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Routine Proceedings

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: — I recognize the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Wall: — Well I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that. It’s a great honour for me today to introduce some very, very special guests that have joined us here today in the legislature, on the floor of the legislature. Mr. Speaker, our province was very proud indeed to have 13 athletes taking part in the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, as well as 10 coaches, officials, and support staff.

Mr. Speaker, we’ll have a chance a little bit later on this morning to honour them in a ceremony in the rotunda to thank them for their example and their dedication and their hard work. And just in a few moments from now, each MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] representing the constituency of a Paralympian or Olympian is going to have a chance to introduce them more formally. But I just want in a very general way to welcome them here.

We’re also in the company of medalists, a couple of bronze medal winners for the women’s soccer team, and a silver medalist. We know the bronze medal for the women’s soccer team should have probably been a different kind of medal, a different colour medal, but much like the Saskatchewan Roughriders, they were also playing the officials in that one particular game. But nonetheless, we’re so very, very proud of all of them. We thank them and we welcome them all to their Legislative Assembly today.

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

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’d like to join with the Premier in welcoming all of the athletes and coaches and officials who have come today to the legislature. We all feel part of your victories or your struggle in the Olympics, and we very much want to thank you for representing what’s best about Saskatchewan.

We also want to say thank you to Sask Sport and all of the coaches and others who prepared you to go to the Olympics. We often forget how important the coaching in various places across the province that happens, how that is a contributor to the best. So welcome, and we look forward to hearing about all of you. Thank you.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wyant: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it’s my honour to introduce to the members of this legislature, Kaylyn Kyle.

Saskatoon’s Kaylyn Kyle was in the midfield position for the Canadian women’s soccer team when they won bronze at the 2012 London Games. Kaylyn has previously earned a gold medal at the 2011 Pan American Games in Guadalajara, Mexico. Kaylyn was born and raised in Saskatoon and has been playing for Canada since 2008. She is a midfielder for the Vancouver Whitecaps football club. Please welcome Kaylyn to her legislature.

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

Mr. Merriman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce, on behalf of MLA Rob Norris to the members of this Legislative Assembly, Kelly Parker.

Kelly played the mid-field position for Canadian women’s soccer when they won their bronze at the 2012 London Games. Kelly also played in the 2011 FIFA [Fédération Internationale de Football Association] Women’s World Cup against Germany and then went on to win a gold medal in the 2011 Pan American Games in Guadalajara, Mexico.

Kelly considers the great city of Saskatoon to be her home town. Kelly, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Corrections and Policing.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce Reuben Ross. Reuben returned in 2012 for a second Olympic Games, and he placed sixth in the 3-metre synchronized diving with his diving partner, Alexandre Despatie, at the 2012 London Games.

He was named the Saskatchewan Athlete of the Year in 2008. Reuben was born in Pilot Butte and currently resides in Edmonton. Reuben, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it’s my honour to introduce Rachelle Vinberg. The 2012 London Summer Games was Rachelle’s third Olympic Games. This summer she won her first Olympic medal, silver, as part of the women’s eight rowing team.

Rachelle was born and raised in Regina and now resides in Toronto where she is looking forward to focusing on her career as a naturopathic doctor. Her proud mother, June Mayhew de Jong, is here in the east gallery. And I know that her father, the late Hielkede Jong, would also be very proud of her, as well as another relative, Honey Deglau, who is here. So I welcome you, Rachelle, to the Legislative Assembly.

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

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, I am honoured to introduce Arnold Boldt. He’s a Paralympic high jump legend. Arnold made his cycling debut on the Canadian paracycling team for the 2012 London Games. London was Arnold’s sixth Paralympic Games, throughout
which he has won seven gold and one silver medal.

Arnold, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Merriman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce, on behalf of the MLA from Greystone, Logan Campbell.

The 2012 Summer Games was Logan’s first competition at the Paralympic Games. Along with his fellow teammates Bruce Millar and Scott Lutes, Logan sailed in the Sonar class. The team finished 10th in their class. Congratulations to Logan and his team. Logan, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce to you today Keira-Lyn Frie. Keira-Lyn competed in four events: the 100-, 800-, 1500-, and 5000-metre wheelchair races. The 2012 London Summer Games was Keira-Lyn’s first Paralympic Games. Keira-Lyn, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government House Leader.

Mr. Harrison: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it’s my honour to introduce to you today Paralympian archer Bob Hudson. Bob started competing in 2005. He has been to the World Championships in Italy, Korea, and the Czech Republic. Bob captured the silver medal in the 2011 Parapan American Games in Guadalajara, Mexico. He competed in his first Paralympics in wheelchair archery at the 2012 London Summer Games. Bob, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

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

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it’s my honour to introduce to you today, Lisa Thomaidis. Lisa went to London with Team Canada’s 2012 women’s basketball team as an assistant coach. It was her first Olympics. The team earned its Olympic spot with a victory over Japan on Canada Day during the last qualifying event. She’s taking a sabbatical from her head coach position at the U of S [University of Saskatchewan] and is proud to call Saskatoon her home. Lisa, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Government Relations.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce to you today Natalie Scott. This was Natalie’s first Paralympic Games experience as a coach at the highest level. Natalie became involved with goalball at age 13 through her mother, Launel, a provincial and national team coach. She stepped in to coach at the 2005 International Blind Sports Association Pan Am Games and was an assistant coach at the World Youth Games last July, earning her a spot in Canada’s coaching staff at the 2011 Parapan American Games. Natalie, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member for Regina Qu’Appelle Valley.

Ms. Ross: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce to you today Marj Walton. Marj attended the 2012 London Paralympic Games as team manager for the Canadian swim team. A former competitive swimmer herself and overall sports enthusiast, Marj was team manager for Canada’s national Paralympics swim team at the 2010 international Paralympics committee swimming world championship in Eindhoven, Netherlands. She was also the swim team manager at the 2011 Parapan American Games in Mexico and at the inaugural 2011 Pan Pacific swimming world championships in Edmonton. Marj, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it’s my honour to introduce to you Launel Scott. Launel has been involved with Saskatchewan Blind Sports Association since 1986 as a coach and in 2000 decided to focus on officiating. Since then she has officiated at three junior world championships, two Parapan Am Games and her first Paralympics Games in London where she was one of two Canadian referees selected. Launel, we welcome you to your Legislative Assembly.

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

Mr. Parent: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce to you Al Bodnarchuk. Al Bodnarchuk attended his fifth Olympic Games as a massage therapist when he went to 2012 London Summer Games. One of the best massage therapists in the country, Al has travelled as a member of Canada’s medical staff to three Commonwealth Games, eight World Athletic Championships, and he was a recipient of the Queen’s Jubilee Medal in 2003 for dedication to athletes in Canada. Al, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Marchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you, it is my honour to introduce to you today Mr. Dave Robertson. Dave attended the 2012 Olympic Games as technical analyst for Team Canada’s canoe-kayak team. Now that the Olympics are over, Dave will turn his attention to the 2016 games in Rio de Janeiro as CanoeKayak Canada’s under-23 men’s kayak development coach. I’m glad I’m not kayaking. Dave, welcome to your Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — At this time I would also like to thank the athletes, coaches, officials and support staff who could not make it here today. Cory Niefer, Olympics, shooting, air rifle; Krista Phillips, Olympics, women’s basketball; Brianne Theisen, Olympics, athletics, heptathlon; Carla Nicholls, Olympic coach, shooting, air rifle; Cindy Hamulas, Olympic coach, rifle; Pat Fiacco, Olympic official, deputy technical
delegate boxing; Alexandre Dupont, Paralympics athletics; Earle Connor, Paralympics athletics; Nancy Brawley, Paralympics, diving official; and Rick Reelie, Paralympics coach, wheelchair athletics. Congratulations to all these members.

As Speaker, I actually have a guest today to introduce. Seated in the Speaker’s gallery today, we have Speaker Andrew Scheer of the House of Commons. As everyone knows, Mr. Scheer represents one of the four federal ridings in Regina, and I would ask the Assembly to welcome him here today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m pleased to rise to present a petition on behalf of residents from across Saskatchewan who are concerned about education in our province. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly call on the Sask Party government to make education a top priority by establishing a long-term vision and plan, with resources, that is responsive to the opportunities and challenges in providing the best quality education and that reflects Saskatchewan’s demographic and population changes, that is based on proven educational best practices, that is developed through consultation with the education sector, and that recognizes the importance of educational excellence to the social and economic well-being of our province and students for today and for our future.

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

These petitions today are signed by concerned residents from Hudson Bay and Regina. I so submit.

[10:15]

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

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I bring a petition in support of bringing cellular service to unserved areas in the northern part of province. And in the prayer that reads as follows:

That the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan undertake as soon as possible to ensure that SaskTel delivers cellular service to the Canoe Lake First Nation, along with the adjoining communities of Cole Bay and Jans Bay; Buffalo River First Nation, also known as Dillon, and the neighbouring communities of Michel Village and St. George’s Hill; English River First Nation, also known Patuanak, and the hamlet of Patuanak; and Birch Narrows First Nation, and the community of Turnor Lake, including the neighbouring communities in each of these areas.

And this petition is brought to you from the citizens of Dillon, Saskatchewan. I so pray.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

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

International Co-operative Alliance Youth Arts Contest

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently the International Co-operative Alliance held a youth arts contest entitled Co-op Art in honour of the United Nation’s International Year of the Co-operatives. The ICA [International Co-operative Alliance] is an independent, non-governmental organization that unites, represents, and serves co-operatives worldwide.

The contest was open to people aged 16 to 35 which aim to raise awareness of young people through photography, video, and music. Out of 35 countries that participated, 174 submissions were sent in, and Canada had four finalists. Among the four finalists was Emily Erhardt who is the Saskatchewan Co-operative Youth Program alumnus, coming in second place for her rap song, “Join a Co-op.”

Winners of each category won a trip to the Co-operatives United Conference in Manchester, United Kingdom as well as $3,500. Second place winners won $1,500 and third place entrants received a tablet computer. Charles Gould, the director general of the ICA, praised the high quality of work that he saw in all the submissions. He felt they reflected a true depiction of global representation of the positivity that co-operatives can bring to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me today in thanking the ICA for organizing such a great event to bring out such a diverse array of talent, especially Emily on her competition. Thank you.

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

2012 Olympic and Paralympics Games

Mr. Merriman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today at 11:45 there’ll be a recognition ceremony in the rotunda to celebrate the Saskatchewan athletes, coaches, officials, and support staff who participated in the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

This event is dedicated to the individuals who served as ambassadors for our province and are world-class role models for our youth. We not only honour these athletes for their achievements in their sports but also their contributions to our communities and to our province. Mr. Speaker, today is an opportunity to relive some of those most memorable moments in the games — moments that kept us on the edge of our seats, moments of defeat, moments of great pleasure, and moments of triumph like the women’s Canada-US [United States] soccer match. This game combined all the highs and lows of a great Olympic event.

We host this event not only to recognize the accomplishments of those who participated in the games, but also to recognize the dedication and support of their families and friends whose sacrifices are instrumental in making their dreams become a reality.
Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in congratulating our Saskatchewan Olympians, Paralympians, coaches, officials, and support staff, and to wish them the best in their future endeavours. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Saskatchewan Authors Win Literary Awards

Ms. Sproule: — Mr. Speaker, this week has been a wonderful one for two Saskatchewan authors. Both Candace Savage and Ross King recently won two of the most prestigious literary awards in Canada for their outstanding non-fiction literature.

Candace Savage won the Hilary Weston Writers’ Trust Prize for Nonfiction valued at $60,000 for her book A Geography of Blood: Unearthing Memory from a Prairie Landscape. She currently divides her time between my constituency of Saskatoon Nutana and Eastend, which was also home to writer Wallace Stegner, one of the giants of American literature in the late 20th century. His presence is throughout her book, which she spent a decade researching, about the tortured relationships between Aboriginal residents and white settlers in the southwest part of Saskatchewan.

Ross King won his second Governor General’s Award for Non-fiction for his book, Leonardo and The Last Supper, which introduces readers to the complex history behind the famous painting. Although he currently lives in the United Kingdom, he originally hails from North Portal, Saskatchewan and credits authors like Robert Kroetsch and W.O. Mitchell for his success. He said he was inspired by these authors because:

It then makes you see that it isn’t beyond someone from Saskatchewan. To be a writer, you don’t have to be from Toronto or Montreal, or London or Paris, that it can be someone from a small town in Saskatchewan.

My congratulations to Candace and Ross.

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

University of Saskatchewan Awarded Canadian Excellence Research Chair

Mr. Tochor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate the University of Saskatchewan on an outstanding recent achievement. The U of S is one of eight universities in the country awarded the $10 million Canadian Excellence Research Chair aimed at attracting the world’s best researchers to help build successful research teams in areas of importance to Canada.

This prestigious position is expected to be filled by early 2014. The U of S will recruit a chair who will work on an integrated approach to infectious diseases. This will help to ensure that the new knowledge is translated rapidly and effectively into practice and that new technology, policy, and programs are relevant to communities, policy-makers, and health practitioners.

Mr. Speaker, our government views collaboration and partnership between sectors as essential for success in building and strengthening our provincial economy. Our province is growing, and we want to ensure better health and better care for our population. This prestigious award will help address preventable diseases and improve prevention, diagnosis, and control of these diseases in a more effective way based on the latest advances of science.

Mr. Speaker, I’d like to invite everyone in this Assembly today to join me in congratulating the U of S in this achievement. Thank you.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Government Whip.

Anti-Bullying Week

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it’s nice to know you think I’m as handsome as the member from Cumberland. Mr. Speaker, November 13th to the 16th has been proclaimed Anti-Bullying Week in the city of Yorkton.

Members of St. Mary’s School community school council will be taking part in a Canada-wide initiative to stop bullying. A number of events were planned throughout the week including a flag raising at city hall. Anti-bullying T-shirts were distributed, and children were educated on the dangers of bullying.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is a social disease that affects the people in the way they live, work, play, and treat one another. It creates barriers to success by fostering prejudice and hate. In September an exclusive Ipsos Reid poll conducted for Global News found that a staggering 88 per cent of Canadians say they’re worried about youth bullying. Mr. Speaker, bullying is no longer relegated to the playground or soccer field. With the increased participation and popularity of social media, cyberbullying is quickly becoming a prevalent issue.

The goal of Bullying Awareness Week is to raise awareness of the simple yet powerful actions that parents, kids, educators, and everyone can take to prevent bullying. Mr. Speaker, bullying can be stopped. All it takes is one bystander to stand up to bullying.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to join me in thanking St. Mary’s School community school council and the city of Yorkton for their efforts to stop bullying. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Deputy Premier.

Pay it Forward Splash Park

Hon. Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform members about a special project currently underway in our province. This project is the Chase Kraynick Pay it Forward Splash Park. This park is being built in Canora
in memory of Chase, a little boy who lost his life in a farming accident last year.

Mr. Speaker, pay it forward is the idea of participating in random acts of kindness without expecting anything in return. Chase was taught this idea in his kindergarten class, and he took the idea to heart. For Chase, pay it forward meant doing chores on the farm, washing the dishes, or helping neighbours shovel their driveways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Canora community is looking to pay it forward by building a splash park in memory of Chase. In a recent fundraising project the community raised almost $7,000 by recycling old car, truck, and tractor tires. The splash park is also in the semi-finals for an Aviva Community Fund grant worth $100,000. Starting next month, Mr. Speaker, the public can vote for the splash park on the Aviva website to help the project advance to the final round of competition.

Chase Kraynick was a remarkable young boy, Mr. Speaker, and even though he was only six years old, he made a difference in our province.

Mr. Speaker, starting on December 3rd I ask all members of the House to help continue Chase’s legacy by voting on the Aviva website for the Chase Kraynick Pay it Forward Splash Park. Thank you.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member for Prince Albert Carlton.

Royalty Rates and Dutch Disease

Mr. Hickie: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the NDP [New Democratic Party] have made it quite clear that they’re going to barrel down the same path set by Dwain Lingenfelter only a few short years ago by advocating that we begin jacking up royalty rates and sending jobs and economic activity out of the province. For example, leadership candidate Erin Weir seems to believe that by raising royalties on potash and oil, Saskatchewan can do its part to help fight the fabled “Dutch disease” that federal NDP leader Thomas Mulcair has blamed Western Canada for creating.

In referencing Mr. Mulcair’s Dutch disease theory, Weir stated, “Saskatchewan is well positioned to help implement and benefit from this approach by raising provincial resource royalties.”

Mr. Speaker, in Weir’s opinion, Saskatchewan should put the brakes on its own potash and oil industries just to fall in line with the wrong-headed approach of the federal NDP leader. Never mind the fact that Mark Carney, the governor of the board of Canada, has stated that “most fundamentally, higher commodity prices are ambiguously good for Canada,” or that former Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said that the NDP’s Dutch disease implication that “one part of the country is not prospering because another is, is wrong.”

Mr. Speaker, will the NDP finally renounce their fictitious theory of Dutch disease and relinquish their pursuit to raise royalty rates?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION PERIOD

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

Potential Changes to Labour Legislation

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It’s now been several months since the government introduced an alarming discussion paper on a topic nobody voted for in the last election. And, Mr. Speaker, we’ve now sat through three full weeks of session. Several pieces of legislation have been introduced but funny enough we haven’t seen, they haven’t tabled the labour legislation.

People in Saskatchewan want to know what the Sask Party has in mind because they certainly didn’t vote for massive overhaul of labour laws in the last election. Mr. Speaker, people are very concerned when the minister says he’s bringing in the most changes to labour laws in the country. To the minister: where’s the legislation?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, I can advise the members opposite and would like to advise the citizens of the province that the officials at the Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety have been working on this project since the consultation finished during the summer. It is moving along quite well. And our original timeline was to have the bill introduced sometime in the fall session and, Mr. Speaker, that is still the plan and the process is coming along as it should. And to the member opposite I’d just say, a few moresleeps and we’ll have something for him.

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

Mr. Forbes: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that’s an interesting answer but not very helpful because the minister seems to have a lot to say about his labour law to groups, for example the North Saskatoon Business Association. And this wouldn’t be the first time the Sask Party introduces what they bill as a big idea in front of a paying crowd. The last time this happened it was a $100 a plate dinner to hear about the Premier’s little booklet. And I’m not sure what’s being charged tomorrow for the minister.

Mr. Speaker, why is the minister talking about his labour laws at yet another private function instead of here at the legislature?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, to the member opposite, I think both he and I attended the SFL [Saskatchewan Federation of Labour] convention not that long ago. I didn’t pay to attend there. I don’t know whether he paid or not. But we spoke about things there, including labour legislation, changes to occupational health and safety. And, Mr. Speaker, we had I think a good, open, and frank discussion.

So when I speak to the NSBA [North Saskatoon Business Association], I don’t know what their charge is tomorrow, but I
don’t intend to ask them … or don’t intend to be asked tomorrow how much that I paid for SFL or one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to provide the information as we go forward, to a variety of groups through the province and intend to continue doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that, you know, we have a good record with labour relations in our province. Mr. Speaker, I have a quote I’d like to read, and it is, “Our economy has been moving along quite well with relative labour peace for many, many years.” Mr. Speaker, that is a quote from the Leader of the Opposition during a scrum that he had on October 23rd.

So, Mr. Speaker, even the Leader of the Opposition acknowledges the labour . . .

[10:30]

The Speaker: — Next question, please.

Mr. Forbes: — Mr. Speaker, that’s the key part of our argument when they talk about this massive overhaul. Things have been working, so to get it right you don’t need to do the massive overhaul.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, they put out this massive discussion, or this discussion paper on May 2nd, and they didn’t hold a single public, open public meeting to get their feedback by July 31st. Clearly they had a pretty good idea that people in Saskatchewan want to see this new labour law introduced as quickly as possible. But a lot of people, quite frankly, think it’s been sitting already written in a drawer somewhere since the Sask Party first started talking about it.

Mr. Speaker, there has been several pieces of legislation tabled this session but not one of them is the new labour law that this Premier touted in his Throne Speech or mused about in his little booklet. Mr. Speaker, why won’t the minister table his legislation and we can start the debate?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Advanced Education.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has made comments before that the legislation was pre-written. I think perhaps you’d like to tell that to some of the officials over at the ministry that have been working long hours and often some 16- and 18-hour days, on weekends and well into the evenings, Mr. Speaker. There was not pre-written bills or anything else and they are still working and we are getting very close to finalizing.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the consultation process, we received over 3,800 responses that went into the new legislation. I would like to use this opportunity to thank everyone that made a submission.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to consultation, in 1999 the members opposite introduced and passed The Special Payment (Dependent Spouses) Act ex gratia payment to widows — no consultation; 2001, amended The Labour Standards Act to extend parental leave benefits, no consultation; 2004, trade union Act, no consultation; 2006, labour standards Act for family, no consultation.

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

Funding for Education

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The Saskatchewan School Boards Association met this week. They represent the publicly funded boards from across our province. I was pleased to join trustees as they discussed education in classrooms in our province as did the Minister of Education.

In my consultations, I’ve heard about many challenges and opportunities in our education system. One thing those in the education sector have not been calling for is for dollars to be diverted to fund new private, independent schools. Did the minister hear something different?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Marchuk: — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I recognize the member opposite for the question. You know, education in our province is a priority. It was articulated in the Throne Speech, articulated in the growth plan. It’s a priority for all the students in our province.

Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to providing a high quality of education system that supports Saskatchewan families and attracts new families to our communities. The funding of qualified independent schools provides parents with that choice.

And as the Minister of Education I am concerned about the quality of education, and that quality of education will be maintained through adherence to the Saskatchewan curriculum and reports through the continuous improvement and accountability framework at the end of the year that all school divisions and qualified independent schools will be required to participate. So all of our students receive the same quality of education and are guaranteed that quality. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, almost one year ago that government forged ahead, diverting dollars from our publicly funded education system into funding new private schools. This came as a shock to many. It wasn’t mentioned in the election campaign and there was no consultation with the education sector. Beyond the risk of fragmenting education, it takes dollars away at a time that we need to properly fund and support education in this province.

We do have a new Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, who has a long history in publicly funded education. To the minister: does he support the changes that were introduced a year ago to divert dollars from our publicly funded education system and into new private, independent schools?
The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Marchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the member opposite for the question. Mr. Speaker, funding parents’ choices for schools in Saskatchewan’s not new. We fund the Catholic school system to 100 per cent of funding. We fund stand-alone Protestant school at 100 per cent, including capital. Historical high schools have been funded. Alternative schools are funded. Associate schools that are faith or culturally based have been funded.

Mr. Speaker, we’re concerned about educating all of our students in this province and allowing parents the choice to send their children to the schools of their choice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The government introduced this plan, as I say, about a year ago, to start funding these new private, independent schools. It’s not about the traditional relationship that’s been had with many deliverers of education. These schools can have as few, Mr. Speaker, as just a handful of students in some of them.

When concerns were raised, the government made the claim that somehow these schools were being funded with new dollars. Of course that’s just not so. In fact, since the government announced its plan to divert dollars to new private schools, the publicly funded education system has faced more and more constraints and cutbacks. Students and staff have suffered as a result and school boards have become frustrated. I guess my question to the Minister of Education: why is he more committed to fragmenting education instead of strengthening it?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Marchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again I recognize the member opposite. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the education of children. Children are the most important resource that we have in our province and it’s critical to our growth plan going forward. And I want to make sure that every single student in this province has a high quality of education that adheres to that, that adheres to the Saskatchewan curriculum, and that we can monitor that as we go forward. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to provide funding to allow parents to make that choice for their children. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Mr. Speaker, interesting comment from the minister because the environment’s something different. School boards have been forced to make cuts because of that government’s actions. We’ve seen province-wide cuts and reductions of educational assistants all across this province. Full-day kindergarten has been cut. Classrooms and schools are overcrowded. Vibrant neighbourhoods are without schools. Others with health and safety issues haven’t been fixed or addressed by that government.

The reality is that classrooms and the people in them — students and teachers and professionals — are strained and pressured. Will the minister do the right thing? Will he stop diverting dollars from a publicly funded education system? Will he put forward a plan that supports all students in this province?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Marchuk: — Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again I recognize the member opposite for the question.

Mr. Speaker, we have had unprecedented contributions to education funding in this province: a 21 per cent increase in funding over the course of our government; $500 million in capital expenditures since coming to office, Mr. Speaker. And on top of that we’ve had an historic tax reduction, property tax reduction, which has allowed our province to continue to grow.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to make investments in education. We will continue to make education a priority. And we will continue to do that so that our children have the best opportunities going forward and will lead this country in student outcomes as we move forward, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Planning for Closure of Valley View Centre

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sask Party government decided earlier this year to close Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw. When governments make decisions like this, decisions that impact so many people, there needs to be a proper plan in place for residents, their families, and the caregivers who have provided hands-on care for many years.

It has now been nine months since the government first announced this decision. That’s a good chunk of time that’s already disappeared from the tight timeline the government put in place before the final resident is moved out of their home at Valley View.

Without the rhetoric we’ve all heard before about there being more work that needs to be done, can the minister explain specifically what work the government has done so far to ensure that there’s a proper plan in place for the closure of Valley View Centre?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the work we have done when it comes to Valley View and the residents. There is planning and consultation that has been going on with individual residents and with their families since we made the announcement last February. It’s very important that we have a person-centred plan as we go forward so that each individual, we can customize the work that should be done and the places that they should be living in. There’s residential care services that’s going to be needed for them as an individual.

Mr. Speaker, we’re going to develop a made-in-Saskatchewan
plan. We have a committee that’s made up with the members of the Valley View families. We’re working with SACL [Saskatchewan Association for Community Living]. We’re working with other involved individuals as well as the staff that are working out at Valley View to ensure that as we move forward, Valley View residents have the very best place to live that they can, and be part of our community.

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are more than 200 residents who will need another safe, caring, and supportive home when Valley View closes its doors because of the Sask Party government’s decision. This is something all Saskatchewan people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, it’s the minister’s responsibility to ensure that every resident has clear options from which to choose, and those options should be developed with input by those who know best: the residents, their families, their caregivers, experts in the field, and others. Without a clear plan, confusion, frustration, and fear loom large from residents and their families. And that, despite the minister’s comments about consultations, is exactly what I’m hearing is happening to far too many residents and their families.

What are the clear and explicit options being provided to residents and their families as they face this move? That’s what they would like to know.

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, I’m sure the member opposite is aware that in 2002 the NDP government decided to not take any more admissions into Valley View. And at that time they didn’t really make an announcement about it; they just sort of let it happen.

So what we really need to do is make sure that we have an involvement with the families and with the community. We have met with them individually. By the end of November, every family member will have been met with and the discussion on what they would like to have done with their loved one, in conjunction with the government, is going to go forward.

The group has also made trips to three other provinces and went to other residences and looked at other organizations and structures to help them determine what should be happening into the future. We also have looked at residences within the province and we’ve had a chance to meet as a group on many occasions to see what the plan is going to be.

The group has also made trips to three other provinces and went to other residences and looked at other organizations and structures to help them determine what should be happening into the future. We also have looked at residences within the province and we’ve had a chance to meet as a group on many occasions to see what the plan is going to be.

I’m hoping that in beginning of January, they will be presenting to me and to our government the options that the families and the residents lay out in front of us. This is not the opposition’s decision. This is not government’s decision. This is for the people of Valley View and their families.

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since many of the Valley View residents have spent their lifetime in Moose Jaw, they will likely want to remain in Moose Jaw, but some will want to locate to other communities.

Unfortunately, we are hearing concerns from health professionals, especially those who work in acute care. They are worried Valley View residents will end up in emergency wards or places like the Dubé Centre in Saskatoon because inadequate supports currently exist in the community. They worry because the government has not yet articulated a plan or a clear timeline to create the necessary residential spaces or what these spaces will look like. A Saskatoon Health Region employee said to me, “The closure of Valley View keeps those working in acute care awake at night.”

How does the minister plan to create the much needed capacity for residential options in Moose Jaw or other communities across the province to ensure the best outcomes of community living are realized for the residents of Valley View?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, in 2002 the then minister, Joanne Crofford, said that the decision is a gradual phase-out, would be the best way to describe it. So over the last number of years, there’s been a phase-out. We are down to 203 residents in Valley View, and we have to ensure that we have the spaces in place where they need to be geographically and with the very best trained staff, Mr. Speaker.

June Avivi who is the Co-Chair of the Valley View group home said, “The Valley View group home family applauds the decision of government, and we are pleased to move from talking the talk to walking the walk.”

Mr. Speaker, that’s what we are doing. We’re ensuring that as we move forward . . . And the closure isn’t going to happen till 2015, and there’ll be a transition. We have to ensure that the right spaces are there. We have to ensure that we’ve had input from the families and from the communities and that the people, the 2,003 residents we have now . . . And as we develop the model into the future, will be the very best model there is in Canada.

[10:45]

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

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The closure of Valley View is a very significant decision. It’s significant for the families and for the residents who are affected, but it’s also very significant for the community of Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, and from an economic perspective. Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw has been a large employer in the community for many decades, currently employing over 500 people. Mr. Speaker, these 500 people who are working at Valley View Centre support local businesses. Mr. Speaker, they pay mortgages in the community, and they pay taxes to the city.

My question to the Minister Responsible for Employment: has the ministry done an analysis of what the economic impact will
be with the loss of potential jobs related to Valley View Centre?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, when our government talks about Valley View, we’re talking about the residents in Valley View. We’re talking about the people who need special care and help because they have a disability, many of them very complex disabilities. I acknowledge, and so do all my colleagues, that the support they’re getting from the staff there is very, very important. But what we’re really doing is designing a home — not a place to put your head; a home — for individuals as they move forward.

The institution that’s in Moose Jaw right now is the only one of two that are left in Canada where we actually institutionalize people that have a disability. Mr. Speaker, we have to move forward, and we will move forward to ensure that we are giving these individuals the very best care as we move forward. And that will take into consideration the plans of the family. And I’m sure some of the places will be in Moose Jaw, but I’m waiting to hear from the families of the residents of Valley View.

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

Mr. Broten: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do thank the minister for that answer. And I would agree, Mr. Speaker: when we’re talking about the closure of Valley View, the interests of the residents, Mr. Speaker, have to be the top concern.

But what I’m asking about also are the implications for the community because that’s an important part of the decision too, Mr. Speaker, which can’t be overlooked. And I think now realizing that, it’s important to ask, Mr. Speaker, what’s next for the community of Moose Jaw? And what’s next for the employees who have been working at Valley View Centre for many, many years in some cases?

The monthly payroll, Mr. Speaker, at Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw is $1.8 million. That’s $1.8 million that goes into local businesses, purchases cars at dealerships, Mr. Speaker, and pays mortgages for the homes in the community. These are also the same workers, Mr. Speaker, who make Moose Jaw such a great place to live, who volunteer in the community and give themselves to so many causes. And I’m worried, Mr. Speaker, that with no cabinet minister at the table from Moose Jaw, we’re talking about Valley View when you’re talking to me. We’re talking about the opportunity to ensure that the 203 people, with some of them very complex disabilities, have the opportunity to be included into the community.

My question to the Minister of Employment: what is the plan with respect to employment in Moose Jaw to ensure that the people that are working at Valley View Centre, and have served faithfully for many years, have a bright future in Moose Jaw?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, when we’re talking about Valley View, we’re talking about the people that live at Valley View when you’re talking to me. We’re talking about the opportunity to ensure that the 203 people, with some of them very complex disabilities, have the opportunity to be included into the community.

Mr. Speaker, I’m well aware that we have very dedicated staff. I’m well aware that some of the residents consider those staff family, and that’s why we’re working with, to ensure that families have options when it comes to where buildings will be built, where there’ll be other opportunities for these residents to be part of.

What I don’t understand is why the members opposite left the list of 440 people with complex disabilities on a list and didn’t really think about them at all. They didn’t care about who was going to be looking after them, and they weren’t fighting for a job for those either. Mr. Speaker, the record of the members opposite when it comes to people with disabilities is dismal.
The Speaker: — I recognize the member for Saskatoon Massey Place.

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Speaker, when we’re discussing the closure of Valley View Centre, indeed there are many factors to consider. And as we covered in question period, a very important factor to consider, the most important factor, is the care for the residents. There are other concerns, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the local economy and employment in Moose Jaw, and if the Minister for Social Services doesn’t want to answer those questions, it’s open to any minister who would like to speak about that real aspect of the closure.

Mr. Speaker, we’ve heard in question period how many families have concerns about the plan or the lack of plan or the progress of plan. It’s necessary for the Sask Party government to be much more clear on that.

Mr. Speaker, we’ve heard also that there’s no real plan, according to the answers that have been provided, with respect to transitioning employees to other options, to new careers or new places. Based on this, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the local MLAs are going to bat for their community for those Sask Party members that are sitting around the caucus table.

My question to the minister: at a time when the people in Moose Jaw need a clear plan on employment, on the future of Valley View, all they’re getting, Mr. Speaker, from members opposite is the request to just trust us. Why is that so?

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Social Services.

Hon. Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Moose Jaw care very much. They care about the residents of Valley View. They care about the people that are working in Moose Jaw. They care about the future of their city. That’s why they’re delighted about the hospital. That’s why they’re delighted about the increase in the number of people living in the potash mines that are going up. That’s why they’re delighted about the local economy and employment in the province. And that’s why they’re happy that we’re going to take till 2015 or thereabouts to ensure that there are residents and the places for these residents is right. We have to ensure that we are doing the best for the people with disabilities. That is our concern, along with the people that look after them. But I am concerned about the 203 people that call Valley View home.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 67 — The Community Planning Profession Act, 2012

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Government Relations.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 67, The Community Planning Profession Act, 2012 be now introduced and read a first time.

The Speaker: — The Minister of Government Relations has moved first reading of Bill No. 67, The Community Planning Profession Act, 2012. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — First reading of this bill.

The Speaker: — When shall the bill be read a second time? I recognize the Minister of Government Relations.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Next sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Next sitting.

Bill No. 68 — The Justices of the Peace Amendment Act, 2012/Loi de 2012 modifiant la Loi de 1988 sur les juges de paix

The Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wyant: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 68, The Justices of the Peace Amendment Act, 2012 be now introduced and read a first time.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by . . . The Minister of Justice and Attorney General moved first reading of Bill No. 68, The Justices of the Peace Amendment Act, 2012. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Carried.

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: — First reading of this bill.

The Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Wyant: — Next sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

The Speaker: — I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

Performance of Government

Mr. McCall: — Mr. Speaker, it’s with mixed feelings, mixed emotions that I rise to move this motion today, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it’s interesting, you know, just this time last year we’d wrapped up a time out on the campaign trail, and certainly the parties had put forward their platforms, the people had made their judgment. And of course the people in their wisdom saw fit to return, you know, 49 on the one side and 9 on the other.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? Fair enough. That’s democracy. That’s people putting forward their platforms, having them weighed and assayed, putting forward their candidates, their leaders, and then the people make their decision. And one of the things that is important in that is that you’re being upfront with the people as to what your plans are. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I’ve been around here long enough to have seen the members say, oh, there’s no hidden agenda.
here, Mr. Speaker. There’s no sort of secret plans. There’s no sort of off-the-balance sheet arrangements, Mr. Speaker.

But I think what we’ve seen over the past five years, and over the past year in particular, Mr. Speaker, is a record from this government that didn’t match up with the bill of goods that was being promoted in the campaign. And I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, out there on the hustings in terms of places like say, Trianon, or Davis Mews, I think of the seniors that looked at the record of that government in terms of what was being promoted around the seniors’ income plan. And certainly there was some very fine-sounding things that they came forward in that.

And come the budget, Mr. Speaker, there was again another fine bit of rhetoric in terms of the attention that was being paid to the seniors and to the seniors’ income plan, and the kind of benefits that that government was putting forward for the pioneers in this province, the people who have done the most to build this province. But what we didn’t hear about on the hustings, of course, Mr. Speaker, but what we heard about in the budget was the fact that for every dollar that was being put forward in the seniors’ income plan, there were $3 being clawed back in terms of the prescription drug plan for seniors.

And again, Mr. Speaker, it’s not, it’s not hardly surprising that in politics, you know, I guess this is the thing that engenders a bit of cynicism on the part of the electorate that makes people look at the politicians that seek to speak to their needs, their hopes and aspirations. It makes people cynical in terms of what comes forward at election time and then what gets practised thereafter.

And I think about the different sort of seniors’ polls, and certainly they had a very compelling platform and what happened in the campaign. And there were a lot of seniors that bought that bill of goods from that party opposite, Mr. Speaker, many of them for the first time. But I often think about, you know, it’s too darn bad they didn’t campaign on the idea that, you know, for every dollar that we’re going to talk about in terms of the seniors’ income plan, putting forward for your benefit, we’re going to take three of them back in terms of the prescription drug plan for seniors.

And, Mr. Speaker, if they’d had that kind of forthrightness on the hustings, if they’d been straight up with the seniors in that particular case, I think we would have had a different result in terms of some of those polls. I know that for a fact, Mr. Speaker. And I’m very interested to see how this plays out in the next election because, of course, elections are when you make your covenant with the people. It’s when you say, here’s what we’re going to do. Here’s what our plans are. And it was nowhere in terms of the Sask Party platform in this last campaign.

And I guess, Mr. Speaker, I raise that because for me it’s a particularly egregious example of the surprises that the Sask Party played once getting elected. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, they didn’t campaign on three more MLAs in terms of what their plans were for the people. And I would’ve like to see how that worked out on the doorstep, Mr. Speaker, that you’re high on your friendly neighbourhood Sask Party candidate and, you know, above all else in terms of the things that we want to do for the people of Saskatchewan, we don’t think you have enough MLAs. I don’t think that that would have gone very far on the doorstep, Mr. Speaker.

So again, that they saved it as a surprise to sort of whack the people with after they’d gotten elected is not a surprise in and of itself, Mr. Speaker. But what it does do is feed into the cynicism, feed into the kind of disrepute that what should be an honourable profession sometimes falls into. Because if you’re not straight with the people at election time — which they had full opportunity to do so, Mr. Speaker — then they would’ve said, well you know, a growth agenda, that would include growth in our number of politicians. But were they there for that, Mr. Speaker? They were not. They were not.

And I guess, you know, I think about all the doorsteps I’ve had the pleasure of being on and the opportunity to be on and the kind of tough questions you get from people out there when you’re talking about what issues are important to them and what it takes for them to express support for you. And that is no small thing in this pursuit of ours in terms of politics, in terms of trying to do good on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

But one thing I know for sure about the people of Saskatchewan and the people that I’ve had the opportunity to meet in election campaigns and between election campaigns, Mr. Speaker, is that they appreciate honesty. They appreciate being forthright and they appreciate people levelling with them. And in too many circumstances, Mr. Speaker, we’ve seen this government not be straight with the people at election time, but post-election, Mr. Speaker, the surprises keep rolling out.

And further in that train, Mr. Speaker, we see what’s happened with the film industry. And that one is particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker, because I represent a very diverse riding. But I represent a riding that, one of the great things about it is the impact that the cultural industries have in the riding of Regina Elphinstone-Centre. And we have a lot of people that are directly affected by the film and television industry in Regina Elphinstone-Centre.

And there were people, I can distinctly recall a conversation I had on a doorstep just off Victoria, Mr. Speaker, in the campaign where I talked to one of those cultural workers, and their interest in the Sask Party’s platform because their leader had come out to a Saskatchewan Arts Alliance thing before the 2007 election. You know, it didn’t sound too bad. They were interested in what might be said after the election, despite the things that had been said earlier in the decade around the sound stage and the kind of attacks that the members opposite had levelled against the cultural industry.

After that, Mr. Speaker, you know, the 2007 election, it was time to make nice. The Sask Party came forward and were all smiles and chuckles about, you know you do a great job. And the Premier went on Corner Gas and, you know, there’s a great shining up of the industry that went on.

And in 2009, we had the cultural industry’s report where again the film industry and the approach to that sector by the government was again confirmed and affirmed. And people in
the film and television industry had every reason to believe that, you know — despite some obvious departures such as the sale of SCN [Saskatchewan Communications Network] and the way that that was botched through, Mr. Speaker — they had every reason to expect that this government was as good as its word when it said, well you know, we think you’re doing a great job. Keep up the good work. What can we do to help?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we find out that again campaign time, for one thing with this party, is something very different when it comes to actual governance. Because there was no forewarning, in fact there was, you know, indications all in the opposite direction: that this government opposite supported the film and television industry, that they thought there was good work being done, that there was a sound economic return to the province, that it was a good investment on the part of the people of Saskatchewan. Only come budget day, Mr. Speaker, do we find out that there’s some kind of vendetta that they’ve got to see through in terms of what they . . . And I have no other way to . . . You know, the kind of ignorance or misunderstanding is one way to put it, Mr. Speaker, straight and malevolent in terms of the way that they’ve approached the industry on the other. And the kind of disingenuous approaches that they’ve made and the way that the then minister botched the file and the way that that has been played through by the current minister, all the while backed up by the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

And again, this is a Premier that was quite happy to make nice and try to, you know, build that big tent before elections, and after the 2007 election was quite happy to jump on the Corner Gas bandwagon and come along for a shine. But, Mr. Speaker, if you’re there for the good times, you’re there for the work as well. And I think that’s something else that Saskatchewan people appreciate, is that you just don’t sort of show up to jump on the float at the parade, but you’re there to roll up your sleeves and do the work.

Government had been a partner in the very successful work of the film and television industry in this province, and it had been a point of pride that was so compelling, Mr. Speaker, that we saw the kind of charm offensive that the members opposite felt that they had to engage in before the 2007 election and the kind of assuaging and sort of hold-the-line work that was done before the 2011 election.

And I think back to that conversation I had on Victoria Avenue, Mr. Speaker, where that cultural worker was very interested in what the Premier had to say, what the Sask Party was campaigning on. And there was a general sense on the part of that individual of, well you know, how bad could it be under the Sask Party? So far it’s been pretty good. And in that particular profession, you know, there have been some bumps. But this is a government that’s not hostile to our interest. This is a government that, you know, claims some kind of interest and is interested in coming around to shine us up at the good times, you know. Fair enough, as long as they keep working in partnership on the other sort of tools that have built the industry in this province.

But there was no indication on the part of those members in terms of the hustings, and there’s certainly no indication — be it on the public record or leading up to the election in 2011, and certainly not after — up until the budget when of course they dropped the hammer on the industry, Mr. Speaker. And then the Premier got religion on the whole question of what happens, how you support a film industry in this province.

And it’s been interesting to see them carry forth since then, Mr. Speaker, and the kind of lessons that I think they’re teaching the people of Saskatchewan, wherein if you don’t agree with this government, here are the kind of boots that they’re going to put to you. And if your facts don’t agree with their view of reality, then they’ll just go and order up some other facts. Again, Mr. Speaker, there’s evidence-based decision making, and in this case I think we’ve got opinion-based evidence making in terms of the way that these individuals have approached what has been a valuable sector for this economy and the kind of political games that they’ve played with an industry and with people’s lives.

And I think of no finer example of how that has played out in the fair riding of Regina Elphinstone-Centre, Mr. Speaker, where this week we’ve had word of Partners in Motion being included in the work around Argo and the kind of positive attention that draws to the industry in this province. And again, Mr. Speaker, Partners in Motion, before this government had rolled out the wrecking ball to the industry, Partners in Motion was headquartered in the riding of Regina Elphinstone-Centre, just down from Taylor Field, Mr. Speaker. And of course, the Partners in Motion headquarters today has a for lease sign in the window because they’ve moved out to British Columbia where there’s a province that, when they say that they’re going to work in partnership with the industry, then they’re going to take care of their promises.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the case of, in the case of the seniors’ drug plan, in the case of what has happened around three more MLAs, in the case of the film industry, and now one thing I’d like to add too, Mr. Speaker, is the case with the Information Services Corporation. And again this is a government that in the aftermath of 2003, they took a good, hard look at their record and despite decades of lip service to the notion of, well if it’s a public corporation then we should sell it off, they figured out in the 2003 election that that wasn’t where the people of Saskatchewan were at. So what have they got to do, Mr. Speaker? Well they got rid of their leader faster than you could say Jack Robinson.

Then after that, Mr. Speaker, they figured well we’d better take the pledge and say that we’re for public ownership of our Crown corporations, full stop, period, four-square. And again, Mr. Speaker, there are some of us, you know — call me cynical — that doubted the conversion experience on the road to electoral Damascus that went on over there. But they took the pledge. They didn’t talk about, you know, how it was a pinky swear or that you should see the asterisk and the footnotes and the sort of exceptions that have been made to the deal or that, you know, there’s some fine print that we’ve got our fingers crossed behind our back upon, Mr. Speaker. That was the order of the day from the leadership on down in that party.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, now we find out about the plans they’ve got for ISC [Information Services Corporation of Saskatchewan]. And this is no surprise, I guess this is no surprise for those that have some passing familiarity with the record of the members opposite and what happened in this
province in the 1980s, what happened in this province in the 1990s, and the fact that the 2003 election saw privatization as a pivotal issue on which they felt like they needed to do some inoculation, Mr. Speaker.

So they took the pledge, and since then, Mr. Speaker, I think what they’ve been pursuing is for the most part a path of incrementalism. You know they’re not going to get right the wing revolution completed all at once, Mr. Speaker. They want to do it brick by brick and build that wall so it’s nice and tall and do it like that, Mr. Speaker, not all in one go. And I think the Premier, you know, is a gifted communicator and has been very persuasive to his troops in making that happen and saying, you know, that it’s a long game that we’re looking to play. We can’t do it all at once like the Mike Harris revolution. We can’t do it like the post-’86 Devine operation which, you know, that Premier had a front-row seat in the operations of, Mr. Speaker, and the way that they pursued privatization. So what they were going to do was go after privatization incrementally.

And we see that in spades in this recent passage, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what’s happening with ISC. We see it with the interference that has been bandied around with the operations of SLGA [Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority]. And we see it in terms of normal functions of other Crown corporations being privatized out, contracted out to third party operators when that work had been performed and performed well and cost effectively for the people of Saskatchewan by the people of Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I’m quite happy to be in this debate today to move the following motion:

That this Assembly condemns the government for a legislative agenda for surprises that people didn’t vote for, including spending millions of dollars to add three more MLAs, decimating the film industry and privatizing our information Crown, ISC (Information Services Corporation).

I so move.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Opposition House Leader:

That this Assembly condemns the government for a legislative agenda of surprises that people didn’t vote for, including spending millions of dollars to add three more MLAs, decimating the film industry and privatizing our information Crown, ISC (Information Services Corporation).

Is the Assembly ready for the question? I recognize the member for Carrot River Valley.

Mr. Bradshaw: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Surprisingly, well surprisingly I don’t support this motion. It is my pleasure to join in this debate and inform this Legislative Assembly of what the people of Saskatchewan did not vote for.

Mr. Speaker, what Saskatchewan people didn’t vote for were the surprises of the former NDP government. Saskatchewan people did not vote for the closure of 52 rural hospitals, surprisingly — two of them in Carrot River Valley constituency, both Arborfield and Carrot River. Surprisingly that was never mentioned in their platform. They didn’t vote for the longest surgical wait times in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Isn’t that a surprise. Mr. Speaker? They didn’t vote for the alarming shortage of nurses and the worst doctor retention in all of Canada. Surprise again.

They didn’t vote for the expansion of the $1 billion pothole in our highways or an ad hoc plan to infrastructure divestment. And they definitely didn’t vote for a government that told them to fix their own potholes.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan people did not vote to keep on going into risky ventures, risky, money-losing ventures, surprisingly. Now here’s a surprise. We have tapped into.com which cost a surprising $6.7 million; Persona, the cost a surprising 9.4 million; Navigata, 43.4 million; Retx.com, 26 million, another surprise; Craig Wireless, 10 million; NST [NST Network Services of Chicago], 16 million. These are surprises, Mr. Speaker. They are not myths. They are surprises.

We can continue on. And let’s get down to SPUDCO [Saskatchewan Potato Utility Development Company], what was surprisingly supposed to be, supposed to be a government and private partnership. Unfortunately, surprisingly, there were no private partners. Isn’t that a real surprise, Mr. Speaker?

Channel Lake, a surprising 15 million; Guyana, a surprising 2 million; Coachman Insurance, 16.1 million. Then, oh yes, let’s get into the bingo. Bingo, yes, we wanted to a have a surprise in the bingo end of it. These are not myths. These are surprises that the NDP . . . The people in Saskatchewan did not want to continue on going with that.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan didn’t vote for a party that raised taxes 17 times while in government including the PST [provincial sales tax] three times, income tax twice, business taxes four times, and fuel taxes twice. They definitely didn’t vote for surprising tax increase in PST right after the election in 2003 when they said that they weren’t going to raise taxes. That was surprisingly not on their platform.

Mr. Speaker, they did not vote for a party that wouldn’t increase a seniors’ income plan for 16 years or a party that eliminated nearly 1,200 long-term care beds and closed 16 long-term care facilities. Mr. Speaker, this government surprisingly decided to open up 13 new ones.
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Mr. Speaker, they did not vote for child welfare caseloads to grow by 53 per cent from 2000 to 2007. And they did not vote for a former government that allowed 440 people with disabilities to go without the care they needed.

And, Mr. Speaker, surprisingly they forgot about rural Saskatchewan, the oft-neglected area of the NDP policy. Not only did they close the hospitals, they decided to just to stay on the status quo when it came to education property taxes although they said they were going to change it. Surprisingly they didn’t. They did not vote, the rural people of rural Saskatchewan did not vote for the NDP who surprisingly tore
Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan did not vote for a government that closed 31 rural offices over 16 years. The people of Saskatchewan did not vote for a government that clawed back 600 million from municipalities and off-loaded costs onto RMs [rural municipality] and cities. The RMs and the cities are quite happy now.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan did not vote for the 22,000 people leaving the provinces in the decade, in the past decade that that government was in power. I’m proud to say that my children are both working in this province of Saskatchewan. That’s a surprise for the NDP that they’re actually staying here.

You know, but according to the NDP, the out-migration wasn’t such a bad thing because, and I quote, we ought not to worry because when people leave there is “more left for the rest of us.” The former NDP Economic Development minister, Eldon Lautermilch, said that, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan definitely did not vote for that economic development plan — what a surprise.

And that’s just their record, Mr. Speaker. We haven’t even talked about their campaign platform. Let’s talk about the financial aspect of their platform which I assume was put together by their Finance critic from Regina Rosemont. Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the member from Regina Rosemont has leadership aspirations. And as Finance critic you would think that he would be a financial guru, financially prudent. But, Mr. Speaker, this want-to-be leader can’t even manage his own leadership campaign funds. He acts ... Surprisingly he’s spending close to twice as much as what he’s bringing in. And he wants to manage this province, Mr. Speaker? Yikes.

Mr. Speaker, in the NDP 2000 election platform, the members opposite put forward a reckless and unaffordable plan that would have drowned our province in debt. The people did not vote for a platform that cost $3.1 billion which would create a 2.4 billion deficit. The people of Saskatchewan did not vote for a revenue sharing plan with First Nations that wasn’t costed. Revenue resources in this province belong to all Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan people did not vote for an antiquated reliance on failed policies like rent control. They did not vote for a reckless hike in our province’s royalty rates. They did not vote for a platform or a party that would take Saskatchewan back, back to a period of economic stagnation, to where our province’s youth were heading west in droves.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit there were some surprises. When this government was elected in 2007, we had a platform, a platform that contained many promises, promises of what we would do as government if we had the privilege and confidence of the Saskatchewan people. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? We kept those promises. This was a surprise to the NDP because they just didn’t believe that a political party was supposed to keep the promises that were made in the heat of an election battle — surprise. The good people of Saskatchewan took notes. They remembered that in the 16 years that the NDP were in government, every time there was an election, they would say one thing, and when the dust settled and they were back in power, they’d renege on everything they said.

That’s why, Mr. Speaker, in the election of 2011, the people of this province said, we believe in the Saskatchewan Party. They said what they were going to do, and they did it. To that end, Mr. Speaker, this is why there are so many on this side of the House and so few on that side.

Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise. It’s just a simple matter of doing what you say you’ll do and keeping your commitments. Mr. Speaker, what Saskatchewan didn’t vote for is that former NDP government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government has come forward at a time when the economy has done very well. And we know that in the election of 2007, there was a concern that the Sask Party government would be able to manage the economy. And the economy’s done well. But it’s built on a base and, frankly, a lot of cash that was available when they were elected at that time.

In the 2011 budget, the Sask Party ran on a platform that didn’t have a lot of promises in it. And so what we’ve seen in the last year is continual surprises.

Now last week I got to go through a whole list of those surprises when we were talking in the 75-minute debate. This week I want to talk about a couple of things which I think are troubling all of the people of Saskatchewan. The first one is the seeming move by the Premier and executive government to diminish the role of this Legislative Assembly.

What we have is a Premier who seems to be mimicking or copying the kind of thing that’s happening at the national level as parliament is being pushed to the side. This is a trend that we know various political scientists have been looking at as it relates to our parliamentary democracy in Canada. But this session we have been seeing executive government — and I have to believe it’s the Premier that’s behind this — where they are diminishing the role of this place.

And I raise this at this particular time because we have various attempts by ministers, I think at the direction of Executive Council and the Premier, who will schedule events right at the time when question period is on or when people are in the legislature or just after so that what happens is the traditional method of dealing with question period ... And going on, there are other things. To have a full event at a time when many things are happening ... Also what we have is a Premier who ends up announcing his plan for the province at $1,000-a-table luncheon in Saskatoon. And so, Mr. Speaker, what happened ...
the member, the Leader of the Opposition. Other members will have their opportunity to enter into the debate. I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nilson: — And, Mr. Speaker, when the Throne Speech is presented in this House, traditionally there has been a very vigorous and extended debate in the Throne Speech where the ministers present a statement on behalf of their ministry about what their plans are for the year. We didn’t hear a single one of those this year, and in actual fact we ended up then shortening the number of days available. This is a concentrated effort by the Premier and the Executive Council to diminish the role of this legislature. And I think all members, that side of the House and this side of the House, should start thinking about what this means for our role as legislators.

This is a surprise. This is a surprise that has come more so since this last election. It fits with all of the other surprises that are here. And, Mr. Speaker, when the minister . . . the member from . . . The Minister of Highways, the member from Indian Head, is yelling about all of these things in here. He also has a responsibility as the Minister of Highways to get up in this legislature and tell us what the Highways department is going to be doing. The Minister of Health has that responsibility, all of those ministers do. But we ended up not hearing that kind of information at all.

And, Mr. Speaker, that diminishes the role of us in this legislature. It diminishes the ability of the people to understand what this government is doing. We’re not quite certain whether this is an attempt by the Premier to control the message. He doesn’t want too many voices out there. That’s what we see in Ottawa. But are we seeing the same thing here? I hope not because practically what we want in any legislature is the ability to get the information out to the public but also get it out to us who are here in this legislature. Over the years there is a concerted effort by the Premier to diminish what is happening in this place. And I ask him, I ask all of those members to think about things that they are doing that cause some difficulties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the legislature and the role of the legislators is diminished, it diminishes the ability of the people of the province to have a say in what happens. And that’s why this motion is here today because there are too many things that are surprises. I mean, nobody voted for more MLAs. Nobody voted for eliminating counting people under 18 in calculating the boundaries. Nobody voted for damaging the film industry without any other plan in place. Nobody voted for increasing costs in municipalities.

I mean practically one of the things that was the centrepiece of this Premier’s election campaign in 2007 was enterprise and enterprise regions, and there wasn’t any mention in the last election that they were going to wipe these out. And in fact people in various parts of the province were quite disappointed when that happened because effectively what it did is it off-loaded the costs of that regional economic development on to municipalities, whether they’re RM’s or urban municipalities, in a way that nobody anticipated in last year’s election.

And frankly it affects many of the rural ridings of the members opposite, and we don’t hear very much, if anything, about that. And what we’re hearing as opposition is there’s a surprise that goes right to the heart of developing the economy of this province, and our MLAs don’t say anything about it. So what’s . . . you know, there’s a surprise that’s hurting all of us.

What we know, we have the surprise in this Throne Speech of them bringing back the old P3 [public-private partnership] secretariat. We know that that didn’t work, so they changed the name of it, tried to reorganize it, and they’re coming forward with this SaskBuilds operation. What we know about that is that if you don’t have the money to do things, you try to figure out ways to spread the costs out down into the future on to future generations.

Frankly we’ve had enough of that in Saskatchewan with what happened in the 1980s. And, Mr. Speaker, they love to go back and talk about history, but they always forget that decade because that’s where many of these people learned their skills in running the province. And that’s the biggest surprise that people in Saskatchewan are afraid of, is that the Premier will return to some of the failed policies of the ’80s and put us in financial difficulty.
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What we know over the last few years is that the government says that they’re going to have a balanced budget, but by the end of the year, we’re into a negative situation. We’re looking forward to seeing the six-month statement of the province, but we know that it’s going to be some very, very big challenges there as we move forward. So we probably will end up with a fourth year in a row of negative number at the end of the year.

You can’t manage this province by spending more money than you’ve got. And unfortunately we saw that in the ’80s. We don’t want to see that big surprise showing up in the next number of years. And so when people talk about government running . . . organized by delivering surprises, that’s the biggest one that everyone is worried about. So I’m going to be speaking in favour of this motion.

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

Mr. Makowsky: — Well thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. It’s my pleasure to enter the debate today. Again it’s my pleasure to speak on the government’s behalf on the motion from the member from Elphinstone-Centre. I’m a little surprised by the motion actually. That’s one of the surprises. I mean it paints a pretty bad picture from their record for 16 years. He must’ve forgot about that. I think the rest of the province wants to forget about it too.

But certainly there are a lot of surprises, but I think there’s a lot of pleasant surprises that this government has brought to the people of the province the last few years, certainly the most vulnerable. I think just recently it was announced 430 people with disabilities are no longer on a waiting list backlog. Mr. Speaker. They get to live with dignity and respect, and they get to create a home as the minister mentioned. They’re not institutionalized, waiting in a hospital, Mr. Speaker. Along with the SAID [Saskatchewan assured income for disability] program, Mr. Speaker, these people, these folks, our fellow
citizens have a home. And the members opposite, they create lists. They didn’t do anything about it. We got rid of the list. Ten people are still to go, Mr. Speaker. They’re expected to be placed in homes by March of this year, Mr. Speaker.

We just recently, in this country, celebrated or remembered on Remembrance Day, Mr. Speaker. We had veterans here last week. And what our government has done, we’ve given $5,000 scholarships to people, members of our armed service, who we are so proud of, and we’re so happy, the work they do for us overseas and in previous wars, Mr. Speaker. Our government has given those veterans $5,000 or if, heaven forbid — it has happened a few times — if somebody is lost overseas, their kids, their children are able to go to a post-secondary institution. Five thousand dollars goes to those people, Mr. Speaker. I think that’s a surprise that they’re pretty happy with. It’s the only place in Canada where that happens at all.

The high-performance athletes that we saw, were introduced in the House earlier today, I believe they’re out in the rotunda right now, Mr. Speaker. But they make our province very proud, Mr. Speaker. I think they would be surprised that our government brought the Saskatchewan program for athletic excellence . . . provides funding of up to $6,000 per year for a national senior team athlete. That never happened before, Mr. Speaker. We’re certainly proud of those athletes, and we want to support them. I don’t want to put words in their mouths, Mr. Speaker, but I think they would be pleasantly surprised by that announcement.

I think folks in rural Saskatchewan or people who work in mines in sort of remote areas, not in Regina or Saskatoon, they’re surprised when a helicopter if, God forbid, they’re hurt, a helicopter, a new helicopter comes to pick them up, Mr. Speaker. The STARS [Shock Trauma Air Rescue Society] program, it’s helped I’m sure many people massively cut down the time to get to a major tertiary centre, and that’s something we’re certainly proud of. I think those people might be surprised.

Mr. Speaker, personally in my family, I know when I do my taxes, I’m pleasantly surprised as well. I know we have here in Saskatchewan the highest income threshold before paying taxes anywhere in Canada. That helps families. That helps people all across our province. Lower property taxes on the education side — historic reductions in that, Mr. Speaker — $250 active families benefit. One hundred and fourteen thousand people, when they do their taxes, Mr. Speaker, on the Saskatchewan taxes owed, there’s a zero, Mr. Speaker. That helps those people, certainly families all across the province.

Now the NDP raised taxes 17 times, Mr. Speaker, 17 times. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? The former minister, actually, in the NDP government, when it came to taxes, what he said — and it sort of speaks to this idea of surprises sprung on Saskatchewan people — the former Finance minister, Harry Van Mulligen, said, “I suspect that anyone who talks about tax hikes is not likely to be very popular during the course of an election campaign,” Mr. Speaker. He didn’t say, boy, you know, times are tough, things change; we had to make some tough decisions. He said, we knew we were going to do it and we did it. We didn’t tell the people beforehand. So it’s a little rich when they brought this motion ahead, as I mentioned before. That’s the covenant they had as the member mentioned about earlier.

You know, Mr. Speaker, my family was recently surprised, pleasantly surprised again. We’re very lucky. We haven’t had to have surgeries or a lot of hospital stays, Mr. Speaker, in my family, and we thank God for that every day. Recently though in our family, in our immediate family, we knew, he had heard, or we lived through and heard about the old Saskatchewan where we had the longest wait-lists in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

But my family, we were very surprised. We were very fortunate to have great care, first of all. But with the new surgical care initiative, we got our family member into surgery. It was on the urgent list. And, Mr. Speaker, it was within the benchmark set out by the ministry. And he, well he got in on time, and everything seems to be okay right now, Mr. Speaker. And the thing is he doesn’t need follow-up care because he was able to get in.

Now I don’t know if it’s fair to say that that never would have happened in the past, but I think the odds are much better on this with the surgical care initiative . . . excuse me, the surgery initiative. And you know, I like our odds much better when this government’s in power.

So what we saw from the members opposite on this file, and so very close to my family, Mr. Speaker, is . . . What we got from them is rhetoric and excuses, frankly, for many years. And this government, we set aggressive targets, Mr. Speaker. We set aggressive targets. From the members opposite, we heard ideology. We heard spin, and the result was the longest wait times in Canada, Mr. Speaker. With this government now, people can get back to their lives quicker. They can get back to work. They can be grandfathers again, Mr. Speaker, and not have to worry about their health. Not in every case, Mr. Speaker, but a much better chance to get that care they need on this side of the House with our policies as compared to them, Mr. Speaker.

When it comes to surprise, Mr. Speaker, I think people outside our province might be surprised as to what’s happening with Saskatchewan. You know, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, setting those aggressive goals that we’ve seen in the growth plan 2020. A lot of governments, and I certainly I’m not an expert on what happens around the world, but I know a lot of governments, they won’t touch it. You don’t have to look farther than 10 yards across the aisle to see a government that wouldn’t set goals. But they . . . Our government is sort of putting our neck out there, and we’re going to be judged by the electorate on the goals we set, and we’re happy to do that, Mr. Speaker. And we see the results of that in my own family and families right across this province, Mr. Speaker, and we’re very proud of that.

I think when people look at our province, they are surprised that we have a balanced budget, Mr. Speaker. We tabled a balanced budget.

An Hon. Member: — Only one in the country.

Mr. Makowsky: — That’s right, the only one in the country and in a world really that’s awash in red ink, austerity
programs. They talk about, our neighbours to the south, about a fiscal cliff, Mr. Speaker. And they’ve got a lot of problems right around the world, Mr. Speaker. And we’re very lucky in Saskatchewan that this Minister of Finance tabled the Saskatchewan advantage budget, the only balanced budget.

And, Mr. Speaker, people look and are surprised. How do we get a credit upgrade, Mr. Speaker? I haven’t heard of anywhere else in the country, certainly in North America, that’s actually ... In these tough times of high debt and deficit budgets, Mr. Speaker, how do you increase your credit rating? S&P [Standard & Poor’s Corporation] upgraded us to a AAA rating, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, 10 billion, another surprising number since ’07; 20 billion in capital investments. Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of that private sector, Mr. Speaker. Economies around the world would love a stimulus plan like that. They talk about quantitative easing in the States, Mr. Speaker. Any place would love to have a doubling of capital investments in the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing I’m quite surprised about, Mr. Speaker, that’s come up recently and certainly during the NDP leadership campaign, Mr. Speaker, I’m surprised that the two members in the House here have not stood up for Saskatchewan against their NDP federal leader, Mr. Speaker, who wants to tax the oil and gas sector and our natural resources to apparently.

Those two members aren’t standing up for Saskatchewan, and that’s something I’m very surprised at. Maybe surprised isn’t a strong enough word. Maybe shocked; maybe thunderstruck. I don’t know. So I’m quite surprised by that, Mr. Speaker. The only leadership candidate that has stood up is, from what we understand from political pundits around, is certainly the front-runner because he has at least said where he stands. He agrees with the federal leader. Of course we don’t, on this side of the House, agree at all, Mr. Speaker. But you know a lot of people think he is a front-runner. And large reason for that is he has at least taken a stand ...

The Deputy Speaker: — The member’s time has expired. I recognize the member from Riversdale.

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of the motion around this government’s many unwelcome surprises since the last election, including rewriting 100 years of labour legislation, adding three more MLAs, privatizing our Information Services Corporation, the Saskatchewan immigrant nominee program, ensuring that families who had committed to Saskatchewan no longer have the opportunity to bring their loved ones here and have the support network here so they can stay and have a good quality of life here. So there is a long list of those unwelcome surprises, Mr. Speaker.

But I’m going to narrow my focus, and I’m going to focus on the film employment tax credit, which was an incredibly unwelcome surprise. And why, Mr. Speaker, and why, Mr. Speaker, am I choosing to talk about this? Well I am an eternal optimist, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that there are members on the opposite benches who do not understand the ramifications of the cut to the film employment tax credit, Mr. Speaker. I don’t think they understood the benefits. I don’t think they understood the ramifications. So I live in hope — I am an eternal optimist — that this government will do something very quickly about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In terms of the unwelcome surprise around the film employment tax credit, I’m looking at page 35 of the Sask Party’s 2011 election platform where it says, “Promoting Saskatchewan’s arts community,” and this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, “Providing a 10 per cent increase in funding to SaskFilm in the last budget and increasing funding for the Film Employment Tax Credit.”

There’s nothing in this platform, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that would have led anybody to believe that this government, just a few short months later, had the plan to cut an industry off at the knees, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I can tell you that there’s many people who signed the online petition in the spring who voted for this government because there was no indication that this government planned to decimate an industry that is very important to our province.

From that petition ... So you have the opportunity to sign the petition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but you also have the opportunity to leave comments. And Greg Wensel had this to say, Sask Party supporter and business teacher: “... this decision does not hold water. ...”

Ian Rogers, which was signature no. 2,446 on the petition:

Remember me Premier Wall? The guy that shot your Christmas message. Thanks to the SFETC, I’ve had a successful 25 yr. career in the province of my birth, the province I love. Raised a family here. Hoped to retire here. Now I will be forced to follow the producers that leave if I want to continue working on the world-class documentaries I’ve been so lucky to be part of. Merry Christmas to you too.

I don’t think Greg or Ian saw in this government’s last election platform or its Throne Speech any indication of this cut. Shane Chapman, Sask Party supporter, also signed the petition: “... very disappointing. Please reconsider.” Meet Doug Russell: “Dad, volunteer, editor, TV spots for Riders, Rawlco, and you. Now what?”

So I don’t think any of these people or the thousands of people who signed the petition in the spring had any indication in this last Sask Party platform or in last year’s Throne Speech that their industry would be decimated because of an ill-informed decision by this government.

I had an opportunity a week ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to read into the record just a short list of — I only had 90 seconds, so you can only squeeze so many names into 90 seconds, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it’s quite unfortunate that I didn’t have all seven members’ statements to speak to because my list could’ve filled up that time — some of the amazing people, award-winning, talented, skilled people here in Saskatchewan who because of this government’s short-sightedness cutting the film employment tax credit, that they have already had to leave. Within the last nine months, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have already had to leave to pursue their career elsewhere.
I don’t know how the members on that side of the House felt about that list, but I can tell you it sure didn’t feel very good to me, and it sure doesn’t feel very good. It’s downright depressing actually, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the mail that I’ve been cc’d [carbon copy] on that this government has received from people whose lives, their roots have been ripped from this province. And some of them, some of them are Saskatchewanians by birth. They’ve been here their whole lives. Other people have been transplants who’ve chosen to call this province home. And they no longer have that opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this government does not understand the film employment tax credit.

They clearly, in comments that both their minister and their Premier have made, do not get the tax credit, which if any two people on that side of the House should get it, those two should. But I think there’s many members on the government benches who don’t understand it, who need to have a little lesson. There’s many people in the film industry who would be very happy to sit down with government members to explain fully and clearly how the tax credit works, who gets it, and the benefits that it brings.
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Seventy per cent of money spent in Saskatchewan in the film industry came from outside of our borders, Mr. Deputy Speaker: new money to our province; money that wouldn’t have been here had there not been a tax credit, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Just thinking about people who have already left, there’s one individual. He helped build the industry. He’s been in Saskatchewan for 27 years, recently sold his home, actually last week. Possession date was October 31st. He’s packed his bags and he’s on his way to BC [British Columbia], Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Another person, she’s leaving in three days to begin a new job as the head of the Film and Sound Commission with the Department of Economic Development for the Yukon government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Department of Economic Development is hiring a film . . . the Film and Sound Commission is under the Department of Economic Development because the Yukon recognizes that the film industry is a driver of the economic engine in any jurisdiction, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So again, this decision, why am I talking about this? Why am I focused on this? Because this is one of the surprises. This is one of the surprises in this government’s last year that has had huge ramifications. These aren’t numbers. These are people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whose lives have been altered in a way that one would say is not positive, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say the least.

So why am I continuing to talk about this? Because I hope the people on those side of the benches see the error and recognize that sometimes in government it’s okay to say you’re sorry, and that you’ve made a mistake, and fix it. That is what good leadership is about. Everybody makes mistakes. We are not infallible as human beings, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And sometimes it is okay to acknowledge that we are not infallible and that we can fix our errors.

And why continue to talk about it? Because time is of the essence. Every day people continue to leave. Just reading from SMPIA [Saskatchewan Media Production Industry Association], the Saskatchewan Motion Picture Industry Association — Media Production Industry Association’s “Submission for: Moving Saskatchewan’s Creative Industries Forward,” this is in their conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So why is time of the essence?

If funding and programming decisions are left until spring, it will be a monumental task to rebuild our industry. We need a model that works with Canada’s media production system now while there’s still a chance to get back on our feet.

So it’s not exaggeration or hyperbole to say, when I’ve gotten up and asked questions, saying why can the minister or the Premier not fix this now? Now is the time to do this. It is absolutely imperative that we get a system in place before everybody has had to leave or change professions, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think I have some huge concerns with this surprise as well in terms of this government not knowing . . . actually just thinking about what the minister said in the House yesterday. He made a comment where he had commented that, “We think refundable tax credits are not good public policy.” He said this yesterday in the House, Mr. Speaker. But the irony — if you turn to page 134 of the 2012-2013 Estimates, Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport — so we have actually on the same page, the same page we have the film employment tax credit being reduced from 8.2 million to 5.2 million, and right below that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the active families benefit, also a refundable tax credit, being increased from 9 million to 12 million.

And I think the active families credit is a great benefit, Mr. Speaker, as a parent of young children who are involved in activities. But I would think that this minister has some problems with some of the things that he says in the House that are just contradictory and not true. So with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

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

Mr. Tochor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to join in the debate today, and it centres around the premise of a surprise or change. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP fear change and change that brings opportunity. It’s been in their DNA that change is a bad thing, that anything that is different than what is in the past is bad, and we’ve seen that during their time in government.

And what we saw in the ’90s when the NDP was in government is a decline in population, a decline in the economy, and the surprises that went with it. It was a lost generation. So with that the people of Saskatchewan voted for a government that was a little different, a little bit. They didn’t fear the change in opportunity and, Mr. Speaker, they voted for the Saskatchewan Party. And they voted for us because we kept over 140 campaign promises from our 2007 platform, Mr. Speaker.
And that was the surprise that, as a candidate for the first time — was running in 2011 — that I heard at the doorsteps was that they in the past governments didn’t keep their promises. And that’s one of the reasons why I believe that we elected 49 members on this side of the House is that the population looked at what we promised in the 2007 election and what we delivered on. And that’s an impressive résumé of completed promises. And it’s these surprises that a government would keep its word is why I’m lucky enough to represent Saskatoon Eastview.

One of the campaign promises in 2007 that was fulfilled the following day after getting elected is the set election dates. And that was just the start of a flood of promises that we kept in our first term. The people of Saskatchewan voted for a government that has passed four consecutive balanced budgets and reduced debt by 44 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That was a surprise I think to everyone in this province, that a government could decrease our debt by 44 per cent. And that is something I am very proud of, to represent the government that was able to reduce the debt by 44 per cent.

Meanwhile our government has invested 2.2 billion in highways over the four years. This is a 64 per cent increase over the four years of the previous government. That is a surprise the people of the government voted for. This increase in highways resulted in 6000 kilometres of highway being improved. That is what this government has completed in highways.

The people also voted for a government that dramatically reduced surgical wait times. This was a surprise I think to many, is that a right-of-centre party can fix health care. They can turn around the decline that was on . . . The decline of health care and the quality of care that we received from our health care system under the former NDP had the longest surgical wait times in the country. It was the government that claimed that, we can’t set a goal in how many nurses to hire because what if we miss it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the record of this government is that we set goals and we fulfill them. And that is why you’re seeing the surgical wait times in this province reduced significantly. We’ve also hired 120 new police officers. Mr. Speaker, law and order is important to, I believe, most in the province. And what we saw with the former government was not keeping pace to the need of police officers. And what we’ve done is hire 120 new police officers.

We’ve also increased funding by 35 per cent for transition homes and sexual assault centres. We also eliminated the PST on used cars and trucks. That was a surprise that I think the people of Saskatchewan read about in our campaign promise in 2007, and our newly formed government removed the PST on them.

The people of Saskatchewan voted for a government that created the most aggressive graduate retention program in the nation — a rebate of up to $20,000 in post-secondary tuition for those who stay and work in Saskatchewan. That’s a surprise, I think, outside the borders of Saskatchewan that a lot of graduates would love to have in other jurisdictions, but they have to move to this province. And that’s what we’ve seen, is a record in-migration which drives growth. It drives our economy. It drives our tax base which, Mr. Speaker, enables us to fix some of the issues that we have here.

One of the things that this growing economy was able to do, allows us to do, is that we take the dividends of that growth and we have the largest educational property tax reduction in Saskatchewan’s history. That is what growth does, and that’s what change does. And what the opposition calls surprises is really opportunity. That’s what is so important about this economy right now, continuing to grow.

We’ve also, with the dividends of growth, fulfilled the promise to provide municipality revenue sharing to 20 per cent of the PST. Around the country there’s other municipalities would love the opportunity that we provide of having 20 per cent of the PST go directly into the municipalities. That affords them to operate and to improve the cities and towns in the province. And that is a surprise I think that many in the municipalities are pleased with.

On health, it’s dear to me, and it’s one of the reasons why I got involved in politics, is that I was fearful of the health care system in decline, a declining tax base that was not going to be able to afford proper care for my parents and family and loved ones. And that is something I hold dear that this government has been able to improve on. And since November 2007, the number of patients waiting more than a year for surgery has reduced by 81 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That reduction is enormous in fixing some of the issues that we have in health care. Also the number of patients waiting more than six months has been reduced by 56, 56 per cent, Mr. Speaker. These numbers represent families and represents loved ones that are no longer in discomfort and pain. They’re actually getting their surgeries done. It’s a quality of health issue, Mr. Speaker, that we’re able to fix on this side of the Chamber.

Another important announcement and a surprise to many, I believe, is for MS [multiple sclerosis] patients — the surprise that they’ve received that we were committed to funding research in the liberation therapy.

Mr. Speaker, these are surprises that I think that are very positive for the province and ones that are welcomed by Saskatchewan. In health care we also promised to introduce the STARS. And it is currently operating down in Regina, in Saskatoon now. It’s just expanded.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think people would be surprised that under the former government of the NDP, they only had a select few countries where we could recruit trained physicians from. We looked at this and said, this is ridiculous. There’s other countries that we could recruit physicians, and we made that change. Now we’re welcoming right now in 2011, 37 foreign-trained family physicians. This is the surprises that are beneficial to our province and to our economy and to the families that call Saskatchewan home.

Just briefly on education, which is important because that drives the economy, in the last five years we invested 3.5 billion in post-secondary education system. That has been
The Deputy Speaker: — Time for debate has expired. Question. I recognize the member from Regina Qu’Appelle.

Ms. Ross: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 2004 when the NDP were in power, the leader of the Opposition was a government minister and head of the committee that drafted The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act. In a cabinet meeting note from 2004 from Tom Waller, the lawyer who drafted the legislation, shows the NDP deliberately took ISC out of The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act. When asked about this, the leader of the Opposition stated that, and I quote, he had no recollection of this discussion.

To the member from Saskatoon Riversdale: are you surprised that the ISC was left out of The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act?

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What surprises me is that I can’t, I have flipped through the Saskatchewan Party platform and there’s not one single page that outlines any of these surprises — three more MLAs, the changes to the immigrant nominee program, gutting the film employment tax credit. That is what I find surprising, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member for Regina Elphinstone, sorry.

Mr. McCall: — There we are, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question is for the member from Saskatoon Eastview. There is a significant number of seniors in the riding of Saskatoon Eastview. How many doorsteps did that member talk about the increases to the costs that seniors are going to be asked to pay under the prescription drug plan with the Saskatchewan Party government? Did he know about that before the election, or did he get surprised about it by his political bosses along with the rest of the folks?

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

Mr. Tochor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I’d like to thank the member for the question.

What I heard on the doorsteps in Eastview, when I was talking to seniors and I was talking to people throughout the community, is the need for better seniors personal care home benefits. We talked about how the former government never increased the program. What we talked about was subsidizing the difference between a senior’s monthly income and threshold of $1,800, increasing it to $2,000 by 2015. Those are the kind of conversations that we had on the doorsteps in Eastview.

We talked about how do we get the surgical wait times down. And we talked about what we accomplished in our first term and the fact that we’re going to get it down a three-month wait for any surgical care in the province. That is what we talked about on the doorsteps in Saskatoon Eastview.

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

Mr. Parent: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When the NDP were in power, they surprised Saskatchewan people with 17 different tax increases, including raising income taxes twice, raising business taxes four times, raising fuel taxes twice, and raising the PST three times, including a PST hike in 2004 after saying they would not.

Now NDP leadership candidate Erin Weir has proposed a $200 million tax grab from Saskatchewan’s small businesses.

To the member from Saskatoon Riversdale: what other surprise tax hikes is your party proposing?

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the member from Meewasin, I thank him for the question. And I would just like to add that I’m wondering if he heard on the doorstep if people wanted to kill the film industry; add three more MLAs; charge seniors more money for drug prescriptions, more for ambulance rides, more for hygiene supplies living in care facilities, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So I’m just wondering which doorstep the member from Meewasin heard that discussion?

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

Mr. Nilson: — Yes, for the member for Saskatoon Eastview. He talked about what happened when he was on the doorstep during the election. The bigger question for me is, what kind of response is he giving to the people now who are seniors in his riding about these surprises that we’ve outlined today and over the last number of months — increased costs for drugs, increased costs for supplies, and increased costs right across the board, and less money available for the city of Saskatoon. So I ask that member, what’s he saying now?

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

Mr. Tochor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I’d like to thank the member for the question. And he asked about what am I hearing since the election. And I’m proud to tell the member opposite that I’ve been busy in the community. I’ve been out having coffee parties and meeting with seniors.

And you know, what I’m hearing from them is that they’re very grateful that we’ve, with the SIP [seniors’ income plan] program, that we tripled it from the NDP by the end of the second term. That was 16 years without any increase from the opposition. That is what the seniors are remembering — for the 16 years that they were in government, was no increases, the surgical wait times longest in the country, and problems in nursing shortages. And that’s what I’m hearing, is that we’re actually fixing health care. That’s what’s important to the seniors, and that is what we’re hearing in Saskatoon Eastview.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Saskatchewan Rivers.
Ms. Wilson: — March 22nd in an interview with CTV [Canadian Television Network Ltd.] news, the Leader of the Opposition stated that an NDP government would have found money for a non-refundable tax credit for the film industry by clawing back government initiatives for municipalities and agriculture. When the NDP was in government, they surprised rural Saskatchewan. They tore up GRIP contracts, increased crop insurance premiums without increasing coverage, and cut spot loss hail from crop insurance, not once but twice.

To the member from Saskatoon Riverdale: given these cuts that unfairly targeted Saskatchewan producers, are you surprised that the NDP can’t find any support in rural Saskatchewan?

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What surprises me again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government has no justification for adding three more MLAs. Surprise — we’ve got three more politicians. This government has no justification for killing an entire sector. Surprise — we don’t need a film industry here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Surprise — let’s charge seniors more for hygiene supplies living in care facilities. I’m sure that’s what the member from Eastview has been hearing at his coffee parties as he visits with folks. Thank you.

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

Mr. McCall: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. With all respect, the member from Saskatoon Eastview didn’t answer the question. It’s been put to him twice now. So we’ll try it three times, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the third time will be the charm.

And the question is this: did that member level with seniors on the doorstep? Yes or no?

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

Mr. Tochor: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to thank the member for the question. And he talked about levelling and levelling with each other. What I heard from the people from Saskatoon Eastview is they like what we’re doing. They like the direction this province is going. They love the fact that what we say is what we will do, Mr. Speaker.

The seniors of Saskatoon Eastview have expressed interest in why don’t we have long-term care units built in this province. And it’s pretty apparent that the opposition closed long-term care units. They failed to plan for what’s going on with the seniors right now. We have limited . . . What we’re hearing from seniors is that we need more facilities, and that is exactly what we’re doing in this province. That is what the people of Saskatchewan has been levelling with me, and they want this to continue on.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Yorkton.

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. On November 13th, the member from Saskatoon Centre stated, “. . . I think that in a province that at this point in time when we see economic indicators that, you know, the average weekly salary is going up and . . . that generally this province is doing well.” And on November 14th, the member from Athabasca stated that there is “a growing economy in Prince Albert.”

Yet in a Globe and Mail article from October 16th, the Leader of the Opposition stated that Saskatchewan’s economy is “a myth.” To the member from Riversdale: are you surprised that your leader thinks that Saskatchewan’s economy is “a myth”?

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

Ms. Chartier: — Thank you again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you to the member for the question. What is surprising to me is I’m wondering if any of those members from rural Saskatchewan, I’m wondering if any of those members from rural Saskatchewan had heard or explained to anybody that they were abandoning rural Internet users by taking . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The time for the 75-minute debate has expired.

PRIVATE MEMBERS’ PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

PRIVATE MEMBERS’ MOTIONS

Motion No. 1 — Impact of Western Canadian Energy and Resource Boom on Central Canadian Manufacturing Sector

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Hickie.]

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

Mr. Hickie: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It’s a pleasure yet again, two weeks though, Mr. Deputy Speaker, since I last stood in the House to talk about this Dutch disease, this Dutch disease statement by the federal NDP leader that apparently we were led to believe that the NDP supports fully, on the other side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It’s been two weeks and all we’ve heard from the NDP leadership candidates is nothing. Except for one: Mr. Erin Weir did say that he actually in fact enjoys that his name is attached to some of the ads currently on television that links him to the NDP leader, Mr. Mulcair, and the Dutch disease, links him to Mr. Mulcair.

So here we have again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a situation where we have the front-runner . . .
The Deputy Speaker: — The member from Prince Albert Carlton has adjourned debate on this motion and therefore . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Oh he moved, he moved the motion? And I understand that the member’s opportunity for discussing the motion has . . . He’s no longer eligible to discuss it because he has moved the motion and other members are eligible to enter into the debate.

I recognize the member from Arm River-Watrous.

Mr. Brkich: — [Inaudible] . . . join this debate. We’re doing a debate that’s very vitally important to the province of Saskatchewan. You know, natural resources have been the backbone of this province, part of our economy. And it’s always been we’ve always tried to foster a good relationship with the East, and we’ve had that with the government we have. And yet we have a leader now from the NDP that is trying to do an east-west split. I thought we were over that. I thought we were over that for many, many years. You know, that was taken away a long time ago, I thought — that debate.

But now a new leader from the NDP is trying to re-foster that again just to get some votes in down east because they know that they are getting nothing going in the West, you know. And that’s not a debate that we need in this country. That is a debate . . . This country should be pulling together, especially in the economic times that we’re dealing with, that the world situation is dealing with. The economic times are troubling throughout the world as we watch what’s happening in the US, divisions between the parties there and the fiscal problems that they’re having, you know, and not working together for the betterment of the people.

And when parties from the east and west should be working together, should be the view for the betterment of the country, not to try to divide the countries, or not to divide the East, West. Not to go back to the way it was maybe in the 1930s, 1940s when there was always an east-west split. You know, we can’t afford that now. We can’t afford our industry and we can’t afford what’s happening if that happens with the tax.

If that party ever, ever, God forbid, ever forms government and tries to basically shut down the West . . . Not just Saskatchewan’s economy. We’re talking BC. We’re talking Alberta — the tar sands, the oil industry, the uranium industry which they’ve also talked not favourable about on the federal side. You know and our concern is, with the party here, the provincial party here, that they should be standing up for the people.

[12:15]

Because, tell you what, you know, when we formed this party, Saskatchewan Party, that was one of the first things is why I became involved in it. You know, and the constituents I talked to and the people said, you know what? We need a party that stands up for the West, stands up for Saskatchewan, stands up for the interest of Saskatchewan and the West. You know, and that’s what . . . And the leaders that formed the Saskatchewan Party, many of them are still here today. Many of them are still involved in this party, and that was their biggest contribution.

That’s why they formed this party, was for the betterment of this province, Mr. Speaker, for the betterment of the people here. They didn’t do it for any personal gain, not for anything like that. It was that they wanted Saskatchewan to grow, Saskatchewan to be a leader, which we’re working toward, to be an equal partner with each and every province in this Confederation. And that’s what this great country was founded on — to be equal partner with each province.

Now with the motion we brought forward and why we’re pushing the provincial NDP on this is because that’s looking to split that up. That’s looking to say putting their interests ahead of the whole of Canada. You know, and that’s . . .

An Hon. Member: — Political interests.

Mr. Brkich: — Political interests, like the member beside me from Saltcoats. And he’s so right. He was one of the founding members of this great party and that’s, you know, it’s one of the reasons that he told me why he was forming this party — for the betterment of Saskatchewan. He’s seen the potential of the growth in this great province. And the other members, that was their goal in that, you know.

And as I’ve listened to, and I guess listened to the lack of responses, either through the media or even in speeches here, you know, nothing saying ever saying, you know what? This isn’t that right for the province of Saskatchewan — that, you know, we need to work together with Canada. Our party, their party, the NDP, need to work provincially with the federal for the betterment of the whole country which includes treating Saskatchewan, Alberta, BC equal.

You know, I’ve gone through, you know, the speeches. I’ve been here a number of years. And I know there’s a quote that I’d like to put on. I would . . . The quote is the Leader of the Opposition:

Mr. Speaker, I as the leader of Saskatchewan New Democrats and all my colleagues stand for common sense perspectives on the issues of the day. We know, we know that this Premier shares the ideological values of the President of the United States’ opponents. But that is not a reason for his attacks on the current sitting President when so much of the province’s economic activity relies on strong relationship with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the Keystone XL pipeline, we’ve been on record many times in support of the National Energy Board regulated project.

But you know, he made that quote and I’m hoping he would stand behind it because I’ve heard a lot of their members never talk much about the Keystone XL pipeline, which is a vital part of our economy, and also the United States’. I mean they need energy; we need energy. I mean that’s a common fact. Everybody knows that we need energy to . . . Agriculture needs it, industry. It’s just part of what we need up to survive here in the western world.

So when people start, you know, basically attacking an industry just on ideological reasons, not for the betterment of the people, you know, that hundreds of thousands of people that rely on that jobs are also relying on the power that’s generated, on the
oil that will flow to the United States that will come back in manufactured products to us, and also products that we trade to them. I know that, you know, it’s a joint project where many companies will benefit from the XL pipeline, many companies — both in United States and Canada — where thousands and thousands of jobs are going be generated with that. And you would think as a party that they would be, you know, in favour of that. You know, as they talk about, you want economic growth in this province. You want job security. You want to generate revenue because let’s face it, revenue is what keeps our health care going, is what keeps our education going, what keeps this province going, which gives us money back to operate them programs. You know, Mr. Speaker, that’s vital to Western Canada.

So when you have a national leader on the NDP that, you know, that talks about the Dutch disease, you know, just trying to generate some votes in eastern Canada at the benefit of another region and the party that’s attached to them does not say, you know what? You know this isn’t right. This isn’t something that we provincially is good for Western Canada and Saskatchewan. You know, we’ll distance himself from it.

And we’ve yet to hear any of the remarks from any of the members, and also the four leadership. You know, you have four members from the NDP that are vying for the membership of their party over there. That you know, that they, in their mind, would plan to lead the party. I mean you know, they would hope that they would form government. I mean that’s, you know, that’s their goal. It may unrealistic, especially to my constituents, but still that is their goal.

You know, so their forefront main thrust should be, what is good for Saskatchewan? You know, that’s the first thing you should ask and that’s the first thing that our leader asks. When anything, you know, comes across on the national screen that we’ve discussed and, you know, it’ll be discussed at caucus, our leader will ask, well how is this going to affect the Saskatchewan? How is it going to affect the residents of this great province? How is it going to affect the day-to-day lives of the constituents? How is it going to affect the business? And that is how we form basis on our policy, on our economic and our social issues.

Yet the party opposite, and what I’ve seen of it, that doesn’t seem to be their main motive. It doesn’t seem to be the main motive of their leaderships. You know, there’s a quote by the member from Rosemont. And I quote:

And I’ll highlight Mr. Erin Weir, an economist, a senior economist with the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, and I would quote, “Saskatchewan is collecting far too little revenue from potash.”

. . . We need to make sure that we do a review and get the dollar right and make sure we collect a fair share from our dollar. Because quite simply, Mr. Speaker, from our potash [revenues] . . .

We need to make sure that we do a review and we get the dollar right and make sure we collect a fair share from our dollar. Because quite simply, Mr. Speaker, from our potash [revenues] . . . our most prosperous resource, 5 cents on the dollar doesn’t cut it . . .

We’re calling for a review and an increase to potash royalties . . .

. . . and to leave it right now where we get pennies on the dollar — 5 cents on the dollar, Mr. Speaker, for our potash — and to leave the burden on Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, is unfair.

But when you have quotes like that, which is wrong, you know — we’re the second, I believe the highest, we tax our industry probably the second highest. We have a tax break on new mines to get the companies here because they’re investing not $1 billion — 20, 30, as high as, you know, as quoted as high as 3, 4, to $5 billion, you know, to build their mine, to provide job and resources for us. But once that mine is up in production, the people of Saskatchewan are getting a fair return on the potash royalties because to get the businesses here that is how you work with business.

Where the NDP’s role was in the ’70s and I was . . . I can still remember it when they took over the potash industry, when they started up Saskoil, when they actually nationalized the industry, chased away the one German firm. And right now just on the edge of my constituency — and I forget the name of it — is building a new mine and one of the first . . . K+S as my members around me have reminded me of it. It just happened to slip my mind. You know, but I can still remember one of the CEOs [chief executive officer] there had said that he still remembered when their company was taken over in the ’70s by the government. Taken over, taken away. He said, I didn’t think that could happen. Maybe in Cuba. Maybe in Russia. You know, he says, but not here in the province of Saskatchewan. And you know what? They left. They left with that investment money. They left with them jobs.

I can remember through the ’80s, you know, I had friends that worked in the potash mines. Shutdowns were as much as six months of the year with production. You know, they would always have to be either on unemployment or always kind of looking for a job and still wanting to hold the potash job because when you did work in the potash industry, it’s a well-paying, very well-paying unionized job. They are nice paying jobs, good benefits.

And now with the mines, what we did, the mines are working almost year round. So these people have increased employment by some of the mines by 50, 60 per cent, never mind the expansions that have gone on at Allan which is on the edge of my constituency. I know when I was door knocking in Young, I know as we did the 75-minute debate, it was mentioned, you know, what did you hear on the doorsteps? As the debate went back and forth between the two members, you know, and I was thinking, I know what I was hearing at the doorstep in places like Young and Watrous and Simpson and Imperial and Davidson and Kenaston and Hanley and Dundurn and Thode and Shields was. You know what? With the mine expansion that’s happening in the PotashCorp and Allan and also Colonsay, we’re seeing benefits. We’re seeing huge benefits with that expansion.

We’re seeing towns that I visited that in ’99 had empty houses.
I used to visit with the mayor and the reeves of the RM’s and the councillors, and their biggest concern was empty houses, people leaving. Now when I meet with them, it is houses are full. You know, how can we work on subdivisions? A town like Young is working with a developer building houses, expanding because of what’s happening in the potash industry.

And the spinoff that comes from that generates that much more taxes and that much more revenue for the province. You know, the growth of a mine just isn’t just the royalties you get — which we do; the people of Saskatchewan are getting a very fair share of their potash revenue — but it also benefits everywhere else. How much more tax money is coming to the rolls with, you know, we’ve grown probably . . . You know, we’re well over the million mark of people and growing every year. Our population is growing, adding to the tax rolls, adding to the money that also helps health care, helps all the other social programs that comes with that industry.

You know, that’s only one industry. I mean agriculture benefits hugely, you know, from potash. You know, that’s an economic driver of this province too, is agriculture and the potash that’s derived too, that the farmers use to fertilize their crops, to grow the crops. But also that’s just one industry.

But you can apply that to the oil industry, same thing. In my constituency, there’s not huge development yet. But my cousin, who is a geologist, he’s working in Calgary now because when he left in the ’70s — and he’s the same age as myself — there was no jobs here for geologists under the NDP government. You know they were trying to privatize Saskoil. He just said there was nothing here in Saskatchewan. He just says, it’s just automatic. He says, we come out of the university, we’re going. I say, I’ve got to work in Alberta, you know.

But I can remember him telling me, he says, you know, under where we farm, he says, there’s more than likely oil there. There will be potash, he said, for sure. And he says, there’s more than likely oil. I mean this province was a sea at one time. And he said, you know, the oil may be in our constituency. It may be a little harder to get, a little deeper, but he says it’s there. But he says, you know, he says, and it’s sad. And he was only 19, 20 at the time or 21 when he graduated. He said, you know, it’s sad. He says, I’ll probably never see any development of our resources in this province under the NDP government.

You know, so he went to Alberta. And he did very well for himself in the industry, you know, worked there many years in fact. He’s retired now. And now with the remarks that’s coming from the NDP leadership federally, that’s looking at possibly . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, it is. If he had his way, they would drive that back. They would drive the economy back, would drive that industry that not only is helping many families, just not that work directly in the oil industry. There’s a spinoff off it — tire companies, the hotels, the motels, the restaurants, people that service vehicles, all the servicing that goes with the oil industry, all the technicians, and all the environmental work that goes with it.

[12:30]

Because, you know, we have some of the strongest environmental regulations in Canada and I know in the world. And the oil companies, they welcome that. They want to have a good reputation. They don’t want to be known for having a bad reputation when it comes to the environment. They are very conscious. I know very many people that work in the industry, and they are very, very conscious of . . . I think every rig now has to have an environmentalist engineer. I don’t know the exact term that they use for it. But his role is to make sure that there’s no spills, that any oil that’s even changed in the vehicles is accounted for. And used oil all goes back to recycle centres, oil filters. Anything that is done on the site where the oil rigs are is very monitored, very regulated by the province but also by the oil companies. I mean they welcome that. They know that to drill here in Saskatchewan and to sell their product, you have to have a good reputation. You know, they’ve certainly worked very well with the government, and they’ve policed themselves very well.

And with that, yet, you have a leader from the NDP that is basically telling them that they’re running a disease, a Dutch disease, that they’re detrimental to the rest of the world, to the rest of Canada, you know, basically sending out what I would call falsehoods of information that is basically trying to hurt the West for the betterment of some eastern votes.

You know, and this motion discusses basically what the provincial NDP here is saying, which is nothing, and that troubles me. They should be standing up for Saskatchewan residents. And I would know that in the city . . . I’m not sure. Maybe some of the NDP MLAs but I know the one that ran against myself, that ran against myself in Arm River-Watrous constituency, would have heard exactly what I heard on the doorstep because I mean in a constituency in a small election time frame such as we have . . .

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

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Ask leave to introduce some guests, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Yorkton.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Ottenbreit: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. To you and through you to all the members of the Assembly, I’d like to introduce two individuals in the Speaker’s gallery, actually people I’ve known for a little while but new employees to the building.

One is Mr. Jarret Coels. He has worked in ministry offices before and ministers’ offices before but is currently in communications in our caucus office. He’s proven to be very effective in some of his drafting skills and very rarely do we have to correct any of his spelling or grammar. He’s quite good.

Beside him is Ms. Kim Gillies. She’s with us, another one of
the newest employees to our office — members of our team. I would say, not employees of ours. But they both definitely work with us not for us. Kim is again very, very good at her job with communications and organizing interviews and, you know, making sure we have all the information we need when we’re doing our communications duties with our specific newspapers and radio and TV throughout our constituencies.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I’d just ask all members on this House and the other side of the House to welcome these two very important members of our caucus team to their Legislative Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the member from Arm River-Watrous.

ADJOURNED DEBATES
PRIVATE MEMBERS’ MOTIONS

Motion No. 1 — Impact of Western Canadian Energy and Resource Boom on Central Canadian Manufacturing Sector (continued)

Mr. Brkich: — Mr. Speaker, I . . . [inaudible] . . . to join back into the debate. You know, we talked about the member that ran against me. I know he would have heard that same stuff on the doorstep. And I’m thinking, you know, when they have their wrap-up, you know, when after the election is over and they have their wrap-up — you know, why we lost, why we basically got defeated that soundly — you think he would say, you know what? You know, maybe we should start looking at our policy on natural resources. You know, you’d think he . . . And I don’t know if he did or not. I wasn’t privy to what happened in the backrooms of their wrap-up session after their election. But I was hoping he would take that message to them. And he very well may have because I haven’t heard from him since then in any retrospect from the NDP. So he may have taken that message and then been told to maybe just to see you and have a good day.

Even though, I liked him as he ran against me. You know, he went out — and he did. He door knocked every door — I’ll say that — in every town where he could. He didn’t have much help, but he was out there. And so he had heard what I heard on every doorstep. He’d have heard the same thing, you know.

But also as we go back to some of the other quotes, I’ll look back on the member from Athabasca, you know, his quotes on the oil sands. You know, he says:

There’s no question we’d welcome investments, Belanger said in reference to the possibility of an oil company harvesting the major areas filled with the heaviest, thickest form of petroleum discovered at Wallace Creek, Axe Lake, Raven Ridge in 2006.

That was a quote from the Northern Pride newspaper.

I also have another quote from the same newspaper, Northern Pride newspaper, on March 13th, 2012. He said:

It’s a great opportunity. There’s lots of optimism [at that time, 2006]. There was a significant amount of money spent which leads one to believe there’s indeed significant findings there.

Also with the same paper on March 13th, 2012, he goes on to say:

I absolutely hope that someone takes advantage of it. I think the region needs it. People were optimistic then, and I think they’re optimistic now.

You know, and those are good quotes. You know what that tells me? That when he’s back in his constituency, that’s what people are telling him — we need the natural resources. We need, for the jobs . . . especially northern Saskatchewan. They’ve always faced a challenge there for jobs, you know, just because it is limited. A lot of the jobs in northern Saskatchewan deal with natural resources. And I think the member there understands it. Yet when he comes back here to Regina, he seems to get a little bit of maybe dome-itis — it’s the kind of term we use — and he just gets falling back in the policy of what the NDP say.

You know, and I’m glad back home that he’s speaking up for his region and for his people because the North will benefit lots from the tar sands, from uranium. The companies are . . . That is the region that of all Saskatchewan will benefit. And I think he understands that we need the resources here, that we need to develop the resources, that we need to work with the companies.

And yet I find it, that when he’s down here, he won’t say that — you know, what Mr. Mulcair had said, his NDP federal leader has said — you know what? It’s detrimental to my constituency. I don’t know and I can’t say personally that he would have actually said that to him. But I would hope that even in a private conversation he would say, you know what, Mr. Mulcair? This is detrimental to my constituency, to the people that need jobs in my area. You should be supporting this industry. And how can we foster it to keep growing because it will provide jobs for years and years and years, decades and decades to come, which a lot of communities in northern Saskatchewan need. Yet I’ve never heard him state publicly any of that, you know.

And this is what this motion deals with is, I know . . . And the other member from Cumberland would have heard the same things, would have heard the same things on his doorstep about that: how we need to stand up for Saskatchewan, how we need to keep developing our natural resources, how this is going to help us with our job growth, how it’s going to actually help the North develop, how to help the North grow.

And same thing, the member from Cumberland, I’ve never heard him publicly state that, you know, what our national leader has said is wrong. They’ve never said that. Yet I think when they go back home, I think they tell that. I think when they’re sitting at coffee rows and sitting with their people in the different towns and villages that they visit, that they actually are saying that. So I wish they would publicly say that here in Regina.

Now some of the other NDP members here, the rest of them,
are from what you’d call strictly the cities, you know. There the oil industry maybe isn’t quite as understood. They may not hear that quite as much on the doorstep.

But I’m pretty sure that . . . I also door knocked for some members up there. One of them was for the member from Eastview. I remember spending the day up there. And the economy was always huge on the doorstep. It was, you know, it’s how can we keep Saskatchewan, start to keep it growing to keep that boom? Will my son or my daughter have a job here in Saskatchewan? You know, you could always tell if it was somebody that had kids that were just in high school. That’s almost the first thing they’d ask, say, you know what? I want my kids to work here in Saskatchewan, which they didn’t have that opportunity as much through the ’70s. But the economy was talked lots at the doorstep.

Natural resources, how to develop them and how to use the money to further help health care and social issues and all the things that you need to govern a province properly. And yet I’ve never heard any of them ever say, you know, that we should be working with the oil companies. I know that that stems still from the old days when they, you know, when they nationalized it and they started Saskoil. They nationalized the potash. And I think most people understood that the oil industry was next, that they would have if they hadn’t got voted out in ’82. The oil industry in Saskatchewan would have been nationalized followed probably by the uranium industry shortly after that.

We all know what happened to the potash industry when it was nationalized. It just went right in the ground. I mean, it just . . . There was very little production. There was absolutely no growth. There was absolutely no growth in jobs. There was no mine expansion. There was none of that. And if they would have got a hold of the oil company and they would have got a hold of the uranium companies, that’s exactly what we’d have seen — that every one of them industries would have been gone or driven very close to the ground, and we would be a have-not province forever. And I tell you what, the people of Saskatchewan have no desire to go back to when they were a have-not province, Mr. Speaker, no desire at all.

And I think that’s what goes back to the thinking of Mr. Mulcair is, you know, that they didn’t get a hold of the oil companies. They didn’t get a hold. They lost control of the potash. Because I think in their party there is still that desire or that thinking to nationalize, that they can run an oil company better, that they can run, that they can run the companies . . . and not even better because I think they know they can’t run them better than the companies. But that they should own them, that they should own and everything should be government run, that they should have that Big Brother attitude. And when I hear Mulcair speak — and I don’t listen to him too much — but I have listened to some of his speeches because it does affect Saskatchewan. And it can affect Western Canada, and it can affect what happens out here, so I do listen to it. And I still . . . And the way he talks, that he actually believes that, I believe, the oil companies, the potash, the natural resources are better under government control.

And we can talk about potash. We can talk about oil. We can talk about natural gas. But also there’s other natural resources industries. I mean this is a huge, rich province. You know, there’s been exploration of diamonds. There’s been, you know, gold. There’s been, some things are . . . Coal has always been huge in this province, you know, huge natural resource market.

I mean this is a . . . And for a national leader to basically try to put that in jeopardy and yet have the provincial party here not really just . . . They didn’t try to distance themselves from it just kind of like, yes, you know, he’s probably right. He thinks . . . I think he’s, you know, what he’s saying is pretty good, you know. No, that’s not. I mean Erin Weir said basically that yes, it’s a good idea. We need to tax some more and get some more out of them. Well that’s what they started with the potash industry, you know. They just didn’t nationalize it overnight. It just wasn’t, you know . . . What they started — and my memory’s a little faulty on this — but I think they actually started to raise the taxes, the royalties. That’s what they started.

[12:45]

I remember when Blakeney ran against Thatcher. I wasn’t that old then, but I was still old enough to remember, you know, some of the rhetoric that was going on. And I can remember Blakeney, I’m pretty sure, pounding the table and saying, you know what? We’re not getting enough for natural resources. We need to tax them more. We need to hit them more. He didn’t say we were going to nationalize them. He didn’t run on that platform when he ran against Thatcher. He didn’t even mention that. I can remember that. That part I can remember. He never said, we will take that industry over. We will never wrestle it from them. We will never take that from them. But we’re not getting enough money.

You know, you didn’t use . . . the term Dutch disease hadn’t been invented yet, hadn’t been mentioned because that was after that. But if it had, that’s the term he’d have used. That’s the term that he would have used, was Dutch disease, when he ran against Thatcher. He’d have used that and said, we’re having a bit of a Dutch disease here and we need to, you know, adjust the royalties. We need to like take a little more control. But he never mentioned nationalizing. But what did he do? What did he do, Mr. Speaker? He nationalized them. He ran them in the ground and basically then started nationalizing them and worked towards that until he was defeated.

But the next step was Saskoil, and the same thing. They were talking the same rhetoric in, I believe, in the ’78 election. My counterpart who I took over from, Gerald Muirhead, won that, just won it. In ’78, I remember, I think he just defeated Don Faris, and it was very, very close. Faris was running on, you know, we . . . I believe, we need more money from the oil companies. You know, look at what we did to the potash . . . [inaudible] . . . like, you know, this is the way to go, you know.

And it took another election until we finally got rid of them. But if we hadn’t won that election in ’82, we wouldn’t have an oil industry here now. We wouldn’t have a uranium industry. We wouldn’t have a growing population. The only thing we’d be getting, the only thing we would have would be equalization money coming in. That would be it. That would be what would be happening in this province right now.

You know, and that is why that worries me. And that’s why this
motion is, that’s why that this party, the party opposite, the NDP party, should be talking about what their national leader is trying to do to this province, trying to hurt it. They should be standing up. They should be proud of this province. They should want to, like, want it to grow. They should want the industries to grow. If you want a province to grow, you have to do it through business. You have to do it through resources. You have to work with the businesses here. You can’t tell them that we’re going to take them over or we’re going to . . . You’re going to overtax you or we’re going to hold you back.

You know, the role of a government when it comes to industry is through regulation. That’s our role, to make sure that they’re following the rules, that they’re doing the environmental rights, that they’re doing environmental standards the right way. That’s the role of government, not to manage and own the natural resources, not to tell companies how to go. Because you know . . . And I know that we talk about natural resources, but I can’t remember when they actually, when the NDP came in, but you know, when they bought shoe factories and they bought businesses and that was their philosophy.

The Regina Manifesto was still on their website, was still front and centre up to, you know, a very short time ago. It was still there, where it talked about the evils of capitalism, you know. And it’s still, I think, below their surface a bit because they still just cannot say that maybe in 1930 it was all right rhetoric, but maybe now the Regina Manifesto was wrong, you know. It’s wrong. You know, we’ve moved. It’s time to maybe move on. But you know what? They cannot say that. They cannot move on. They cannot forget their past, and that — that is their past. Let’s be honest. That’s their past, is a nationalization of their businesses, natural resources.

You know, I believe that Mulcair has spoke quite a bit against the XL pipeline going south. You know, I think if I remember right, that there was some federal MPs [Member of Parliament] that actually went to Washington to talk about, to talk against the XL pipeline. Why? You know, I mean, the pipelines that are going in are as environmentally safe . . . It’s the safest way to move oil. A lot safer than moving it by rail — a lot quicker and a lot cheaper — but a lot safer and moving it through a pipeline underground. You know, and why would you talk against it? Why would you say that we don’t believe that a pipeline is good? I mean, other than you’re just against, you know, growth, progress, jobs, and jobs that will benefit, benefit both sides of North America, both the United States and ourselves.

You know, we need the jobs. We need the growth. We need the energy, plain and simple. We need the energy to survive. We need the energy to heat the long-term care facilities, to heat the hospitals. You know, we need them natural resources. So why would you be basically trying to shut it down, trying to say, you know what, no pipeline? So okay, there’s no pipeline. I don’t know then where they think the oil industry is going to go, or where the power to power vehicles, to drive agriculture, to drive business is going to come from if you’re going to shut down every pipeline. You’re basically going to shut it down.

And I believe that fundamentally that they are against the oil companies that much that they would actually . . . where it would be a deterrent to this province and they wouldn’t care. You know, that’s what I’m hearing from them or what, I guess, what I’m not hearing from them. You don’t stand up and say . . . I’ve never heard them say, you know what? We’ve got to work together. This is, you know, this is going to provide jobs. This is going to provide, can find growth, long-term growth, for this province. Huge long-term growth, that this province will be a have province for — well I hope — forever. And I think it will be. You know we have the opportunities. The opportunity for this province is huge. I mean the growth is huge in this province, and what we want to do is, you know, as a party here, we want to keep that growth.

And so when a national leader down east talks about how it’s going to hurt my province, my constituents, I will speak against that. I will speak against that because I think that is fundamentally wrong that a leadership, a leader in Eastern Canada is speaking out to hurt one area of a region. And yet and what probably bothers me most is that their leadership candidates aren’t saying anything on it. They’re not saying anything for the people of Saskatchewan.

You know, like right now, they’re out, they’ll be selling memberships over the weekend and that. And I’m hoping that if some of the NDP hopefuls or NDP members are watching this debate, they will ask them, they will ask them or send them an email and say, where do you stand on our natural resources? Where do you stand on the XL pipeline? Where do you stand on the remarks that were made by Mr. Mulcair? Where do you stand on that?

So I would ask any of the membership people that are listening today to ask them that, to ask them, where do you stand on that? You know, I hope that they would answer it in the way that they believe it. They believe that the pipeline, to hurt Saskatchewan, it’s better to stay with Mulcair and to hurt the positive future of Saskatchewan, to come up and say that. Just say, you know what? We support the NDP leader, no matter what he says. It doesn’t matter what he says, anything. It doesn’t matter.

And I would make the same speech if Mulcair was talking about the agriculture industry. And that worries me, too, because if he thinks, if he thinks that he could get some votes in Eastern Canada by saying something about Western Canada agriculture, that would be a deterrent to it. You know, whether it be trying to slow our agriculture imports to the United States, which are huge. I mean we have huge amounts of cattle and grains that are now exported to the United States, but also all over the world.

You know, and I’m wondering if he speaks against agriculture or there’s something that would hurt Western Canada, I wonder if they would even stand up for anything? Or would they just follow whatever he says, you know? Whatever that Mr. Mulcair says, that they will follow and just say, whatever he says that’s fine. It probably won’t hurt Saskatchewan. We don’t know that. We’ll just let it slide because, man, he’s the leader. He knows what he’s talking about. And man, we can never, ever question what our federal leader is saying. You know, and that’s what I’m getting from there.

And you know, the member, the Leader of the Opposition in 75-minute debate, he had talked about the backbenchers saying, well you’re on the doorstep. You should be, like, speaking up at
your caucus and different things. Well why don’t you? Why don’t you follow your own advice? What you said in the 75-minute debate just earlier was, why don’t you? I know exactly why — exactly. The Leader of the Opposition was hearing on the doorstep, what Mulcair is saying is detrimental to the province of Saskatchewan. I haven’t heard him yet say anything on that line yet, you know. So for him to say . . . You know, it’s funny, it’s almost like, listen to what I say but I’m not going to do it, you know.

Like he made comments along them lines basically in the 75-minute debate that, oh, you should be listening at the doorstep. Well I know what they’re hearing at the doorstep. I know exactly what they’re hearing on the doorstep, that what Mr. Mulcair said was wrong, that you should be standing up for Saskatchewan.

Because I know when I go door to door . . . And it doesn’t matter. When I go back home on the weekend, you know, you talk to people. I mean they’re proud of this province. They’re proud of the growth that’s growing. They’re proud of what’s happening, you know. And I know they’re just saying: just keep it going, just keep the growth going. They know that it has to grow through natural resources, has to grow through agriculture, has to grow through manufacturing. All of them are all in conjunction with one another. That’s how you run a province. You know, they all support one another.

You know, we have a great natural resource. That economy that just benefits our manufacturing, it helps our growth, the growth with the population. It also helps the growth with the towns. It’s a circle that needs to be like this. If you want a growing economy, all sectors have to be basically firing. And they want to shut down part of that engine. They want to say, hey, whoa, whoa, we’re going to shut down part of the engine. It’s not going to matter to the other part.

Well I tell you what: I farm, and you blow two pistons on a six-cylinder tractor, you ain’t going anywhere. And that’s what they’re looking to shut down. They’re looking to shut down part of that engine and saying, well, it’s not going to affect the rest of the engine. It’s not going to hurt it. You’re still going to be able to run away. You’re still going to be able to fire up that tractor. You’re still going to be able to go. Well you’re not going. You’re not.

And that is what this motion deals with, is that hurting part of our industry, part of that circle that drives this province, that keeps this province growing, when he speaks against that, that’s what he’s speaking against. He’s speaking against the people in Saskatchewan. He’s speaking against the workers in Saskatchewan. He’s speaking against the industry. And he’s speaking against every constituent in my constituency that has been benefiting from the growth of this great province. And he speaks against that.

That is why this motion is on board, and it is why I wish the members opposite would be standing up to the NDP leader and saying, you know what, this is important. This is important for the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Mulcair. You should not be trying to shut down a part of our industry. You should be not speaking against it. You should be saying, how can we work together in a country and stand up for all of Canada, not just where you’ve won some seats in Quebec or Ontario because he did not win any in Saskatchewan and very little in western Canada. They are not speaking . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — It now being past the hour of adjournment, this Assembly stands adjourned until Monday at 1:30 p.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 13:01.]
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