



FOURTH SESSION - TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

(HANSARD)

Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Don Toth  
Speaker



**MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

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

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>	<b>Constituency</b>
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Belanger, Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornerud, Hon. Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Boyd, Hon. Bill	SP	Kindersley
Bradshaw, Fred	SP	Carrot River Valley
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Brotten, Cam	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Chartier, Danielle	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Hon. Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Furber, Darcy	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
Gantfoer, 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, Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Hon. 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
Lingenfelter, Dwain	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
McCall, Warren	NDP	Regina Elphinstone-Centre
McMillan, Hon. 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, Hon. Laura	SP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Schriemer, Joceline	SP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Stewart, Lyle	SP	Thunder Creek
Taylor, Len	NDP	The Battlefords
Tell, 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
Wyant, Gordon	SP	Saskatoon Northwest
Yates, Kevin	NDP	Regina Dewdney

[The Assembly resumed at 19:00.]

### EVENING SITTING

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The House now being back in session, debate will continue on Bill 157, *The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 2010*. I recognize the member from Athabasca.

**Mr. Belanger:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal point of order.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — What is the member's personal point of order?

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Just to respond to the House Leader on the government side and charges against me in terms of the language I used yesterday.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I will let you continue. I recognize the member from Athabasca.

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was quite surprised today in terms of the charges made by the House Leader on the government side in relation to, in his words, the profane language I used in the Assembly. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I withdraw that comment, I want to assure the people in the Assembly and certainly a number of other people that may be listening, the fact . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I will remind the member that if you wish to withdraw the comment there is no remarks with it.

**Mr. Belanger:** — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment.

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

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 157

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Boyd that **Bill No. 157** — *The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 2010* be now read a second time.]

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on Bill No. 157, *An Act to amend the Oil and Gas Conservation Act* at 5 o'clock when we were interrupted by the clock. And I was, in a nutshell, saying that this Act, it takes 44 pages of explanatory notes alone, 44 pages to explain essentially that anything that the oil and gas industry want to make their job easier in the search for oil and gas is a good thing according to the Sask Party government. And anything that's for constituents like a reduction in the price of fuel at the pump or a reduction in the price of diesel fuel for farmers about to be seeding, a reduction in home heating,

natural gas, that's not anywhere on the Sask Party government's agenda, Mr. Speaker.

So I was pointing out the difference. Everything for industry that seems to want something, they could get it, and nothing for the people of Saskatchewan. And while I laud — I think it is a good thing that we keep an eye on industry and try to enable industry to do its job better — it can't be as one-sided as it has been.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also noted that . . . I didn't note this before, but I'm getting to this new point in my speech. In the second reading speeches, the minister responsible said that, and I quote from — as soon as I get my glasses — from page 6145, November 22nd, 2010. The member says that "Becoming a registry partner was one of the government's early deliverables out of the New West Partnership."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the New West Partnership is a watered down TILMA [Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement]. It involves three provinces as opposed to a larger group. But what this New West Partnership is all about is a drive to the lowest common denominator, that is, you would not have any jurisdiction that has an environmental hoop this high to jump through when another one has a hoop this high. Instead you just go to the lowest common denominator, lowest environmental hoops or hurdles threshold for industry to jump over, or to trip over in the case of the New West Partnership.

The New West Partnership, Mr. Speaker, is very arguably an undemocratic partnership because it was never brought to this legislature. Never have we had a discussion and a vote on the New West Partnership. That's something that the Sask Party dreamed up. And the minister proudly says, this is one of the early deliverables that we have. An early deliverable, but not once, not once have we voted whether Saskatchewan should join the New West Partnership. Not once have we had that debate in this legislature. And yet here we have a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is coming before us. We're expected to say, oh yes, let's go with this piece of legislation that meets some artificial hoop set by the Sask Party government, without any comment, without any opportunity for the opposition to say the New West Partnership is great or it's terrible or it's somewhere in between. No opportunity at all.

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing could be less democratic than that. Not since 1990-91 when Fair Share was being introduced by the then Devine government have we seen things so anti-democratic. And at that point, the Tory government of the day actually prorogued the House without having passed the annual budget of the province of Saskatchewan. That's what right wing governments are all about. They say, elect us and we'll show you, prove to you that government doesn't work. And every once in a while they get elected, and sure enough they prove that government doesn't work. They make it a self-fulfilling prophecy, Mr. Speaker.

And I say, shame on the minister for saying that this is one of the earlier deliverables of the New West Partnership proudly in his second reading speech without bringing it to the legislature for comment. We need to have things like the New West Partnership brought here for . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . And

the minister says, I'm commenting right now. It's a tad late when this is November of 2010. And here we are now some months later and we're still, we're dealing with a piece of legislation that follows from the New West Partnership, the watered-down TILMA, if I can call it that. They couldn't quite get TILMA passed, so they came with the New West Partnership.

Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell this Bill, this Bill No. 157, *An Act to amend the Oil and Gas Conservation Act* is troubling in that it is symptomatic of a government that just cares only about industry and not about the people that elected you, not about the people that put you here and brought you to the dance.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame when we see gasoline prices at a buck twenty a litre right now and on the way up. It is a shame when we see the price of diesel at the pump is even higher than that. And mark my words, with spring seeding just . . . It doesn't seem like it's just around the corner. We've had a total of one melting day and that was today. But spring seeding will be here for farmers, you know, before you can say Rumpelstiltskin very many times.

And the price of diesel is going to continue to go up, and the government is going to continue to sit on their hands and do nothing for the people of Saskatchewan with respect to high fuel prices. They'll do nothing with respect to the price of natural gas for home heating and for other purposes, and yet they'll pass this Bill if they can.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I've outlined the major concerns that I have. I'm tempted to carry on because I know the minister responsible doesn't like to hear any, any, any, any plea on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. The minister doesn't want to hear about the people of Saskatchewan who have had their rents go from 500 to 700 and \$800 a month, the people of Saskatchewan who every time we buy groceries we see the price just escalating at an atrociously high rate, Mr. Speaker.

And the government says, but it's not ours to do anything about, is what the Sask Party government says. Well that's a different story than what they said in opposition. And they either were being deceitful then or they're being deceitful now. And, Mr. Speaker, take their pick.

I've outlined my concerns with Bill 157. I think I've coupled it with a plea for a little bit of sanity for regular people, my constituents and the constituents of everyone else in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn debate on Bill 157, *An Act to amend The Oil and Gas Conservation Act*.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from Regina Coronation Park has moved to adjourn debate on Bill 157, *The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 2010*.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

## Bill No. 159

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Norris that **Bill No. 159 — *The University of Regina Amendment Act, 2010*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Forbes:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is a pleasure to rise tonight to speak to Bill 159, *An Act to amend The University of Regina Act*. And I've just been taking a moment to read some of the previous speeches. I mean this is a . . . on this Bill.

And you know, the role of the universities in Saskatchewan have been huge. And we look at our two universities and they're very different. As my colleague from Saskatoon Meewasin said, they're not twins. They shouldn't be treated as identical. They come out of different circumstances. The University of Regina in the 1960s, it has a long history prior to that, but really gave birth in the early '70s to the U of R [University of Regina]. In fact I was a student. I took my Bachelor of Education at the U of R, so I have a good feeling, a good sense of what the U of R's purpose was and how it relates to the community. Likewise University of Saskatchewan — long history in Saskatchewan's history in Saskatoon. And the role it did and it played in the development of Saskatchewan continues to play a real leadership role. They both do.

But in many ways this Bill seems to be in many ways mirroring a Bill that we've seen in the past year or two and the changes around the visitor section and also the election of the chancellor and senate representatives. And so we understand that there is widespread support but not universal support. I'm not sure how the consultations went on this, and we know that this government's track record in terms of consulting with all interested parties, I'm not sure if I'd use the word stakeholders because quite often we think of stakeholders as having a vested interest, that there's some sort of maybe funds or money, some sort of major role.

But you know, people in Saskatchewan have a real interest in the health and well-being of their universities here. They have a real interest in post-secondary education. We take a lot of pride in our school system here in Saskatchewan. And after kids graduate from their schools, we want to see them succeed in their adult life. And whether it's in the trades or a more academic background, our post-secondary offers great, great opportunities for our young people. And we see that with University of Regina and we see that with University of Saskatchewan.

So the two changes really relate to, as I said, the removal of the visitor clause and repealing that with a new process of appealing disputes. And apparently the visitor clause was never used. And I remember when we had this discussion, when the U of S [University of Saskatchewan] wanted it and asked for it, they had some challenges prior. They had much more involvement in it, and so it was really a big issue for them.

And I have to . . . I had some reservations that I continue to

have. I'm not sure if that's how you solve the problem. When you have issues that need to be resolved, you should really get to the heart of the issue. And it's not the process that's a problem, it's the issue itself. And when there's a tradition like that, I think that it has served many universities well. I know that many universities are changing. And I haven't taken a real deep look at this, but I know neither have a lot of people. Not a lot of people have.

And so I do think that while we have some questions, I know when we get into committee, I'll be interested in hearing what the minister has to say about this because we understand that there's not universal support for this. He would characterize it as broad support, but not universal.

And so I'm curious about who he has been consulting with, particularly the students. Students more than ever now need to have confidence in their institutions so that if there are issues that there are fair appeal processes that are quick and get to the heart of the issue and will serve everyone well in a fair manner. The problem is, if it doesn't, these students, especially . . . well I think all students. I was going to say especially some over the other, but that's not true. In fact all students need to have confidence in the system because they're investing a lot of time and a lot of money to get themselves well-educated. And so in this case I think that I'm left with some question marks on the visitor section.

[19:15]

And in regard to the new processes for the election of the chancellor and the senate representatives, I understand that there has been some discussions about that. I understand, and particularly the member from Battlefords made quite a logical argument about the challenges in the new system. It's not quite as straightforward as it might appear to be. So we'll be interested to hear what people have to say, the minister has to say in committee because clearly there is . . . We want to make sure things go well.

You know, I think I can speak, for all members on this side of the House anyway, when we say we are deeply committed to making sure that our post-secondary institutions and our universities are world-class institutions. And that people want to come here, study here from around the world, but also the kids and the folks who are students in the university here, when they succeed, they can succeed anywhere in the world. It's a two-way, two-way street. We want people here to do amazing things around the world, but also people from the world to come here.

We know that this is the case, especially around the climate change piece, that the U of R has really shown some real leadership and educationally shown some real leadership. And so we have a lot of faith, and we think they're heading into some really positive directions as a university. They represent our province well.

So with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm looking forward to seeing this move into more discussion about this. And we'll have questions further on down the road . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I'm glad I caught the eye over there because I thought, somebody's listening very carefully. And so with that,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move to adjourn debate on this Bill.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from Saskatoon Centre has moved to adjourn debate on Bill 159, *The University of Regina Amendment Act, 2010*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

#### Bill No. 144

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Duncan that **Bill No. 144 — *The Litter Control Amendment Act, 2010*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure here tonight to rise to enter the debate on Bill 144, *The Litter Control Amendment Act, 2010*. I want to start here tonight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by talking a little bit about the Bill, about the history of the Bill in fact.

*The Litter Control Act* was originally passed in 1973, and its purpose was to provide or set out to provide the government with legislative authority to address litter-related issues, to create related regulations, and to establish a provincial beverage container collection and recycling program. I think for me the interesting thing going back to 1973 — well I was three — but I grew up in the '70s and that's interesting when you think about that time. I remember being an elementary school student in the '70s, and the big deal at that time was litter, litterbugs. I remember being a little kid and heaven forbid someone threw a candy wrapper on the ground. And we liked to call people litterbugs.

I also remember all those times where, during school, the teachers would organize a cleanup. The biggest, most pressing issue around the environment I think in those days seemed to be litter and having to deal with it. So just thinking about that time period, 1973, the most pressing issue was controlling litter, unlike right now where in the environment we have the issue of global warming. We have the issue of, well of global warming, and we have a government actually who has been unwilling, for all intents and purposes doing absolutely nothing about greenhouse gas emissions. It's been tokenism. So it's interesting how in the '70s the biggest thing around the environment seemed to be litter, but little did we know just a few decades later our environment, the world would be in serious peril because of human beings.

So I think the thing that's interesting to me as well, just last year this legislature, this government passed a Bill, *The Management and Reduction of Greenhouse Gases Act* that actually says very little. So that this Bill says very little, but I remember when speaking to that Bill last year and doing some research, this is a government who has members who didn't even believe in global warming. I remember doing some research and being quite surprised that there were members of our sitting government who don't believe (a) that global

warming exists, and the second part of that, (b) that global warming even has anything to do with what we humans do to our environment. So anyway, back to Bill 144. I digress here a little bit, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So in 1973 we had the passing of *The Litter Control Act*. So in 1988 *The Litter Control Act* was amended to create the program for recycling designated containers. Designated beverage containers included all sorts of things — non-refillable alcohol, wine, beer, soft drink, water, tea, and juice containers. The program at that point imposed an obligation to pay and collect a refundable deposit and an environmental handling charge on any designated beverage container. The money that's collected through this program is the funding source for the beverage container collection and recycling program operated by Sarcan.

I think the thing for me about this, the forethought in this, the idea that government actually has a role to play in shaping and impacting our behaviour. Government . . . You go to, you travel around, around the world or even around Canada, where if there isn't a deposit, people tend to throw those kinds of things, or you can't see a garbage can not overflowing with cans or milk containers, those kinds of things, where government hasn't had the forethought to put in place something like this. So that was a wonderful thing. It even amazes me though, even though there is this deposit on refillable containers or on beverage containers, even here in Saskatchewan where this is the case and we have a very good rate of recycling here, but we still can't help but see that people still tend to throw things out.

But government definitely has a clear role to play in public policy that encourages certain behaviours. So I thought 1988 was a good time here in Saskatchewan when it comes to making sure that we are becoming better environmental stewards.

So this last spring, this last spring this legislature passed amendments to *The Environmental Management and Protection Act* that will see the incorporation of *The Litter Control Act* into *The Environmental Management and Protection Act*. And at this time, amendments to the existing litter control Act are needed to address a lawsuit, outstanding lawsuit against the Government of Saskatchewan related to environmental handling charges. So these amendments that are being proposed today, there is a positive side to them. The amendments will provide clarity to the original intention of the government regarding environmental handling charges for the purpose for the provincial beverage container program. But these amendments also . . . The lawsuit that's outstanding, the claim asserts that the environmental handling charges collected by the province under *The Litter Control Act* are actually a tax and not a fee. So these proposed amendments retroactively negate the lawsuit and future lawsuits.

So the piece that's positive is the fact that it will provide clarity to the original intention of the government regarding these environmental handling fees. But there is some concern. You always have to think. It's very unusual to make a Bill retroactive, and not retroactive a year or six months in the past. We're looking back to 1998. That's 13 years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So what are the implications of a retroactive Bill? What precedent are you setting in saying that basically these

amendments will mean that this lawsuit can't proceed? So what message are you sending? Are you taking away an individual's or an organization's right to say to government and to pursue and sue government and say what you're doing is incorrect? So I think that before you pass a law retroactively — and 13 years retroactively, Mr. Speaker — you really need to consider the implications of what message that's sending. What are the long term implications? Is government able to do this for multiple pieces of legislation? So I think that that would be something that we need to be concerned about.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I know that I have other colleagues who are interested in entering the debate on this. So with that I'd like to move adjournment on Bill 144. I would like to adjourn debate on Bill No. 144, *The Litter Control Amendment Act*.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from Saskatoon Riversdale has moved to adjourn debate on Bill No. 144, *The Litter Control Amendment Act, 2010*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

#### Bill No. 155

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Duncan that **Bill No. 155 — *The Natural Resources Amendment Act, 2010*** be read a second time.]

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

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise tonight to participate in debate on Bill No. 155, *An Act to amend The Natural Resources Act*. It is with a certain sense of irony that I rise tonight and to take part in the debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of course I haven't been in this House forever, but I have been here long enough to see some of the actions of this government as it pertains to this file and as I believe, as I believe brings to this legislation being brought forward.

Of course there are certain measures in here that are housekeeping. There are certain measures that are about clarifying. There are certain measures that are about changing the title of the steering committee to the advisory council, and we're advised in the explanatory notes that this is to enhance the profile of the committee. Oh fair enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are some changes that allow for a bit more scope in terms of the steering committee as it comes to the operation of the Fish and Wildlife Development Fund. Again, not necessarily a bad thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In the minister's speech when he introduced this measure in the House this past fall, he talked about, well this amounts to about \$3.5 million annually, the fact that the fund to date has acquired through purchase or donation approximately 212,000 acres of land for wildlife habitat purposes. And again, you know, all good stuff.

He talked about who's on the committee, being the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, the Saskatchewan Bowhunters Association, the Saskatchewan fly fishers association, Nature Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Trappers Association, and the Saskatchewan Outfitters Association.

Now I guess here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is where we start to get into what I find ironic about this Bill. This Bill took place against a backdrop where, in the year previous, this government had chosen to remove 3.5 million acres of protected habitat from legislation, did so in many cases without advising or consulting with the very kind of stakeholders that we find enumerated in this steering committee that has now been renamed an advisory council. In many cases did so without, you know . . . This legislation comes forward to re-profile and to add to the esteem accorded to these organizations that participate in this advisory council. But when it came to removing 3.5 million acres of protected habitat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, did so without consulting many of these organizations that they now seek to curry favour with.

I guess the irony is that perhaps if they had done the job of consulting with those organizations in the first place, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we wouldn't be here today to talk about the need for that government to re-profile and to curry favour with the groups involved.

Again with the groups involved in the advisory council which, you know, the new name under this legislation, one of those groups of course is the Trappers Association, the Saskatchewan Trappers Association. There was a small fee that . . . or a small bit of funding that had been accorded to that organization by the provincial government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And of course what we saw is this government not only take that funding away, but to not have the guts or the decency to show up to tell them why this was such a great idea to take their funding away. So I guess the trappers remember that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and believe you me, they will have something to say about it and something to act about in the days and months ahead.

The 3.5 million acres that were removed from protected habitat status that again this legislation, the minister's introductory comments shines up the fact that this legislation involves just north of 200,000 acres of land — 212,000 acres compared to 3.5 million acres. It brings to mind that the Sask Party taketh away and then the Sask Party giveth a little bit back, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

[19:30]

So again what we see at the base of this legislation is the need for that government opposite to try and shine up their credentials to try and mend some fences, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And again this may work for people that have short memories, but for those of us that pay a bit closer attention to what that government says and then what happens in actual fact, the irony is not lost, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I guess the last irony that this legislation brings to mind is that the work that that government had done, unilaterally withdrawing funding from the environmental protocol that had been shared with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, and again did not do so in consultation with that

organization but dropped it on them on budget day, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again when it comes to this government's capacity for consulting, we've seen a pretty definite pattern when it comes to First Nations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where they say one thing but they do something entirely different.

So different members, I've heard them give speeches over the years about the importance of working in partnership with First Nations, about the importance of consulting, genuinely consulting with First Nations. But again when it comes to something like the environmental protocol, which had been built up over years between the province and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, we see something else entirely different, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So I guess in sum there's some fine measures in this legislation. We are vigilant in terms of what we'll be looking for as this plays out over time, as this legislation plays out over time. We think there are some fine groups involved in it. And again, in enumerating the committee representatives, I would note again that there's no First Nations representation on that body, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But again that's in keeping with the way that this government very cavalierly approached the ripping up of the environmental protocol and the way that they approached the removal of 3.5 million acres from protected habitat status.

So I'm sure that certainly my colleagues have been able to speak on this previously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm certain that a number of my colleagues will want to speak in this debate as well. And in that regard I will now move to adjourn debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre has moved to adjourn debate on Bill 155, *The Natural Resources Amendment Act, 2010*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

#### Bill No. 149

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Krawetz that **Bill No. 149 — *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2010*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to join the debate and to talk about Bill 149, *The Income Tax Amendment Act*. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to point out that the Minister of Finance that introduced this Bill primarily indicated that the Bill implements a five-year tax holiday for mining corporations making investments of at least 125 million and maintaining at least 75 full-time employees. And that's of course in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And on the face of it, the opposition is supportive of this measure.

And I want to point out to the people of Saskatchewan that as a government, you know, we look at everything that the Sask

Party does. And we certainly want to also point out that, that as the New Democratic opposition party we are in totally in favour of building this economy to greater heights and to greater opportunities for all people, Mr. Speaker, in all the corners of our province. And we want to invite as many corporations and as much activity and have these corporations and business people invest in our province, and something that we embrace, and something that we really truly want to see happen every day and continue to happen for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a history lesson to the Saskatchewan Party because a lot of times they tend to think that history was written when they took over government, Mr. Speaker. And the fact of the matter is, the hard work, the burden that was carried by the former NDP [New Democratic Party] administration was great, Mr. Speaker. Not only the debt burden was difficult but rebuilding the economy, which these guys enjoy now, was something that took a lot of elbow grease, took a lot of hard work, took a lot of determination, took a lot of sacrifice, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now when the Minister of Finance gets up and proposes Bill 149, of course as an opposition, we're going to look at it. Does it do exactly what the Bill intended it to do? And I look with a bit of amusement at some of the recent announcements, one of them being from the Minister of Resources when he talks about a plan for PA [Prince Albert] of bringing in jobs 18 months from now, Mr. Speaker. And again I go back to my earlier point, they lose 500 jobs from the original plan and it's 18 months away. So is this Bill 149, the income tax amendment, is it typical of the Saskatchewan Party where you talk about something but really don't deliver anything for Saskatchewan? And that's what we're trying to find out with this Bill and many other Bills, Mr. Speaker.

Now when it goes down to trying to build an economy, Mr. Speaker, we will not take no lessons from the Sask Party, Mr. Speaker, primarily because the true and tried method of what we've done in the early 2000s, and certainly the years before that, is we helped put the base in for this economy that that party enjoys, Mr. Speaker. They inherited every bit of good luck that they got, Mr. Speaker. And some of the measures that they talk about today in Bill 149, Mr. Speaker, is merely adding on to the great base of work that was done by the former NDP administration, Mr. Speaker, alongside of the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I go out earlier and I looked at some of the plans. And I remember some of the names that we had. One of the names that pops out certainly is a gentleman by the name of Eric Cline. And of course Eric Cline is now in the private sector, but he was the minister of Finance as many of the colleagues here were also ministers of Finance. And, Mr. Speaker, I can remember the day that Mr. Cline said, well today is our final year of our four-year personal income tax plan where we reduced the personal income tax of all people of Saskatchewan dramatically over four years. Why? Because we could afford to do it, Mr. Speaker, at the time. We could afford to do it.

And I can remember when the debt surcharge tax was eliminated, Mr. Speaker. That was done by the NDP government, Mr. Speaker. I can remember the corporate review

of all the taxes being paid. That was done by the NDP government, Mr. Speaker. And finally, Mr. Speaker, the royalties and all the royalties that are out there, it was done by the NDP government, Mr. Speaker.

So when I look at some of the added on . . . And one of the things that people ought to know is that they are merely following the path that was blazed before them. That path was built on a solid base of a personal income tax plan that reduced the taxes of all people. That's the plan that was put in place by the NDP government. So whether it's a debt surcharge tax or whether it was a corporate review or the royalty taxes and people's personal income tax, Mr. Speaker, they are merely following the path that was laid out before them, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now we obviously as a government are quite proud, quite proud of that work. And they are the benefactors. But they tend to come along and say, look what we're doing here, folks. And I think everybody in Saskatchewan — and they know it as well — everybody in Saskatchewan is in debt to the previous administration called the NDP for putting many of these measures in place that complement Bill 149.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that when the review was done on the royalties, we wanted to stimulate the economy. And things started moving. We started seeing more and more activity, and people were coming to Saskatchewan and all of a sudden we seen this great move. And I can remember articles in the paper that talked about Saskatchewan being a rising star, Saskatchewan going to be the place to be. And this went back to 2005, Mr. Speaker.

And today now these guys come along, and they say, oh look, we're reinventing Saskatchewan. Look at all the great things we're doing. You shouldn't be taking any credit for something that you have not done. You should not be taking credit for the inheritance that you got. So I tell the people of Saskatchewan, you're riding on the coattails of what the NDP done when they assumed power in 1991 and built this province up. You know it, we know it, and 90 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan know it, Mr. Speaker.

So when we come along, Mr. Speaker, and talk 149, Bill 149, and I say to the people of Saskatchewan, the history of the NDP is very, very promising to many, many people that'll look at us as a party that can deliver many, many economic benefits to our province, Mr. Speaker. We want to see corporations. We want to see businesses thrive. We want see things really move, Mr. Speaker. But we shouldn't pretend something that we're not. And that's exactly what that party opposite is doing. Under a pretend government they are telling everybody, we're doing all these wonderful things, when simply Bill 149 is merely an add-on to some of the great work done in the early 2000s and even before that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government had over the past four years, I would estimate, maybe \$40 billion in all their budgets combined. And, Mr. Speaker, it's important for people to know that when the NDP were in power they maybe had about 24 billion over those four years, or even less before that. And, Mr. Speaker, we could've done a tremendous amount of more work for the people of Saskatchewan in building that brave new



economy and continuing that particular work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I look at Bill 149, I look at Bill 149 and I say to myself, well that's great. We applaud that. We applaud efforts to bring people into our province. We applaud the effort of having corporations and businesses come because as many of us have said, we cannot have a social agenda without having a corporate agenda in place. You can't have people profit if you don't have businesses here. We agree with that. We support that. And as our leader said, there's three or four planks in a great new economy, and part of that's having a thriving business community. And this Bill merely complements some of the work that we did in the early or late 1990s and the early 2000s, Mr. Speaker.

Now I'll look at the Bill itself. We have a lot of questions. We have a lot of answers that need to be given, certainly to the opposition and to the people of Saskatchewan. And any time we done anything, Mr. Speaker, we always looked at a number of issues before we proceeded with the Bill. And, Mr. Speaker, there's environmental considerations. What is the environmental imprint or the footprint on this particular Bill? Does anybody know exactly what the implications are?

Mr. Speaker, on worker safety and paying our workers a fair share and a fair salary, is that consideration part of this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The net benefit to our province, is that in consideration with this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker? Is there any reference to the strategic resource that this Bill may implicate or certainly complicate? So those are some of the questions offhand that we always, typically always assess at the start of any process when we are trying to attract businesses to our province, Mr. Speaker.

So I say it loud and clear, and I say it to the people of Saskatchewan, that from our perspective, we will always, always be proud of the work that we did. We'll always be proud of the personal income tax measures we put in place. We'll always be proud of the efforts around reducing the debt surcharge tax. We'll always be proud of the reviews that we did when it comes to corporate tax. We'll be proud of the revenue sharing and the royalty scheme that we looked at when we talked with different companies. We'll be proud of our balance on the economy. We'll be proud of our balance when it comes to the environment, when it comes to worker protection, worker pay — all these things that we balanced, Mr. Speaker, in relation to anything we brought to attract business to the community was always part of the mix.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is one small step with many more questions that we have to answer before we support any Bill that that Sask Party presents in this Assembly. So, Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from Athabasca has moved to adjourn debate on Bill No. 149, *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2010*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

## Bill No. 150

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Krawetz that **Bill No. 150 — *The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Amendment Act, 2010*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this evening to enter the debate at second reading on Bill No. 150, *An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act*.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation has been debated for a short while in the legislature. There are still a number of questions that need to be answered about this Bill, as there are with so much of the legislation that this government introduced in the fall and is expecting the legislature here, Mr. Speaker, to move through these Bills quickly.

But just to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, Bill 150 has two main provisions. The first provision is to clarify how spousal survivor benefits are to be calculated in the case of a person who may have been married more than once or who may have both current and former spouses who could claim to be qualified to receive some type of survivor benefit. Mr. Speaker, the opposition members have enunciated this in remarks previous. The opposition wants to have a better understanding of the potential impact of this provision, particularly on vulnerable people. However, on the face of it, Mr. Speaker, this provision may have some merit. And with some continuing consultation, we may be able to support that.

However, Mr. Speaker, the second provision continues this government's pattern of hiding important information from public view. This government proposes to remove from public reporting the amount of money and benefits paid out to individual superannuates and, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this provision. Mr. Speaker, this is a provision, and I'll read it specifically in the legislation in front of us. It calls for a new section 50:

### **Section 50 is repealed and the following substituted:**

#### **“Annual report not to disclose personal information**

So new section 50, this is the legislation as it reads:

The report transmitted by a board to the president of the Executive Council must not show the names of individuals who retired or died during the period to which the report applies, the amounts of superannuation or other allowances or benefits granted in individual cases or in any other personal information respecting any of those individuals”.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, when he introduced this piece of legislation on November the 15th of 2010, Mr. Speaker, made it very clear in his remarks. And I'll quote from page 6038 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Finance said very clearly: “This amendment will remove the requirement to

disclose personal information in the . . . [financial] reports.”

So, Mr. Speaker, this is one piece of legislation that the government is quite clear on what it is doing, and that is to protect from disclosure a number of individuals, protect from disclosure a number of individuals. This government knows already, Mr. Speaker, that any amounts over \$50,000 paid to individuals or organizations in one year by government have to be publicly disclosed. The public accounts annually, Mr. Speaker, show the lists of people who work in the departments of government who are remunerated greater than \$50,000 per year, and that remuneration, Mr. Speaker, is compiled and presented in an accumulated manner.

The salaries of everyone who works for a minister of the Crown or Executive Council, and who make more \$50,000 a year are indeed publicly disclosed each year in Public Accounts and it's a requirement, Mr. Speaker, of this legislature. The same holds true for all other employees in the public service.

So, Mr. Speaker, what this legislation is trying to do, with the specific direction of the Sask Party government, is allowing former employees to be held to a different standard. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it's possible to leave the Public Service, come back under contract and not have to disclose the amount of funds that have been provided to you. The opposition of course, as I indicated, believes that this could result in former employees being able to collect their pension benefits while continuing to work for government on a contract basis. This is what most people call double-dipping, and nobody, Mr. Speaker, would be the wiser of this. Nobody would be the wiser of this because the Sask Party is by law saying this will be exempt from disclosure.

We know that this government likes to contract out services to its friends, Mr. Speaker. This is happening more and more frequently. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, we learned today in question period — actually we learned a couple days ago, but the minister was called to account today in the legislature — contracted out health services meant to reduce the wait times in Saskatchewan are not producing the results, Mr. Speaker.

So what this government has been doing in contracting out services, Mr. Speaker, providing funding but getting very little benefit for the people of Saskatchewan in return. Starving the public health system for the funding that it needs, Mr. Speaker, to benefit Saskatchewan people while at the same time providing funds that could be used in the public sector, Mr. Speaker, to their friends in the private sector, Mr. Speaker, with no discernible results for the people of Saskatchewan. And of course, Mr. Speaker, we know that on this contracting out they've signed a \$27 million loan guarantee to Sask Party friends for the development of Amicus, a privately developed and to be delivered long-term care facility in the city of Saskatoon.

They're trying to pretend, Mr. Speaker, that this help-your-friends-out-with-contracts process is something new and innovative, Mr. Speaker. And it's not new at all, Mr. Speaker. Old-line governments, conservative governments in particular, have been doing this for tens, dozens, maybe hundreds of years, Mr. Speaker, worldwide: rewarding their friends with public money. And, Mr. Speaker, the only way to

ensure that the people are protected in circumstances like this is simple — full disclosure. That's what protects the public purse, Mr. Speaker. Full disclosure. That's what protects the public from a government that simply wants to use public resources for private benefit, Mr. Speaker. Public disclosure is the key to ensuring confidence of the public in the government that they have entrusted to manage the public resources.

So, Mr. Speaker, if this Bill is allowed to pass, the government could contract services out to former employees. Those former employees could receive payments from the government for that contract. At the same time, those people can collect pension benefits from the public purse and nobody would be the wiser, Mr. Speaker. Nobody would know about it. Specific, that's what this Bill is all about. There's only two provisions in the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This provision of non-disclosure is very clearly set out and very clearly defined by the Minister of Finance in introducing the legislation to the House back in November.

The government claims, Mr. Speaker, or may claim, if anyone else decides to speak on it, that this is an innocuous Bill. But this the same government that tried to bring in what we in the legislature know of as Bill 9. This would have raised the bar for non-disclosure of government spending from 50,000 to \$350,000, Mr. Speaker.

We will remember that there was a short debate, and the Bill seemed to have disappeared, Mr. Speaker. This government decided that the law which requires the government to disclose any payment over \$50,000 for services — Mr. Speaker, not for wages and remuneration but for services, disclose any spending over \$50,000 — well, Mr. Speaker, this government early in its mandate thought, oh gee that's a lot of disclosure, Mr. Speaker. Let's up the limit to \$350,000.

So, Mr. Speaker, this government was trying to give itself the right to hide every cheque it wrote under \$350,000 and, Mr. Speaker, that's not right. The people of Saskatchewan knew it wasn't right. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we haven't seen much of Bill 9 since the government got part of that message.

This is the same government that fires employees for trying to raise issues in the public interest, and this is the same government that pretends to fix the problem by bringing in a new public interest disclosure Act that keeps allegations of wrongdoing private. And some people, Mr. Speaker, who pay attention to the legislature would know that this legislation that I'm talking about, *The Public Interest Disclosure Act*, is doing for public interest or whistle-blowers what the Bill 150 in my hand, Mr. Speaker, is doing for the finances of this province — trying to ensure that the public doesn't know what's going on. And again, Mr. Speaker, this is completely unacceptable.

This current pattern of secrecy and lack of accountability and transparency that defines this government has to stop, Mr. Speaker. We can't support this legislation because of that. Mr. Speaker, there's lots here that the government has to clarify, maybe even backtrack on, Mr. Speaker. And therefore in order to ensure that the government has time to think about this legislation, to rethink the position that they have taken on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would move that debate on Bill No. 150 be now adjourned.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member from The Battlefords has moved to adjourn debate on Bill No. 150, *The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Amendment Act, 2010* be now adjourned. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move the House do now adjourn.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried. This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

[The Assembly adjourned at 19:57.]



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### EVENING SITTING

Belanger (point of order).....	6679
--------------------------------	------

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 157 — *The Oil and Gas Conservation Amendment Act, 2010*

Trew .....	6679
------------	------

#### Bill No. 159 — *The University of Regina Amendment Act, 2010*

Forbes .....	6680
--------------	------

#### Bill No. 144 — *The Litter Control Amendment Act, 2010*

Chartier .....	6681
----------------	------

#### Bill No. 155 — *The Natural Resources Amendment Act, 2010*

McCall .....	6682
--------------	------

#### Bill No. 149 — *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2010*

Belanger .....	6683
----------------	------

#### Bill No. 150 — *The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Amendment Act, 2010*

Taylor.....	6685
-------------	------

# 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  
Telecommunications

**Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff**  
Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations  
Minister Responsible for Northern Affairs  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Gaming Corporation

**Hon. June Draude**  
Minister of Social Services  
Minister Responsible for the Status of Women  
Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission

**Hon. Dustin Duncan**  
Minister of Environment  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Water Corporation  
Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated

**Hon. Donna Harpauer**  
Minister of Education  
Provincial Secretary

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison**  
Minister of Enterprise  
Minister Responsible for Trade

**Hon. Darryl Hickie**  
Minister of Municipal Affairs

**Hon. Bill Hutchinson**  
Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport  
Minister Responsible for the Provincial  
Capital Commission

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

**Hon. Ken Krawetz**  
Deputy Premier  
Minister of Finance

**Hon. Tim McMillan**  
Minister Responsible for Crown  
Investments Corporation  
Minister Responsible for Information  
Technology Office  
Minister Responsible for Information  
Services Corporation  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Government Insurance  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Liquor and  
Gaming Authority

**Hon. Don McMorris**  
Minister of Health

**Hon. Don Morgan**  
Minister of Justice and Attorney General  
Minister of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety  
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan Workers'  
Compensation Board

**Hon. Rob Norris**  
Minister of Advanced Education,  
Employment and Immigration  
Minister Responsible for Innovation  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Power Corporation  
Minister Responsible for Uranium  
Development Partnership

**Hon. Jim Reiter**  
Minister of Highways and Infrastructure  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Transportation Company  
Minister Responsible for The Global  
Transportation Hub Authority

**Hon. Laura Ross**  
Minister of Government Services