confidence in this government and in this democracy is lagging these days with this Sask Party government. So when we talk about consultation, just with respect to Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, the Minister of Environment, in question period on several occasions, has talked about how she's consulted. And she said, we've sent out notices inviting people to participate.

Well real consultation involves ensuring those impacted by decisions or who understand the decisions have ample opportunity to participate. It's not just about saying, to whom can we fire off a few emails or send a few letters? And you know if they don't respond, or if they've got other things on their calendar, well then we've consulted. This is what we've done, and we've consulted by sending off that first letter.

The government has a priority. It should be the priority of government to ensure that those people who are impacted by legislation or who have some strong knowledge about a piece of legislation and why it's in place, those people . . . every effort should be made to allow for that participation. It's not just about setting a meeting; oh you can't make it, so I guess our initial letter to you was consultation. It's about making sure that you create the opportunity and the space for real consultation to occur.

People in government, those of us in government or on the government benches, have an obligation to provide ample room for participation in decisions that they make to ensure that they . . . public policy is addressing the needs and the concerns of people here in Saskatchewan. So consultation isn't a one-way process.

It's interesting the way we talk about consultation here or hear about it. We hear the people are being consulted, or we've consulted them. Consulting is not a passive one-way activity. Again as I said, it's very important to create the venue for participation, the timing for participation, ensuring that those who are going to be involved in consultations have the proper background information. People have to know about what it is, the subject on which you're planning to consult. That's absolutely critical. And you need to ensure that all stakeholders,

both individuals and groups, have ample opportunity to participate. And consultation has not been a strong suit of this Sask Party government.

I've only been an MLA since September, and this is only my second opportunity to be here in this Chamber, but I find it absolutely appalling the number of occasions that have come up where this government has clearly done absolutely no consultation. Consultation to this Sask Party government is introducing a piece of legislation, a firestorm erupts, and then it's time to do the consultation at that point.

Well that's not how it should work. Consultation needs to happen well before the introduction of legislation, the drafting of legislation. It needs to start when you're going to make a major policy shift or a major shift in the policy paradigm. Consultation needs to start early on in the process, not after, as one of my colleagues has said, after the train has left the station. And this is a record that this Sask Party government has of consultations after the train has left the station.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is far too late for the people of Saskatchewan. Some examples, some examples, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, Bill 132, it's been a clear case of this government failing to consult before making a radical shift in policy.

The Saskatchewan Communications Network, the privatization of SCN is a very good example of the government not having a clue what it was doing with respect to privatizing the Saskatchewan storyteller. When it comes to consultation . . . well around SCN and this government's track record of lack of consultation, there was an independent board in place, and in the two-plus years that this independent board was in place, not one contact from the first minister and no contact from the second minister who was then responsible for the privatization of SCN. No consultation whatsoever with the people who actually knew what was going on at the Saskatchewan Communications Network.

You would think that you would want to talk to the people who actually have some knowledge in the industry, but no, this government believes in charging ahead, often ideologically based into . . . somehow address its base, I guess.

I'm not quite sure why it's making some of these decisions because quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, the decision to privatize SCN was completely without merit. I mean with respect to Bill 132, this Act, the lack of consultation around SCN speaks to this government's inability to consult whatsoever.

This government has a track record of not consulting. Whether it's Bill 132, whether it's the privatization of SCN, whether it's Bill 80, Bills 5 and 6, the domestic abuse outreach program in Saskatoon, this government does not believe in consulting or connecting with the people for whom they're to be governing.

Just because you're elected, that doesn't mean that you get to run roughshod over the people of this province. Yes, you have a mandate to govern, but when you're making a drastic shift in a policy paradigm that you haven't discussed in your election platform, it's absolutely critical that you go back to the people of Saskatchewan and ask whether or not that . . . whether or not

I hear . . . whether or not there is a connection or whether or not the decision you've made is based in good information and has a positive impact on the people of Saskatchewan.

So personally I do recognize, despite the fact that I've been elected to represent the people of Saskatoon Riversdale, that I still need to know what's going on in their world. And the only way that I can do this is by asking my constituents what's going on.

This Sask Party government was not elected to bring the Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* before this legislature. This was not part of this government's party platform. This is a radical shift in the way we've protected our wildlife habitat, our sensitive wildlife habitat for many, many years actually, when the Bill was originally brought in by their Conservative cousins in the '80s. This is a radical shift. So this government does not have the mandate to make this radical shift in how we've protected wildlife species.

They did not mention, there's no mention of this change, this shift in protecting this land in their platform, nor was there anything . . . again, the lack of consultation around SCN. There was nothing in their platform saying that they were going to privatize our Saskatchewan storyteller and our public broadcaster — not a single mention of that. And oh, lo and behold, no consultation on SCN either.

The delisting of chiropractic services, I don't believe they actually mentioned that in their platform either. No consultation, no connection. Bill 80, TILMA [Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement] or the rebranded TILMA — they actually said in their platform that they weren't going to do this.

So whenever you're going to make a radical paradigm shift in policy, you need to make sure that you know who your decisions impact, what the outcomes are, and why you're doing that. It shouldn't be just to speak to your base. We govern for all people here in Saskatchewan.

I represent Saskatoon Riversdale, but I recognize that . . . My goal is to be the conduit or the voice of Saskatoon Riversdale but I'm an MLA for all people in Saskatchewan — New Democrats, Liberals, Green Party members, Sask Party members. I am here to govern or here to be the voice of people in Saskatchewan. And this government I don't think quite understands that their role is to govern for all people of Saskatchewan and thus need to stay connected to the people in Saskatchewan.

[15:30]

So as I said, I recognize that although I've been elected to represent Saskatoon Riversdale and I've been given that privilege, I still need to know what's going on in my constituency, and the only way I can do that is by talking or connecting to people. And how does one do that? You make sure that you go out to community events. I've created an incredibly accessible office. I believe that knocking on doors is still very important.

You need, in terms of consultation, if you're not going to

consult, you need to be connected and know what's going on. You need to reach out and understand what the issues are, and I believe this government has done a very poor job in knowing the outcomes of their decisions.

And Bill 132 is a very good example because there's been an outcry. There's more than 1,000 people on a recently started Facebook group to save the . . . to ensure that this Bill stops and slows down — Bill 132 — that the government pulls it and stops to reflect about what this Bill will actually mean to the people of Saskatchewan.

So as I said, I think that representative democracy is absolutely fabulous, and that's what we've got here. I represent the people of Saskatoon Riversdale, and my colleagues all represent a group of people.

And I was elected because my values and philosophies I think generally are representative of the majority of voters in my constituency. I was elected because I speak the language of my constituents or the majority of my constituents. But that said, I know that you can't always . . . people don't always agree 100 per cent with what you've got to say, or they still want to feel like they're being heard even if they don't entirely agree with your views or values. And perhaps they didn't vote for me. It's still important that I know what's going on in their lives and what's important to them.

So when I was on the doorstep last fall and last summer, I made a commitment to voters — and this is what I think the Sask Party needs to do, especially around Bills like Bill 132 — and this is a good example of how one might consult or stay connected. As I said, I made a commitment to voters to remain connected to them, whether it's at community events, by having my accessible office, which I mentioned, by continuing to live my life in my constituency, whether it's running into friends and neighbours while walking my dogs or getting groceries or playing with my kids in the park in my constituency — that's a way to stay connected — and by being on the doorstep. I don't think for one second that just because I've been elected that I don't have to listen to the voices of the people in my community any more. It's very important to stay connected and to consult.

Bill 132, there's so many voices of people who do not feel like they have been properly consulted on this. I have a letter right here actually that I'd like to read regarding that lack of consultation. And this letter was written to the opposition at the end of April expressing some concern:

Dear Mr. Lingenfelter, Ms. Morin and Ms. Higgins:

We write concerning the governments statement that conservation stakeholder organizations were consulted about the Crown land sale program, in particular the sale of land designated under the Wildlife Habitat Protection Act (WHPA).

Both the Ministers of Agriculture & Food and Environment have publicly stated WHPA [or *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*] lands will not be sold. We can assure you that no meaningful consultation regarding the sale of Crown lands has occurred with Nature

Saskatchewan. On occasion we were told some details of the land sale program, but this is not consultation. Nature Saskatchewan was never asked for an opinion about the sale of Crown lands. The Crown Lands Stakeholder Forum, which did provide an opportunity for discussion about the management and future of Crown lands was abolished by the Minister of Agriculture.

We request you to urge the government to delay the passing of the amendments to the Wildlife Habitat Protection Act which would see these lands removed from the Act and placed under regulation where they could be sold at the discretion of the Minister.

The Government has not properly consulted with the public on this very important issue which has the potential to cause significant consequence to biodiversity in Saskatchewan.

We look for your assistance in stopping the passage of this legislation.

Sincerely, Gary Seib Acting General Manager Nature Saskatchewan.

So when you say that you've consulted with someone, and then the person who's apparently been consulted says, well I actually would disagree, I haven't felt consulted, I would have to say that you'd need to take the opinion of the person who's supposed to be the consultee. If you don't feel like you've been consulted, then there's been something missing in that process.

And this is why consultation, whether it's Bill 80, whether it's the privatization of SCN, whether it's *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, whether it's Bills 5 and 6, whether it's small but important programs like the domestic outreach program in Saskatoon, consultation and knowing how your decisions impact people is absolutely critical. You have to know how your decisions are going to impact the people of this province and what those outcomes mean for the long haul.

It's not about four-year election cycles. Politicians, we're elected because we're supposed to have vision and make long-term decisions based on the best interest of people today. But our children, our grandchildren, future generations, we have an obligation to ensure the decisions that we're making are well-informed with all the information possible in order to be able to ensure that we're leaving a good province, a good place to live, for future generations.

And why is consultation so important? So I talk a little bit about representative democracy here. But I'd argue, looking around here, that we actually don't really have a truly representative democracy or representative of the people of Saskatchewan. Of the 58 MLAs in this Chamber, only 13 of those are women.

I know of the 58 MLAs, there's only two on this side of the House, of our 20 MLAs, who are of Aboriginal ancestry. I believe that there are one or two in the government side. But even if it was four or five members of Aboriginal ancestry, of 58, that's not reflective of the Aboriginal population in Saskatchewan. Five out of 58 isn't a great number or four out of 58.

There's no other visible minority represented here in the legislature, despite our growing immigrant population. So we don't have a representative democracy and that's why consultation . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Currently the motion up for debate is Bill 132, the wildlife habitat Act. So I'd ask the member to address the Bill rather than a wide-ranging debate that can take place on other occasions. I recognize the member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you . . .

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — To request leave to introduce guests.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to all members of the Legislative Assembly, sitting in your gallery — indeed it is a very special day for Saskatoon Fairview — we have some other guests from Saskatoon Fairview and some very special constituents of mine. One, Connie Hill. Connie can give us a wave there. Connie works in the education field and provides services to many people in our province. Also up there Dorothea Stasiuk also from Saskatoon and the constituency of Saskatoon Fairview. Mr. Speaker, Dorothea also is a volunteer, has worked extensively doing all sorts of volunteer activities in Saskatoon.

Dorothea has also assisted me on the NDP Saskatoon Fairview constituency. One event in particular, Mr. Speaker, we hold a Ukrainian night, and the sauerkraut, Mr. Speaker, was out of this world at the last . . . The people were talking about it, mentioning it to me a couple of weeks and days later. So it was a wonderful, wonderful evening and without help like that . . . I know, Mr. Speaker, we all understand what these people bring and help us. So with that I ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to help welcome these two people to our Assembly. Thank you very much.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to carry on here with Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. And the

reason consultation is so very important is because we don't have a representative . . . We technically have a representative democracy here, but truly the makeup of the legislature is not representative of the makeup of this province, and that is why consultation becomes especially important because not all voices are represented here in this Legislative Assembly.

So that is why consultation becomes even more important and the government has dropped the ball, incredibly, on the need to consult and reach out and make sure that stakeholders, individuals, and organizations — and not just groups for whom you have an affinity — are engaged in a real and meaningful consultation. Again there's a big difference between sending out a letter, one letter, and inviting someone to come out, and the time or the date doesn't work out and so, oh well, we've made our attempt to consult. Real consultation involves making sure that you are working with your stakeholders in terms of, as I said, venue, time, information. You need to make sure that the people with whom you're consulting are fully engaged in the process. So that is why, like I said about representative democracy, we aren't reflective of the makeup of the province. And that is why we need to consult even more than ever.

And timing again, I can't emphasize this enough, but consultation doesn't occur after a Bill is introduced. Well actually it does here in this Legislative Assembly. In the last two and a half years, consultation apparently occurs after a Bill has been introduced. But that is not when consultation should occur. It should occur well before a Bill is ever even drafted.

We saw that, as I mentioned, with SCN, the Saskatchewan Communications Network, the Dutch elm disease program, the West Nile program. There is no shortage of examples of this government's inability to be connected to the people of Saskatchewan when it makes policy decisions. It tends to be governed by ideology and not sound public policy. And again I haven't been here for very long, but it amazes me that I can come up with innumerable examples of this government's failure to consult or connect with people on a whole host of issues. I haven't even been here a year, Mr. Speaker, and I think I can name 10.

So again, I had mentioned Gary Seib's letter from Nature Saskatchewan when and where he says:

We can assure you that no meaningful consultation regarding the sale of Crown lands has occurred with Nature Saskatchewan. On occasion we were told some details of the land sale program, but this is not consultation.

So again if the groups that you say that you've consulted don't feel consulted, then you have a bit of a problem there. That is not genuine consultation.

And just to be clear here, consultation does not always mean you'll make a decision that everyone likes. There's so many competing interests in governments. It's hard to govern. And I think this Sask Party government is realizing that, that governing isn't easy. You have many, many interests to balance. It is not an easy task. And consultation isn't always pretty, and you're going to make decisions that don't always make people happy.

But if you have a much fuller picture through consultation of the issue and everybody has an opportunity to address their concerns, and maybe government discovers, I didn't think of that unintended consequence of my decision to sell off *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* or I didn't realize the unintended consequence of . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Pardon me — land. Thank you to the member from Cannington for clarifying that for me. I appreciate that always.

Or this government's decision, as I said, to . . . In terms of learning unintended consequences, consultation helps you understand and helps you learn about those unintended consequences — for example with SCN, the unintended consequence of kicking the film and television industry clearly in the stomach by the privatization of SCN. So again consultation is important so you have full understanding of the unintended consequences of the changes that you are perhaps proposing.

So consultation helps deal with that. And maybe you flag something or maybe you make a change to your piece of proposed . . . the piece of legislation that you're thinking about. You talk to someone and you think, that's interesting. I hadn't actually thought of that before, and I will make, we will make a change to that piece of legislation because we actually have now a full picture of the issue. So consultation helps you make good public policy, and good public policy is what the people of Saskatchewan are expecting.

[15:45]

And people in Saskatchewan are not feeling like Bill 132, the wildlife . . . the amendments that are being proposed to *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act* are good for the people of Saskatchewan. They're not good. They're not good for trappers or fishers. They're not good for the future of this province. We think about what could potentially happen for our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren and future generations. What is going to happen to some of these sensitive areas that can be sold off?

And no one is questioning the stewardship of the current lessees of many of these lands. There's no doubt that many of these lessees are wonderful stewards of the land, but what happens when that land is sold? And going back to the minister's comment here that this Act, "This Act will allow the government to protect sensitive land more efficiently, more effectively, and more sustainably than ever before." Again, I don't understand how creating the capacity to sell sensitive lands will, in fact, be a sustainable way of protecting sensitive lands. That makes absolutely no sense to me. I don't understand that.

So again, decisions . . . I'm a social democrat and a very proud social democrat, but I like to think that I believe in good public policy. And I think good public policy is based on knowing what the decisions that you're making, what impact those decisions are going to have, intended and unintended consequences. And decisions should not be made based purely on ideology.

We've heard the Minister of Environment talk about, well we believe in landownership. Well nobody is arguing that

landownership is a good thing, but as I've mentioned earlier on when I was talking about the backgrounder for *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, we learned that there's many things that still can carry on or continue even though the people who are leasing the lands aren't the owners. It doesn't inhibit . . . many, many things that landowners can do.

As I said, the:

. . . WHPA [*The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*] recognizes and supports some agricultural uses and petroleum activities. These lands are leased mainly to cattle producers who use them for grazing or haying. The WHPA, the designation has no effect on a lessee's rights to continue leasing their lands, or on the terms and conditions of their leases. Leases can be routinely renewed and transferred, as in the past. In fact, the Act has very little effect on daily operations at all. Routine developments such as fencing and dugout construction can also take place without question. Oil and gas companies can explore and drill, but must ensure they do very little damage to the surface.

So I don't understand how the sale of this land or the potential sale of about 10 per cent — the minister has said about 10 per cent of this 3.4 million acres — is aside from the ideology of landownership, how this advances the cause of our sensitive wildlife habitat here in Saskatchewan.

I don't know if I'm missing something. I've been following this issue and reading everything that comes in front of me and listening and hearing what people have to say, and I don't know. I don't understand that how continuing to be a lessee is harmful to the lessee rather than owning the land. I'm not sure what activities being a lessee is limiting in terms of ownership except perhaps having the title to the land. But as we talk about selling that land, we know that that lessee, even though he or she may have been very good stewards of the land for generations, we don't know to whom that land might end up, to who, in whose hands that land might end up — which is the problem, which is my concern.

I'm a mother. I have two children. I want to be able to appreciate and enjoy some of this sensitive wildlife habitat. I want to be able to go and see a burrowing owl and wild crocuses, and I'm concerned that there is the possibility that, by selling this land, that those opportunities won't be there — not just for my children but for their kids and for generations down the road. It is critical that we continue to protect this land and not make a public policy decision simply based on ideology when that . . . being a lessee, I don't . . .

From all the information I've read — and perhaps I need to continue to talk to more people as well because it's important as an elected representative to talk to people, which has, I think, been my key theme here — that maybe I'm missing something, but I understand that's there's very little . . . Obviously there are controls because it's protected land, but you're still able to do what you need to do with respect to grazing and haying. You can build your fences, dugout construction, all those things can still occur. So I'm not quite sure why this government is in such a rush to sell off our Crown land.

And we talk about land ownership. Well you know what? There's a million people here in Saskatchewan who own those Crown lands and want to be able to have . . . sorry, Mr. Speaker. There are a million people here who believe that they are landowners already and would like that land to stay in their family and with them and . . . which is the family of the people of Saskatchewan.

Which takes me to another point. I don't know what percentage this is, but I know that some of these Crown lands have been donated through gifting and wills. So I can tell you if I had donated some of my land and, instead of passing it on to my family, I passed it on to the Crown understanding that it would be protected in perpetuity, that I'd have some very, very grave concerns — no pun intended — I'd have some serious concerns that it could be sold down the road.

There's many people I am sure who have gifted land in their wills who, had they known before they passed away that their land could potentially be sold, never would have done that. They would have been very hesitant to pass it on. Because I'm sure they would have tried to put some of their own protections in place, but they trusted that the government, the Crown, would protect their land they felt was sensitive habitat and needed to continue to have protection.

So I would argue, I think it's important that the government pulls the Bill and holds off on this so there is the opportunity. Perhaps people who have donated this land and have passed on, maybe their families need to have the first right of purchase of this land rather than that land perhaps going to the lessees if it's someone who's donated land, and perhaps their family would like to ensure that that land stays well protected.

We've talked about many of the lessees being good stewards, and I have no doubt, I have no doubt that the majority of lessees, regardless of the circumstances, would continue to be good stewards as owners of the land.

But there's always one person who . . . Just to be the devil's advocate, the reality is, if some of these constraints to doing things on the land are removed, then there's always the opportunity to do things to the land that damage the sensitive nature of it and hurt the biodiversity and the ecosystem that's there. So I'm sure that *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, Bill 132, has done a very good job in ensuring that lessees remain good stewards, because there's always the hammer, the threat of the loss of leasing rights which always remained as a deterrent to ensure that the lessees would be good stewards.

And you know what? I have no doubt that most of these, most, 99.9 per cent of the lessees are wonderful stewards and would continue to be wonderful stewards, wonderful stewards of the land. But there is always the opportunity that perhaps the fact that this Act was in place, it served as a bit of a, as I said, a bit of a hammer to ensure that through the loss . . . If you messed with the land, you would lose your lease rights or that that threat was there so that's what has helped keep people be good stewards.

And as I said, I have no doubt that 99.9 per cent of the people leasing the land would be good stewards regardless of whether or not this was in place. But this is really important, really

critical land here in Saskatchewan, and we want to ensure that it stays protected and under the control of the Crown for that very reason — that this is not one person's land. It's a million people's land. It's the land of the people of Saskatchewan.

So in an editorial in the Saskatoon *StarPhoenix* on April 29th, 2010, the headline of this article says, "Short-sighted of gov't to sell protected land." So, quote:

The provincial government's plan to remove from under the protective umbrella of the Wildlife Protection Act nearly three million acres of Crown land smacks of short-term thinking and political expediency that's detrimental to all citizens of Saskatchewan.

And [this is a quote] despite Environment [Minister's] . . . claim that the move, which she wants to make by the end of May and would see about 10 per cent of the land sold to ranchers whose families have leased it for generations, "isn't about monetary things," her decision remains puzzling.

Even in a large province that boasts 43 per cent of Canada's arable land, the removal from wildlife habitat protection chunks of land that amounts to twice the size of Prince Edward Island, is cause for consternation.

I want to draw your attention to this line in particular:

At a time when the entire world is becoming increasingly aware of the value of preserving natural habitat for wildlife for the sake of future generations as well as our own, the government demonstrates a breathtakingly short-sighted approach to its duty and obligation to act as a responsible steward of the public interest.

It carries on here:

There's no doubt that the ranching families who've leased some of these parcels for decades have proven themselves excellent stewards of the land. However, the onus has remained with the government to ensure that its lessees comply with the habitat act, and the loss of leasing rights remained a deterrent to those who might be tempted to contravene the law in order to maximize profits.

However, wildlife protection and conservation groups, First Nations leaders and others are quite right to be concerned that, once private buyers acquire Crown land, there are no restrictions on the further resale of the land or any guarantees that the habitat will remain protected in the long run.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's what this is about. This is the long run. This is the big picture, the overall vision of the province. So I'll carry on here:

It simply isn't acceptable that [the minister] seems determined to push through changes to three-decade-old legislation without properly discussing them with groups other than the ranchers who have a stake in protected land.

As Darrell Crabbe, executive director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation aptly notes: "We just think that the future generations of Saskatchewan would be better served if there was full consultation with everybody and the original protection was left in place.

"This is a huge issue for us. We're talking about millions of acres of land that we consider to be a jewel in the crown of Saskatchewan."

And the editorial goes on:

For a government that's heading into an election year last year in a province whose economy shrank by 6.3 per cent in 2009 and is struggling to keep its spending in line with its diminished revenues, any source of revenue — especially when it's tied closely to making some of its rural support base happy — might seem attractive.

It's easy to understand why groups such as Ducks Unlimited are concerned about putting in place conservation easements before any protected land is sold, so that subsequent owners are prevented from draining wetlands or breaking it up, and about the mechanisms the government is putting in place to assess the value of property that . . . [the minister] thinks "no longer has to be under wildlife habitat protection."

Here, from Ducks Unlimited:

"We're not convinced that they have the means to be able to accurately define which lands have greater or which lands have lesser ecological value," suggests Brent Kennedy, DU's manager of provincial operations.

Given the steady loss of wetlands in Saskatchewan through drainage, with farmers making economically rational decisions that are at odds with the needs of wildlife, it's easy to understand from where Mr. Kennedy is coming.

The call by DU and other conservation groups for the Saskatchewan government to develop a wetland policy to conserve and restore wetlands in the province has gone unheeded. This even though wetlands are crucial to protecting water supplies, reducing effluents from washing into lakes and rivers, and recharging groundwater supplies.

Instead, the Environment minister is acting to further erode the protective legislation already in place. No wonder those who take a longer view of the province beyond its four-year election cycles are concerned.

So that was an editorial in *The StarPhoenix* dated April 29th, 2010 entitled, "Short-sighted of gov't to sell protected land." And it draws into question . . . The minister has said, the Minister of Environment has said that this isn't about money. The sale of this 10 per cent, she says approximately 10 per cent, of this 3.4 million acres is not about money. But again, and that editorial mentioned that too, that one has to question that. This government in this past budget made all kinds of budget decisions that seemingly don't make a whole lot of economic

sense.

[16:00]

Like I said, the closure of SCN which actually will cause citizens of Saskatchewan to lose money. The film and television industry and outside investment will be impeded by this. So the reality is . . . Is the government trying to get revenue out of these land sales? They say they're not, but one has to question when you're running \$1 billion deficit, you're stripping the Crowns of all their equity, and your debt is going up 55 per cent by 2014, that you might be looking to nickel and dime in absolutely every place humanly possible.

So the minister has said, it's not about monetary issues, it is about land ownership. And again I just want to go back to that point that it's not that people are opposed to land ownership. As I've said, the people of Saskatchewan already own this land — 1 million people own this 3.4 million acres of sensitive wildlife habitat — and so this isn't about people being opposed to land ownership.

But my question comes to ask, why is the government always in such a rush to make some of the decisions that they've made without consulting and connecting with people? Why is it absolutely critical to pass this when people are calling on them — not just the opposition, the opposition is not the only group that's asked for, the opposition is not the only one — who's called for the pulling back of this Bill?

There are First Nations and Métis groups. There's environmentalists, hunters and trappers. There are no shortage of people who have said, slow down, let us have an opportunity to at least have a discussion about how this impacts our various organizations and the things that we see, how these changes can negatively impact our work, but also ultimately the people of Saskatchewan for generations to come.

So again I have to go back to that need for consultation, and there has been none around Bill 132, *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. Or perhaps the government can say there's been consultation, but again consultation is a bit of a buzzword. And consultation isn't really meaningful unless the people who have been purported to be consulted with feel like they've been consulted and had a say. To say that you consulted with someone and the people with whom you've apparently consulted say, oh well, we've talked to the government on one or two occasions, but that doesn't mean they've consulted with us — it doesn't constitute consultation. That's a hard one to say, a little alliteration there.

So if you don't feel like you've been consulted, then you haven't been consulted. And government owes it to its citizenry to take that opportunity to connect and know what's going on and how their decisions impact people. Duty to consult — this government has the FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] . . . Actually have a letter from the FSIN here that I'd just like to read into record, a small portion of . . .

An Hon. Member: — Please. That's a good idea.

Ms. Chartier: — Yes. With the treaties that have been signed here in Saskatchewan, in fact there is a duty to consult. There is

an obligation to consult and to accommodate where feasible and possible. So this is a letter dated April 29th, 2010, cc'd to the opposition and written to the Minister of Environment. So, "It has come to . . ." And sorry, it's written by the federation of . . . Or it's from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations and signed by Lyle Whitefish, the office of the fourth Vice-chief. So Vice-chief Lyle Whitefish wrote this:

It has come to my attention that you are informing your government colleagues and members of the Saskatchewan Legislature that your Ministry consulted and accommodated the First Nations people prior to initiating . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — Order. Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Allchurch: — Mr. Speaker, with leave to introduce guests.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — I recognize the member from Rosthern-Shellbrook.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to thank the member from Saskatoon Riversdale for allowing me to make an introduction. Seated in the west gallery, Mr. Speaker, is 33 students, grades 10, 11, and 12, and they're from Rosthern Junior College from Rosthern. And they're here today to view the Legislative Assembly.

Their teacher here today is Richard Janzen. And they have chaperones Dave Feick and Kathy Powley. It's always a pleasure to have constituents of mine come down to the Assembly and, today, to have the Rosthern Junior College come down and visit the Assembly is a pleasure. So I would ask all member of the Legislative Assembly to help me welcome these students to their Legislative Assembly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again, we're back to where we left off. I just want to read a portion of a letter from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations Vice-chief Lyle Whitefish. And he says here:

It has come to my attention that you are informing your government colleagues and members of the Saskatchewan Legislature that your Ministry consulted and accommodated the First Nations people prior to initiating

this program. I find these statements extremely troubling since no such undertakings have occurred. There has been no attempt by your Ministry to enter into a consultation process with First Nations people regarding the expansion of the sale of Crown lands protected under *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*.

Judging from past experience I can only ascertain that your deliberate refusal to consult and accommodate First Nations people on your Ministry's initiatives, including the sale of Crown lands protected under the WHPA, as well as your Ministry's "Results-based Regulatory Review", is a reflection of the policy position that your government has taken with regard to the First Nations people in Saskatchewan. The province has no regard or respect for the interests, concerns and the Inherent and Treaty rights of the First Nations people in Saskatchewan. Furthermore, it appears your government views the Inherent and Treaty rights of First Nations people as a hindrance to [the] Premier's . . . "growth agenda" and that the government will proceed by attempting to ignore the provincial Crown's constitutional and legal obligations to the First Nations people in Saskatchewan.

Since the FSIN was not involved in any consultations, I am requesting a detailed explanation of how your Ministry purportedly undertook to consult with First Nations prior to the decision being made to expand the sale of Crown lands protected under the *Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*. Rather than a vague reference, I am seeking a response that includes the listing of all the meetings your Ministry held with the First Nations and the dates such were held, which First Nations and their leaders or representatives who attended such meetings, what their responses were, how these were incorporated into the report your Ministry used to make the decision, and how your Ministry reported back to the First Nations of your decision. I also request a copy of such a report.

So that again is from Vice-chief Lyle Whitefish of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations. So those are strong words, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Those are very strong words coming from an organization that apparently was with whom the government consulted.

And again I go back to my earlier comments. If you don't feel like you've been consulted, it's not meaningful consultation. Consultation again isn't just about extending a letter of invitation. And if a person doesn't have an opportunity to reply or has other things going on at the time you're holding your consultations, that is not meaningful consultation. Government has a responsibility to engage actively with stakeholders and make sure — again, timing, venue, full information — that the individuals and the stakeholder groups with whom you're consulting have all that they need to be active participants.

Because as I said, despite the fact we live in a representative democracy, this legislature isn't particularly representative of the people of Saskatchewan. So it becomes even more critical, more critical that consultation, real and meaningful consultation become a part of this government's lexicon, which it really isn't. As I said, in my short time here, I find it absolutely appalling that there are a number of issues that this government

has failed to consult on. And consultation doesn't mean you engage with people after you've introduced a piece of legislation. Consultation has to occur right at the start.

And it's not always easy. As I said, governments make decisions all the time and have to make hard decisions that not everybody agrees with. Governing is difficult. And it's about choice, but in order to make the best choices for the people of Saskatchewan, you have to ensure you have the full breadth and depth of information and how that will impact not only the current generation but future generations to come. That's absolutely imperative.

And government policy should not be based simply on ideology. As I've said, and I'll say again, I am a proud social democrat but I believe that good public policy comes from, not from ideology necessarily, but from well-informed discussions with the people for whom you're creating the policy. You need to know what's going on.

So I just want to go back to emphasizing that the background on *The Wildlife Habitat Protection Act*, from a few years ago here — that acknowledges there are many wildlife-friendly farmers and ranchers. It says here:

Ranchers who lease WHPA lands are good stewards of the land and wildlife is benefiting. Preserving important wildlife habitat has enabled Saskatchewan to come to the forefront of national and international habitat and natural eco-system conservation, which is helping Canada contribute its share towards global environmental conservation. Wise, multiple use [I want to emphasize this — wise, multiple use] of public lands can curb habitat loss while accommodating the interests of agriculture, wildlife and the public.

I'd like to know, I would like to know how Crown lands and the leasing of Crown lands, how this has inhibited the interests of agriculture, wildlife, and the public. Because, as we've heard earlier that:

Routine developments such as fencing and dugout construction can . . . [still] take place without question. Oil and gas companies can explore and drill, but must ensure they do very little damage to the surface.

Grazing and haying can still occur. So I need some help understanding how the ability to sell these Crown lands will enhance or support the protection of the wildlife habitat that we have here in Saskatchewan. And again the minister's comment, one of her first comments earlier on: "This Act will allow the government to protect sensitive land more efficiently, more effectively, and more sustainably than ever before."

Again, sustainably — I don't know how having the capacity to sell the lands makes the protection of wildlife habitat sustainable. I'm not sure how that works here. I have some concern about some of the measurement tools.

And it's not just me. There's been much correspondence that's come in from all kinds of stakeholder organizations who know far more about this than me, who are on the ground and know the issues first-hand, and they have expressed concerns. It is not

just the opposition. The opposition's a conduit for the concerns of citizens, for individuals and groups.

So it's not without . . . I would still urge it's not too late. I would urge the government to consider pulling this Act until it fully has the opportunity to engage in real and meaningful consultation with the people who are asking to have this real and meaningful consultation. There's people who want to discuss this and know exactly the government's rationale, and they want to share their concerns with the government. They want that opportunity, and I think government owes it to its citizenry to make sure, when it's doing a radical policy shift at a policy paradigm, it needs to engage and know what those, what those issues are.

So, I believe that one of my colleagues has some more to add to this debate. So with that I'd like . . . I think that I've had plenty to say and again, the overarching theme was around consultation. And again I can't emphasize how very, very important that is. But as I said, I believe one of my colleagues is eager to get into the debate. So with that I cede the floor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure to enter into the debate on the wildlife, Bill No. 132, wildlife habitat protection amendment Act, 2009. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to start by just reading into the record again, as part of my comments, the comments made by the Environment minister. I'll be returning to those comments, Mr. Speaker, because they're somewhat discouraging.

[16:15]

I would think the word would be "discouraging" in terms of when you look at what was said when she made her initial comments in bringing forward this Bill, and what we have since learned that is happening in terms of the groups that are now concerned about her legislation. You've heard much, many things said about the lack of consultation. And again, just if I could, Mr. Deputy Speaker, now I'll just read, again so we're reminded, so that we all can hear again those words that she spoke on that day when she brought this in. And part of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, she went on to say this: "Until now, the government had no detailed values inventory of protected land in our province," Mr. Deputy Speaker. "Until now," she said, "the government had no detailed values inventory of protected land in our province."

Now just that first sentence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you think about that, that somehow magically the protected land that we had under the former government and under the former Grant Devine government that started a lot of this, the land that was protected is . . . Somehow this minister failed to see how that got there, failed to see that there was no . . . what she'd have us believe is that there was no way, no values, detailed values inventory, as she said on that.

Now I suppose to many of us who are not involved in those sorts of details, involved in the environmental issues that deal with land, who might've briefly read some reports on that to retain all that information, but upon research and upon speaking

to people and upon people who are involved in that looking at that, I wonder. I wonder how embarrassed she is about that statement, to say that "Until now, government had no detailed values of inventory of protected land in the province."

That there had been no work done since she came onto the scene, as some sort of superhero and was now going to save these protected lands. And she went on to say:

We didn't know why a piece of land was currently being protected and if that land still had the characteristics that originally qualified it for protection. Much of the current protected land is used for various activities such as grazing. We will now be able to identify which land has changed and is suitable for limited activity. We'll also be able to tell which land is the most sensitive and needs stronger protection.

Now did she not, did she not know in terms of how that land got there? Perhaps I could just read to her something and that is the definition of enduring features based on four specific factors. And this comes from the RAN [Representative Areas Network], the protected land, the Saskatchewan Representative Areas Network that talk about this.

And they have the definition of enduring features are based upon four specific factors, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Soil development: how soils were formed through various factors like climate, soil organisms, the nature of the parent material, the topography of an area, and time. Number two: origin of the parent material, the method by which material such as soil, gravel or rocks was deposited; example — wind, water, glacial melt water. Surface form, number three: physical land features such as eskers or potholes. And four, Mr. Speaker: slope, the steepness or grade of the surface terrain.

Now the Saskatchewan Representative Areas Network program was launched in 1997 with the approval of the Representative Areas Network final action plan. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again for the minister, the plan sought — and this is 1997 — the plan sought to conserve representative . . . in a unique example of Saskatchewan's varied and diverse landscapes.

Since the beginning of the network's launch, more than 2 million hectares of both Crown and private owned land has been added to the nearly 3 million hectares of lands that were already protected as parks, ecological reserves, and other protected areas.

When the network is complete, nearly 7.8 million hectares or 12 per cent of the province will be recognized as contributing to the goals of the Representative Areas Network. Now the 12 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the target as committed including the Saskatchewan Biodiversity Action Plan. I think we've reached 10 per cent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but the 12 per cent that's there was the UN [United Nations] goal. Now I know what they think of the United Nations and that's clear, but it's also now a sad commentary of this minister and the approach that she is taking as the new hero on the block of the environment.

And again, just by the comments, many people are shocked that the minister would make comments such as, "Until now, the

government had no detailed values inventory of protected land in our province.” Now this, coming from a minister . . . And I would at any time that she would again want to say that, she would make that statement, would say for the record that she stands by that statement, I would ask her to do so, if she can screw up the courage to do that again and say that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, many . . . As my colleague before me went on to talk, the minister also, just in terms of . . . Before I leave what she had to say about this, she also said:

The Act also creates a Crown land ecological assessment. This will allow government to evaluate and identify important ecological values and know how best to protect them. This has been developed in consultation.

In consultation. Now we know the value that these folks put on consultation and what they think of consultation. And on many times again, they’d got notice of the UN, who in certain times it has said to them they, on certain Bills, must start over again. Time and time again we hear there has been no consultation and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I’ve said before, this has now become a trademark of this Sask Party government.

Now where the Minister of the Environment, the groups that she said she consulted and we heard just recently . . . but she says:

This has been developed in consultation with a wide variety of stakeholders . . . The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, the Nature Conservancy of Canada, Nature Saskatchewan, Ducks Unlimited Canada, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, Saskatchewan Cattlemen’s Association, and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

Now she says that, that the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, that she consulted with them. Now perhaps again, as here, that she feels she’s the new superhero on the block in terms of when it comes down to lands and the environment and that what she thinks is right, should go. But I would also like to at this time from an article in *The Border R Town News*, May 12th — very, very recently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what they think of this minister’s approach to consultation, not only consultation, but her understanding of this. And I just remind that this is the two paragraphs that I read into the record, probably short of that. They are probably three-quarters of what she had to say on this issue when she first brought this Bill in — rather a weak performance. But let me read what Darrell Crabbe here says, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, to the minister, and who she says she consulted:

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation (SWF) continues to have grave concerns surrounding the recent Legislation aimed at dismantling [Mr. Deputy Speaker, it says dismantling] the Wildlife Habitat Protection Act (WHPA), the legislation that was created almost 30 years ago and is still considered to be one of the most visionary conservation programs ever developed in North America.

Now here we have superhero Environment minister, Sask Party style, coming in saying, I know what’s happening and I consulted all of these people. All of these people I consulted,

and you know maybe we’ll just slip this one by because the people of Saskatchewan aren’t listening. We have our own definition. She must be thinking of consultation, and we’ll use that word loosely. Consultation, we’ll use it loosely, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And here we have . . . Maybe I would just read that again, so in case the minister misses it when she is no doubt going to review all the materials, so that she can make the appropriate decisions on this issue.

Or perhaps, perhaps she won’t care. Perhaps she won’t care, like a good number of groups where they say they’ve consulted. And they would just push ahead because they have an agenda that is their own agenda, that is their own agenda, and that they have looked at the world, not in governing for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but governing for somebody else. Perhaps it’s the people who fill their coffers to get them re-elected. And maybe that’s the agenda, and maybe that’s the only people that they’re playing to these days. But that is short-sighted. We all know that’s short-sighted, and they will pay dearly for that come November 2011.

But I think it’s people who have dedicated their lives, dedicated their lives to this area who are passionate about these things. It has struck me, and it’s somehow unbelievable that you would simply pass over these people who work in there, who dedicate their lives to that, oftentimes at not a lot of remuneration, that we might think of people just simply doing that, but who dedicate their lives to that, to the pursuit of whether it be environmental lands or whatever other issue that we here debate that.

And I sometimes feel that we don’t do it justice, that we don’t do it justice. But we have set in place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have set in place committee works, debates, things to do that. But over and over again we see the Sask Party government push forward. And when I say push, I would . . . probably the appropriate word is ram. Ram through Bills because they feel that they know what’s right even over people who are committed and passionate and are saying, as Mr. Crabbe has said here, again he said:

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation (SWF) continues to have grave concerns surrounding the recent Legislation aimed at dismantling the Wildlife Habitat Protection Act (WHPA), the legislation that was created almost 30 years ago and is still considered to be one of the most visionary conservation programs ever developed in North America.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don’t pretend to be an expert in this area, but that is what we get elected to listen to the people of Saskatchewan when they make comments on this. And I wonder what the minister, whether she simply has earplugs not to hear this or simply does not read the papers or does not get briefed on issues around the environment, particularly this Act, Bill 132.

The over, Mr. Crabbe goes on saying:

The over 3 million acres presently protected in the Act would now be controlled under regulation and would be able to be sold or changed at the discretion of the

Minister.

Now I can recall saying those things and hearing laughter from the other side, that in fact no, that's not what was going to happen, not going to happen. But here we have now the experts in the field saying exactly that: that it allows you to do that. When we build legislation, we build it to last. Good legislation you can tell because the test of time will prove that out. The legislation that is here, the things that, the principles that we build democracy on or be it different Bills, that's what it is built on.

And so here we have somebody saying that the minister actually disagrees with this, disagrees with this, with this statement. Somehow saying that no, no, under her system this will be protected. It's short-sighted. It's short-sighted, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's sad. It's a sad day for Saskatchewan that we have come so far and we've gotten 10 per cent of our land up to be protected, and now we get a minister in, a minister in who sadly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is bent on destroying this.

And perhaps she just doesn't even know what she's doing. Perhaps she doesn't even know what it is she's doing, but that has become a bit of also a trademark of not understanding and not knowing what they're doing. And so putting on the big boots and just clump, clumping out into that or walking with big muddy boots on the kitchen floor, just coming right in from outside and stomping on everything because there's no respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no respect for the environment.

And it's a sad day that that minister would even be called the Minister of the Environment. Because in fact it's almost the opposite of what is going on here, the opposite of what is going on. It is the getting rid of the environment and not the minister that protects the environment. The Minister of Environment, perhaps she doesn't understand what the Minister of Environment's role here is, but the Minister of Environment should be concerned about the environment. That is what it's called, the Ministry of the Environment. That's why it is there. That's why it's there. But I'm not sure that that minister has gotten that, has quite figured that one out.

I mean it's quite well known that nothing has happened in that ministry. Nothing has happened. There are no targets. It is sort of an example of the Sask Party policy in terms of the environment — nothing. A big zero, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now Mr. Crabbe goes on to say that:

Under WHPA, any lands that were removed or changed were required to be debated in the Legislature and allow for public scrutiny. Under the new legislation there would be no transparency.

Now that doesn't come as any surprise to me. For sure that's no surprise to me because one thing they are not is transparent.

[16:30]

On a daily basis we see where they are coming up and trying to . . . Now they're trying to sneak things under the carpet in terms of the issues that were just debated here earlier in the legislature today surrounding new care homes in Saskatoon. And they may

laugh about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or they may smirk, but the truth is that they've gotten caught with their hand in the cookie jar again. And that is also becoming quite common.

In such a short time to lose such contact with people, people who work in areas such as the environment, people who work in, for example, our health care workers . . . And many places right across this province now, in terms of those health care workers, many communities, and whether that be in the minister of natural resources who's sitting over there smiling, Kindersley, or in Meadow Lake. And especially the member from Meadow Lake should be very concerned about this because there is definitely no love lost there.

And I guess in the same way that they consulted when people came to their offices, where they slammed their doors in their offices or snuck off, that's a sad day for democracy. If you say to somebody, you're a health care worker, therefore I'm not going to meet with you — singling out a group where they will not meet with people — and that's sad.

But it's the same thing in here. Now here we have the minister saying, as she said in here, that she's consulted with this group of people, she's consulted with the Wildlife Federation. And here we have a letter on the 12th . . . And obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a while back when the minister presented this Bill. Now we have a . . . Obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a while back when the minister presented this Bill. Now we have the executive director of the organization saying another thing, saying something else. So if you don't listen to the executive director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, who exactly are you listening to?

And this is not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as they have said, oh well there are folks that will be taking care of the land and they are good guardians. They are good people that they will take care of the land. And I'm not here to say that they won't. I believe they will too. I believe they will too. But this is not what we're talking about.

This is a bigger picture issue, and the bigger picture issue is that we have determined that we want to preserve certain lands, preserve certain lands, as I read earlier, in terms of the RAN, that in terms of what they had to say, were that they determined that the plan sought to conserve, as I read earlier, "The Plan sought to conserve representative and unique examples of Saskatchewan's varied and diverse landscapes."

Totally missed by the minister, totally missed as to what she was talking . . . In fact, as I mentioned earlier, she said she didn't think there was any detailed inventory of land. There was a huge gasp, as I understand it now, across the province when she said that. Who's in charge? Who's in charge here and who's doing this? This is important. This is important stuff.

There was people, a lot of people that put a lot of time, energy, and passion into this, to determine this, to build Saskatchewan for the future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the future — for our children, for our grandchildren, and for people that come after that, after we are long gone. That people will look back and say, this was something. As was said here that this ". . . legislation that was created almost 30 years ago and is still considered to be one of the most visionary conservation programs ever

developed . . .” Thirty years ago this was done and now we have the situation that we’re under now. And isn’t that just a shame that we’ve come to this, that now we have to come to a crossroads where people have to say everything we’ve built is now means nothing.

And why does it mean nothing? Because we have a Minister of the Environment who doesn’t understand. Or if she does understand, then what a sad day for Saskatchewan that somebody is taking this kind of approach to the environment and protected lands of this province that people have worked so hard for. And who did she talk to?

It was a letter from Chief Lyle Whitefish which I will still get to, but in terms of what the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians said, and in terms of the kind of, the kind of . . . where more and more groups on a daily basis are impacted by the Sask Party’s calling, saying it’s consultation. And where somebody phones people right from two hours before they’re going to put a Bill in, or in the spring, and say, we’ll see you down in the office and we’ll consult here and, you know, we’ll call that consultation — maybe a phone call. Maybe a phone call will be all will be necessary that we should do this, and that’s where we’ll be on this.

And they take this very lightly. They take this very lightly. And how soon we have gotten so arrogant, how soon we have gotten so arrogant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be able to dismiss all the groups and to say that we consulted them, to say that we consulted them, and to hear the people say back, what an outrage if that’s what you mean by consultation.

And maybe we give it to the minister, and maybe we give it to the whole Sask Party that this is what they think consultation is. You know, perhaps that’s where they’re at and that’s what they think consultation is, and it’s a very dismissive, very dismissive type of approach, very arrogant type of approach. And they’re feeling the pushback from people because people are writing in newspapers, people are writing in letters, and people are talking to us. And I am amazed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the turnaround — amazed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now I know, and perhaps I feel like perhaps I shouldn’t warn those folks over here about what’s happening out there, but they are living in a glass house. They are living in a bubble if they don’t see this, in amongst all of the others things that they are doing, as to what the people think about that. We’re not talking . . . Perhaps it’s an ideological thing. I haven’t quite figured this out. But I sense that what I’m seeing here is that it is pandering to people who are supporters and pandering to people who give them money. And it is at the lowest, the lowest kind of indicator, the lowest kind of that they’ve, the lowest possible place that they’ve reached to common . . . that they’ve reached for reasons to pass legislation.

Because I do want to get all of this. And this is again Wednesday, May 12, so that is last week, not even a week old here. And again, I think this is just where I was, if I could just do this again, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Under WHPA, any lands that were removed or changed were required to be debated in the Legislature and allowed for public scrutiny.

And again we’ve spoken about that and what I think about the ability of that Sask Party to do that. And:

Under the new legislation there would be no transparency [at that point]. In addition, the newly passed Conservation Easement Legislation that the Saskatchewan Government [the legislation that goes with this] would place on most of the sold parcels gives the Minister the power to remove or change the easement without public knowledge or recourse.

And this is perhaps noteworthy. “The combination of a lack of consultation . . .” Now the executive director of the Wildlife Federation says:

“The combination of the lack of consultation and the aggressive time line on this Bill has effectively made it impossible to address our concerns and left many important questions unanswered,” states Darrell Crabbe, executive director of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation.

Now I would think that if, as the government, if we would receive this sort of thing, there might be a call from the Premier’s office to the Minister of the Environment saying, what’s going on over there? I mean, you know, what’s happening? You said you consulted. Well we’re getting these letters that say you haven’t. What does that mean? What does it mean for the legislature here when these folks come out in question period or when they bring forward Bills, and we say we consulted, we say we consulted?

Now I guess fortunately this makes it really clear why you need an opposition, an opposition that would take the time to look at this Bill. Otherwise it would go by and they would say they consulted, and only later would we find out from people or people of this province that in fact there has not been any consultation. And in fact, as was said here, the lack, the combination of the lack of consultation and the tight timelines, this is ramming. This is the definition of ramming it through.

And to whose benefit? To whose benefit? Is it to all those people who have worked over the past 30 years.? Was it? Was it the Grant Devine government that they no longer feel that . . . Colin Maxwell who raised concerns about this issue? Even right across the political spectrum people are looking at this and saying that. So maybe they . . . Sometimes they lead us to believe that they’re somehow representative of the people and they represent all sorts in their party, but I don’t think so. I don’t think so. And I think this is even a sad . . . They definitely gotten themselves on to an island on this one because in fact whether you are a . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Yates: — Requesting leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — The member has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — The member may proceed.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the House two guests we have in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker. We have Travis Lingenfelter and his partner Caitie who are down in Regina tonight for a very important dinner in about an hour and a half from now and decided to come to their Assembly for a few minutes and spend some time here. So I'd like to introduce all members of the Assembly to both Travis and Caitie. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard): — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

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

Mr. Iwanchuk: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, and no doubt what a wonderful event it will be tonight, a wonderful event. Because this is what I've been talking about and people are turning in droves, turning in droves because they can see that they made a mistake. Over and over again I receive many contacts in my office saying, we voted for them once and we'll never do it again.

And you might, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they might think that that is just simply posturing, but I would think they should take it as a warning. And I wouldn't repeat it too many times because in fact . . . Well I guess I could repeat it because they're hardly going to listen here when they don't listen to the people of Saskatchewan. When they don't listen to the people of Saskatchewan I doubt that they listen here, and that becomes obvious on a daily basis. But, Mr. Speaker, this is important work and we have to get this on the record because people will say, how did that happen? How did that happen that they're doing this? And we'll say, well here's what the things that we said, here's the things that we said back and doing that . . .

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member from Moose Jaw North laughs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I would think that in terms of being a one-term wonder I think that's where it's going to start, is right there in Moose Jaw North in terms of being a one-term wonder and in terms of what they will be writing after November of 2011 about a one-term wonder government. Because not ever so quickly have people, has a government fallen so far out of favour, and in fact as the newspaper articles are now saying, lost — they've lost their way.

Now the Premier lost his way back in . . . He said he lost his way with the Grant Devine government. He lost his way there in terms of delivering the alcohol and all the other things that we know about. Perhaps they lost their way when they are now tied up with the PC [Progressive Conservative] trust fund and in the court case and they lost their way. And now the newspapers

are starting. Isn't that incredible that in fact you now see that in fact with this Sask Party that this Premier has now again lost his way in terms of governing? Because it was easy to govern, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was easy to govern when you have \$2.3 billion in the bank and you can go on a spending spree and everybody's your friend.

And now that's over, and the saddest day is that some people are saying that they want to sell off this land to get some more money, try to get my hands on some more money because as soon as I get it I want to spend it because it feels good. And then you get the hangers-on who come after that. And now we see what is happening in terms of people perhaps benefitting in terms of the Department of Health.

Now they should be worried about the children's hospital first because they promised a lot of people in Saskatoon the children's hospital. And now they say the money's there. But where's the money? And every day now, we start the debate about where the children's hospital going to be? Where's it best? In Royal University or is it City Hospital or some combination? And now the debate starts there. No direction.

And perhaps they've lost their moral compass, because of any number of things. We had a member statement earlier today in terms of driving while drinking; we heard some of the stories over there from Kindersley, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of some of the events there. So I think not only they've lost their way but they've lost their moral compass. And that's a dangerous combination.

Much as it is dangerous when not only, as Darrell Crabbe has said, the executive director, the combination of lack of consultation and aggressive timeline is devastating, so not only have they lost their way in terms of government and directions as they flail about, whether that be miscalculation of potash or whether they flail about on an issue like this.

[16:45]

And it is almost amazing, almost unbelievable that the Minister of Environment can stand up in this House and say the government had no detailed values inventory of protected lands in our province. Amazing statement. Amazing statement that she could say that. That somehow nothing had occurred before she came on the scene. Nothing had occurred.

And yet we had a list of lands, a huge, huge list of lands, a huge list of lands here, updated, a list of lands contributing to the RAN. And as I mentioned earlier, the Saskatchewan Representative Areas Network, it was listed all out here. And this is from list of lands contributing to RAN updated September 1st, 2005 — 2005. And here's the minister saying this when she passed the Bill.

Now here is what the list of lands are. Under Saskatchewan Agriculture, food and Crown, we have the provincial community pastures. There's 56 and the area is 258 760 hectares. Under that's the wildlife habitat protection lands. There's 24,000 of those, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1 437 562 hectares. The RAN ecological reserve, the Great Sand Hills, the Great Sand Hills, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course there's one. And there are 36 585 thousand hectares. Under the

Saskatchewan environmental Crown land ecological reserves, there are five ecological reserves with an area of 159 678 hectares. The FWD Fund [Fish and Wildlife Development Fund] lands, Mr. Speaker, the number is 1,486 or 78 277 hectares. Parkland reserves, Mr. Speaker, we have two. Those are 4998 hectares. Provincial parks, Mr. Speaker, we have 34. There's 1,172,512 recreation sites.

Now I know the Minister of the Environment will want to hear all these numbers because of course it's her impression that there was nothing detailed or no inventory. Under recreation sites, there's 130. The area is 36 723 hectares. The RAN ecological reserves, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are 32 for 408 951 hectares. Special management areas there are three, 601 983 hectares; wildlife refuge, 24 and an area of 24 596. Under the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority lands there's a number is 361 and there are 910 hectares.

Now the federal administration, the CFAD [Canadian Forces Ammunition Depot] Dundurn, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the military installation, there is one and there are 23 209 hectares. The migratory bird sanctuaries, there are — for the minister's information — there are 15 for a total area of 57 702 hectares. National parks, Mr. Speaker, there are two here for a total area of 487 056 hectares. There are national wildlife areas, Mr. Speaker. There are 34 with a total area of 37 225 hectares.

The PFRA [Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration] community pastures, there are 64 with a total area of 696 870 hectares. Mr. Speaker, corporate lands, corporate lands, PCS, [Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan] Rocanville, one. There is 1552 hectares. Under non-government organization, Ducks Unlimited Canada, there's 355 875 hectares. Private lands, Mr. Speaker, conservation easements — now this should be of interest to those folks over there, Mr. Speaker — there's 195 and there's 23 772 hectares.

Now total RANs, contributing to RAN, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of parcels when you add all this up, there's 26,470 and in terms of hectares there's 5 964 765.

Now in case perhaps that is too, takes too much time for the Minister of the Environment to deal with that. Perhaps it takes too much time to put that into her statements. But in terms of, Mr. Speaker, in terms of where we go here, what in fact the Minister of Environment does do is she comes out and she says the government, after perhaps listening to all of that, Mr. Speaker, she . . . the audacity here to come out and say, until now the government had no detailed values of inventory protected land in our province, no inventories. And I could read that again perhaps so that she, perhaps she, the minister, would take the time to say that in fact there are no detailed inventories in the province. And what does that actually mean?

But perhaps the minister is not, just doesn't read newspapers. I think the one newspaper that she did read though, Mr. Speaker, was the *New York Post*. Was it the *Post* that she made it into, the *National Post*? I believe the Minister of the Environment made it into the *National Post* with the pig roast. And now she's got some international acknowledgements. She's not a lot in terms of the office for policy. Not a lot happening there because we haven't heard anything new or otherwise out of there. But she does have a bit of notoriety on the international scene. A

little bit of notoriety of there in terms of making the *New York Post*, Mr. Speaker.

But I would rather, I think, rather be known for good environment policy, for going and consulting people who are now locally saying that she didn't consult. And what was amazing, as amazing then as amazing now, that when first contacted and talked to her about her little event there that she had, where she got the international recognition, that she also didn't see there was anything wrong at that time. They simply brushed that one off too.

But there were a lot of people who noticed that and were well aware of what happened there. And what a sad, sad day for Saskatchewan out there, when the Premier's out running around the country, that we would again be known as the place of the pig roast — place of the pig roast. That's what we would be known here in Saskatchewan, thanks to the Environment minister.

Now it would have been rather that she would have been known for, as Mr. Crabbe here said, about the legislation, that it was created almost 30 years ago and is still considered to be one of the most visionary conservation programs ever developed in North America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would rather be thought of in that fashion than, Mr. Speaker, than in looking at this and saying, well I'd rather be known for a poster and gain some national exposure in the *New York* newspaper and international fame. But instead of having good environmental policy, supporting environmental policy that by people in the field who feel that it's important — no, we have a different way of gaining popularity and that is by an insensitive poster that is recognized internationally.

And then the amazing part is that not to acknowledge that and not to say, you know, we have offended some people, we should pull this off. And instead they go through a bunch of contortions of trying to say that this, in some way, they didn't mean it. What people are saying, who are involved in that, the families in the 9/11 disaster were saying that it's a bad, bad thing to do; you would think that there'd be some quick reaction. But there wasn't and so we made it into the *New York Post*. We made it into the *New York* news media.

And that's how we get to make it into the news media, not on good environmental legislation, Mr. Speaker, but we get . . . The minister is quite popular now internationally. She's gained some prominence. So the next time she travels to *New York* she could perhaps do some interviews — not on the environment, but on the towers, the trade towers which she has now made famous in Saskatchewan. Or should I say made famous, made Saskatchewan famous in *New York*.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had the opportunity of going to *New York* and visiting the place of the twin towers. And it is indeed a place that, when you're there, you feel the enormity, you feel the enormity of the situation. And it is not something . . . Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't go near that and in terms of trying to somehow capitalize or make . . . Mr. Speaker, it's just a sad day. It's a sad day because when you're there, you feel the enormity of the tragedy and the people there and what they must have gone through watching that. Still those visions of

those planes crashing into the towers are, I think, in all of our minds. And it's sad that we should gain notoriety in that fashion.

But again, Mr. Darrell Crabbe, executive director, who went on to talk about what visionary conservation legislation we have here in Saskatchewan . . . Right across North America. no doubt that they have travelled, held conferences, done many things, and talked with people across North America. who say, because I'm sure Mr. Crabbe just wouldn't put in writing that this is.

But this was created 30 years ago, 30 years ago. If we subtract that from here this puts us right into 1980. Now we know who brought or which government played a role in that. It was the Devine government and we had Colin Maxwell speaking out on this issue in terms of that. But would you think that this party would, that the Sask Party would listen to things like that? They didn't. They didn't.

So across the political spectrum, as people talk to them, give them input, there is just simply no input. It's like they have shut down all ability, all ability to listen. They call it consultation and we have . . . I haven't gotten to the letter from Chief Lyle Whitefish, office of the fourth Vice-chief of the FSIN, haven't even gotten there yet, Mr. Speaker, because there's so much material here to be brought forward on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the executive director, Darrell Crabbe, of the Saskatchewan Wildlife says that, that the way:

The combination of a lack of consultation and the aggressive time line on this Bill has effectively made it impossible to address our concerns and left many important questions unanswered [Mr. Speaker] . . . We need the Minister to table this Legislation until all the variables can be properly addressed.

So what they're asking for is to do that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would now move that this House adjourn.

The Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Fairview has moved that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Speaker: — All those in favour say aye.

Some Hon. Members: — Aye.

The Speaker: — All those opposed say nay.

Some Hon. Members: — Nay.

The Speaker: — I believe the nays have it. I recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Mr. Iwanchuk: — I'm not certain that they quite grasp the issue there, but anyways, Mr. Speaker, the executive director

here in turn went on to say:

We need the Minister to table this Legislation until all the variables can be properly addressed."

The SWF sees a "no net loss" agreement, as has been the [provincial] policy of every Provincial Government since the WHPA was introduced; changes to create public transparency; the establishment of a Conservation Lands Fund and the continuation of protection of properties under WHPA legislation . . .

So again, what are they asking? What are they asking this government?

"We need the Minister to table this Legislation until all the variables can be properly addressed."

The SWF sees a "no net loss" agreement, as has been the policy of every Provincial Government since the WHPA was introduced; changes to create public transparency; the establishment of a Conservation Lands Fund and the continuation of protection of properties under WHPA legislation; as the most pressing issues and is prepared to work with the Government towards this goal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are messages, messages from the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, messages from the executive director of the Wildlife Federation which have unfortunately fallen on deaf ears and . . .

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

[The Assembly recessed until 19:00.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Principal Clerk Celebrates 25 Years of Service

The Speaker	5545
-------------------	------

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hutchinson	5545
McCall	5545
Cheveldayoff	5545
Lingenfelter	5546
Chisholm	5546
Furber	5546
Iwanchuk	5546, 5557, 5561
Brotten	5546
Atkinson	5547
Chartier	5547
Allchurch	5565
Yates	5571

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Harper	5547
Higgins	5547
Junor	5547
Forbes	5548
Vermette	5548
Brotten	5548
Furber	5548
Morin	5548
Iwanchuk	5549
Taylor	5549
Wotherspoon	5549
Chartier	5549

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

50th Anniversary of Boundary Dam Power Station

Eagles	5550
--------------	------

Norwegian Constitution Day

Nilson	5550
--------------	------

Surgery Wait-List Times

Ross	5550
------------	------

Enterprise Saskatchewan

Furber	5550
--------------	------

Canadian Youth Against Impaired Driving Conference

Kirsch	5551
--------------	------

Government's Track Record

Wotherspoon	5551
-------------------	------

New Democratic Party Leader's Dinner

McMillan	5551
----------------	------

QUESTION PERIOD

Arrangements Regarding Long-Term Care Facility

Atkinson	5552
----------------	------

McMorris	5552
----------------	------

Relationship Between Colleges

Brotten	5553
---------------	------

Norris	5553
--------------	------

Consultation with Ethanol Industry

Taylor	5554
--------------	------

Cheveldayoff	5554
--------------------	------

Response to Allegations of Abuse

Junor	5556
-------------	------

McMorris	5556
----------------	------

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on the Economy

Hickie	5557
--------------	------

Standing Committee on Human Services

Ottenbreit	5557
------------------	------

Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies	
McMillan	5557
THIRD READINGS	
Bill No. 105 — <i>The SaskEnergy Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Cheveldayoff	5557
ORDERS OF THE DAY	
GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
ADJOURNED DEBATES	
SECOND READINGS	
Bill No. 132 — <i>The Wildlife Habitat Protection (Land Designation) Amendment Act, 2009</i>	
Chartier	5558
Iwanchuk	5567

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
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
Minister Responsible for the Provincial Capital
Commission

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