



THIRD SESSION - TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

(HANSARD)

Published under the  
authority of

The Honourable P. Myron Kowalsky  
Speaker



# MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Speaker — Hon. P. Myron Kowalsky  
Premier — Hon. Lorne Calvert  
Leader of the Opposition — Brad Wall

Name of Member	Political Affiliation	Constituency
Addley, Hon. Graham	NDP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Hon. Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Beatty, Hon. Joan	NDP	Cumberland
Belanger, Hon. Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornrud, Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Borgerson, Lon	NDP	Saskatchewan Rivers
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Calvert, Hon. Lorne	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
Cline, Hon. Eric	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Crofford, Joanne	NDP	Regina Rosemont
D'Autremont, Dan	SP	Cannington
Dearborn, Jason	SP	Kindersley
Draude, June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, Hon. David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Gantfoer, Rod	SP	Melfort
Hagel, Hon. Glenn	NDP	Moose Jaw North
Hamilton, Doreen	NDP	Regina Wascana Plains
Harpauer, Donna	SP	Humboldt
Harper, Ron	NDP	Regina Northeast
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hermanson, Elwin	SP	Rosetown-Elrose
Higgins, Hon. Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Huyghebaert, Yogi	SP	Wood River
Iwanchuk, Andy	NDP	Saskatoon Fairview
Junor, Judy	NDP	Saskatoon Eastview
Kerpan, Allan	SP	Carrot River Valley
Kirsch, Delbert	SP	Batoche
Kowalsky, Hon. P. Myron	NDP	Prince Albert Carlton
Krawetz, Ken	SP	Canora-Pelly
Lautermilch, Hon. Eldon	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
McCall, Hon. Warren	NDP	Regina Elphinstone-Centre
McMorris, Don	SP	Indian Head-Milestone
Merriman, Ted	SP	Saskatoon Northwest
Morgan, Don	SP	Saskatoon Southeast
Morin, Sandra	NDP	Regina Walsh Acres
Nilson, Hon. John	NDP	Regina Lakeview
Prebble, Peter	NDP	Saskatoon Greystone
Quennell, Hon. Frank	NDP	Saskatoon Meewasin
Serby, Hon. Clay	NDP	Yorkton
Sonntag, Hon. Maynard	NDP	Meadow Lake
Stewart, Lyle	SP	Thunder Creek
Taylor, Hon. Len	NDP	The Battlefords
Thomson, Hon. Andrew	NDP	Regina South
Toth, Don	SP	Moosomin
Trew, Kim	NDP	Regina Coronation Park
Van Mulligen, Hon. Harry	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
Wakefield, Milton	SP	Lloydminster
Wall, Brad	SP	Swift Current
Wartman, Hon. Mark	NDP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Weekes, Randy	SP	Biggar
Yates, Kevin	NDP	Regina Dewdney

[The Assembly met at 10:00.]

[Prayers]

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Cypress Hills.

**Mr. Elhard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again this morning, sir, it's my privilege to present a petition on behalf of constituents of Cypress Hills, in particular those concerned about the planned closure of the SaskPower office in Shaunavon at the end of this month. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to keep the SaskPower office in Shaunavon open to provide full service to the community and surrounding areas.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, these two pages of petitions are signed by individuals from the community of Eastend, Shaunavon, and Climax. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to rise again today on behalf of people who are concerned about the lack of cell service in rural Saskatchewan, specifically the Porcupine Plain-Weekes area. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause this government to ensure that SaskTel provides access to cell coverage in the Porcupine Plain-Weekes area.

As in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

The people that have signed this petition are from Porcupine Plain and Chelan. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have yet another petition that asks the government to maintain full service of the SaskPower office at Rosetown. And, Mr. Speaker, the petitioners note that the bank cannot accept payment if the customer doesn't have documentation of service which the office supplies. The prayer of the petition reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to keep the SaskPower office in Rosetown open to provide full service to the community

and surrounding areas.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of signatures on this petition and they come from the communities of Rosetown and Mildren. And I'm pleased to present this petition on their behalf.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Humboldt.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again rise today with citizens concerned with the safety of driving on Highway No. 5. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to upgrade and widen Highway No. 5 from Humboldt to Saskatoon.

And the signatures, Mr. Speaker, today are from Saskatoon, St-Denis, and Humboldt. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again today I rise to present a petition on behalf of citizens of southeast Saskatchewan who are very concerned over the condition of Highway 18. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to invest the needed money to repair and maintain Highway 18 so it can return to being a safe and economical route for Saskatchewan families and business.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, this is signed by people from Beaubier, Lake Alma, and Gladmar. I so present. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Biggar.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present another petition for safer driving conditions on Highway No. 3. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to resurface and properly maintain Highway No. 3 from Fairholme to Turtleford and the Livelong access road.

Signed by the good citizens of Livelong and district. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Wood River.

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I have a petition from concerned citizens that believe that the withdrawal

of lab services in the Lafleche and district health district would cause undue hardships to residents, particular seniors. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary actions to ensure that lab services are continued at the Lafleche and District Health Centre.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is signed by the good citizens of Lafleche, Woodrow, Meyronne, and Limerick. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Rosthern-Shellbrook.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the Assembly this morning to present a petition on behalf of citizens of Saskatchewan that are concerned with the highway conditions in the province. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause government to resurface and properly maintain Highway No. 3 from Fairholme to Turtleford and the Livelong access road to No. 795.

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

Mr. Speaker, signatures to this petition are from Livelong and Turtleford. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The member for Batoche is recognized.

**Mr. Kirsch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I bring forward a petition from the people of rural Saskatchewan concerned about cellular coverage. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to provide reliable cellular telephone service in the regions encompassing the constituency of Batoche.

And is duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's signed by the good people of Humboldt and Watson. I so present. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Arm River-Watrous.

**Mr. Brkich:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition for citizens calling on the government to upgrade Highway 20 to primary weight status:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that Highway 20 be upgraded to primary weight status to ensure the economic viability in the surrounding areas.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This particular petition is signed by the good citizens from Lockwood, Nokomis, Semans, Strasbourg. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Southeast.

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to rise in the House today to present a petition calling for the widening of Highway No. 5. I will read the prayer for relief, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to upgrade and widen Highway No. 5 from Humboldt to Saskatoon.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by good citizens from Humboldt and Saskatoon. This highway runs right through the width of my constituency. I'm pleased to present it on their behalf. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Clerk Assistant (Committees):** — According to order the petitions received at the last sitting have been reviewed and pursuant to rule 15(7) are hereby read and received.

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Swift Current.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### Member Named Honorary Elder by Yellow Quill First Nation

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to able to rise in the Assembly today to inform members of a very special honour that has been bestowed on the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon at a special ceremony, the Yellow Quill Saulteaux First Nation bestowed, and I quote:

the highest honour and respect to Elder June Draude MLA as an Honourary Elder with all rights and privileges that this title holds.

According to that First Nation, and again I quote:

An Honoured Elder is an Elder who is not from the Yellow Quill Community. This individual is held in the highest regard with the utmost respect. This person can contribute to the community with the high standards of expertise in their field or his/her line of work. He or she can be called on by the community, and may be used as a consultant if required . . . In turn, the Yellow Quill first nation will respect and honour this person, and bestow the title 'Honoured Elder'.

Mr. Speaker, our caucus members are extremely proud of the hard work from the member for Kelvington-Wadena not only with respect to her constituency but on behalf of First Nations and Métis people in her critic duties with the Saskatchewan Party. She has been a leader in the area of mandatory treaty education. She has provided leadership in the area of the duty to consult and accommodate. And we are proud and benefit from her desire to continually learn more about the First Nations of our province, including those close to her home — the Yellow Quill Saulteaux First Nation.

I invite all members to join me in congratulating the hon. member for this honour received yesterday.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Coronation Park.

### Z99 Radiothon

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well today is about our friends at Rawlco Radio. It's about Z99, CC, Lori, and Buzz — saga 20. This year marks the 20th consecutive year of the Z99 radiothon raising funds for Regina General's neonatal unit.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud. This year they're raising money for state-of-the-art heart monitors. No, not for CC. These heart monitors are for the babies in the Regina General neonatal intensive care unit. These heart monitors feature three tiny paddles attached by cable to a monitor. And it monitors heartbeat and breathing for these babies in their time of need, and the alarm will sound if their breathing or heartbeat gets too fast or too slow.

Mr. Speaker, Rawlco Radio, Z99 are providing the generous listeners in southern Saskatchewan — and anywhere but particularly southern Saskatchewan — an opportunity to participate in making our world, our province, our southern Saskatchewan a better place — and a better place to raise families, a better place to have babies, a safer place. Hats off to Rawlco Radio, Z99, and especially all of the listeners that are supporting CC, Lori, and Buzz in this their very special 20th year. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Canora-Pelly.

### Member Marks Third Anniversary as Opposition Leader

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, March 15 marks the third anniversary of the day the member from Swift Current became the Leader of the Saskatchewan Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, under his leadership the Saskatchewan Party's membership has soared.

Our leader has also led the Saskatchewan Party through two

successful by-elections — one in the constituency of Weyburn-Big Muddy last June and most recently, earlier this month, in the constituency of Martensville. In Weyburn, the home of Tommy Douglas, the Saskatchewan Party won with nearly 50 per cent of the vote. And who could forget the Saskatchewan Party's historic victory in Martensville earlier this month when our newest MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] took in 77 per cent of the vote, and the NDP [New Democratic Party] failed to get its vote out resulting in the worst turnout for the NDP in the constituency since 1944.

Mr. Speaker, our leader was also responsible for calling for a comprehensive policy review that resulted in a broad policy document from our members that the NDP continues to borrow from.

Mr. Speaker, being the leader of any political party means a great deal of time away from home. Our caucus would like to thank our leader, the member for Swift Current, for the many sacrifices he has made for the people of this great province. We'd also like to thank his wife, Tami, and their children — Megan, Colter, and Faith — for lending us their husband and father. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[10:15]

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order. The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

### The Ides of March

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House of a quote by Shakespeare from Julius Caesar that I think is particularly appropriate today. It's "beware the ides of March," Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan should take heed of this warning because today is not only the ides of March but is also the three-year anniversary of the election of the member from Swift Current as Leader of the Opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Morin:** — We have had three years of improvised Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, where the Leader of the Opposition pulls party policy out of his hat and if Brenda Bakken didn't like it, that was just too bad.

We've had three years of pretending that privatized Saskatchewan isn't his plan for the Crowns, but a small town newspaper in the member's own constituency once said, "The Sask Party made complete morons of themselves" on the topic of Crown corporations.

But where do the Leader of the Opposition's delusions of adequacy come from, Mr. Speaker? His time as a political hack for the worst premier in Saskatchewan's history.

And what does the leader of alibi Saskatchewan have to say about that? I quote: "I think it is an asset that I was involved in a government that lost its way . . ." which just goes to show that the member from Swift Current has Van Gogh's ear for

public sentiment. He even had to cancel his recent golf excursion, Mr. Speaker, because of allegations of selling access to a privileged few. I guess that was just unwise Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Rosetown.

#### National Recognition for Community Beautification

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Each year Communities in Bloom holds a national competition . . .

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're having a lot of fun this morning.

Each year Communities in Bloom holds a national competition to showcase the efforts of communities across Canada. Through this national beautification program, communities are recognized for their commitment to the environment and their community. I would like to congratulate Rosetown for being declared the national winner in the population category of 2,001 to 3,000 people.

Communities in Bloom is a Canadian non-profit organization committed to fostering civic pride, environmental responsibility, and improved quality of life through community involvement and maintenance of parks and green spaces.

Rosetown is being honoured for the impact of their enthusiastic, visionary, and committed Communities in Bloom committee. Through their initiatives, partnerships, and volunteer groups, businesses and municipal government have been formed to make Rosetown an outstanding west central Saskatchewan community.

Congratulations should also be extended to Outlook for their work on the Sky Trail project. Outlook received a four bloom rating for a population of 2,001 to 3,000.

Communities entered for this award are evaluated on eight key criteria including tidiness, environmental awareness, community involvement, natural and cultural heritage conservation, urban forestry, landscaped areas, floral displays, and turf and ground covers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Rosetown and Outlook for achieving national recognition for their hard work and dedication that makes these communities among the most beautiful in Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Wascana Plains.

#### St. Patrick's Day Greetings

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well last we heard,

the ides of March is upon us. And as we saw outside last evening, winter's not quite behind us. But soon the lawns and trees in our province will be lush and full. Maybe it's because of my own Irish roots and optimism, but I'm looking forward to those familiar sights of spring — green leaves, fields, and grass. March in Saskatchewan is usually full of green, Mr. Speaker, but not only because of the plants. In March we also celebrate St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, Irish settlers in Saskatchewan have made significant contributions in the building of this great province. When Saskatchewan was founded over 100 years ago, one of ten of our residents were either born Irish or of Irish origin. Communities like Limerick and Shamrock will always remind us of this origin, Mr. Speaker.

With their laughter, music, dance, rich storytelling traditions, and of course their understanding of leprechauns, the Irish have been a vital force in the evolution of our province and our culture. On St. Patrick's Day we celebrate all of these accomplishments.

I would like to wish all members the luck of the Irish, Mr. Speaker, and in closing offer a traditional Irish blessing:

May the Irish hills caress you.  
May her lakes and rivers bless you.  
May the luck of the Irish enfold you.  
May the blessings of Saint Patrick behold you.

So to all of you this Saturday, Mr. Speaker, Erin Go Bragh.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Humboldt.

#### Murdoch Carriere Settlement

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our caucus office and constituency office have been flooded with letters and phone calls from people irate with the incompetence of the NDP government by the fact that it awarded a man fired for harassment and convicted of assault \$275,000. And it's not only citizens speaking out, but columnists, commentators, and editorial boards. I'd like to share a portion of the *Leader-Post* editorial from March 1 with this Assembly, and I quote:

The NDP's handling of this case before Tuesday's announcement did nothing to inspire confidence in its managerial competence.

Its refusal to disclose meaningful detail about the reasons behind the settlement — citing the usual legal requirements — does nothing to address concerns about the deal with its former civil servant.

And now — with . . . prevarications stripped away — its plea to us is: "Trust us."

As taxpayers, and more importantly, as citizens who expect their government to do the right thing, settlements such as Tuesday's erode the very trust to which Nilson is

appealing.

What of provincial workers, who must also trust the government as an employer?

We agree with the Saskatchewan Party labour critic Ken Krawetz, who says the settlement sends a disturbing message to women in the workplace.

And of those directly involved with the Carriere matter?

We share the sentiment of Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union president, Bob Bymo: "We feel for those women."

End quote, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Melville-Saltcoats.

#### Minister's Comments at Municipal Convention

**Mr. Bjornerud:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, two days ago the Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity to speak at SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities] convention and was very well received, and I believe that was very good for the Saskatchewan Party.

And yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Premier spoke to SARM convention, accompanied by the Minister of Agriculture and some other cabinet ministers, and I believe that was even better for the Saskatchewan Party, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NDP Minister of Agriculture stood before about 2,000 SARM delegates and basically called one of them a liar. When a producer from the Southwest said the NDP has done nothing to help with the drought, the minister called his statements completely inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP has done absolutely nothing to help the producers in the Southwest and when someone points that out, the minister responds by insulting them. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister of Agriculture to apologize to SARM and to that delegate in particular on behalf of his government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

**Hon. Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I really never mind taking the brunt of things when I'm actually guilty of doing something that is wrong. In fact I think I need to be accountable. But I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker, whether it's the member opposite or whether it's somebody from SARM who's standing up and saying things which are inaccurate, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to sit and just allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, why? Because it's important in these issues that

affect so many people that we seek to be clear, honest, and straightforward in what we're doing, Mr. Speaker. And so when someone stands up in an assembly like that or an Assembly like this and twists what one of us has said, then, Mr. Speaker, we need to identify the inaccuracies and we need to speak clearly to the people that are in that assembly.

Mr. Speaker, that's what I did. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Melville-Saltcoats.

**Mr. Bjornerud:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier got one big round of applause yesterday at one spot, and it was when one of the delegates got up and wished him a good last year in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bjornerud:** — Mr. Speaker, for years and years this NDP government has ignored rural Saskatchewan, and now the Premier thinks he's going to waltz into SARM after downloading them on since 1991 and make an announcement of a few infrastructure dollars and buy everyone's vote with that announcement.

Mr. Speaker, the people at SARM see right through this Premier and his government. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture's comments yesterday and his arrogance were the last straw. Mr. Speaker, will the Premier insist that that minister apologize to SARM and apologize to the members there for his attitude and his comments yesterday?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

**Hon. Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to be clear as well, what I did say to the members of SARM was that I had met three times with the folks from the Southwest. Our department has been in continual discussion with them. I have been speaking to the federal minister about the issue of the drought in the Southwest.

Mr. Speaker, we have been pushing hard to get a program in place. And we have committed to funding 10 per cent of whatever the federal government will put in. Plus, Mr. Speaker, we have committed to funding a water program with the PFRA [Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration].

Mr. Speaker, any suggestion that we have done nothing is absolutely, clearly, honestly inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. But what, Mr. Speaker, would the members opposite do that's different, Mr. Speaker? Well the member opposite who's just got up and speaking says that it would be their opinion that 100 per cent of any disaster should be fully funded by the federal government. So if he's going to point and attack somewhere, point it where the problem is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Martensville.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Government's Settlement with Complainants in the Carriere Case**

**Ms. Heppner:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Prince Albert a meeting took place. Approximately 50 employees from the fire control office were invited to attend. We were told that the purpose of this meeting was to address recent issues related to the Murdoch Carriere situation and that there'd be an opportunity for an open forum to address questions. Can the minister confirm that this meeting took place and who represented the government at this meeting?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister for the Department of the Environment held a meeting at the fire centre in Prince Albert yesterday.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Martensville.

**Ms. Heppner:** — Mr. Speaker, my father would have said that putting 50 people in a room to share their feelings is like asking students to stand up in front of a classroom and discuss their problems with algebra — it's a pretty intimidating situation.

However, Mr. Speaker, someone did ask about the settlement signed by the victims and why they weren't given a copy. The government officials said that not giving the victims a copy of the settlement was a mistake — a mistake, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister agree with her department officials? Does the minister agree it was a mistake to refuse to give a copy of the settlement to the victims?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[10:30]

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the opposition handed out a letter from the lawyer representing . . . in response to counsel for one of the women, a Mr. Gordon Wyant who is representing one woman. And the letter says very clearly:

Firstly, you are correct in stating that my former partner, Martel Popescul, acted for [blank] . . . to the Murdoch Carriere matter. Because there are multiple clients, I need to determine whether the other clients must provide their consent to the release of the file. Further, as I have had no involvement with this file prior to my most recent

conversations . . . I will need to extensively review the file to determine whether there are portions which may not be released to her due to solicitor-client privilege with respect to our other clients [Mr. Speaker].

Mr. Speaker, there were nine complainants. Nine complainants were represented by legal counsel, and, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, if one were to release the file, one would need to speak to all of the people to the action because their personal information is contained within the file.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Martensville.

**Ms. Heppner:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister showed us yesterday how much respect she had for these victims. We handed her a consent form for the government to sign to release the settlement — not the personal information contained in those files; the settlement — and the minister threw it in the garbage. That's how much respect she has for these women. I'll ask the minister again. Does she agree with her officials that it was a mistake that these women were not given a copy of this settlement? Not the personal files, the settlement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of this Assembly a lawyer, the Justice critic, who represents the Saskatchewan Party in Saskatoon Southeast, indicated on the floor of this Assembly that I should sign a release form for one person when it contains information on other complainants. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the members opposite don't get it. They don't get it.

There's called the freedom of information and privacy protection Act, which is . . . There's the freedom of information and protection Act, privacy and protection Act that is a piece of legislation that all members of the legislature are subject to, all public institutions are subject to. And, Mr. Speaker, I find it surprising that I read in a scrum with the media the Leader of the Opposition indicating that information should be released. It is surprising.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

### **Disclosure of Information Regarding Murdoch Carriere**

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to again remind the minister of the words used by the judge that presided over the Carriere case. The judge said that he, and I quote, could “. . . not understand how Carriere's conduct could have gone on for as long as it did without being detected by other supervisors.” We agree with the judge's comments.

Mr. Speaker, does the minister know of any other harassment



complaints that were brought forward against Mr. Carriere prior to the women in the Gillies report?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — . . . appreciate it, because the members opposite have used the judge's statement on more than one occasion, I'd really appreciate it if the member opposite could table the document — not what she's reading from, but the actual document where the judge actually said this. Because this is an important point, Mr. Speaker, because we're not clear that the judge actually said it. So we would appreciate receiving a copy of the actual document that the member is referring to, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's review the facts. On April 1, 2003 the members opposite asked that Murdoch Carriere be fired. They asked on the floor of this Assembly. They asked it to the former minister responsible for the Public Service Commission. On April 2 the minister announced that he had been terminated, Mr. Speaker. And what did the members of the opposition do? They supported the decision of the government; they supported it, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I'm sure with the resources available to government that this minister could get a copy of any report that she wanted to get.

Mr. Speaker, the other day when questioned by reporters . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order. Order. Order. The member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, for the minister's information, that was tabled.

Mr. Speaker, the other day when questioned by reporters of other prior complaints about Murdoch Carriere, the minister's response was she could not answer the question with any precision. That sounds like a yes coming from the way the minister's answered other questions in this case, so she needs to clarify her answer. The minister has had lots of time to review this file and to come up with some very important answers.

Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any knowledge of any prior harassment complaints against Murdoch Carriere, not including the women that were brave enough to come forward? And what year was the very first harassment complaint brought against Murdoch Carriere?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to reconsider her answer that the actual document was tabled in this Assembly. I'd like her to reconsider her answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I can say to the member opposite — and this is important because I understand the members opposite want to become the government of the day — we are talking about personnel files, and personnel files are protected by the freedom of information and privacy protection Act, Mr. Speaker. There is information in the public domain. But what I find so startling, Mr. Speaker, on March 14 the Leader of the Opposition, when asked a question about the facts surrounding this case, and he says this, that:

If that's the reason that they are in contravention of their own policies legislation perhaps — and that's also very serious — that goes directly to the competence to a government abiding by its own policies and legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's say this. We have made it very clear we did not follow the process. They supported it. And we now have the result of the Murdoch Carriere settlement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, what the people of Saskatchewan want is an answer from that minister, just once a clear and simple answer. This is a very simple question — and I'm going to say it very slowly; maybe you can understand it — how many women came forward with complaints against Murdoch Carriere prior to the women in the Gillies report?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, personnel files are not to be in the public domain, Mr. Speaker. It is very clear — personnel files are not to be in the public domain. And I will not answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Canora-Pelly.

#### **Ministers' Knowledge of Disciplinary Action Regarding Murdoch Carriere**

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked a very simple question of the Premier, but the Premier would not get up and give an answer so I will try again today. Was the Premier ever briefed by any government official on the Murdoch Carriere harassment investigation and the subsequent disciplinary action prior to April 1, 2003?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, appropriately, no.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for

Canora-Pelly.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that answer. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said over and over again that you should know as a Premier what is going on in your office. Mr. Speaker, this is the deputy minister to the Premier who has been involved in a file, who has been involved in discussions, who's been involved in discussions on transfer and/or termination.

Is that what the Premier is going to tell the people of Saskatchewan — that he knew absolutely nothing prior to April 1 of the charges that were being brought against Mr. Murdoch Carriere?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, to inform the critic who's just been on his feet and the Leader of the Opposition who seems to want to advance this theory from his seat, the deputy minister to the Premier of the province is not part of the Premier's office staff, Mr. Speaker. The deputy minister to the Premier in the Government of Saskatchewan, and I would say in all government structures, serves the people of Saskatchewan, works for the people of Saskatchewan and not for the Premier of the day.

Now I know why the Leader of the Opposition thinks that every public servant works for the Premier, because that's the school of public governance he attended when he worked in this building in the 1980s.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — And, Mr. Speaker, when I ask about individuals, ministers not knowing what's going on in their office, there is the example of someone who either did know what was going on in the office when he worked in that office or didn't. Now he ought to tell us that, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Canora-Pelly.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier, if the Premier does not know what's going on . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. The House shall come to order. Member for Canora-Pelly.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the Premier did not know what was going on as a result of the actions being taken by his deputy minister, the other person who must have known something is the former minister of the Environment. All of a sudden, just as we're starting to gear up for the forest fire season, the director of fire management is suddenly suspended and transferred to Regina. It defies belief that no one would explain this to the minister. They must have had been told something.

Mr. Speaker, when was the former minister of the Environment briefed about Murdoch Carriere's suspension and transfer? And what was he told?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Public Service Commission.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question. And, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite want to review the press immediately following April 2, they will find the answer in their press clippings. The minister, the former minister of the Environment has already answered that question quite publicly, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

### Management of Harassment Complaints

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier, and I can also provide a bit of an answer to him, Mr. Speaker.

Should the people of this province decide to change the Government of Saskatchewan later this year, and should there be a different premier sitting in the Premier's office, here's what would happen in that instance. So I can remove all doubt, here's what the Government of Saskatchewan would do and what the premier would do. If somebody in the government, if someone in the Government of Saskatchewan was harassing nine women, someone who was later actually convicted of assault, Mr. Speaker, and they reported that to my deputy minister, I would want to know what the information was and I would want something done about that on behalf of the women of that government. You bet I would. That is exactly what would happen, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, in April 2003 . . . In April 2003, the then minister of Justice said, in the event that there's a lawsuit against the Government of Saskatchewan, it'll be the position of this Government of Saskatchewan that the termination of Mr. Carriere was justified, and that this would be vigorously defended in the courts. What has changed since then? Why has the government lost its way? Why are they now rewarding those who do the harassment, Mr. Speaker?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, to review again, to review again, Mr. Speaker, when this came to our attention at the political level, and appropriately, I repeat, appropriately, I repeat, the senior public service of Saskatchewan are charged with dealings with matters of personnel. That is not, that is not a charge to this Premier or any future premier, that premiers should be involved with the personnel files of the public service of Saskatchewan. Let's make that clear.

When, Mr. Speaker, this came to the attention of the elected, it was our determination that the process had not been followed to

our satisfaction or had achieved the desired outcome, which was the termination of Mr. Carriere. On the recommendation of the minister, I directed that Mr. Carriere be terminated. Mr. Speaker, that was taken out. We know now that the process was not followed correctly, and we've ended up paying. I did that, Mr. Speaker, I did that in the knowledge, in the knowledge we were not following the process. We did it in public knowledge and with the support of the opposition. We did it, Mr. Speaker, in the knowledge that some day we would likely have to pay.

Are we happy about this, Mr. Speaker? We are not happy about this. Would I change my decision made in April 2003? I would not, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[10:45]

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, the question to the Premier is this: does he not run the kind of government, does he not lead the kind of government where, if the senior-most official in his government — the one that reports directly to him — becomes aware that women are being apparently systemically and in a patterned way harassed by a senior manager of this government, does he not run the kind of organization where he's instructed those officials to let him know so that action can be taken? And if he isn't running that kind of government, if he's not that interested in those kinds of issues, Mr. Speaker, then what good is he?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, in this case a court action was taken. Mr. Speaker, action was taken. And as a follow-through to this particular circumstance, we have significantly changed the harassment policies within government, Mr. Speaker.

But note what the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting — that if he were the premier of the province, he would exercise the power of this office to hire and fire and intervene in personnel matters of public servants in this province, Mr. Speaker. Is it any surprise . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. The House will come to order. Order. The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder this Leader of the Opposition takes that position, because that is exactly what went on in government when he worked with this government in the 1980s. That is exactly what went on.

And, Mr. Speaker, we resolved, in taking government back from these folks, we resolved that never again in the history of Saskatchewan should the public service be threatened by politicians with hiring and firing as they did and would do again.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, it's amazing what the Premier's admitting to here today. He thinks it's perfectly reasonable that the most senior official in his government, his deputy minister, the one that reports to him, when informed about this, about harassment in the workplace — nine different cases, maybe more; we can't get an answer — that he doesn't want to know about it. He's told his deputy, I'm not interested in that; I want to be detached from that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province deserve a government that would want to know something about it and would do something about it, Mr. Speaker. That's what they would want. Or, or, Mr. Speaker, is it the fact that Mr. Carriere is connected with this government? Maybe that's the reality.

My question to the Premier is this: what is he hiding, Mr. Speaker?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — There we have it, Mr. Speaker. There we have it — the classic example of a right wing, a right wing party's approach to the public service. There we have an example of a would-be premier, a would-be premier, Mr. Speaker, on his feet casting innuendo on members of this House and former members of this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is a line. There is a line, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition simply does not understand — a line between the elected and the public service. I have instructed and this government have instructed there is a zero tolerance policy for harassment in this government — a zero tolerance harassment policy. That is the role of the elected — to set policy. It is the role of the public service, particularly, particularly when it comes to personnel matters, to enforce that policy. That's what's being done, and that's what was done, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of PSC [Public Service Commission] said from her seat, what the Premier has said in the answer to the question, do they think it is crossing the line for senior officials of the government to be notified that when there's cases of harassment like this, that they should brief their ministers who are responsible and accountable? That minister said and that Premier says, yes, it's crossing the line. We think this NDP has crossed the line of decency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, that Premier, that Premier would rather pay \$275,000 to someone fired for harassment, convicted of assault. He would rather preside over a government that

won't release the settlement, that won't answer any questions as to why, Mr. Speaker.

My question again to the Premier, on behalf of the people of this province who want answers, is simple: what is he hiding, Mr. Speaker?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Premier.

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, in matters in this import, you would at least believe, you would at least believe that the Leader of the Opposition would place the correct facts on the floor of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carriere has not received this payment for harassment. He was put through a process. He's been through the courts. This settlement, Mr. Speaker, is clearly as a direct result of our decision to terminate Mr. Carriere, to terminate him from the public service, to remove him from the workplace, Mr. Speaker. And having not abided by policy at that time, Mr. Carriere took this matter to the courts. On the best legal advice, we were told to settle or it could cost considerably more to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We've chosen that.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is so illustrative in this debate is the attitude that that Leader of the Opposition and that party would take to public servants in our province. They want hirings and firings and discipline the purview of the Premier. It will not be under this Premier or this New Democratic Party government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Environment.

#### Release of Saskatchewan's First State of the Watershed Report

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise today to announce the release of Saskatchewan's first state of the watershed report. Mr. Speaker, the state of the watershed report is an important monitoring tool allowing us to assess the health of our watersheds and ensure our water resources are sustainable. The report, Mr. Speaker, uses indicators to assess the stress being placed on watersheds, the ecological health or condition of the watersheds, and the management activities being undertaken to mitigate the stresses.

Each watershed's condition, stress, and response ratings are presented in an easy to understand report card format. Based on this assessment of Saskatchewan's 29 watersheds, Mr. Speaker, 17 watersheds were rated as having a high degree of management activities and intended to minimize the stresses and improve ecological health. These include Big Muddy Creek, Eagle Creek, and the Kasba Lake watersheds. The report also found four watersheds that were given a high-stress rating and 12 watersheds were rated as having impaired ecological

health. However, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that the health of the watersheds is impacted. Identifying which watersheds have lower health ratings or higher potential stress levels will help to determine which watersheds in the province need to be assessed further and targeted for management activities.

Mr. Speaker, as this is the first state of the watershed report, the information it contains will provide a benchmark which will allow us to compare the results in future reports which will be completed every three years. This will allow us to observe trends in watershed health, assess the effectiveness of our responses, and further develop and refine our work to protect our water for Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, this report is another step in implementing the safe drinking water strategy and it supports Saskatchewan's soon-to-be-released green strategy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the release of the state of the watershed report is another example of our leadership in the protection of our natural environment and the development of a green economy, furthering our efforts to provide our residents with a healthy place to live, work, and raise a family. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — In response to the ministerial statement, the Chair recognizes the member for Martensville.

**Ms. Heppner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the minister for providing me with a copy of the report this morning. It took the NDP government 16 years to have a report on the status of our watersheds. And it's fabulous that we have a report, but we're looking for some action on this front as well. The minister referred to this report as an important monitoring tool, which again raises the question why it took 16 years to create a report that was this necessary. It is extremely important to our environmental health of this province and the well-being of Saskatchewan that we know what the state of our watershed is.

We see from this report that there are 12 watersheds rated as having impaired ecological health. Why did the government allow these watersheds to reach such a deplorable state? There are four watersheds with a high-stress rating. And what is the government doing to ensure that these watersheds do not reach the state of having impaired ecological health? What is the government's plan on this?

We see from this government that they like to write reports and set up committees, but we're worried about the action side of things. And I'd like to quote the Sierra club. When the NDP's green strategy framework was released, the Sierra Club had this say, "... [This was] a document that was full of rhetoric and environmental happy talk ... talk but no action."

The Sierra Club also went on to say that "... [Saskatchewan] has ... an environmentally regressive premier and [a] cabinet whose NDP orange verges on brown."

According to the Suzuki Foundation, greenhouse gas emissions are the highest of any province or territory on a per GDP [gross

domestic product] basis. Greenhouse gas emissions have grown more since 1990 than every other province and territory. With numbers like these, how can the NDP government believe that they are growing a green economy? And how is the environment one of their main pillars in a previous election? It is clear this government has no credibility on the environmental issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### **Bill No. 52 — The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la faune**

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Environment.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 52, The Wildlife Amendment Act be now introduced and read a first time.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of the Environment that Bill No. 52, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007 be now introduced and read for the first time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — The motion is carried.

**Clerk Assistant (Committees):** — First reading of this Bill.

**The Speaker:** — When shall the Bill be read a second time? The Chair recognizes the Minister.

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

**The Speaker:** — Next sitting.

##### **Bill No. 53 — The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007**

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Minister for the Environment.

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 53, The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007 be now introduced and read a first time.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister for the Environment that Bill No. 53, The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007 be now introduced and read for the first time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — The motion is carried.

**Clerk Assistant (Committees):** — First reading of this Bill.

**The Speaker:** — When shall the Bill be read a second time? The Chair recognizes the Minister.

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

**The Speaker:** — Next sitting.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government Whip.

**Mr. Iwanchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government, I'll be tabling responses to written questions no. 343 to 380 inclusive. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — Responses to questions 343 to 380 inclusive have been submitted.

#### SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### Federal Government's Program Funding

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the federal government has made some very significant changes in recent weeks to various programs that affect Saskatchewan people. Unfortunately for the people of this province, all of the changes seem to be for the worse. For that reason, I'll be moving a motion calling on the federal government to undo many of the program changes at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, because the number of programs that the federal Conservatives have either cut funding from or altered is so great, it would not be possible for any one member to address all the implications. For this reason, I'll be directing my focus primarily to the various changes to programs for women.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this does not mean that any of the other issues that the federal cuts raise are any less important. For example, the Harper Conservatives had also cut funding to museums across Canada, and I think that this is significant. Mr. Speaker, the federal government obviously doesn't see museums as necessary service providers. The Harper cabinet obviously sees them as extraneous. I think that cutting funding to museums reveals inept and ideological prejudice, Mr. Speaker. Conservatives have absolutely no reverence for the arts generally. Conservatives and neo-cons, the Harper government included, see no value in those organizations that don't involved the drilling or refinement of oil, the jailing of criminals, or the military.

[11:00]

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about culture? How can we allow the federal government to forsake an institution that contributes to our Canadian culture? Of course we all know what the Sask Party thinks of arts and culture, Mr. Speaker. After all the

member for Wood River once said to a group of arts and culture associations no less, that he is, quote:

... just curious as to why all of a sudden we have ... singled out artists as somebody that we have to include in a Bill to satisfy — and this is why I'm at a loss — satisfy what?

It's clear from his comments, Mr. Speaker, what the member from Wood River thinks about arts. I wouldn't exactly call him a patron. He thinks that legislation is wasted on artists and cultural organizations. You see, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that spans beyond both Sask Party members and federal Conservative Party members. Conservatives are ideologically opposed to the arts and ideologically opposed to culture.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I can see no ... I can see other more practical reasons for the federal Conservatives to cut funding to museums specifically. They have absolutely no interest in being reminded of the past. Who would want to remember a past that includes association with the Mulroney government, a government that plunged our great country into almost unprecedented levels of deficit and debt.

Who, Mr. Speaker, would want to remember a past that includes the Reform Party of Canada? The former leader of the opposition ought to remember that party as a former Reform MP [Member of Parliament]. The member for Carrot River Valley, another former Reformer, should also remember that group.

In some respects I can't blame the Harper government for trying to stop the preservation of history by cutting museum funding. I certainly wouldn't want to be remembered as someone who was involved with a group of fundamentalists far-right ideologues like the Reform Party. That's something the federal Conservatives and Sask Party have in common, Mr. Speaker — an aversion to history. I wouldn't be surprised to see and hear that the Sask Party supports funding cuts to museum. They also have a vested interest in not preserving history, Mr. Speaker, not to mention a disdain for the arts.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to bother to detail all of the connections that the Sask Party has to the nefarious Conservative Party that governed this province in the past. I'm not going to bother to talk about their professional histories. After all, neither does the Leader of the Opposition. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I say that with one caveat. I would like to talk a little bit about the professional history of the newest member to the legislature because it is relevant to our debate today.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Martensville was once staff to none other than the federal Minister for the Status of Women, Beverley Oda. This is significant because Minister Oda presided over some of the most regressive changes to programs for women that our country has ever seen. Minister Oda was agent to the closure of 12 of the 16 Status of Women Canada offices and to the removal of the equality clause from the Status of Women mandate. If I was the member from Martensville, a former staffer tasked with helping to actualize these tragically regressive policies, I wouldn't want to be reminded of that history either.

Perhaps one day, Mr. Speaker, there will be a museum dedicated to the chronicles of the fight of Canadian women for true parity. Perhaps it could include the pen that Bev Oda used to sign the closure notices for the 12 Status of Women Canada offices, next to a picture of the member for Martensville. Of course, Mr. Speaker, a museum like this will not be possible for many, many years. Not because it's impossible for us to succeed in the struggle for parity, but because there isn't any federal funding for it any more. It could take years to secure private funding for a museum, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, aside from ideologically motivated cuts to museums, the federal Conservatives have made regressive changes to the Status of Women Canada. Twelve of sixteen regional offices are scheduled to close, and about half of the Status of Women Canada staff will lose their jobs. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that's not all. Advancing equality for women has been removed from the mandate of the agency women's program, and the program will no longer fund research and advocacy projects.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Why is the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood on his feet?

**Mr. Hart:** — With leave, to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member from Last Mountain-Touchwood has requested leave for introductions. Is leave granted?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Leave has been granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Hart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank the member from Regina Walsh Acres for allowing me to introduce guests.

Mr. Speaker, seated in the east gallery are 13 students from the Punnichy Elementary community school. They are grade 5 students. They're here this morning accompanied by their teacher, Tara Hartl, and chaperones, Sheldon Thomas and Sterling Brass.

They've come to Regina this morning over, I know, snow-packed highways, particularly north of the Qu'Appelle Valley, because I drove over those same highways myself this morning. And I'm very pleased to see them here, and I will be visiting with them in a few moments time. We're going to be going down to the staircase to have our pictures taken. And then we're going to go and have a visit, and I'll hopefully be able to answer their questions and those sorts of things. And I know all members will be well-behaved while they're in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. And I'd ask all members to help me welcome them this morning. Thank you.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — I would also like to welcome these students here

and hope that you're going to enjoy today's debate.

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

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

**The Speaker:** — The member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre has asked for leave for introductions. Is leave granted? Leave has been granted. The member may proceed.

**Hon. Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and my thanks to the member from Regina Walsh Acres for her indulgence at this time. I'd like to make a couple of specific introductions, although I'd like to generally welcome the students from Punnichy.

A few years ago I had the pleasure to be at the grand opening of the newly renovated and added onto Punnichy School. And it's a great school, lots of good students and a lot of good things being done there. But specifically, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to introduce my brother, Sterling Brass, and my niece, Kaylee Brass — if they could give us a wave there. Yes, there we are.

All right. Now you may be wondering, Mr. Speaker — these people are obviously much better looking than I am — so how could we be family? But a couple of summers ago I was adopted as a son into the Brass family, and Sterling is my brother. Kaylee is my niece. And I'm very glad to see them here today, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

## SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

### Federal Government's Program Funding (continued)

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, advancing equality for women has been removed from the mandate of the agency's women's program and the program will no longer fund research and advocacy projects.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to acknowledge the federal government has recently increased the budget of the women's program but only after intense public outcry over the sweeping cuts that the federal government made to the budget months before. But, Mr. Speaker, the increase will do nothing to prevent the office closures nor will it prevent the loss of grassroots support for women's organizations that those offices provided.

No amount of money can compensate for the removal of the advancement of equality for women from the program's mandate. The federal minister responsible for the Status of Women Canada ostensibly believes that women in Canada have achieved full equality with men. This must be the reason for the change to the mandate of the women's program.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not so. If men and women truly enjoyed true parity, the professional lives of women would be

truly uninhibited. This is certainly not the case for more mothers according to Stats Canada. The choices most women have in terms of the kind of work they do and the level of commitment that they can make to a job or career are shaped to a much greater degree by responsibility for unpaid family work and children than for men. Mothers experience more precarious employment, lower income, and less economic security than men. Because of children, women are typically less able than men to accept shift work, overtime, occupations that involve travel, and professional development opportunities.

Many women are forced to choose occupations and hours of employment that accommodate unpaid work, which for many means working part-time. Part-time work typically means lower wages, lower overall earnings, and less access to benefits. In Canada women have represented about 70 per cent of the part-time work force since the 1970s. In 2005, 75 per cent of women in Canada who work part-time reported that they wanted to work full-time but were unable to do so because either of family obligations or because they were unable to find full-time jobs.

Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of single-parent families in Canada are headed by women. And in 2003, 49 per cent of single-parent mothers were living in poverty compared to only 20 per cent of single-parent fathers. Mr. Speaker, between 1995 and 2000 the wage gap in Canada grew between males and females working full-time and full years. It grew in every age category. The widest gap was between men and women with post-secondary educations.

Mr. Speaker, according to the previous census, Canadian women who worked full-time for a year with a university degree, diploma, or certificate earned on average only 67 per cent of what men with a similar education earned. Women with a college or trade certificate or diploma earned on average 70 per cent of what men with similar educational credentials earned. It is clear by simple economic indicators alone, Mr. Speaker, that women have not yet achieved parity with men.

Unfortunately, and quite contrary to the views of Minister Oda and the Harper government, economics are not the only problems still facing women. The funding cuts to the Status of Women Canada has eliminated the possibility of crucial research that was to be done with respect to violence against women, in particular violence against Aboriginal women at the community-based level. Tremendous work and steps had already been undertaken that unfortunately came to a grinding halt with the funding cuts by the Harper Conservatives.

For example, some of these statistics are atrocious. Rates of stalking were twice the level for Aboriginal women than non-Aboriginal people and almost twice as high for Aboriginal women as for non-Aboriginal women. The rate of spousal homicide was eight times higher for Aboriginal women than for non-Aboriginal and 38 times higher for Aboriginal men than for non-Aboriginal men. And as I . . . You can hear, Mr. Speaker, the opposition clearly doesn't want to hear these statistics because they don't want to hear the reality of what's happening to women in Canada, and they don't want to hear the reality of what's happening to women in Saskatchewan. They would prefer to shout out over the statistics instead of actually listening to them and maybe having some concern for them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Morin:** — There is an article in *The Parliamentarian*, which is a group of parliamentarians from all across the world that get together to discuss issues. And their conclusion was, I quote:

... delegates noted that to eradicate domestic violence, although penal provisions have an important role to play, they cannot be enough. What is more important is the enforcement and implementation of laws. Delegates also agreed that empowerment of women and children is also an important factor, hence Parliamentarians should take steps to educate women and children, promote their financial autonomy, reform social and religious practices and customs, raise political and social awareness, and ensure legal provisions for equal opportunities.

One of those opportunities that would have achieved some of this is the Kelowna accord — something else the opposition do not want to hear about. We know that. So I'm just going to go over it quickly.

The Kelowna accord was vitally important to the First Nations and Métis people, and much work was done to reach this agreement, Mr. Speaker. This agreement was especially important to the First Nation and Métis women and children with respect to improvements to health, education, and housing.

Furthermore — and as though this isn't disappointing and insulting enough — the Harper Conservatives must be suffering from the delusion that racism is no longer an issue and that therefore education and support that the Saskatchewan Office of the Treaty Commissioner provides is no longer necessary because the Harper Conservatives have shamefully not committed to new funding for the Saskatchewan Office of the Treaty Commissioner, and as a result has laid off its staff. And the office itself will likely be forced to close its doors at the end of the month, Mr. Speaker.

In contrast to that, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan is going to continue to focus on meeting the needs of the victims of family violence, particularly women and children. Saskatchewan is working in partnership with other governments and with police forces and community organizations to develop policy, legislation, and programs to respond to and reduce violence against women. Saskatchewan's strategy to address and reduce violence against women is led by the departments of Community Resources, Health, and Justice, and is supported by other departments including Learning and the Status of Women office. Unfortunately ...

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Order. I apologize to the hon. member who's on her feet. The interruption that's coming on the benches of the opposition is at a level that is just too high to be able to hear the speaker. And there was also some noise level coming from the government side as well. And I would just ask members to be quieter so that the member who is on her feet can be heard. Thank you.

[11:15]

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, and

quite contrary to the views of Minister Oda and the Harper government, economics are not the only problems still facing women. And the province of Saskatchewan is dedicated to making sure that those issues are dealt with, as well as many other issues that are facing women with respect to these problems.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I want to say that this is something I feel very strongly about, and I know the women of my caucus feel very strongly about, and is very strongly supported by the men of our caucus. And I am very proud to be with the NDP of Saskatchewan that stands firmly behind these issues and is doing everything in its power, in its creativity, and its will to make solutions happen for these problems that women and children, especially of First Nation and Métis cultures, are facing in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and numerous others that time will not permit me to discuss, I would like to move the following motion that was seconded by the member for Regina Wascana Plains:

That this Assembly calls on the federal government to reinstate funding to child care programs, literacy programs, and funding for the Status of Women office, as well as return the goal of equality to the mandate for the Status of Women office.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — ... read the motion first? She's got to read the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I think the member of the opposition has a valid point and that the motion should be read, and I've just received it now. And the motion is as follows:

That this Assembly calls on the federal government to reinstate funding to child care programs, literacy programs, and funding for the Status of Women office, as well as return the goal of equality to the mandate for the Status of Women office.

So that is the motion before the House, and I recognize the hon. member for Regina Wascana Plains.

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you. As I was mentioning, it's with a heavy heart that I am rising today to speak to and address the motion before the Assembly on the breadth of community cuts that have happened throughout our society, Mr. Speaker, and to point out the areas that we are working on to try and help address the shortfalls from those types of measures.

Many years ago working on city council, I was able to be in touch with a broad range of groups in community. And now with the work that I've been doing with the voluntary sector initiative, I know how hard and how diligent people are working in community to provide for a community throughout our province that is measured by the civil society having the ability to help everyone become active in the economy, to



participate freely and strongly in democratic processes, and to be able to organize their communities in a social manner that helps everyone to succeed.

We believe as New Democrats that we are responsible to be an active part of and involved in organizing our society through the collection of tax dollars. This helps assist us and provide economic stimulus, provide the backdrop to the economy, and to assist all people to realize their goals and their dreams, a society where no one is left behind.

And that's today why I rise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as an elected representative to speak out on behalf of community, but on behalf of the province, and to say how those cuts are affecting us particularly in areas that have a strong goal in helping to provide the basis for a strong economy, a strong society, and a civil society at that.

And of course from a women's perspective the cuts are . . . [inaudible] . . . felt because they're in areas that most impact on the lives of women. And one that my colleague has most eloquently addressed is the removal of the goal of equality, the mandate of the Status of Women offices, and programs because who here — male or female — would believe that women have achieved equality?

Couple that with the dollars removed from the women's groups and organizations who advocate on behalf of 52 per cent of our population and are shamefully under-represented at all levels, at all levels. This sends a terrible, sexist, patriarchal message throughout society.

As I was preparing for International Women's Day, Mr. Speaker, I was looking on a website and I recognized one where there are two women who come from Saskatchewan communities — Pam Kapoor and Bernadette Wagner — and on their website they say:

[This is all happening] at a time when everyone knows the stats about women's lower income, women's under-representation in elected office, and when women are proportionately poorer.

They do this at a time when violence against women is commonplace. Recent reports of gruesome testimony from the Pickton trial make the Paul Bernardo case seem mild. We can't seem to go a month in Canada without hearing of another woman murdered at the hands of her husband. Stories about missing women are so common, they've become like white noise. [And] Women's lives — or the . . . [expediency] of them — are sensational enough for the evening news, but apparently not enough for the Harper government who would sooner mock women's equality than support it.

And so the question we should all be asking appropriately today on International Women's Day, does the Harper government really believe in celebrating women or merely aiding in the ongoing denial of equality?

Another site I looked at contrasted the concepts I've believed in and have tried to operate under, in that we as a government have the responsibility to organize ourselves to promote

economic growth and development. But also from that comes social development and the progression of people in our communities. And contrasting that with an article that said, "'Great Dismantler' puts ideology into action" written by Dimitry Anastakis who says:

Although he leads the weakest minority government in Canadian history, this has not stopped Prime Minister Stephen Harper from pursuing his real aim in government. Ultimately, all of Harper's policies are designed to dismantle the capacity of the federal government as a force in Canadian economic and social policy.

While he's doing all of this seemingly under the radar because of course it's an attack on those who are least able to vocalize these issues in community:

. . . doing [all of] this under the radar, slowly and bit-by-bit, anyone who has listened to or read Harper's writings over the last 20 years knows this has always been his sole and abiding goal.

Now, after a year in government, we see his ideology in action.

So, for example . . . the much-heralded . . . [cut to the GST]. While it may cut \$5 billion annually from the federal treasury, it has virtually no impact on average Canadians. Unless, of course, the "average" Canadian buys lots of big ticket items, such as boats or luxury cars.

But, more importantly for Conservatives, the phantom GST cut means the federal government no longer can use that \$5 billion for any other program — such as literacy, or the Status of Women. Then, they dismantle social programs, even though there is a surplus. For example, they ended Ken Dryden's hard-fought national early learning and development plan, and replaced it with their own Conservative so-called child-care plan.

This "program" both cuts federal revenues and destroys a social program at the same time. By amounting to nothing more than \$1,200 tax cut every year, the Conservatives have yet again cut billions out of the federal treasury and ended support for thousands of much-needed day-care spaces built . . . [on right] across this country.

So right across the piece, when I'm looking at the motion before us, what's been happening? In key areas for economic development and the foundation for people to be involved in the economy, Labour Market Partnership Agreement, \$109.3 million federal commitment under the Canada-Saskatchewan economic accord not going to be implemented. The federal government is saying we'll get back to you. There'll be some later date, some announcement that will be dealt with under fiscal imbalance.

Well I'm waiting for next Monday's budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Early learning and child care agreements, the previous Liberal government committed to transferring \$1.15 billion in each year for 2007-08 to 2009-10 to the provinces for early learning and child care agreements. The Conservative government's agreed to transfer \$650 million in 2006-07, but

has completely cancelled these agreements for the remaining three years.

What does this mean for Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan community? It will cost the Saskatchewan communities \$105 million in those years, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The early childhood development agreement and the early learning child care agreement both expire in 2007 and '08. These are considered at risk, and they are cited by the federal government as inappropriate areas of expenditure. Those agreements are valued at \$25 million per annum.

The cuts to our community slice deep into the very fabric of our community, and the members opposite don't want to talk about it. Have they brought forward to this House the cuts to child care? Have they brought forward to this Assembly the cuts in literacy? Have they brought forward what this does to the status of women? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Hamilton:** — They have been silent in this Assembly on the cuts that cut deep in our communities. Literacy programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, recently the federal government's announced a cut of \$17.7 million to literacy funding. This results in a reduction for Saskatchewan of \$650,000 in Saskatchewan and a very significant negative impact on literacy programs and services to roughly 5,000 adult learners.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what that does to the foundation we're laying for people to be able to access jobs and bridge to jobs? These are people who need the programs and services so that they'll be able to access secure commitment to employment in our economy.

And what have those literacy cuts done to community? Well in this article by the National Union of Public and General Employees, it says:

The cuts have sent shockwaves through the literacy community.

At a news conference on Wednesday, Wendy DesBrisay . . . [from] the Movement for Canadian Literacy, said "the cuts will decimate the infrastructure built co-operatively by all levels of government and the literacy community and will set us back years in our ability to meet the literacy challenges of [our] Canadians."

Shameful, shameful, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that's why I rise today . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Humboldt.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it is with great pleasure that I enter this debate. And I just have to comment that what I find shameful is that this government is so tired, so old, so out of vision, so out of ideas, it's amazing to me that they have to bring forward a motion and debate on bashing the federal government instead of addressing what is very, very

important to this province and a number of provincial issues. So I would be more than happy to help them out if they're not aware of the provincial issues or what is important to the people of the province.

And I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the member from Estevan. And the amendment reads, I move:

That all the words following "on the" be removed, and the following be substituted:

provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that all harassment complaints are treated seriously, regardless of who they are alleged against, that due process be followed, and that women who bring complaints forward are not further victimized by department's actions or lack thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP mismanagement from the start of the Murdoch Carriere actual scandal — it's scandalous what has happened with that — demonstrates that this government is not only out of touch, they're not only old, they're not only tired, they're not only out of ideas, but they have no clue what the values of the people of Saskatchewan are. They are absolutely clueless as to what is right or wrong any more. They are so disconnected from what's right or wrong that they continue day after day, since this session has begun and before, to defend the absolute indefensible.

It's absolutely indefensible that the women who were harassed in their workplace were only paid \$15,000, that they had to sign as a collective group, that they had any individual rights or opinions taken away from them, they had to sign as a group, and that the offender is paid \$275,000, plus given a top-up to his pension. That is totally indefensible.

[11:30]

And they talk about . . . they give lip service to the value of women — women in the workplace, women in the community, women in the family, women in this province. And yet the Premier, which is the head of our province and his government, when questioned in this House whether he would do this again in the case of the Murdoch Carriere case, and he said, "You bet I would." And what does that tell the women, the women of the workplace, the women of this province? What does that tell them? He said, "Would I do it again? You bet I would." I would reward the wrong person \$275,000 and a top-up to his pension while the women had to collectively agree and sign to \$15,000 each.

What does that tell the women? What does that tell those women? Those nine . . . not only just those nine women, what does that tell all the women in this province? It tells them they have no value. It tells them they have no respect. It tells them that they can be treated with total disregard for their feelings or their desires or their individual rights, that there is no regard for them.

And if anyone doubts this, if they want to argue with this such as the Minister for Learning wants to argue about this from her seat, then let's just see what one of those women had to say. Is she going to laugh at what one of those women had to say on

the John Gormley show on March 12?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I ask for two things. First I'll ask the hon. member for Humboldt to relate her remarks to the motion. And second I ask for quiet in the House. I'm reluctant to intervene when I'm cutting into the time of members, but I ask for order please so that the member for Humboldt can be heard. Thank you.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm just going to quote from the transcript from the John Gormley show on March 12. And he was questioning the guest speaker. He said:

I appreciate this is really tough on you. You've been hearing so much about this Murdoch Carriere stuff the last couple of weeks. How is this making you feel?

And the guest on his show said, "I feel victimized all over again." That's how that woman felt. And that is how a lot of women in this province feel about the way that this case has been dealt with. They said in addition . . . She also said when he questioned her about her feelings and how the settlement was done, how it was handled, how they were treated by this government, she said:

Angry. Feel totally worthless. We're on a different scale from what he was obviously. To do the criminal things such as what he did and get paid for it doesn't say much for us.

And that's the message that these nine women got. And that's the messages that are going to all of the women of this province, is that is what this government and the members of this government feel about the women within this province — the working women, the mothers, the sisters, the families — the women of this province . . .

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I ask the hon. member from Humboldt, I'm trying to give her some liberty and leeway, but her remarks do not relate to the motion. The motion relates to child care programs, literacy programs, funding for the Status of Women office, and I would ask her to relate her remarks please to the motion. Thank you.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to point out that I made an amendment, and I am speaking to the amendment now . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Thank you. We're obviously running out of time, and it's a 10-minute limit, so I would like to do, very, very quickly, a very quick review on how this government has treated these women and sent a message to all the women of the province throughout the whole Murdoch Carriere case.

And it isn't been a treatment of intimidation and of ignoring their desires or their rights. When the government first learned of this, what did they do about it? Did they fire Mr. Carriere? No, they didn't. They merely shuffled him to another department. This was a man who had strong political ties with the NDP government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And when they first learned about it, instead of starting . . . They didn't even initiate the process; they didn't even initiate the process that he could be fired with due cause. No, instead they just shuffled him

within the department and he kept his full pay. Did those women feel that they were valued at that point in time? I doubt it very, very, very much.

And they didn't address it until there was an investigation and the consultant's report was leaked. It was leaked to the media. It was leaked to the official opposition. And that's when they finally recognized that they would have to address it. They were dragged kicking and screaming and they were shamed into firing Mr. Murdoch Carriere. But had they started the process so that he could be fired with due cause? No they hadn't. They had not addressed the issue in the proper process.

So they fired him, and then what did they do next? Well when the nine women that actually brought forward the complaints and were in the report, when the nine women threatened to sue this government, they decided to make an agreement. Did those women have individual rights or individual opinions? No, they had to agree to something as a collective body of nine. If any one of them did not agree to the settlement that was offered to them, then none of them would get it. It was taken off the table. How is that respecting women? It was take it or leave it. And furthermore if you choose not to take it, then you will also take it away from the other eight complainants. How is that treating women fairly or acknowledging that they have rights, they have opinions, and they should have a personal choice in this issue? There were never given those rights. So what does that tell all of the women of our province?

Then when there was a settlement made, the women signed an agreement. They signed it and were not given a copy of it. I find that absolutely amazing — absolutely amazing that they were not given a copy of the agreement that they had just signed.

But then there was the settlement with Mr. Carriere, and they didn't know about that either, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They weren't consulted. The government just decided, we'll just make this settlement.

What are they hiding? What are they hiding that they had to make that quick settlement? They never talked to the women. They never said, do you want us to fight this? Do you think that making a settlement of \$275,000 plus topping up his pension is fair? What do you think? No, those women were not given that respect. They were not allowed to consult. They were not allowed an opinion. They were allowed a phone call after the fact a few minutes before it was announced. That's the respect that those women were given. That's absolutely appalling.

So this government can sit there and give lip service all they want to how they feel about women. Their actions are what the people of Saskatchewan are looking at. Their actions is what's telling the tale.

So now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the women are asking, they're going back and they're saying, can we see the agreement? They've got legal counsel. Can we see the agreement that we were basically forced to sign? And they're told no, the government has to get permission for you to see the agreement. How does that work? They paid their legal counsel. They paid their legal counsel. They had the agreement. They had a lawyer and yet the government has to give them permission, and the government is saying they can't have it again until all nine sign.

They do not have any individual rights.

It is absolutely appalling and I'd like to know what this government is hiding in this whole case. And this is unacceptable by this government, and the message it gives all of the women in Saskatchewan is appalling.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Order. I recognize the hon. member for . . . the Minister of Learning, the hon. member for Moose Jaw Wakamow.

**Hon. Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure to be able to rise on my feet today and join in this debate. And I truly had looked forward to an opportunity where this House would send a clear signal to our federal government about our disappointment with the cuts to programs and changes that have drastically affected the people of our province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it really has been a pretty difficult year for many groups across the province. And I'm not speaking just about the Government of Saskatchewan or those of us that sit in this Assembly but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, people out and about right across this province have felt the withdrawal of funding for programs and the withdrawal of programs by our federal government.

Mr. Speaker, early on in the beginning, right after the federal election, there have been many years — and I mean many years — where women and community groups right across this province have worked to be able to establish a national child care program. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all know that there was a great deal of enthusiasm for the project of the former Liberal federal government when they had committed to funding, five years of funding for a national child care plan.

Each of the provinces put in substantial work, working with their community groups, working with partners, working with workers within the child care industry, that they would put together a plan that was appropriate for our province and that people and families and young people in this province would feel.

Mr. Speaker, we received two years of funding from the federal government for the national child care plan, and we had our agreement in, our memorandum of agreement signed, and we were prepared to sign the final deal for the remainder of the five-year funding that had been committed, when the election came and we had a change of government and that program was ended.

Now part of the issue, I think, during that election campaign was the Conservative government or the Conservative opposition at that time made the commitment of \$100 for each child under the age of six. And they portrayed this as giving families choice.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many people viewed this as an addition over and above the national child care plan but didn't . . . I guess as human nature we often look at the points of a platform that we like and often don't pay attention to a lot of the

fine detail or listen to many of the speeches — as much as I hate to admit it as a politician that people don't often listen to everything we say, pick and choose the pieces that appeal to them. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's what happened. Many people felt that the \$100 per month for a child under the age of six would also be on top of the national child care plan that had been announced a couple of years before. But that was wrong.

And for all of those people in our communities that have spent 30, 35 years working towards the goal of a national child care plan, that just went by the wayside — \$100 per month sounds wonderful, and what parent wouldn't turn it down to have another \$100 per child in their jeans?

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, people will start to realize the effect and how much they actually get to keep shortly when we file our income tax returns because that \$100 a month isn't like the national child benefit. It is taxable income, so parents will have to start putting that amount of money on to their income tax forms and doing the calculations. They'll get a truer value of what they actually get to keep.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$100 in your pocket is not choice. To have choice, you need to have options to choose from. You have to have options to choose from. Mr. Speaker, that is where this program sadly goes by the wayside and really doesn't provide any service to the families, the young families, the working families right across this province. Mr. Speaker, that's one thing that I think we're all distressed over.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you a story about the difficulty of working with this new federal government. Quite often major events I think for all ministers are federal-provincial-territorial meetings where ministers from the territories, the province, and the federal minister have an opportunity to get together over a couple of days, put in place priorities, talk about issues that affect us nationally. Well this new federal government, sometimes they show up; sometimes they don't. They have no input. They have total disregard for the provinces and the work that we do in the provinces. There's very little source of co-operation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can live with that. That doesn't . . . I mean, whatever. If that's the way they want to work, that's the way we'll work. But the losers in this are the people of our province. And here are the Sask Party. They're quite content to be distant cousins of the Conservatives in Ottawa. They're back and forth to each other's conventions, but they have no formal connection — I understand that. But, Mr. Speaker, these issues affect Saskatchewan people.

[11:45]

Here we are, we're sitting at an FPT [federal-provincial-territorial] meeting down in Newfoundland, waiting for the federal minister to show up, and what do we hear? The top priorities for the ministers of Education across Canada have been literacy and First Nations education. And as we're sitting in a meeting in Newfoundland, and neither of the federal ministers have the time to come and meet with the provinces, they release their announcement out of Ottawa that they've cut \$1 billion — \$1 billion.

What were the targets? Literacy — which was all of the Education ministers across Canada and the territories, it's been a priority for a couple of years that we have been working jointly together on — and First Nations education, along with a whole raft, a whole list of other programs. Was there any type of a heads-up to the ministers? No. Was there any type of heads-up to the provinces? No. It's just gone.

We don't think this is a priority. How can literacy not be a priority? When you listen to, when you listen to the employers, when you listen to people in the community, there is an issue with literacy. People may have some skills but need to upgrade those skills for today's economy. This affects many people in many ways.

So now the federal government has actually talked . . . I'll flip back to my previous kind of topic on child care. The new federal government has committed to putting \$250 million a year, each year for the next five years, into the creation of spaces as tax credits, while that has been tried in two provinces previously and has been a dismal failure every time. We have made our point to the federal government that this isn't the way we want child care to operate. And in an economy such as Saskatchewan where we have medium to small businesses, tax credits for employers to create child care spaces is not the way to go.

Now I'm hopeful that come the budget on Tuesday we will see some changes in the federal government's position on this. I know every one of the provinces have lobbied the federal minister. We have spoken to him, sent letters, and expressed our point. We have expressed our point that the federal government needs to work with the provinces so we can best maximize the resources that we have and provide the best services for the citizens in each of our provinces.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I truly hoped we would've been able to as a legislature send a one solid voice to Ottawa from the province of Saskatchewan saying, restore these services for the people of Saskatchewan; they are important. They are important. They are important for young children to have that early good start in life. They're important for working families. They are important for single-parent families and, Mr. Speaker, in the long run they are important for us all, because that good start, those early supports, mean continued success throughout their life.

Now I know the Saskatchewan Party says, well we're not Conservatives, we're not Conservatives. And I know that they travel back and forth between the Conservative and the Sask Party conventions when they have their party conventions. It's covered in the news. And they're . . . I mean, it's talked about quite openly in the news. So what I would ask the Sask Party, what I would ask the Sask Party is that while they're sitting in the visitor's gallery at the Conservative convention, after they've done their glad-handing and chit-chatting, I wish they would please make the point and make a plea for Saskatchewan people. We need these programs restored, and we need better supports for Saskatchewan families, and we need these programs to be continued. And, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion wholeheartedly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chair, and it was interesting listening to this motion brought forward by this government. Usually I am pleased to be part of any debate or of any issue that's discussed in this Assembly. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's . . . I have a difficult time feeling pleasure because of the sanctimonious way this NDP government has a notion to . . . feels they can condemn a government for their treatment of anybody on women's issues while their own record is at best dismal, and at worst, it's disgusting on most issues when it comes to women.

And I know that I'm going to talk to you for a few minutes later on about the Carriere issue. And I'm also going to bring forward an amendment to this motion, and if you would prefer I can discuss the amendment at this time. But I also wanted to bring forward the fact that women in this province have looked to this government for over 14 years now for leadership in a number of areas — I guess it was closer to 16 years — and the Carriere case is one of them.

But we could also talk about the zero tolerance of children that were being sexually exploited in this province. We know that it was only under the work of a previous member, Arlene Julé, that we actually talked about the children on the street and the impact that had on women in this province.

We also could talk about the FAS [fetal alcohol syndrome] issue in this province that affects women. That hasn't even been on the radar screen till 12 years ago when we brought it up from this side of the House. And then all of the sudden the government said that they cared about this issue. Although I know at the recent conference in BC [British Columbia] last weekend, I awaited the minister's appearance — but I didn't see him there — to just talk about how important that issue is in this province.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to facilitate the proceedings in the House today, I am advising the House here that I'm going to be bringing forward a motion to amend the motion on the floor right now. And the motion will read:

That all the words following “on the” be removed, and the following be substituted:

provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that all harassment complaints are treated seriously regardless of who they are alleged against, and that due process be followed, and that women who bring complaints forward are not further victimized by this department's actions or lack thereof.

This motion will be seconded by the member from Estevan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also wanted to remind the people in this Assembly that we know that not all Sask Party members are of the same federal persuasion and allegiance, unlike the NDP opposite. But I wonder how anyone would want to admit that they were a federal NDP when the leader doesn't know the

difference between SARS [severe acute respiratory syndrome] and BSE [bovine spongiform encephalopathy].

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the facts about women in this province that we were . . . on the issue that affects them in their home or in their workplace is well quoted in a number of statistics. And one of them is the violence against women. There was statistics taken from reports and others. In 1996 approximately 80 per cent of victims of criminal harassment were women. We also know that in a violence against women survey, 87 per cent of women have experienced sexual assault. That in itself is the kind of numbers that sends fear down the spines of many, many people because they know it. They know it, living in their own lives.

I also for the record want people to know that of those women who admitted that they had been victims of spousal violence, only 26 per cent reported an incident to police. Women are three times more likely to report incidents to police if the children are watching. Women interviewed did not call the police for protection or help in ending violence; 57 per cent of these women were injured by their partners.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also think it's important that people realize that 8 out of 10 Aboriginal women in Ontario reported having been battered. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to stop and say hello to one of the First Nations women who are watching us right now. Her name is Brenda and to her this issue is very important. Because to talk about women's issue and not mention the fact that there are other issues that are very important to women in Saskatchewan today would be just plain wrong. Between 75 and 90 per cent of women in northern Aboriginal communities are harassed, Mr. Speaker.

That being said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the issue that's on the minds of the majority of women in Saskatchewan right now is not the issue that this government has brought forward. And I do believe that governments have a right or have a duty and responsibility to bring forward the issues that are foremost in the minds of people in the province. And right now, today in Saskatchewan, the majority of people are thinking about the abuse that went on in the Carriere case. More specifically they are thinking about this government's decision to pay a male abuser 10 times more than women who were assaulted.

Mr. Speaker, these stats are alarming. But I know, in fact every woman alive knows, that that number is misleading because it's low. Many women do not report sexual abuse or harassment for many reasons. They have the fear. They have embarrassment. They have shock. They have intimidation. But especially in the workplace, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fear of losing your job or of not being promoted is foremost.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude or the message sent by this government to the women of Saskatchewan regarding harassment is get over it. The message that boys will be boys is the message that is clear to the women. Women who are sexually assaulted or harassed cannot and do not get over it. The memories stay inside of them for the rest of their life. The fear and the humiliation and the disgust and sometimes the hate can eat up women. In some ways, usually unseen ways, life never moves on from the moment of the attack. It shapes your thoughts. It shapes every working moment. It shapes every

sleeping moment in most cases for the rest of their lives.

Right now I want to refer to some of the facts that we've dealt with in this legislature in the last couple of weeks about the case that is on the mind of people. On February 27 the NDP announced that it had reached a legal settlement to pay \$275,000 to a former senior civil servant who had been accused of sexual harassment by nine female employees and later found guilty of common assault. The NDP government first learned of the accusations, and a senior official in the Department of Environment was called in to review. And it was determined harassment did occur, "both in terms of abuse of authority and in terms of inappropriate sexual behaviour." The consultant's report stated:

Mr. Carriere used his authority to intimidate staff. He takes liberties with the staff that he has no right to. The six complainants were conscious of his frequent reminders that they owed their jobs to that man.

The NDP moved Mr. Carriere to a new position in another department of government and provided him with a positive letter of recommendation and told the women involved not to talk about the investigation. End of the story.

And once the report became public, the women who had accused Mr. Carriere of sexual harassment threatened to sue the NDP government, so this government opted to settle the case out of court. And they paid nine women \$135,000. That worked out to \$15,000 each. And what did Mr. Carriere get? \$275,000 out of their money that they paid in tax. These women all paid income tax, and just about all of it went to pay for the person that actually harassed them.

Mr. Speaker, the minister opposite talked about the difficulty working with federal government. Women in this province have difficulty working with this provincial government. They are the losers. The minister talked about the losers are the people in the province. Well in this case the losers are the women in this province. They are the women who have to go about living in this province and knowing that their tax money went to pay for their abuser.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to repeat my motion. The motion moved by . . . move my motion, and I move that:

All the words following "on the" be removed, and the following be substituted:

provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that all harassment complaints are treated seriously regardless of who they are alleged against, that due process be followed, that women who bring complaints forward are not further victimized by this department's actions or lack thereof.

This motion is seconded by the member from Estevan, and I do hope there will be support in this House from women on both sides when it comes to supporting women in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[12:00]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — We're going to pause while I assess whether the amendment is in order or not.

I recognize the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Chair, having . . . I heard the Chair wishing to assess the relevance of the amendment, and I rise on precisely that point of order, not to contest the opposition member's right to choose the subject of debate, but whether it is appropriate in this debate in which we are now.

And to inform the Chair about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I refer you and the House to Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules*, 5th Edition, items no. 425 and 426 which relate to amendments to motions. And if I may quote the relevance of the amendments needing to be relevant to the subject and then make my point there. First of all on the rule, rule no. 425 states that:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability . . .

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I apologize to the Government House Leader. I'd ask that the clock please be stopped so that the right of members to speak is not eroded. And with that in mind, I now recognize the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again just to repeat the rule 425:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original . . .

And this is the key part of the phrase, Mr. Chair,

. . . which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the questions.

And then 426 on that precise same point states:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Mr. Chair, it goes on to say:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I'm not arguing on that point. It's the matter of relevance. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on that point of relevance, clearly, clearly by the rules of the Assembly the amendment must be relevant to the main question.

I point out to the House that I've listened to the motion, the amended . . . the amendment proposed by the member for Kelvington, and the amendment clearly deals with provincial government for starters and then courses of action.

If I can remind the Chair of the House that the motion before us, as moved by the hon. member for Regina, is that this Assembly calls on the federal government, calls on the federal government then to reinstate funding to child care programs — there's a list, in other words — and calls on the federal government to reinstate funding to literacy programs, calls on the federal government to reinstate funding for the Status of Women's office, and calls on the federal government as well to return the goal of equality to the mandate for Status of Women office.

Clearly the motion is intended to provide for the Assembly the ability to make a statement from Saskatchewan about the actions of the federal government as they relate to issues of concern to women and families. And that is the intent of the motion. It is clearly the intent.

And in order to be germane, I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the amendment must therefore deal with a matter of reference to the federal government, which this clearly does not. And on that ground, Mr. Speaker, on that ground . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . If the hon. members want to debate the point of order, I'm happy to do that. I mean I can understand why they may, why they may not want to criticize the federal government, but that's not the point I'm attempting to make here.

The point I'm attempting to make is one of relevance for the motion as proposed, and I would ask for your consideration on that. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the Opposition House Leader

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to rise on the point of order proposed by the Government House Leader. Mr. Deputy Speaker, clearly the government's motion, at least in our reading of it, tried to express its concern about the well-being of women in this province and in this country. And certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is an important issue that needs to be addressed and needs to be talked about and needs to be debated.

But I'm absolutely amazed the Government House Leader would stand in this House and suggest that our amendment would be out of order when we call on the government to be accountable for its own actions in regard to the harassment of women in this province. I would think he would be embarrassed before he would stand in this House and draw attention to the fact that their government has misrepresented women's issues that they propose in their motion to defend.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, clearly the rules established say that amendment can be made if it enhances the intent of a motion. Our amendment is intended to enhance the status of the motion whereby we ensure that women in this province are also looked after and their rights are respected in this province. And I would urge you to rule in the admissibility of this amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Members of the Assembly, thank you for your patience while I've had a opportunity to obtain the advice of the Clerks, review the rules of the House.

This is a little bit of a grey area, but I am going to rule that the amendment is out of order. And I do that because of the issue of the main motion being directed towards the federal government, and this amendment being strictly directed towards the province. This motion is about federal policy, and the amendment eliminates all reference to the federal government and federal policy.

I would indicate to members that in Erskine May *Parliamentary Practice*, page 339, the rules clearly state that "... no amendment should be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question." And the elimination to all references to the federal government, I think, by this amendment, violates this rule. So that is my ruling.

And I take it that a member from the opposition is going to rise, so I recognize the hon. member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm pleased to stand today to speak on this issue. I find it very interesting that the previous speakers on the government side, they can't defend . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Chair, had the amendment been in order, then the opposition would clearly be in position to assume its place for the seconder of the amendment. With the amendment not being in order, and if they're following the normal procedure of the House to rotate from side to side, I believe it is appropriate. There was a . . .

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Order. Order. The Government House Leader has the floor. I recognize the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Chair, I recognize that you recognized the person who had previously stood, but there is a member on government side who was wishing to speak to the motion. And following the normal rotation of debate, I ask the Chair to recognize that it's in order to recognize the government member to continue the debate, as the amendment is not in order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, clearly the government member didn't stand up. You correctly identified a member from this side of the House that stood up. This member is recognized, and I would find it reprehensible if you reversed your position.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Well, hon. members, it may well be that I've made a mistake and did not see the government member rising, but at this point I recognize the

hon. member for Estevan, with apologies to the Assembly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I'm very pleased to stand today to speak on this issue. And I can understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why the government continually raises point of orders and that, because they can't defend their own government. So that they want all the chance that they can to get up and attack the federal government. They should be embarrassed — not only embarrassed by their actions but also ashamed. They just continually get up, hammer the federal government. They should have their own House in order before they do anything like that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the previous speakers that have got up and have chastised the federal government for the cuts that they have made to the different federal programs, all they have to do is check their own record. Who cut library funding?

As a return to equality, part of their motion says that they want to return the goal of equality to the mandate for the Status of Women office. What about the status of women for the nine women that were involved in the Murdoch Carriere case? What was the equality there? — \$275,000 versus \$15,000 each for these people. And on top of that they're not allowed to speak out against it, Mr. Speaker; they have been muzzled. And this is this government's treatment on women. This is how the government really feels towards women.

So they can't get up and speak out of both sides of their mouth, attack the federal government for what they are doing, when they are no better. And all they have to do is to talk to their, I guess, their cousin Jack in Ottawa and we all know where he stands on that, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, I find it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it ironic also that on Tuesday the member from Wascana Plains rose in this House and she spoke on and recognized rural women — this March being Rural Women's Month — and yet that same member votes for cuts in agriculture spending, votes for increased premium, reduced coverage in crop insurance, and doing this does create a hardship for rural women as they are forced to go work off the farm. And many of these women do not want to go out to work, but they are forced to. Their husbands are already out working, but because of the way the farming situation is today, there is no way they can make ends meet. So they are forced to go off the farm to subsidize the farm.

What kind of a message does the things that have been happening provincially have on these women? Many of them have never been in the workforce before. And, you know, they must just give their heads a shake and wonder what is going on with this government and where they stand on the Murdoch Carriere case.

The nine women who have been muzzled, who were pressured to sign the agreement, perhaps they have children, perhaps they are a single parent and may be in desperate need of finances, Mr. Speaker. They have been victimized by harassment and revictimized by this government. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not only dreadful, it's absolutely shameful. It's totally



unacceptable.

This is a government that continually gets up here and pretends to have ownership of women's issues, and then on the other side they defend the Murdoch Carriere in this situation. They keep on about equality for women, and I don't know how they do their math but . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . yes 18 times more money, the hon. member has said — \$275,000 compared to \$15,000 each for the women. They were pressured to sign the agreement under duress.

[12:15]

**The Speaker:** — Order please. I would ask the member to relate her remarks to the motion before the seventy-five minute debate.

**Ms. Eagles:** — And I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I just want to make the comparison that this government talks about what the federal government has done in relationship to child care programs, literacy programs — which they have cut the libraries' budget in this province, I might add, and funding for the Status of Women — and how they pretend to care about the status of women and equality for women in this province.

And what we've seen happen here in the last six days that we've been sitting in this legislature certainly is contrary to what they have risen and spoke in the defence of women, Mr. Speaker, and again it's appalling the actions of this government. And I honestly believe that this government has decided to put this motion forward because they cannot defend the actions of their own government. So they attack the federal government and the cuts that the federal government has made to child care programs.

And of course the Government House Leader is chirping from his seat, heaven forbid we criticize the federal government. Well heaven forbid that he would have to defend his own government, Mr. Speaker. Because there is not one of them over there, if they have any kind of a conscience at all, that could defend the actions that government has taken regarding women in this province. And every person over there should be ashamed, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the mover of the motion, the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member from Estevan whether . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. The debate continues on the main motion. The member may speak. The time for the debate on the main motion is now elapsed; we will now proceed to the question portion of the motion. The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we've not yet heard the opposition's position at all with respect to equality and women and what their position is on that, and whether or not they support the funding cuts that the Harper Conservatives have perpetrated against all the women in

Canada. So I'd like to ask the member from Estevan directly: does she support or not support the funding cuts by the Harper Conservatives to the Status of Women Canada offices?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Mr. Speaker, what I will tell you is what this government has done provincially here, and that they have supported the perpetrator in the recent case with Murdoch Carriere and have not stood up for women. And it is very hypocritical for that woman or that member to get up and pretend that she supports women when she doesn't.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Humboldt.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting that the motion talks about the goal of equality for women. And I would like to know if the member from Regina Walsh Acres believes that paying a perpetrator \$275,000, and the women who were victims \$15,000 — is that equality for women? Does she agree with that type of equality that her government has done?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, there's no question that I and the NDP of Saskatchewan support equality of women. We support equality of women through child care, through programs for women in learning, etc., not to mention housing. There is no question that the NDP of Saskatchewan and I support pay equity and equality of women in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Wascana Plains.

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the member from Kelvington-Wadena if, when we're talking about impact on community and talking about women who have been victimized who need to have bridging programs to be able to be active in the workplace, if she supports the funding cuts to Saskatchewan alone of \$650,000 for literacy programs that will impact on 5,000 adult learners — many of them women who want to be actively involved in the economy.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I know that the women out in my community weren't very impressed at all when the provincial government cut funding to the libraries. Because out in rural Saskatchewan that had a huge impact. So that, and also the Status of Women in Saskatchewan — I haven't seen any increase in that forever. So I don't believe your government has any, has any legs to stand on when it

comes to supporting any women in Saskatchewan.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Moose Jaw Wakamow.

**Hon. Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the member from Estevan. And just to clear the air a wee bit, there has not been a reduction of funding to the library system in Saskatchewan. But I have a question. I have a question for the member from Estevan. The member from Estevan stood on a number of occasions and requested and put in petitions on behalf of her constituents about the request for child care spaces in her constituency. I want to know from the member from Estevan if she opposes the cuts that the federal government has made to child care right across Canada.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite are so interested in federal politics perhaps they should run in a federal election. But what I will tell them is that the \$275,000 that this government give Murdoch Carriere would go a long way for child care spaces.

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the member from Walsh Acres. I think many of us believe that actions speak louder than words. And despite this government's harassment policies, how do you believe this Murdoch Carriere case was handled, and do you believe that it sends the wrong message to women in the workplace?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad for the question because there is no question about how the NDP of Saskatchewan feels about harassment in the workplace and its stance on that. Clearly we would never see the legislation that we currently have in The Occupational Health and Safety Act if it wasn't for us in power. There's no question about that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Morin:** — So that is my position. But here's something else I want to make known, especially since we're supposed to be speaking in referral to this motion. This is a quote by Heather Mallick in the *Chatelaine* magazine of March 2007. She says about the Harper government:

Look at his cabinet, his track record and his failure to act  
— Stephen Harper is crushing Canadian women.

Then she goes on to say:

I grew up absolutely confident of my rights as a woman. I  
am no longer so sure . . .

**The Speaker:** — The member's time has elapsed. Next

question.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member from Walsh Acres a question. For a person that gets up and continually blasts the federal government and then expects . . . How can she expect to have a working relationship with the federal government?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — I have no reason to blast the federal government if they wouldn't give me the reasons to blast them on certain issues, Mr. Speaker. And continuing on with that, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the opposition:

Thirty years later, Stephen Harper has crushed the Status of Women. The federal agency no longer fights for "equality," that dirty word having been removed from its official mandate.

I'd like to know how the opposition feels about equality. Do they feel that women in Canada have achieved equality — yes or no?

**The Speaker:** — Next question. The Chair recognizes the member for Moose Jaw Wakamow.

**Hon. Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you very much. To the member from . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . They refused to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, so I guess it's up to me to just ask another one. And I would really like to ask the member from Estevan if she agrees . . . I mean and this is serious because each of these cuts affects people in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what we're doing. We're here doing what we need to do as representatives in Saskatchewan — represent our constituents and fight for the best we absolutely can for them. Does the member from Estevan agree with the federal government cuts to services to the people of Saskatchewan?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Mr. Speaker, what's serious in this province is the situation that this government has got themselves in, in equality to women and the way they have treated the women in this province and the way they continue to treat women in this province. That is what's a very serious situation in this province at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Cannington.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker,

this has been a very interesting debate about the value of equality in Canada for women. Mr. Speaker, in this province we've clearly seen a demonstration by the provincial NDP government that they do not value women in this province. We have seen an example where women who are victimized in the workplace, in a provincial government workplace, are compensated \$15,000 for harassment in the workplace. And yet we see the perpetrator of that harassment receive a benefit from this NDP government of \$275,000.

Is that equality, Mr. Speaker? Is it equal? Is it of equality to women in this province to be valued for their harassment at \$15,000 when the perpetrator gets 275,000? And I ask that question to the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that that member that just asked that question also voted against the harassment policy under The Occupational Health and Safety Act. So is it flip-flop or not? I mean, I find that quite interesting.

Second of all, they are constantly trying to confuse the issue of that payment. It had nothing to do with the settlement of the issue at hand. It was a labour relations issue in terms of the settlement with Carriere. End. Full stop. And that has been explained many times and unfortunately they don't understand it.

As for the member from Kelvington, I find it interesting that she said that none of us have spoken to First Nations and Métis issues in this debate. Well unfortunately either she wasn't listening or elsewhere, but there was great focus on the issue of how funding cuts affect First Nations and Métis women in particular — women in general but especially First Nation and Métis women.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Final question. The member for Regina Wascana Plains.

**Ms. Hamilton:** — I was quite excited about seeing a man get up to enter the debate and I was hopeful that there was going to be one man in the opposition that would speak to the issues that are affecting community and affecting women in community. But I'm going to ask the question from the member from Humboldt.

When we have Saskatchewan women who are joining Code Blue for child care campaigns; when we've got Saskatchewan women during International Women's Day calling for a return for equality for women to the mandate of the Women's Secretariat; when we've got child care issues and labour market issues for women being severely cut in partnership agreements between the federal government and the province, does she see a responsibility for women in this province — particularly in elected office — to speak out against those cuts?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Humboldt.

**Ms. Harpauer:** — I'm glad that the member noticed that a man from this side of the House stood up to ask a question because the men on this side of the House, quite frankly, are very interested in female issues, women's issues, which is more than I can say of the men on that side of the House, because not one of them has entered this debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member opposite would like to take a look at her own backyard, her own house, to make sure it's cleaned out before we start attacking the federal government for all of their issues.

We are not in federal politics here; we are in provincial politics and it is her and her government that has buried the stand-alone Women's Secretariat office into the Department of Labour. It lost its status right here in this government with their office. Has the Women's Secretariat office made any comments on the Murdoch Carriere case? Is her . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order please. We thank the members for the seventy-five minute debate which time has now elapsed. On the agenda we go to private Bills, second readings.

## PRIVATE BILLS

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 301 — The Eston College (Full Gospel Bible Institute Amendment) Act

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 301, The Eston College (Full Gospel Bible Institute Amendment) Act be now read a second time and referred to committee.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the member for Rosetown-Elrose that Bill No. 301, The Eston College (Full Gospel Bible Institute Amendment) Act be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

**Clerk:** — Second reading of this Bill and referral to the committee.

[12:30]

#### Bill No. 302 — The Hotels Association of Saskatchewan Amendment Act

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Wascana Plains.

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I would move second reading, I'd just sort of want to let the Assembly know that this Bill represents a name change only. But it is a change that is important to the industry because it reflects the new name, the Saskatchewan Hotel and Hospitality Association and that's reflected in the nature of business and the broadening of their membership.

And with that, I move that Bill No. 302, The Hotels Association of Saskatchewan Amendment Act be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the member for Regina Wascana Plains that Bill No. 302, The Hotels Association of Saskatchewan Amendment Act be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

**Clerk:** — Second reading of this Bill and referral to the committee.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Southeast.

#### **Motion No. 3 — Loss of Confidence in the Government's Ability to Manage**

**Mr. Morgan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I . . .

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader on a point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, when I look at the motion that the hon. member will obviously be proposing, because it's listed on the blues, I would ask that you would rule whether it is in fact in order.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a long-standing principle that in fact in Beaudesne's is referred to an old rule of parliament, it's been around for so long that it . . . I think it's the only time we've ever seen in a rule that . . . it begins by saying there is an old rule of parliament. It's a very basic principle that says, and I quote:

“. . . That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House.”

And I would make the argument, Mr. Speaker, that the question that the hon. member is intending to propose to the House has already been negated by this House within, in fact, within the last week, Mr. Speaker. I remind the House that on Thursday a week ago, a week ago today, that the House made a decision on a motion which read, and I quote:

That this Assembly no longer has confidence in the Premier and his government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't have confidence? Mr. Speaker, is it surprising they don't have confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the government? You know the Sask Party's all about one thing. It's all about pursuit of power. That's what it's about. Of course . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order please. I believe the member has made his point. Speaking to the point of order, the Chair recognizes . . . Order please. Order please. Order please. I believe the member has made his point of order. He was starting to get into considerable debate. If the member has additional comment to make on the point of order, I would invite him to do so now.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — I'd be happy to do so, Mr. Speaker. And let me proceed directly to that without getting into the debate that we have.

Mr. Speaker, when I quoted the motion that was already decided by this House in this session, I refer to the fact that the motion proposed by the opposition, that was defeated by this Assembly therefore affirming confidence, but the motion was, by the opposition moved, that there is no confidence in the Premier and his government. It is an entirely sweeping motion, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible to make a stronger statement about confidence — or in this case, proposed lack of confidence by the opposition — than that. It is the existence of the executive government under the leadership of the Premier that was challenged in the contents in all of that. Now what is proposed in the motion today that contradicts that is that is it a different notion? Clearly it is not a different notion in the proposed motion that is before us. It is a less comprehensive motion because it refers to specific actions.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the opposition is intending to get around, attempting to get around the motion — with this House having already expressed within the last week entire confidence in the Premier and his government because that was the subject — is intending to get around the rule of the House by saying, well then, we don't have confidence because of something that's less than that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to propose an action that is less than something that has already been ruled on by the House, I suggest, is not in order, and I would ask that you would find the motion out of order.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Opposition House Leader to speak to the point of order.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak to this point of order raised by the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, clearly the motion is different, and clearly the precedence and habit of this House is to express and to allow a fair bit of latitude on private members' day to make sure that members have their right to propose legitimate motions of concern that reflect the current issues in front of the province of Saskatchewan.

I may point out that the motion that was on the floor of the House has been there for some length of time and was indeed a

very sweeping motion, in general a non-confidence in the Premier, specifically, and the government. What is the motion proposed today is much more specific, related to issues that have developed in the near-term past, and addressed certain issues that are very, very important to the taxpayers right now.

Certainly just this week we had the census numbers released, and that's a current issue. Certainly the issue of population decline is an issue that's of very grave concern to the people across this province. And certainly the poor accountability in regard to the Carriere affair is very much a concern and a disappointment to people in this province.

The motion by the official opposition expresses that disappointment in a way that is very clear and succinct. And I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule in the affirmative and allow this motion to go forward.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Members of the Assembly, this motion having appeared in the blues has given me an opportunity to consider the admissibility of the motion. I would like to mention to the members that the confidence motion is not considered in the same sense as a motion on policy when it comes to admissibility for debate. The concept of responsible government and accountability of executive government is a topic that should not be precluded indefinitely from debate in the Assembly.

The general precedence is that wording of a second confidence motion should be different than a motion which may have previously been disposed of. There is precedence for this, which has occurred on a second confidence motion in this Assembly on July 2, the year 2002. I therefore declare that this motion is in order. Debate proceeds. The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Southeast.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morgan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A very good ruling, and I thank you for that.

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order. Order please. Order. The question before the Assembly is the debate on the motion. I would ask members, all members, not to comment and reflect on rulings of the Speaker. The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Southeast.

**Mr. Morgan:** — That motion states:

That this Assembly has lost confidence in the government's ability to manage the province given the most recent population census numbers and numerous examples of poor accountability to taxpayers, including the mismanagement of the Carriere affair.

Mr. Speaker, this motion will be seconded by the member from Cannington, and I would like to just go into my argument on that.

Mr. Speaker, I have practised law in this province for some 30 years. I quite literally have represented doctors, lawyers, and

Indian chiefs. I have represented, in the courts of this province, matters dealing with everything from first-degree murder down to traffic tickets. And in my entire legal career I have never seen two legal cases more atrociously . . . and more bungled than the two that we are seeing since I have been elected in the House — the first one being the Hillson affair and the second one being the Carriere affair.

My reaction, Mr. Speaker, when I heard about the Carriere affair was, what were you thinking? I couldn't believe and was frankly, Mr. Speaker, astounded by the conduct of the government with regard to that.

I'd like to make some comments with regard to the settlement that was paid to Mr. Carriere. The members opposite have said, how dare we raise the issue that he was somehow being paid to do these acts. Well, Mr. Speaker, this was well-known throughout the government circles what was taking place. They chose to promote him. They chose to give him a positive letter of recommendation. They had him on the government payroll. The allegations took place in government facilities. Either it was a terribly bad system or they were wilfully blind. And clearly, Mr. Speaker, it was done under the watchful eye — or supposedly watchful eye — of this government. And frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it could only be described as an embarrassing train wreck for this government.

And when I look back at some of the things that took place during the course of this litigation — this negotiation and the settlement that was paid out — I could not help but be amazed and overwhelmed that the government would voluntarily choose to pay severance that amounts to some 44 months pay in lieu of notice. I just cannot understand and I cannot fathom it. It's one of the situations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that defies any kind of logic, any kind of common sense, and there is absolutely no tie to the established jurisprudence and common law in this province.

The previous minister of Justice made the statement at the time that the matter of the . . . [inaudible] . . . that it would be the position of the government that they would want to assert that there was just cause and that they would want to fight this one. At that time the members on this side of the House thought, yes, it's one of the things that's a matter of principle. We're prepared to stand behind the government if they want to fight this one. But no, what do they do? They fold their tent and decide to pay one of their own 44 months — \$275,000 — in salary.

This is a government that unfortunately has lost their way so badly they can't even fire anyone adequately. And I don't know whether their concern was that they were afraid of defamation, whether they had no ability to assert there was just cause. I've practised law. They've got a number of lawyers on that side of the House. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people that practise law will have told them that a normal settlement for just cause in this province, the cap is generally around 18 months. That would be sort of for somebody that's at the top of their career, little or no chance for re-employment.

Had they chose to settle it — and we weren't supporting that they settle it — why wouldn't they have made an offer of some 18 months or something in that range? It defies any logic that

they would go up to 44 months on the thing. There is absolutely no sense to that, unless there's something in this settlement or something there that they are hiding or that they are covering up. And sometimes it is an unfortunate and rather damning indictment for somebody that when they try to cover something up, what they do is they leave themselves in a position that the public's imagination and the media runs away with the story. And the speculation may be significantly worse than what the reality they're trying to hide would actually be.

The best advice I could give this government right now would be to come clean, give up the legal opinions that they've received, tender all of the documents that are there — certainly with reasonable protection to the employees that are involved — and do something realistic and something meaningful for this. At this point in time they are losing a public relations battle that in the eyes of the media and the eyes of the public is shameful and is incredibly embarrassing to this government that they would reward Mr. Carriere with a payment of this magnitude for something where he's received a criminal conviction.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to talk briefly for a minute or two about the abysmal treatment of the women victims in this particular matter. We realize that they received a settlement of some \$15,000 — a token, a fraction, a small sum compared to what Mr. Carriere received. Even collectively the total amount that they received was roughly half of what Mr. Carriere received.

[12:45]

We can well understand the outrage that the public feels with regard to this. And the public should feel outraged, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because all the dollars that went to Mr. Carriere and all the dollars that went to the victim is money that was taxpayers' dollars. People in this province work hard to earn their money, they work hard to pay their taxes. And to know that as a result of this they've had to pay out \$15,000 to each of nine women, and then the embarrassment to pay out \$275,000 to Mr. Carriere, is something that for members of this public and members of the province is something that is absolutely unacceptable.

The calls that I've received in my office are things that say, what is this train wreck? What's going on? Where are they going? It's something that is absolutely unacceptable in the eyes of the public. The people have come forward and they're phoning in to talk shows, they're writing letters to newspapers, they're phoning MLAs. And if the members on that side aren't receiving the same kind of phone calls it's because the members of the public have already made a decision that come the next election they are going to turn them out and put them somewhere else for the rest of their careers.

Mr. Speaker, the abysmal treatment that they received goes on even further. First they've received a small sum. But the manner in which the government approached settling with them is something that this government should be embarrassed by and should apologize to each and every one of those nine women for. First they require them to attend all in one room together, and then they're told, you all have to sign; you all have to sign today. You can't go out and get independent advice

on the thing. You all have to rely on the same lawyer, and you can't take the document home. You've got to sign today or it's going to be gone. And everybody's got to be all here together; you all have to get on. And no chance to think it over. All tied together. I've never seen such bully boy tactics on anything in my life.

I can't believe that they wouldn't give that kind of treatment to anybody in this province. I'm sure they didn't treat Mr. Carriere that way. I'm sure Mr. Carriere got a chance to think about the offers that were going back and forth, to review the documents, take them home, look at them, think about them, have a private conversation with his solicitor.

And I'll bet you something else, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll bet you anything that Mr. Carriere, in his file at home he has a copy of the settlement documents. Those women don't have that, and those women have to go through some kind of a foolish shell game that the Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission is putting those people through.

And I'd like to comment on something else. I want to talk about the process that these women went through. They were dragged into this room and told this. They were represented by Marty Popescul, good counsel, one of the best in the province, now a Queen's Bench judge. And he probably gave them the advice, this is the only offer you're going to get. Because he has been around this province enough to know that that government over there plays those bully boy tactics and that they were sincere and they were serious. This is a one-shot offer — take it now or that ship is going to sail. He probably gave them the advice, you'd better take it or that ship will sail.

And that's exactly what the members across put forward to those women, and that's what their lawyer understood, and that's something that happened to them. And that's something that they owe those women an apology for and they owe members of the public an apology for.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can't imagine going into a settlement agreement where you refuse to give the parties to the agreement a copy of the document. If you have confidential information relating to one of the parties that are there, why not do nine separate releases for each one of the people that are there? I'll bet you Murdoch Carriere got a copy of the document.

Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker? You go to a bank to get a mortgage. And the bank says yes we'll give you a mortgage. By the way, this is the rate it's going to be; this is the amortization and you got to sign it. You got to sign it right now, and no we're not giving you a copy of it. We're going to snatch it back, put it in our vault, and you got to get a consent from everybody on your block that's dealt with this . . . [inaudible] . . . What a ludicrous thing to say. I can't believe that that government over there would put that across.

I hear the Justice minister beaking from his seat that this is a good idea. He likes that kind of thing. I challenge him to stand outside of the House and say he supports the idea that these women shouldn't have a copy of their document. Murdoch got a

copy of the document. Why doesn't he produce a copy for these women? Blot out the names and do it. I can't believe that.

And then the Minister for the Public Service Commission, she gets up in her seat and she says there is no gag order. Well then we learned Lorne Scott had gone to these people before and threatened them with the heavy hand of the government, told them all this and everything else. Then we learn about the trust conditions that were imposed on the thing.

And then what happens next, Mr. Deputy Speaker? She loads up a plane full of her government officials to go and take those women aside, the people that work in that very office, and try to bully them some more. I'd like to know what she said to them up there. She said this government doesn't act that way, but she's sending deputy ministers up there to talk to these people. Those 50 people or whatever she rounded up yesterday, she owes them an apology for it as well. What kind of pressure did she put under those people?

Unfortunately this has become nothing more than a public relations disaster, an absolute fiasco for this government. It's not like trying to run uphill. It's like trying to swim uphill when you're in a shower. You're just going to get drowned. Those people have no credibility, no chance on it, and I'm wondering where that bully boy tactics are going to go next.

You know, we say earlier this year when the member for, the Deputy Premier tried to bully members of FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] and tried to bully other people on the thing. Well unfortunately he's not here to do the bully boy work, and now we're wondering who's doing it for them next.

The Minister for the Public Service Commission officials that she sent . . . You know something, Mr. Deputy Speaker? This was handled so embarrassingly badly for this government, the best thing that they can learn from this is when they're in legal trouble again, what they should do is find Mr. Murdoch Carriere's lawyer and hire him to get them out of trouble because what they've got so far just digs them in a hole deeper.

They had a bad situation when they started, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They got some reasonably good advice from the person who's now the minister for economic . . . [inaudible] . . . told them, yes we were going to fight this out. But they botched it so miserably that they had to pay out over a quarter of a million dollars to try and bail themselves out of it.

You would think they would learn from the poor experiences that they've had before, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They had a dismal and embarrassing experience with the Hillson matter. And I'd like to comment briefly on the Hillson matter if I could, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I heard the Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission answer one of the reporters' questions yesterday. The reporter asked the minister, well in the Hillson matter, didn't you get your butt kicked on that? And her answer was, well yes we did. Well this is another situation where they chose not to get their butt kicked, to use that quote.

But what they did was they got their entire personality, their entire image kicked, just in the same manner as they did legally

because this has destroyed their reputation and their integrity. It's a sign that these members have lost their moral compass. They are absolutely out of touch with the members of this province, with the members of the public. They have no sense of relation that the people of this province work hard for their money. They have a set of values. Then we pay out \$275,000 because these members couldn't have a policy and a practice where sexual harassment and abuse in the workplace wasn't accepted. What they've done now is they've rewarded this individual and they have paid out substantial amounts of money for that.

And what they've done is they've shown that they don't care about women. They don't care about workers. They don't care about what happens in the workplace. It's something that doesn't matter. What matters to that government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is political expediency. Let's get this done before the next election because if we lose the next election, this whole matter is going to come out. Let's cover it up everywhere we can. Let's use trust conditions. Let's use gag orders. Let's use confidentiality. Let's use everything we can to bury this matter as deep as we can so that we never have to pay a political price.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it didn't work. It backfired on them because the public know right now they're covering something up. They're not bringing it forward, and what they're doing is absolutely inexcusable and unacceptable.

In the Hillson matter, the government went into a paralysis or a stupidity or a stubbornness mode. They saw somebody at the Legal Aid Commission broke The Labour Standards Act.

The first sign that there was trouble was the labour standards officer goes in there and says no, when somebody goes off to serve a term in the legislature, you have to give them their job back. That person should be commended. That person actually writes a letter saying that Mr. Hillson was entitled to get their job back. What do they choose to do when they receive that? Nothing. They sit back and say oh, Legal Aid Commission's independent. We're letting them deal with it. It's a matter of legal interpretation. There's no legal interpretation. Somebody chose to break the law wilfully. And we made a conscious decision this is law; that isn't going to apply to us. So that was mistake number one.

Mistake number two was they have a Chair of the Legal Aid Commission chose not to do anything about it.

But where does the buck stop? The buck stops right there with the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice is made aware of what the labour standards office . . . is made of the situation. He's been a lawyer for several decades in this province, as have I. He should full well know what the thing is there.

But no, they sit there and say no, we're paralyzed. We're not going to do anything. We're just going to let this play itself out. And what's the net effect of it? It goes to the Court of Queen's Bench. At the end of the day, Court of Queen's Bench rules Mr. Hillson's entitled to his job back.

And what's the dollar cost to the province? Once again, hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars. People that go out and work for 5, 10, 15, \$20 an hour, eking out a living in this

province. Farmers that are cash-strapped, and they're going out trying to earn a living in this province. And the effect of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is they know full well that this money is hard to come by and then they take those tax dollars, and they have to spend this on games that can at best be regarded as foolish and embarrassing.

And frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a legislator, I'm embarrassed to be in the same room as some of the members over there that have actually condoned some of the action that have caused this kind of litigation and this kind of problem for this province.

As legislators, we owe a bigger duty to our constituents and the residents of this province. To sit back now and look at what happened in the Carriere situation and look back at what happened in the Hillson situation, two lawsuits . . . the first one they refused to do anything, the second one they get skittish and go exactly the opposite. And they pour money on it quickly to make the problem go away.

What's wrong with sitting back right from the outset and looking at matters and deciding what is the correct thing to do, what is the right thing to do, what's in tune with the people of Saskatchewan? Where's your moral compass? Where's your agenda? What do you want to have happen? Are you going to stand up for the women of the province? Are you going to stand up for the citizens of the province? Are you going to stand up for the taxpayers of the province?

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

**Mr. Yates:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, during the tirade over the last few minutes, the member opposite has on several occasions accused members on this side of covering something up. And, Mr. Speaker, that goes to impugning the character of the individuals, the members on this side of the House. And very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that is not permitted under the rules of this House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Cannington.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — On the point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member's point of order I believe is not well taken. The member from Saskatoon was referring to a number of cases where he believes that not the entire information has not yet been provided to the House and is encouraging the government to do so, and until that occurs, then that information is not known. It's not available. It's not hidden to the members of the Assembly or to the general public at large, and it's in that sense that he's referring to something is not known or is hidden, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I want to thank the member for Regina Dewdney for his point of order, and I want to thank the member for Cannington for his comments on the point of order.

I want to caution members with respect to the use of the words cover up, that this should not be used to impugn inappropriate

activity by other members of the Assembly, and it should not be directed against individual members of the Assembly.

And therefore, I want to ask the member for Saskatoon Southeast to use care in terms of how he phrases allegations, not to impugn other members. If he's talking more broadly about the government, that's, I think, a different question. This should not be directed towards an individual member, and I would ask him therefore not to do that in the future. Thank you.

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you for that. I will try and use a little more caution in my words. My intention, Mr. Speaker, my intention is . . . My concern now, Mr. Speaker, is with the conduct of the government in a general sense in the information that they have not provided to us. What the government has not provided to us is copies of the documents, copies of the legal opinion. And as such, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move:

That this Assembly has lost confidence in the government's ability to manage the province given the most recent population census numbers and numerous examples of poor accountability to taxpayers, including the mismanagement of the Carriere affair.

This motion is seconded by the member from Cannington. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — It has been moved by the hon. member from Saskatoon Southeast and seconded by the hon. member for Cannington:

That this Assembly has lost confidence in the government's ability to manage the province given the most recent population census numbers and numerous examples of poor accountability to taxpayers, including the mismanagement of the Carriere affair.

I find the motion to be in order. And before I recognize the hon. member for Cannington, I note that it's 1 o'clock. And so I recognize the hon. member for Cannington.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Clearly the people of Saskatchewan have lost confidence in this government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — Members of the Assembly, it being 1 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. on Monday. And I wish you all a good day tomorrow and a good weekend. Thank you.

[The Assembly adjourned at 13:00.]





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

Elhard .....	851
Draude .....	851
Hermanson .....	851
Harpauer .....	851
Eagles .....	851
Weekes .....	851
Huyghebaert .....	851
Allchurch .....	852
Kirsch .....	852
Brkich .....	852
Morgan .....	852

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk Assistant (Committees) .....	852
------------------------------------	-----

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Member Named Honorary Elder by Yellow Quill First Nation	
Wall .....	852
Z99 Radiothon	
Trew .....	853
Member Marks Third Anniversary as Opposition Leader	
Krawetz .....	853
The Ides of March	
Morin .....	853
National Recognition for Community Beautification	
Hermanson .....	854
St. Patrick's Day Greetings	
Hamilton .....	854
Murdoch Carriere Settlement	
Harpauer .....	854

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

Minister's Comments at Municipal Convention	
Bjornerud .....	855
Wartman .....	855
Government's Settlement with Complainants in the Carriere Case	
Heppner .....	856
Atkinson .....	856
Disclosure of Information Regarding Murdoch Carriere	
Draude .....	856
Atkinson .....	857
Ministers' Knowledge of Disciplinary Action Regarding Murdoch Carriere	
Krawetz .....	857
Calvert .....	857
Atkinson .....	858
Management of Harassment Complaints	
Wall .....	858
Calvert .....	858

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Release of Saskatchewan's First State of the Watershed Report	
Nilson .....	860
Heppner .....	860

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 52 — The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la faune	
Nilson .....	861
Bill No. 53 — The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007	
Nilson .....	861

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Iwanchuk .....	861
----------------	-----

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hart .....	862
Morin .....	862
McCall .....	863

## SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

### Federal Government's Program Funding

Morin .....	861, 873
Hamilton .....	864, 873
Harpauer .....	866, 873
Higgins .....	868, 874
Draude .....	869, 873
Hagel (point of order) .....	871
Gantefer (point of order) .....	871
The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble) (point of order) .....	872
Eagles .....	872
D'Autremont .....	874

## PRIVATE BILLS

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 301 — The Eston College (Full Gospel Bible Institute Amendment) Act

Hermanson .....	875
-----------------	-----

#### Bill No. 302 — The Hotels Association of Saskatchewan Amendment Act

Hamilton .....	876
----------------	-----

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### Motion No. 3 — Loss of Confidence in the Government's Ability to Manage

Morgan .....	876
Hagel (point of order) .....	876
Gantefer (point of order) .....	876
The Speaker (point of order) .....	877
Yates (point of order) .....	880
D'Autremont (point of order) .....	880
The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble) (point of order) .....	880
D'Autremont .....	880

# GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN

## CABINET MINISTERS

---

**Hon. Lorne Calvert**  
Premier

**Hon. Graham Addley**  
Minister of Healthy Living Services  
Minister Responsible for Seniors

**Hon. Pat Atkinson**  
Minister of Advanced Education and Employment  
Minister Responsible for Immigration  
Minister Responsible for the Public  
Service Commission

**Hon. Joan Beatty**  
Minister of Northern Affairs  
Minister Responsible for the Status of Women

**Hon. Buckley Belanger**  
Minister of Community Resources  
Minister Responsible for Disability Issues

**Hon. Eric Cline**  
Minister of Industry and Resources  
Minister Responsible for Investment  
Saskatchewan Inc.  
Minister Responsible for Information Services  
Corporation of Saskatchewan

**Hon. David Forbes**  
Minister of Labour  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Water Corporation

**Hon. Glenn Hagel**  
Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation  
Provincial Secretary  
Minister Responsible for Gaming  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Government Insurance

**Hon. Deb Higgins**  
Minister of Learning  
Minister Responsible for Literacy  
Minister Responsible for Liquor and  
Gaming Authority  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Telecommunications

**Hon. Eldon Lautermilch**  
Minister of Highways and Transportation  
Minister of Property Management  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Transportation Company  
Minister Responsible for the  
Forestry Secretariat

**Hon. Warren McCall**  
Minister of Corrections and Public Safety

**Hon. John Nilson**  
Minister of Environment  
Minister Responsible for the Office of  
Energy Conservation  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Power Corporation

**Hon. Frank Quennell**  
Minister of Justice and  
Attorney General

**Hon. Clay Serby**  
Deputy Premier  
Minister of Regional Economic and  
Co-operative Development

**Hon. Maynard Sonntag**  
Minister of First Nations and Métis Relations  
Minister of Crown Investments Corporation  
of Saskatchewan

**Hon. Len Taylor**  
Minister of Health

**Hon. Andrew Thomson**  
Minister of Finance  
Minister Responsible for Information Technology  
Minister Responsible for  
SaskEnergy Incorporated

**Hon. Harry Van Mulligen**  
Minister of Government Relations

**Hon. Mark Wartman**  
Minister of Agriculture and Food