



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 Moosomin.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure to present a petition on behalf of residents of the province of Saskatchewan regarding renal dialysis and its services in rural areas. And I read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to implement the strategy that will see a dialysis unit placed in Broadview Union Hospital.

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

Mr. Speaker, the petitions I present today are signed by the folks from the communities of Broadview, Whitewood, Cowessess; I notice Coronach and Kipling. I so present.

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

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I present a petition on behalf of individuals from both within and outside the constituency of Cypress Hills concerned about the recent closure of the SaskPower office in Shaunavon. 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, today's petition is signed by individuals from the community of Shaunavon, Claydon, Herbert, from the Bench Colony, Eastend, Admiral, Orkney, and other surrounding communities. I so present.

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

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions to present today. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary actions to ensure that the Maryfield School remains open.

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

Mr. Speaker, these petitions come from the good people in Maryfield. I so present.

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

Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise again today on behalf of people who are concerned about Highway 310. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to repair Highway 310 in order to address safety concerns and to facilitate economic growth and tourism in Foam Lake, Fishing Lake, Kuroki, and surrounding areas.

The people that have signed this petition are from Kuroki, Margo, Ottman's Beach, Fishing Lake, and Foam Lake. I so present.

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

Mr. Hermanson: — Good morning, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people in the Rosetown area have signed petitions calling on the government to maintain full service of the SaskPower office at Rosetown. Mr. Speaker, they are concerned that if the office closes there will not be immediate receipt of payments for customers. The prayer of their 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, all of the signatures on this petition come from the community of Rosetown. I'm pleased to present it on their behalf.

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Thunder Creek.

Mr. Stewart: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by citizens concerned with the dangerous practice of transferring patients from one ambulance to another on the highway. 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 cease the transfer of patients from one ambulance to another while en route.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by individuals all from the community of Chaplin. I so present.

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

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again today I stand with petitions of citizens that are concerned about the safety when 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, are from Bruno, Saskatoon, Naicam, Viscount, Quill Lake, Watson, and Calgary, Alberta. I so present.

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

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to present another petition from citizens of Biggar opposed to possible reductions of health care services. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Biggar Hospital, long-term care home, and ambulance services maintain at the very least their current level of services.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

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

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Silver Springs.

Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition surrounding the truly tragic circumstances of the death of Doug Bonderud and the lack of acceptance of responsibility by this NDP [New Democratic Party] government. 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 actions to reimburse the Bonderud family for out-of-country treatment costs and improve the future communication and coordination of cancer services for all cancer patients.

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

The petitioners today come from Naicam and northeast Saskatoon. I so present.

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

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again I rise with a petition from citizens that are very concerned that the withdrawal of lab services at the Lafleche and District Health Centre would cause undue hardships to residents, particularly 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 good citizens from Meyronne, Lafleche, and McCord. 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 bring forth a petition signed by citizens of Saskatchewan, especially citizens from the southwest part of Saskatchewan, and their petition regarding the rural school closures. 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 the Limerick School remains opens.

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

Mr. Speaker, the signatures to this petition are from Assiniboia, Limerick, and Wood Mountain. I so present.

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

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition with citizens opposed to possible reductions of services to Davidson and Imperial health centres:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Davidson and Imperial health centres be maintained at their current level of service at a minimum with 24-hour acute care, emergency, and doctor services available as well as lab, public health, home care, and long-term care services available to users from the Davidson and Imperial areas and beyond.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This particular petition is signed by the good citizens from Imperial, Davidson, Liberty, Holdfast, and Dilke. I so present. Thank you.

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 regarding the widening of Highway No. 5, a highway which is one of the two major east-west highways that pass through my constituency of Saskatoon Southeast. The prayer says:

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 the good citizens of Saskatoon. I am pleased to present it on their behalf. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Chair of the Standing Committee on the Economy.

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 3 without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall Bill No. 3 be read in Committee of the Whole? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, I would request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill 3. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — It has been granted. When shall Bill 3 be read a third time? The Chair recognizes the minister.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 3 — The Fuel Tax Accountability Act

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 3 be now read a third time and passed under its title. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Motion is carried.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — The Chair of the Standing Committee on the Economy is recognized.

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 15 without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall Bill 15 be considered in Committee of the Whole? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, I would again request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Speaker: — Is leave granted to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill 15?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. When shall Bill 15 be read a third time? The minister.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 15 — The Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 2006

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, I would move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 15 be now read a third time and passed under its title. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Motion is carried.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — The Chair of the Standing Committee on the Economy is recognized.

Standing Committee on the Economy

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 14 without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall Bill 14 be considered in Committee of the Whole? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, I would request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Speaker: — The minister has requested leave to waive consideration of Committee of the Whole for Bill 14. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. When shall this Bill be read a third time? The Chair recognizes the minister.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 14 — The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2006

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, I would move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 14 be now read a third time and passed under its title. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Motion is carried.

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

[10:15]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — The Chair of the Standing Committee on Human Services is recognized.

Standing Committee on Human Services

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 6, The Youth Drug Detoxification and Stabilization Act without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall Bill 6 be considered in Committee of the Whole? The Chair recognizes the Minister for Healthy Living.

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, I request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Speaker: — The Minister for Healthy Living has requested leave to waive consideration of Committee of the Whole for Bill 6. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. When shall Bill 6 be read a third time? The Chair recognizes the minister.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 6 — The Youth Drug Detoxification and Stabilization Amendment Act, 2006

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister for Healthy

Living Services that Bill No. 6 be now read a third time and passed under its title. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Motion is carried.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

The Speaker: — The Chair of the Standing Committee on Human Services is recognized.

Standing Committee on Human Services

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed by the committee to report Bill No. 39, The Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act without amendment.

The Speaker: — When shall Bill 39 be considered in the Committee of the Whole? The Chair recognizes the Minister for Healthy Living Services.

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, I request leave to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted to waive consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bill 39. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Leave has been granted. When shall this Bill be read a third time? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Healthy Living Services.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 39 — The Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the Minister of Healthy Living Services that Bill No. 39 be now read a third time and passed under its title. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Speaker: — Motion is carried.

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

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for

Humboldt.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 48 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister for SaskWater: when is the anticipated approval for the Bergheim Estates project in Saskatoon, and what is the reason for the delay of the approval and installation of necessary infrastructure?

In addition, Mr. Speaker:

To the Minister of Environment: how much will Tom Waller be paid for the period of April 1, 2007, to April 15, 2007, inclusive as CEO of the Forestry Secretariat?

As well:

To the Minister of Environment: what was the total amount paid to Tom Waller from March 1, 2006, to March 31, 2007, inclusive as CEO of the Forestry Secretariat?

And finally, Mr. Speaker:

To the Minister Responsible for the Forestry Secretariat: what is the scope of duties that Kent Campbell will perform as CEO of the Forestry Secretariat?

The Speaker: — Order please. Order . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Completely out of order. The member for Arm River-Watrous.

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I give notice I shall on day no. 48 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Highways and Transportation: has the province signed on to the federal interprovincial regulations on hours of driving and service, and if so what industries will be affected? And further, are there any industries or departments that have been granted exemptions, and if, what departments or industries have been granted exemptions?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on day no. 48 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Justice: what role does the department perform when a community is considering moving from community-operated policing to the RCMP?

Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased today to introduce to you and, through you, to all members of the Assembly 27 students from St. Marguerite Bourgeoys School in my riding, Mr. Speaker. They're grade 8 students. They're here today to see the proceedings in the legislature, and I hope that you enjoy what you see here today.

Mr. Speaker, they're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Steve Bradley. And I will have the opportunity later to answer questions and have a juice with them and take a photo, and we welcome you very much to your Assembly. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Athabasca.

Hon. Mr. Belanger: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out that I spoke to the House Leader before I got up, just indicated I had a couple of groups to introduce, and he said, well if you can keep it as short as we can. And I'll try my very best, Mr. Speaker, but we have two great groups, and without the blessing of my House Leader I want to go very carefully and slowly to introducing these folks.

First of all, we have, Mr. Speaker, some staff members that I want to recognize, well not so much my staff member but certainly her parents that are here today. As a minister, I've been blessed with some very, very good staff over the years, very, very good staff: Vicky Neiser, Nadine Olson being currently with me, and of course Cheryl Wilkie.

But Ms. Olson's parents are here, and they're from Rosetown. They're solid New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, and it gives me a great pleasure to not only thank Dale and Katherine for their wonderful daughter who works very hard for this government, is very, very good at what she does, but I'd ask all members of the Assembly to please welcome our guests from Rosetown, Dale and Katherine Olson and have everybody recognize their work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Belanger: — As well, Mr. Speaker, we also have some guests from northern Saskatchewan. It's quite a haul to come a long ways to come see the Assembly. I understood they are on a tour of the building. And these are the staff of the Canoe Lake School. And I can say that the people of the Canoe Lake First Nation have always talked to me about their highway into Meadow Lake; it needs a lot of work. So I'll let people know that we often hear that concern.

But we're very happy to see the staff of the Canoe Lake School here today. We have Claire Corrigan, Mary Ann Corrigan, Rene Iron, Lorne Iron, and Wayne Opikokew. And very quickly . . .

[The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.]

So once again, you're very welcome here. You have nothing to fear here. And it's really good to see you guys from the North here. Way to go. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Moosomin.

Easter Wishes

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, this weekend Christians around the world will be gathering together to celebrate the Easter season. This Easter weekend also allows families and friends to gather together to enjoy a holiday, good food, and each other's company. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, people look forward to the Easter season as an opportunity for families to return home.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Easter weekend is more than a family holiday. It is a weekend when Christians celebrate the love of the heavenly Father through the gift of his son, Jesus Christ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will see Saskatchewan residents across the province gathering at Good Friday services to remember Jesus's death on the Cross. We will be reminded of and ponder how on his last words on the Cross as printed in John's gospel, "It is finished." Then he bowed his head and died.

The story, however, Mr. Speaker, doesn't end there. As with the coming of spring, we observe the springing forth of new life. So the Easter morning angelic message rings out, "He is not here. He is risen." It is the message of hope and joy. Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition extend to all members and all employees of this Assembly and the residents of the province of Saskatchewan our best wishes for a joyous, a safe, and a blessed Easter weekend.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Spring and Rebirth

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For thousands of years this has been considered a very special time of year to a variety of cultures across the globe. It's spring, a time when people are compelled to reflect on themes common to all of us. Mr. Speaker, in many regions the snow is gone and the ice quickly receding. Soon the fields and trees will be lush and green. Soon parks, forests, and lakes will be teeming with life. This is a season of regeneration.

Many ancient traditions have long celebrated the theme of rebirth. The ancient Norse might have talked about Freyr, a common fertility figure, and the Greek, Dionysus, who symbolized renewal. Aboriginal cultures across North America tell their own tales of the seasons. Mr. Speaker, sundown on Monday also marked the commencement of Passover. To Judaism this is a week of celebration for the renewal of an entire nation. Tomorrow is Good Friday, and in three short days, it will be Easter. In the Christian tradition we celebrate how the rebirth of a single man can encompass a larger spiritual renewal.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what tradition we each call our own, it's important that we recognize those things that are most important over the holidays. I'd like to wish all members, staff,

employees, all of Saskatchewan a safe and happy Easter and a weekend filled with the joys of family and friends. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Kenaston Pee Wees Win Northern Finals

Mr. Brkich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As most of you know, I'm a big hockey fan so I've very pleased to talk about the Kenaston Junior Blizzards hockey team.

The Junior Blizzards have had a very successful year in the D level of pee wee hockey league. Earlier this month, they competed in the northern finals and were able to score a victory against Paradise Hill. After winning the northern finals, they went on to provincial finals with a final game being played this past Sunday.

The team played an enthusiastic and hard game, but in the end were unable to beat their competitors from Hodgeville. Coaches Phil Johnson, Scott Anderson, and Tim Haugen are still very proud of the effort the team members put into the season and the fact that they have retained the title of northern champs. The team consists of approximately 16 players from Kenaston, Hawarden, Bladworth, Shields, and Thode areas.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to help me congratulate the team members and coaches of the Kenaston Junior Blizzards pee wee hockey team on their successful season and their title of northern champs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Paragon Awards

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, last night I, along with a number of legislative colleagues, attended the eighth annual Regina Chamber of Commerce Paragon Awards: Celebrating Business Excellence. The awards recognize entrepreneurs for their outstanding achievements and contributions to their communities, the city of Regina, and our growing provincial economy.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Paragon Awards winners were, for young entrepreneur, Todd Reichel of Best Price Railing Ltd. The award for community involvement went to the Phoenix Group. The community alliance winner is Rawlco Radio. For marketing and promotional achievement, Cowtown. The winner for customer service excellence is Canadian Western Bank. The New Business Venture Award went to Wintergreene Estates. The Diversity Award to Namerind Housing Corporation. And, Mr. Speaker, iQmetrix Software Development group was the Export Achievement Award winner and was named business of the year. Jim Park won the Volunteer Achievement Award, and Dr. Xue Dong Yang and Orland Hoeber were named winners of the Innovation Award.

The winners spoke passionately about the advantages of doing business in Regina, Saskatchewan, and their enthusiasm was infectious, Mr. Speaker. I ask all members to join me in congratulating the finalists and winners of the 2007 Paragon Awards. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the siblings in the family of Crown corporations, SaskTel, will be paying for former US [United States] vice-president Al Gore's visit to Saskatchewan to talk about CO₂ pollution. But the NDP are hiding an inconvenient truth about the ugly cousin, SaskPower whose CO₂ bad breath is the third worst in Canada.

Under the NDP's watch, greenhouse gas emissions have risen 62 per cent — greater than any other province during the 16 years this government has been in power — while the population is dropping. The David Suzuki Foundation has lambasted the NDP's climate change plan because, quote, it's "... not [a] plan to do anything."

Mr. Speaker, while *An Inconvenient Truth* won Mr. Gore an Academy Award, the NDP government's climate change plan should earn them an award for best work of fiction. Before Mr. Gore gets here, do you think SaskPower will be getting a new facelift and perhaps a new green mint? The NDP have had 16 years to send the ugly cousin, SaskPower, in for treatment for their bad CO₂ breath. After all, SaskPower is the third ugliest polluter in Canada.

This is not a plan about reducing CO₂ emissions because in reality the Premier and the NDP's plan to save themselves ... steadily reducing polling numbers. Typical NDP hot air and CO₂ pollution. It's an inconvenient truth — cash from the Crowns to try and save the NDP; nothing to save the planet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

[10:30]

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Dewdney.

March Job Numbers

Mr. Yates: — Saskatchewan's March job numbers have set another record high. That makes 12 straight months of record high employment numbers here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — There were just over 494,000 people working in the province last month, up by over 20,000 for March of last year. That's an increase of 4.3 per cent, the second highest year-over-year average across this nation. Mr. Speaker, those job numbers are the highest on record for the month of March.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — Full-time jobs are up over 12,000 compared to March of last year. And employment for youth aged 15 to 24 is up by 8,700 from March 2006.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — Mr. Speaker, the solid job increases for the past year are proof positive Saskatchewan's economy is booming. The strength of the resource sector and the hard work of business owners and working men and women are all contributing to strong and vibrant Saskatchewan economy. There are more benefits to a strong job market for Saskatchewan. It also contributes to our population growth, Mr. Speaker, as we see our population continuing to grow.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — Mr. Speaker, these positive numbers are good news for Saskatchewan and everyone including the Saskatchewan Party. When they're defeated in the next election, Mr. Speaker, there will be plenty of jobs for them to apply for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Carriere Questions Remain Unanswered

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday at question period, the member for Nutana had the audacity to suggest that she has answered all the questions on the Murdoch Carriere scandal. Contrary to what the member for Nutana would have us believe, several questions remain unanswered.

Who in the NDP government knew what and when? Why were serious allegations of sexual harassment made against Murdoch Carriere as early as 1994 simply swept under the carpet? Why did the NDP government pay \$275,000 plus a full pension to a man convicted of harassment and convicted for assault? Why won't the NDP government release its secret legal opinion even though precedent to do so already exists?

Mr. Speaker, people in this province are furious with the member from Nutana's lack of action on this scandal and her failure to answer these questions. One opinion writer in the Saskatoon *StarPhoenix* had this to say in the March 30 edition and I quote:

As a woman, I know this stuff happens in many unenlightened workplaces. What I can't figure out is Public Service Commission Minister Pat Atkinson's cold, irresponsible statement that suggests to condemn such action would get her in trouble. As someone who holds a position of great authority in our government, she should resign for vocalizing such a dense, void sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, we couldn't agree more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

Location of Saskatoon Youth Facility

Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, parents in my constituency are understandably upset. They're wondering why there was a plan to relocate a portion of the Calder Centre to a parcel of land directly beside the Saskatoon Christian School in Corman Park.

Mr. Speaker, no one disputes the need for more and better treatment beds to help those addicted to drugs and alcohol, but they wonder why is this facility being built right next to a schoolyard. Mr. Speaker, what other options were considered?

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister for Healthy Living Services.

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm really glad to be able to correct the misinformation that the opposition is spreading. Right now there's a proposal that the Saskatoon Regional Health Authority is putting before the community. There has been meetings with the individuals and the groups around that site of land. It's an 11-acre piece of land. Consultations have gone on to provide information to those people. It's a health care facility that provides treatment to children the ages of 12 to 17.

It has been at the Calder Centre. There's been no incidents in the last 10 years. It's right beside a seniors' home. It's close to a school. There's been many good connections with those young people and the SPCA [Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals], the Sherbrooke Community Centre. This has been a way for Saskatchewan people to stand behind their young people as they battle addictions. Now the opposition can criticize that, but we're going to move forward to help our kids.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Morgan: — This is a 24-bed drug and alcohol detoxification centre. Some of the patients will be there after being ordered into treatment by a judge. David Soubolsky is a member of the board which operates the Saskatoon Christian School. Mr. Soubolsky says the detox centre is a good idea, but not beside a schoolyard.

Mr. Speaker, was there any consultation with this board before the offer to purchase the land was being made? Were there any public meetings held to address the concerns of local residents and parents before the offer was made?

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. The Chair . . . Order, please. The Chair recognizes the Minister for . . . Order, please. The Chair recognizes the Minister for Healthy Living Services.

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, the parents of the children who attend the Christian school I have no doubt are excellent parents and they want what's best for their kids. And the

opposition can be part of the solution or they can try to have it both ways. The best way to protect these kids or all children is to ensure that the incidents of drug and alcohol addictions are decreased in the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, if these young people are not getting the help that they need, they will be using drugs; they will be selling drugs. When they're in this treatment centre, they are getting the help that they need.

This has been next to a school for many years. There's been no incidents at all. This is an 11-acre piece of property. Thank you, Mr. . . .

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Speaker, we support both the need for this facility and we also support and recognize the needs of the parents. This plan just doesn't make any sense. To put an addictions treatment facility right next to a group of schoolchildren just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister commit today to revisiting this idea and having discussions with parents and others who have expressed concern with this proposed new detox centre?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister for Healthy Living Services.

Hon. Mr. Addley: — Mr. Speaker, I have real difficulty accepting the credibility of that member because he obviously doesn't understand the process — or he does and doesn't want to let people know that he understands it.

The offer to purchase the land has been made. There are now public hearings. There's public meetings. They don't have public meetings until the offer of the land is out there. The Corman Park has a public meeting this month. They have a choice to accept, reject, or more likely continue to discuss this issue at a further meeting in May. That's how the process works.

Now the opposition can try to say one thing to those that are battling drug and alcohol addictions and then try to be on the other side of the issue the next day. They should be consistent like this government and this Premier. We're consistent and fighting this issue on substance abuse and we'll continue to fight that issue regardless of whether they want to play petty politics with this issue.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Plans for Recruitment and Retention of Health Care Professionals

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Indian

Head-Milestone.

Mr. McMorris: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we found out that unit 5E at the Regina General Hospital was closing six beds effective April 10 because of, and I quote, “ongoing staff vacancies.” Well today we’ve been advised that six to eight beds are being closed in the orthopedic ward of the Regina Pasqua Hospital. The reasons, I’m told, is staff shortage and too much overtime.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has the longest waiting lists in Canada for orthopedic surgery and now, under this government, more beds are closing. What is the minister planning to do about the chronic understaffing of wards around this province, of bed closures, and the increasing waiting lists for orthopedic surgery?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On a day when Saskatchewan is celebrating another month of record job growth, I’m very happy to be able to stand today and answer questions relating to additional jobs in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite conveniently forget that this government has been planning to deal with shortages of health human resources for quite some time. Mr. Speaker, just recently in February, Mr. Speaker, the headlines in the *Regina Leader-Post*, “Health-care help on way.” Mr. Speaker, positive reports, positive stories about the actions taken by this government to assist in the recruitment, retention, education, and financial tax support for recent graduates, Mr. Speaker, in the nursing fields, in other health care professionals . . .

The Speaker: — The member’s time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Indian Head-Milestone.

Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, there are 7,000 people waiting for orthopedic surgery in this province today. The minister has the nerve to stand in the House day after day and claim that waiting lists are being shortened. Well health care workers know that’s not the case, and so do patients around the province. Mr. Speaker, waiting lists are increasing and, under this government’s watch, beds are closing. That does nothing to reduce the waiting lists around the province.

Mr. Speaker, he claims he has a plan to fix this, but day after day we hear from people that are working in the health care system and people that are waiting on the longest waiting lists in Canada that his plan is not working. When will he look for a different plan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, again proof positive that the member opposite doesn’t understand the severity of the system across Canada nor what is being done in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost on orthopedics, the member opposite claims waiting lists are not decreasing. Mr. Speaker, we are improving access every single day to orthopedics in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, we are also verified, our service is verified through the Canadian health information services, Mr. Speaker. We do more knees per capita than any other province in Canada, and we are the second highest in number of hip surgeries done in Canada, Mr. Speaker. This is incredible progress. We recognize we have continued challenges, Mr. Speaker, but we will continue to apply ourselves to make additional progress, Mr. Speaker, to deal with those who are still on the waiting lists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Indian Head-Milestone.

Mr. McMorris: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it’s under this NDP government and under this Health minister and other Health ministers that we’ve seen the number of training seats for nurses and doctors reduced to record lows, Mr. Speaker, over the last 16 years. They’re starting to try and address it now, but because of record low training and the worst retention rate of anywhere in Canada, we are far worse off than any other province when it comes to waiting lists across whether it’s orthopedic surgery or many other categories, Mr. Speaker.

How can the minister stand in his place on a day like today when we’re seeing six to eight orthopedic beds close at the Pasqua Hospital and he’s still saying that we’re going to be shortening waiting lists? The two don’t add up. His words are hollow. When will he start dealing with the real issues?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And again the lack of understanding of the members opposite completely astonishes me, Mr. Speaker. The regional health authorities will close units or beds or facilities on occasion on a temporary basis, Mr. Speaker, to protect the safety of the individuals who need to use those facilities, Mr. Speaker, and that’s what’s being done in these cases. There are continued consultations within those wards, with the collective bargaining units, within the health regions, Mr. Speaker, before these things done.

But let’s put two things on record, Mr. Speaker. Number one, since 2003 when this government was elected, we have 55 per cent more training seats for nurses in this province and, Mr. Speaker, 70 per cent increase in the LPN [licensed practical

nurse] seats.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time the member opposite stands out in the foyer of the lobby here, Mr. Speaker, and says, when asked about what his plan . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Indian Head-Milestone.

Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, the minister keeps saying we don't understand. What we understand is the health care professionals are being run off their feet. They're being run off their feet and they're not putting up with it any more, and that's why many of them are leaving the province.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in Prince Albert, Victoria Hospital has been without a radiologist since last summer. Dr. Ian Waddell left Prince Albert because he said the workload was far too much. He was doing the job of three full-time radiologists. So what has the minister done since the summertime to make sure there is a radiologist in Prince Albert? The minister's so-called solution to this problem is flying in temporary radiologists from South Africa on a rotating basis. I'm sure that's a huge cost to the Prince Albert Parkland Region.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health: how much is it costing the Saskatchewan taxpayers to fly a radiologist from South Africa on a rotating basis?

[10:45]

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite knows very well that this government is committed, absolutely committed to the support of Saskatchewan families in enhancing the health care needs in this province. And, Mr. Speaker, in a fast-growing regional health care authority like that in the Prince Albert Parkland area, Mr. Speaker, there are services that we know absolutely need to be provided. And, Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are extraordinary measures that have to be taken to ensure that the public safety is protected.

Mr. Speaker, there is a plan in place. It has been in place since 1999 and growing, Mr. Speaker. That plan has been successful. When asked in the lobby the other day, Mr. Speaker, about what his plan is on nurse recruiting and other things, Mr. Speaker, he said, I don't know; we'll have to think about it. What a plan, Mr. Speaker. What a plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Indian Head-Milestone.

Mr. McMorris: — Mr. Speaker, this government has done such a terrible job on retaining our health care professionals. Dr. Ian Waddell from Prince Albert left this province because

the work situation was untenable — and those are his words. It's obviously that this Health minister talks about a recruitment program since 1999 that has absolutely failed, because now we're flying — can you believe this? — we're flying in a radiologist into Prince Albert from South Africa. And he's standing in his place and saying that the recruitment program they put in place in 1999 is a success. It's been a dismal failure, Mr. Speaker, and that minister has to live with it.

Mr. Speaker, is that the solution to all the other health care shortages that we have in Saskatchewan? Will we be flying more health care professionals in from South Africa because he has done such a terrible job in recruitment?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Our recruitments have indeed been successful and, Mr. Speaker, there are more physicians — specialists and general practitioners — practising in this province today than there were in 2003 when this government was elected.

Mr. Speaker, we're very proud of that record. But we also know that there are continuing to be challenges in hard-to-recruit professions and hard-to-recruit locations. And we are continuing, Mr. Speaker, our efforts to deal with that particular issue.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, physician satisfaction is important. And on this day when members opposite won't talk about the new job numbers in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, they should be remembering that they also didn't talk about a report from CIHI [Canadian Institute of Health Information] released in the fall. The report that said that Saskatchewan has the highest satisfaction rate amongst GPs [general practitioner] in the entire country, Mr. Speaker — the highest satisfaction rate amongst GPs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Compensation for Forestry Secretariat Executive

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, actually I do want to talk about one new job in Saskatchewan because the Premier appointed a new CEO [chief executive officer] for the Forestry Secretariat, and he appears to be a very qualified individual. He has his M.B.A. [Master of Business Administration] and a certified management accountant. And his salary is — guess what, Mr. Speaker? — it's \$115,000 a year which is within the range of a level 1 deputy minister.

That brings us back to the person that he's replacing, the NDP lawyer, Tom Waller. NDP lawyer Tom Waller was paid \$410,000 for 13 months to do the exact same job. That's almost four times the amount that they're paying their new CEO to do the exact same job. Mr. Speaker, why was the NDP's lawyer buddy Tom Waller paid \$410,000 to do a \$115,000-a-year job? Why is there one set of rules for the NDP friends and another

set of rules for everyone else?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair . . . Order please. Order. The Chair recognizes the Minister Responsible for the Forestry Secretariat.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, as usual when members of the Saskatchewan Party rise in this House during question period, members on this side will stand up and clarify and attempt to bring some facts to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a CEO of the Saskatchewan forest secretariat hired. He is paid to do that duty. I can tell that member as well that Mr. Waller is on contract and acts as a chief negotiator for this province. And that's a role that he will continue to play. Mr. Speaker, I will say in this House that I believe firmly that we are getting value for our money.

I can tell you this though, Mr. Speaker, the investment that members of the Saskatchewan Party have made in the Conservative members of parliament in Ottawa is not good value for money, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Harpauer: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to review the NDP's pay scale. If you have an M.B.A. and a CMA [certified management accountant] after your name, you get \$115,000 a year. And if you have NDP behind your name, you get \$410,000. One set of rules for the NDP and their friends and another set of rules for everyone else. And here's the question: what did he accomplish for \$410,000?

The P.A. [Prince Albert] pulp mill is still closed. Hundreds of people in P.A. are still out of work but at least the NDP buddy has a job for \$410,000 a year, Mr. Speaker. How in the earth does the NDP justify paying \$410,000 to their NDP lawyer, Tom Waller, when the new CEO is receiving \$115,000? And in addition, Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us if both are now currently employed in the Forestry Secretariat?

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister Responsible for the Forestry Secretariat.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — You know, Mr. Speaker, one gets a little tired of watching the opposition members drag people through this legislature. Mr. Speaker, the attack on Mr. Waller was started on May 26, 2004 by the deputy leader, who accused him of being involved in a criminal investigation — which was patently false. Last week they misrepresented the facts on his contract. They had both documents and they knew it, Mr. Speaker.

So let me make the record clear. Mr. Waller is paid industry standard. He is on a contract working on behalf of the people in this province to create jobs in this province as opposed to chase them out, which is what members of the opposition have been doing ever since they started that operation in the middle of the

night somewhere around the Legislative Buildings here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Harpauer: — Mr. Speaker, that minister knows perfectly well the proper documents were not filed with the Clerk's office within the time frame that they're supposed to be filed, because there's one set of rules for their NDP buddies and another set of rules for everyone else.

So what the minister needs to tell us: is Tom Waller still on the NDP payroll? Is he still under contract with the Forestry Secretariat, as well as the new CEO?

The Speaker: — Order please. The Chair recognizes the Minister Responsible for the Forestry Secretariat.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to again have to set the record straight. They're suggesting that a contract has to be filed with the Clerk of the legislature, which is totally false. It was filed as a matter of clarity and a matter of the fact that Mr. Waller had absolutely — and this government — had nothing to hide. He's a contract employee, Mr. Speaker. They're not required to table those documents. He is not an employee. Those documents were filed as a matter of public interest and clarity and I want to set that member record straight. She should at least get her facts straight before she comes into this House and misrepresents the facts one more time. Shame on her.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for . . . Order please. Order. Order. The Chair recognizes the member for Martensville.

Management of Harassment Complaints

Ms. Heppner: — Mr. Speaker, later today the official opposition will give notice of a motion that it plans to introduce into this Assembly. The motion calls for the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies to undertake an inquiry pursuant to rule 146(3) to consider and report on several issues related to the Murdoch Carriere scandal.

These issues include the government's handling of harassment complaints before, during, and after the investigation into the complaints of harassment by Murdoch Carriere, the \$275,000 settlement paid to a man fired for harassment and convicted of assault, as well as the disciplinary measures that were meted out.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Will he support our motion so that we can get to the bottom of this serious issue and ensure that it never happens again?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've clearly indicated to the House that in September '02 a formal complaint was laid by a number of people in the P.A. fire centre regarding Mr. Carriere. Mr. Carriere was suspended with pay while an investigation was conducted. On February 12 the deputy minister at the time, Terry Scott, demoted Mr. Carriere, placed him on leave without pay, suspended him with leave without pay for three months, Mr. Speaker, and sent him to Regina, red circled him, and he had no people under his employ.

On April 2 Mr. Carriere was fired on the direction of the Premier. As the members will know, this is in contravention of The Public Service Act. Only the deputy minister, the permanent head, can dismiss an employee in the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that have been said by the opposition that are simply not true. But these are the facts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Heppner: — Mr. Speaker, the facts are that women started being harassed in 1994 and those harassment complaints went unchecked by this government. And those are questions that we need answers to.

For the last couple of days the Minister of the Public Service Commission has asked if the opposition will consider changes to The Occupational Health and Safety Act during this session of the legislature. It should be noted that we believe that the problem is not with existing legislation but with the unwillingness of the NDP government to enforce it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have given our commitment that we will examine the amendments the government brings forward. In turn, will the Premier give his commitment to support our motion to have the legislature's Crown and Central Agencies conduct an investigation into the Murdoch Carriere scandal?

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

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member will know that under the occupational health and safety legislation the prohibited grounds in terms of harassment are age, sex, as well as sexual orientation, height, weight, and so on. These are the prohibited grounds.

I understand from speaking with a number of people who have been involved in harassment cases that there are issues around personal harassment where there can be abuse of power, where there can be threats made, coercion, and so on. These are not considered to be prohibited grounds under the occupational health and safety legislation. So personal harassment is an issue, Mr. Speaker.

And I guess I would ask the members opposite — given that there are number of cases that are coming forward that are

outside of prohibited grounds — would the members opposite support a clarity or a strengthening the definition of harassment under the occupational health and safety legislation? It sounds as though they won't, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the Minister for Industry and Resources.

Saskatchewan Records Second Highest Land Sale

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this morning I'm pleased to rise to announce that Saskatchewan has just recorded the second highest land sale of all time for petroleum and natural gas rights.

Driven by strong interest in the Bakken Formation oil play of southeastern Saskatchewan, the April sale of Crown petroleum and natural gas rights generated more than \$70 million in revenue for the province. The all-time record was set in October 1994 at just under 85 million.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our government has been working hard to promote our province as a great place to live, work, invest, and do business. Hard work and diligence has put into place a creative strategy to attract investment not just from local investors, but also from those outside our borders.

This new investment in Saskatchewan included nine exploration licences that sold for over \$39 million and 176 lease parcels that brought in more than \$31 million.

[11:00]

Mr. Speaker, we've been travelling beyond our borders to tell the world about our province in a positive way. We've been telling the world in a positive way about the excellent products made by our companies and the opportunities in our resource industries, certainly including oil and gas.

We now have more news to tell the world. We can tell them about the Weyburn-Estevan area receiving bonus bid activity with total sales of more than \$67 million. We can tell them how the Lloydminster area had sales of 1.7 million and how the Swift Current and Kindersley-Kerrobert area had sales of over 900,000 and 500,000 respectively.

Mr. Speaker, the highest price for a single parcel was nearly \$8.1 million. Petrobank Energy and Resources Ltd. bought this 1,424-hectare exploration licence 29 kilometres east of the city of Weyburn. This sale is a positive story for Saskatchewan and it should be celebrated for many reasons.

Our oil and gas industry is expressing confidence in our province and is doing it with its investment dollars. Despite the naysayers, we're continuing to create a positive business climate in Saskatchewan. The news today underscores just how strong the oil and gas industry that fuels our province is, Mr. Speaker. This industry now provides over 27,000 jobs in communities across our province. It supports state-of-the-art

research at the Petroleum Technology Research Centre that is getting attention from around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the people, the businesses, and others who helped to make the April sale one of the most memorable on record and wish all involved the best in their exploration and investment efforts. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The Chair recognizes the member for Thunder Creek.

Mr. Stewart: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to take this opportunity to thank the minister for providing me with a copy of his statement in good time. This is positive news for Saskatchewan, but it happened because of the hard work and dedication of both small and large businesses, Saskatchewan entrepreneurs, and Saskatchewan people.

In the 2003 provincial election, the NDP party campaigned against business tax reform. They campaigned against increased competitiveness for Saskatchewan companies. They campaigned against economic development. They said that greedy businesses would take over the most profitable parts of our economy. Just two and a half short years later, this NDP government implemented part of the Saskatchewan Party business tax reform plan and the economy has taken off.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — The oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan employs thousands of people, and we would like to take the time to thank these people and their employers and employees for their hard work and for investing in Saskatchewan.

We commit that under the complete growth agenda that will be implemented by the next Saskatchewan Party government that we will be able as a province to surpass the \$85 million record sale of Crown petroleum and natural gas rights that was generated 12 years ago, Mr. Speaker, when oil and gas prices were no where near the boom levels that we see today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart: — This is some progress for this NDP government, but they have once again set the bar far too low. This NDP party and this government seems a little too proud to come in second-best again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order please. Order.

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 question 980 through 1,037 inclusive.

The Speaker: — Responses to questions 980 through to 1,037 have been submitted.

SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Murdoch Carriere Case

Ms. Heppner: — Mr. Speaker, it is a sadness that I rise today to speak on a very important issue. I find it sad that any woman in this province had to go through what Murdoch Carriere's victims faced. I'm saddened that their reports of harassment weren't taken seriously by their superiors or by this NDP government. I am saddened also that after weeks of opposition asking legitimate questions — questions that these women and the people of Saskatchewan deserve answers to — that this NDP government has offered nothing more than evasion and distraction.

I am proud however to be a member of a party that has been able to shed light on this situation on behalf of Murdoch Carriere's victims and to offer a voice to these women — a voice that had been silenced by this NDP government. Our attempts to find answers to questions on behalf of these women is about doing what is right — something that the NDP seems to have forgotten about.

The harassment of these women started as early as 1994. And even after complaints were brought to superiors' attention, nothing was done. The only answer that was given was, "That's just Murdoch." I find this shocking, that this would ever be a response in the face of such serious allegations.

Let's review this scandal. In 1994 we know that Murdoch Carriere started harassing an employee in his department. The woman went to her supervisors to report this horrible situation. Her complaints were ignored and nothing happened to Carriere. In 1997 the same woman was attacked again by Carriere. She again voiced her concerns and was met with "That's just Murdoch." And again nothing happened to Carriere.

Carriere was free to continue his harassment of other women over the next few years because no one bothered to take that first woman seriously. The nine women that we know of spoke directly to deputy ministers, associate deputy ministers, their supervisors, their union, and even to the Premier. The Premier's response was to go back to their deputy minister — someone who had already ignored their complaints once. Instead of taking any responsibility, the Minister for the Public Service Commission has said that these women should have followed the procedure in reporting these incidents. The fact is that these women did follow the procedures. The problem is that no one took them seriously.

After a long overdue internal investigation, the Gillies report found that Carriere had harassed his employees. And what was done? Was he fired? No. He was transferred to another office in Regina.

Not only was he not fired; he was praised for all of his hard work. And I quote a memo dated February 12, 2003, from the then deputy minister, Terry Scott, "I want to thank Murdoch for his valuable contributions to the Fire Program." That very same day, a memo from the very same Terry Scott was sent to Carriere's victims. And I quote, "I want to specifically caution you to treat this decision and any information related to this matter with strict and absolute confidentiality."

Murdoch Carriere was allowed to keep his job, and his victims were told to keep quiet. This was the government's answer to years of harassment.

The NDP have tried to defend their actions for weeks in this Assembly. First the NDP claimed to have a zero tolerance policy for sexual harassment. That policy was nowhere to be found when these women needed it most. On March 8 in this Assembly, the Minister for PSC said, and I quote:

... there is zero tolerance for harassment in the workplace, whether it's directed towards men or whether it's directed towards women. Everybody is protected. They have the right to come forward if they believe they are being harassed ... That is the harassment policy.

This was not the case for Murdoch Carriere's victims. When they needed their government most to protect them from this man, they were abandoned. Then a few days later, the minister bragged about the improved harassment provisions that her government had made, and I quote:

... in 1991, we introduced amendments in this House to the occupational health and safety legislation to ensure that harassment was a provision of that legislation and that workers were protected against harassment, both in the private sector and the public sector.

Yet even after numerous reports to supervisors, these women were ignored and were forced to continue to work with Carriere and face further harassment. This is interesting in light of existing policies that state, and I quote, "It is misconduct for managers and supervisors who know of workplace harassment not to take immediate corrective action." These women talked to many people about the vile work situation that they face — including the Premier — yet only one person, Terry Scott, faced any repercussions from this government.

Now the NDP claims that more legislation is needed. Tougher rules are needed. Better definitions are needed. We don't need more legislation to tell us what Murdoch Carriere did was wrong. And the NDP government certainly doesn't need more legislation to do the right thing now. What they need to do is respect and enforce the legislation already in place.

And after all this came to light, after years of complaints by Carriere's victims, after the Gillies report that substantiated those complaints, what did this NDP government do? They paid off their buddy Murdoch Carriere to the tune of \$275,000 and bumped up his pension so that he could retire well.

And what did the NDP do for these women? They ignored their complaints. And when the NDP finally got caught, they herded all nine women into a room and forced them to sign an

agreement with the threat that if they didn't all sign, none of them would get anything. And what was it that they received after the NDP gave Carriere \$275,000? Each victim received a paltry \$15,000.

The NDP said that they had to, that they had to settle to avoid a court case. They couldn't be bothered to stand up for these women. They caved in and paid Carriere even after the former NDP Justice minister said, and I quote:

In the event that there is a lawsuit against the Government of Saskatchewan, it will be the position of the Government of Saskatchewan that the termination of Mr. Carriere was justified. We will defend that position vigorously in the courts. And in due course ... the courts will make ... [that] determination.

But they didn't do that, Mr. Speaker. The NDP did not defend this in court. They did not defend these women. Instead they willingly offered Murdoch Carriere over \$275,000 and hoped it would all go away. The NDP have apparently washed their hands of this whole scandal. They claim that they no longer need to answer any questions about this. They say they have already answered every question. But this is simply not true. My colleagues and I have stood in this Assembly for weeks and asked questions, questions that remain unanswered.

And here are a few of them. Why weren't earlier harassment complaints taken seriously? Why did the NDP, despite their own anti-harassment legislation stating otherwise, refuse to take action against the numerous individuals who ignored the harassment complaints? When was the first allegation of harassment filed against Murdoch Carriere? When did the former Environment minister learn of the complaints against his friend Carriere?

How many other women did Murdoch Carriere harass? Why wasn't Murdoch Carriere fired years before 2002 when his peers and supervisors all knew of these complaints? How many complaints were brought forward prior to 2002?

Why did the PSC minister tell us that these nine women were checked with before Carriere was given his \$275,000 payoff when we all know that they weren't checked with? Why did the NDP keep their settlement with Carriere secret from his victims? Why didn't the NDP fight for these women in court as they promised to do in 2003?

Why does the NDP continue to refuse to release their secret legal opinions? Why does the NDP refuse to hold an all-party legislative committee to look into this scandal to find answers to ensure that this doesn't ever happen again?

Why did the NDP pay Murdoch Carriere \$275,000 and bump up his pension? How did the NDP reach the pitiful sum of \$15,000 for his victims? How many NDP cabinet ministers have joined Murdoch Carriere at his cabin over the years?

The NDP have refused to answer any of these questions, which has left us with one very important question: what is the NDP hiding? The NDP has an obligation to these nine women and ...

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. Could the clock be stopped please. Order. I ask members on both sides of the House to please keep the noise level down so that the member who's on her feet can be heard by all members. I recognize the hon. member for Martensville.

[11:15]

Ms. Heppner: — The NDP has an obligation to these nine women and to everyone else in this province to answer these questions. As I've said before in this Assembly, I had the privilege of meeting one of Carriere's victims. She deserves answers. She deserves to have her voice heard. The NDP have made every effort to make sure that the voices of these women were not heard. And we're here to make sure that they are.

And we're not the only ones who are disgusted by this government's treatment of these women. And here are a few examples. From a concerned resident in Saskatoon and I quote:

As a woman, I know this stuff happens in many unenlightened workplaces. What I can't figure out is Public Service Commission Minister Pat Atkinson's cold, irresponsible statement that suggests to condemn such action would get her in trouble. As someone who holds a position of great authority in our government, she should resign for vocalizing such a dense, void sentiment.

From radio commentator John Gormley and I quote:

Words often cannot adequately describe how this government stumbles. Here are a few words: bad judgment; terrible optics; incompetence; and a cavalier disregard for your money.

From Murray Mandryk and I quote:

... this government certainly wasn't shy about running up massive legal costs in its futile defense of its Spudco debacle. So why wouldn't it defend the Carriere firing as a matter of principle? Why not test the legal validity of this decision in court?

The problem isn't that we're not understanding the government's reasons for settling with Carriere. The problem is that the government's reasons don't make ... sense.

From a concerned voter in Mossbank:

I'm really upset and angry at our government for paying Murdoch Carriere an out-of-court settlement of \$275,000. What have you taught our young people? In my opinion you have taught them that females are not worth much. What would you have done if these women had been your daughters, your sisters, your wives. I really believe the outcome would have been totally different.

And a woman in my constituency of Martensville copied me in a letter that she sent to the Premier on this issue, and I quote:

I wish to voice my opinion of your disgusting attitude towards women in this province. You have rewarded a

man who has been convicted of a crime and lost his job for his behaviour and treatment of women, yet you give him a healthy settlement. For what? I hope you will rectify this terrible injustice and find a way to solve problems like this in the future because you will have this happen again. There are no consequences for really bad behaviour, so everyone will feel that they can do what they want as long as you are in office. I look forward to your retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the government's mishandling of this entire situation not only impacts the nine women who were victims of Murdoch Carriere. It affects all men and women who are being harassed today. Individuals will think twice about coming forward having seen that serious allegations are not taken seriously by this government.

The Premier has said that his government's response to this scandal has been an act of responsible government and that if he had to do it all over again, he would. Well, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't. We would have fought for these women and made sure that Murdoch Carriere got what he deserved. He would have been fired without the NDP's golden handshake on his way out the door.

And now 13 years after this first complaint was brought forward, we know this: the NDP's zero tolerance of sexual harassment failed because of their inaction and lack of will. The NDP failed to do anything about Murdoch Carriere until they were caught. The NDP failed to protect these women. The NDP failed to apologize to these women until it was politically expedient for them to do so. The NDP have failed not only the women of this province; they have failed all honest, law-abiding, decent residents of this province.

And for that reason, today I move the following motion, seconded by the member for Kelvington-Wadena, and I move:

That this Assembly condemn the government for its mishandling of the Carriere scandal by ignoring complaints of harassment, by not allowing this Legislative Assembly to investigate the matter through a legislative committee, for not tabling its secret legal opinions, and for rewarding a man who was convicted of assault and fired for harassment with \$275,000 and a full government pension, while at the same time paying the harassment victims a paltry sum.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Thank you very much. I thank the member for Martensville. Will members take the motion as read? I will read it.

That this Assembly condemn the government for its mishandling of the Carriere scandal by ignoring complaints of harassment, by not allowing this Legislative Assembly to investigate the matter through a legislative committee, for not tabling its secret legal opinions, and for rewarding a man who was convicted of assault and fired for harassment with \$275,000 and a full government pension, while at the same time paying the harassment

victims a paltry sum.

That's moved by the member for Martensville and seconded by the member for Kelvington-Wadena. And I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Ms. Draude: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there hasn't been one woman that I spoke to since February 27, the day that the Carriere payout scandal hit the news, that wasn't appalled with everything that had anything to do with this case, firstly appalled at the way this government handled the case of a man who was charged with harassing nine women — and who knows how many more — and convicted of assault. Women are appalled at the fact that the government paid the man who assaulted the women nearly 20 times more than what they, the women, got coerced into taking themselves. That man was paid . . . \$275,000 for the harasser, \$15,000 for the victim.

The women are appalled and ask the question, why did a man who was charged with harassment and convicted of assault be given a full pension? In essence what he got, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was a golden handshake. He was let go three years before retirement. He got a full pension plus \$275,000 even though he was convicted of assault.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, women are appalled at the fact that this government has spent every day of this session trying to cover up the facts. They are appalled that this government would do anything to take the focus away from this scandal — everything from leaking a supposedly good-news budget, everything from making a fool of themselves or especially one of the minister, making a fool of herself on budget day to avoid answering questions on this issue. Then yesterday, yesterday the Premier of our great province called a news conference in the middle of question period to get the media out of the Assembly to talk about bringing a speaker into the province.

Now we all know how important it was to call a news conference at that minute, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Goodness knows the province couldn't wait another 20 minutes to hear what the government was finally going to say about the environment. Two weeks ago the Minister of Finance gave his budget and just about forgot about the environment completely, but I guess they got a conscience during the night on this issue anyway and decided in the middle of question period they wanted to talk about it.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would we question the sincerity of this? Except for the fact that the Minister of Youth, Culture and Rec as well as the Minister of Finance were beside themselves with joy as they watched the media leave the gallery. In fact they kept pointing gleefully up in the press gallery saying, they're gone, they're gone — just like a couple of grade 6 kids who finally got away with something.

Who knows what else this government will try to do to divert attention from the scandal that has ruined the lives of at least nine women in this province and maybe more. I would put nothing past this government who has no ethics or morals or conscience, and they're more dedicated to a political philosophy than to the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, whatever the good news that this government on the other side of the House comes up with in this session will be solely to defer attention

from the bungling of this whole issue.

Mr. Speaker, besides the fact that the government paid Mr. Carriere an appalling sum of money for assault, beside the fact that women are brought together in a room and told to sign the agreement at that moment or no one would get any money, besides the fact that the women aren't even allowed to have a copy of the agreement in their possession, and beside the fact that the women were further harassed by the government when they weren't listened . . . when their harassment complaints weren't listened to in the first place — putting all that aside today — even today this government refuses to look into what really happened. They refuse to let this case go to an all-party committee to talk to the . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. Order. I would ask government members to please calm down and . . . please stop yelling across the floor. I would like all members to be able to hear the member for Kelvington-Wadena, and I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Ms. Draude: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, putting aside all of that, today this government refuses to look into what really happened. It looks like they're going to refuse to let this case to go to an all-party committee to get witnesses, to get facts, and to get background information — maybe even to see if there were more victims — and most importantly to find out when the harassment really started and who knew about it and when they knew about and who had the authority or the audacity to sweep it under the rug.

To find out . . . By allowing this issue to be brought to the public would finally bring some closure — and I underline some closure — to women who were victimized, women who were victimized in the workplace, not in the private sector, but in the government . . .

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

Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, point of order. During the last exchange the minister of . . . Point of order. Leave to . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — What is the hon. member's point of order?

Mr. Morgan: — The Minister of Finance was clearly heard to accuse the member from Wadena of lying during the last exchange. We'd ask that he withdraw that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. I did not hear those comments. I would invite the member in question, the Minister of Finance, if he has any comments that he wishes to make or any withdrawal of remarks, to please put them on the record. And I recognize the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Thomson: — I would decline the invitation. Thank you.

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

Mr. Morgan: — I would like to invite you to review the tape

recording of the incident. Several members on this side of the House heard the comment, heard the accusation made by that member, and would like to call on that member to do the honourable thing and apologize and withdraw the remark before it has to go to the point where it comes back another day after the Deputy Speaker has had to listen to the recording. We'd certainly like to give him the chance to do the honourable and the right thing today in this Assembly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I will ensure that the *Hansard* and the recording are reviewed. And I will review the *Hansard* and, if these remarks are recorded on *Hansard*, I will address it on the next sitting. Order. Order. Order. I ask the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley and I ask all members of the Assembly to please maintain order. I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today what we are trying to find out is if this government will allow this whole issue to go to the Crown and Central Agencies so we can talk about the issue in an all-party committee, so we can bring forward all the issues that women in this province, not just the nine victims, but the women in this province and everybody else who cares about what this government is doing. Give me a chance to see what really happened. People have a right to know what's happening.

And to make fun of this whole issue in this House, to divert attention from what's happening in this debate so the government doesn't have to answer this scandal is totally unacceptable. It speaks to the moral conscience of this government. And the philosophy of this government is sweeping anything they want to under the rug, so they don't have to talk about the issues. It's hurting them. Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing that makes everybody cynical and apathetic about government in general.

People have a right to know what their government stands up for. And obviously this government is not standing up for women. It's not standing up for somebody who works in their workplace. It isn't standing up for anybody but their right to keep things under lock and key. Mr. Speaker, the people . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. I am having . . . Order. I am having a great deal of difficulty hearing the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena, and I ask members to please calm down. I'd ask the Minister of Finance to please not continue to make remarks across the floor. And I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we're trying to do through this motion is ask the government to bring this issue, this scandal, to an all-party committee. Mr. Speaker, maybe if we do that, we'd have an opportunity to bring some closure to women who have been hurt, whose lives have been ruined because of a workplace incident, a workplace — a government workplace — not a private workplace, a government workplace.

I want to remind the members opposite, and I'm quoting from the *Regina Manifesto* of 1933, "No C.C.F. government will rest . . . until it has eradicated capitalism . . ." That's the contempt they hold for private sector. And yet it was in the public sector

we have at least nine women who are victimized since at least 1994, and this government doesn't want to talk about at all, refusing to let this issue go to an all-party committee, the government that dealt with the Channel Lake scandal underlines for every woman of this province that it is only talk. They're willing to talk the talk but not walk the walk. They took the Channel Lake issue to the committee and we talked about money. But these guys, who want to believe that they are the social conscience of everybody in this province, they'll take a money issue, but they won't take a social issue to a committee, that everybody deserved to hear something about.

[11:30]

Mr. Speaker, the question that needs to be answered is why. We know from speaking directly to women that the government knew as far back as 1994 that harassment was taking place in the workplace. Their ADMs [assistant deputy minister] knew it. The DMs [deputy minister] knew it, and their comments were, oh that's just Murdoch.

Mr. Speaker, the timelines that were gone through since 2002, December 20, 2002, when the Gillies report submitted their report on the investigation, did say that harassment did occur "... both in terms of abuse of authority and in terms of inappropriate sexual behaviour." And I quote this from the Gillies report.

We have the whole timeline from February 12, 2003, April 2003, November 2003, May 2004. This issue has gone on and on and on until February 16, 2006, when Mr. Carriere was convicted on two counts of common assault and acquitted on two charges of sexual assault. On February 27, 2007, the NDP government announced it settled with Murdoch Carriere for the sum of \$275,000.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government just wants this issue to go away. Everything they have done since session started has proven, whatever it takes, make it go away. It's a huge issue, and it is not going to go away until people of the province receive some answers. They want to know why Mr. Carriere wasn't fired with cause years ago, why the NDP won't release their secret legal opinions, why won't they let the committee look into the details.

The last few days, the minister in charge of PSC has decided maybe there's a need for new legislation. Maybe, but more likely there's just a need for somebody to enforce what they already have. Mr. Speaker, the only reason, the only reason the government refuses to answer questions or to allow this issue to be brought to Crown and Central Agencies is to cover up for their inaction or to protect friends.

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to second the motion brought forward by the new member for Martensville who obviously has more social conscience than the whole NDP caucus put together.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the hon. member for Regina Wascana Plains.

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do give notice at the end of my remarks I'll be moving an amendment to the motion before the Assembly.

In beginning my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really do want to put the debate through the lens of time here. I want to begin when I was first putting my name forward as a candidate in 1982 to run for city council. My children were three and seven. I spent most of my campaign time in those days answering the question about, doesn't this become an abusive situation to my children and my family, seeking political office? Not the important issues of the day to Regina, or at the time that I was running, but of being a young person, a young mom, and that I belonged at home.

In the '80s as a member of city council, we formed a task force on women's issues which I chaired. You can't imagine the backlash at that time. The emerging issues? Child care and family-friendly cityscapes, equal pay for work of equal value, sex education in our schools, harassment issues in the workplace — these were all emerging themes. And these topics stirred much debate. And I became firmly committed to advancing solutions to the issues affecting women. And I welcome this as my first opportunity to express my views on this unfortunate and harrowing series of events.

Mr. Speaker, I have served my constituents in this Assembly since 1991, and I have heard some incredible statements over those years. One of them was captured by a woman, Barb Gustafson, in the *Prince Albert Herald* in 1999 when the member from Rosetown-Elrose, during his chat with the chamber of commerce executive, was asked about candidate nominations and the prospect of women running for the Sask Party. His reply? Words to the effect that it's difficult to get women involved in politics since "their concerns are with the home" and "they don't like dealing with conflict."

Another member, I remember very clearly at the time we were discussing the Human Rights Code amendments, was known to state, Mr. Speaker, he stated, I truly believe God created woman to meet the needs of man.

And the newest member of the Assembly, who's been her feet much during this debate, was an adviser to Minister Oda who directed the Status of Women office to remove the word equality from its mandate. Clearly this member's not sincere in her concerns for women in the workplace if she's not prepared to fight for equality for women in those workplaces.

Mr. Speaker, as a New Democrat and a woman, I have zero tolerance for bullying; intolerance; physical, verbal, and sexual harassment of individuals anywhere. Clearly stated, I believe that we knew — and the opposition knew — that we would pay big time for the political knee-jerk mishandling of the firing.

Did they know? Did we know? You bet. Are we happy? No. We're not happy with this settlement but what it does show is that as an employer we need to be careful around terminations so, no matter what the person is accused of doing, we are handling those issues correctly.

Did Mr. Carriere receive compensation for his actions, as the opposition tends to portray this? No. To suggest he was

rewarded for his actions is insensitive, outrageous, and patently untrue.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Are we happy with this settlement? No. But as a government are we above the rules, and do we have to be honest and follow the law? Yes.

Mr. Speaker, in an interview on Thursday the Leader of the Opposition said he wouldn't have settled this lawsuit. He said he would have gone to court. He would have gone to court against legal advice and at great fiscal cost — additional fiscal cost — to the taxpayer. He knows that. The members opposite know that. Not to mention the insensitivity of dragging these women through additional court proceedings, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite may continue to paint themselves as defenders of the rights of women in the workplace, but their actions and their words through the years say otherwise. The workers of this province see right through their smoke-and-mirrors, red-herring approach to this issue.

Will I stand on the NDP record on this issue as opposed to the Sask. Party record any day? You bet I'll stand here on this record.

What's their record, Mr. Speaker? What's their record? While the government was amending The Workers' Compensation Act and human rights codes and introducing new OH&S [occupational health and safety] Act, the opposition was busy proposing amendments — amendments to water down and later on oppose even putting them forward, Mr. Speaker. What would have those amendments done from the members opposite? They wanted to amend clause 2(1)(g). Right now it says:

"discriminatory action" means any action or threat of action . . .

They wanted to get rid of "threat of action." They wanted workers to have no protection from being threatened, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

They wanted to change the same clause to remove the words, "reprimand, coercion, intimidation or the imposition of any discipline or other penalty . . ." They didn't want employers who use these methods against employees to be held to account. That's their record, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — They wanted clause 2(1)(l) removed. That's the harassment clause that they're opposed to. Let me read it:

"harassment" means any objectionable conduct, comment or display by a person that:

(i) is directed at a worker;

(ii) is made on a basis of race, creed, religion, colour, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status,

disability, physical size or weight, age, nationality, ancestry or place of origin; and

(iii) constitutes a threat to the health or safety of a worker

Those members opposed and wanted harassment removed from the Act. That's their record, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And when that didn't work, they wanted to change the definition of harassment so it only included conduct by a person made on a continuous basis. In other words, workers would have to be repeatedly subjected to harassment to receive protection.

They wanted to change occupational health and safety that means "the promotion and maintenance of the highest degree of physical, mental, and social well-being of workers." They wanted to get rid of "social well-being." They didn't want workers to enjoy social well-being. That's downright mean-spirited, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

They didn't like the word welfare. "Every employer shall: ensure, insofar as is reasonably practical, the health, safety and welfare at work . . ." They didn't want to protect the welfare of workers, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's their record.

I will stand on this side of the House with my colleagues in pride for the solutions and actions we take to address issues before the House. And because I do accept the position put forward by this, I don't accept the position put forward by the Saskatchewan Party. I don't accept the words that they're using within the Assembly that they won't use outside those doors, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I move the following amendment, seconded by the member for Regina Walsh Acres. I move:

That this Assembly call on the government at an appropriate time to propose amendments to occupational health and safety legislation and any other relevant legislation or policy to ensure that working people in this province are protected from harassment so that no situations like the Carriere case are ever repeated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Members of the Assembly, I'll just read the amendment. The amendment is:

That this Assembly call on the government at an appropriate time to propose amendments to occupational health and safety legislation and any other relevant legislation and/or policy to ensure that working people in this province are protected from harassment so that situations like the Carriere case are never repeated.

The debate will continue on both the motion and the amendment, and I recognize the hon. member for Regina Walsh Acres.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Morin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to speak in support of the amended motion, an

amendment that was absolutely necessary. The original motion was full of inaccuracies but then inaccuracy has become a trademark of this opposition.

As I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that they are busily working to help us develop a third Sask Party ethical misconduct document. In fact the Leader of the Opposition called the first document, quote, "a nice little book." It is a nice little book, Mr. Speaker, full of details about the Sask Party's violations of its own code of ethics. But, Mr. Speaker, it's not the current Leader of the Opposition I'd like to begin my discussion with today.

I would like to talk about the Sask Party's history as defender of women's rights. The Sask Party, the Sask Party, in typically hypocritical fashion, has tried to posture itself as the champion of women's issues only recently in order to make some political gains.

I propose to talk about the historical reality of the Sask Party's view of women but in order to do that I'm going to need to go back to the beginning. The current leader will simply say anything to get his hands on the public purse and he is plagued by youthful acts of indiscretion. No, Mr. Speaker, in order to talk about the founding and guiding principles of the Sask Party we must go back to 1999 and discuss the first leader, the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

Now there was a leader, Mr. Speaker. The former leader of the opposition may hold some misguided beliefs — in fact, some of the most misguided I've ever heard — but he was never afraid to take a stand, albeit on the wrong side of every issue.

[11:45]

In 1999, Mr. Speaker, the Sask Party had a leader that was not afraid to threaten the sale of Crown corporations or to privatize health care. Now those were the days, Mr. Speaker, and that was quite the leader.

On March 6, 1999, a journalist for the *Prince Albert Herald* wrote an article entitled, "Recent remarks prove the point: women's work is never done." The article is mostly a discussion on how conservative politicians are incapable of coming to terms with modern issues, specifically as they relate to women. In the article the journalist expresses that she attended an event with then leader of the opposition, the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

Apparently when addressing the local business community in P.A., the member was asked a question about the prospect of women running for the Sask Party. Now the former leader, never to let politics get in the way of exposing the prejudices and true beliefs of his party, turned to his questioner and said, and I'm quoting from the article, Mr. Speaker, "their concerns are with the home . . . they don't like dealing with conflict."

Women's concerns are with the home and they don't like dealing with conflict. Mr. Speaker, I'm not the leader of an opposition party, but I don't understand how such a misguided view could possibly serve the best interests of women. How would the member's beliefs have translated into policy had he become Premier? I shudder to even think about that. What

would his policy on sexual harassment be? Perhaps the member from Rosetown-Elrose would simply hope that women would stay at home so that he wouldn't have to deal with harassment issues at all.

Mr. Speaker, the columnist goes on to say this, quote:

Some of the women . . . [who] heard his remarks dealt with their immediate conflict — between wanting to wring his red neck and the knowledge that such an action would be illegal — by walking out of the meeting.

The words are surprising only in their honest expression.

There is little doubt about what the Sask. Party sees as women's proper role; you just don't hear it articulated that clearly very often.

There you have it, Mr. Speaker. That is how a Sask Party leader deals with the issues of women. Some of the women who were at his meeting might not have agreed with him. In fact they were so upset they chose to leave his company, but not everyone can recognize a visionary. Mr. Speaker, as many members will know, not everyone can stand to be in the company of someone with the *gravitas* of the member from Rosetown-Elrose — a real leader.

Mr. Speaker, the amended motion calls on this government to amend occupational health and safety legislation to ensure that instances of harassment like the Carriere incident are never repeated. Many of the members opposite are likely not aware, but in Saskatchewan harassment falls under The Occupational Health and Safety Act. The Sask Party might hold some dubious views of women but, Mr. Speaker, surely they can't object to protecting people in the workplace, at least not again. Historically the opposition hasn't had much interest in protecting workers either. In fact, quite the contrary. The current Leader of the Opposition, not to be outdone by his questionable predecessor, has already declared war on working people. On at least this point he is just as willing to make a stand as the member from Rosetown-Elrose.

The Leader of the Opposition has decided to take a stand against working people in Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Opposition has said that, quote:

. . . red tape and regulations that have been foisted onto the business community by this government, be it through Workers' Comp or occupational health and safety or various pieces of labour legislation, too often has driven businesses and the jobs they create and the taxes they pay out of the province of Saskatchewan.

The opposition leader is obviously not too concerned about working people or working women in this province. One leader says that women should be at home and the next says that workers shouldn't be protected in the workplace. Between women and workers, the Saskatchewan Party has taken issue with 85 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

It's a wonder why the opposition takes any interest in the Carriere case at all. Why are they so suddenly — and in contradiction of their own past sentiments — so concerned

about a group of women workers? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is politics. That Leader of the Opposition is desperate to get his hands on the public purse. And if that means he has to tell the public that his party is the champion of women's rights, though they are so clearly not, or that they support workers, though they so clearly do not, then that is exactly what they will do.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition will have a chance to make a positive change to labour legislation in this province. If he is as committed to these issues as he is in the theatric of their articulation then there is no reason for him not to support the amended motion today. And there is absolutely no reason for him not to support this government when the time comes to effect positive change for the great people of this province. The people of Saskatchewan deserve strong legislative protections, not to be told to stay at home, not to be told that their safety is not a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I will be proudly supporting the amendment put forward by the member for Regina Wascana Plains today and urge all the members of the opposition to do the same. But I have reservations as to whether or not that would be the case, Mr. Speaker, given that we also have the member from Kelvington-Wadena saying on November 9, 2006 — which was as recent as just a few months ago — that when it comes to occupational health and safety legislation, you don't . . . quote she says, quote:

You don't have to put forward every rule and regulation, because employers know [that] if you don't look after your employees, they're not going to be there.

So on one hand she's saying we should be looking after our workers, but on the other hand she's saying we don't have to legislate it. Despite the fact that right now we have legislation under the current Occupational Health and Safety Act that is not as comprehensive as it could be, as it should be, and we as the NDP government have recognized that and are making the plans right now in terms of making the changes to further enshrine our commitment to the working people of this province and the working women of this province.

We are not going to back down from our commitment to these women and to the workers of this province. We are not going to back down because we're getting a whole bunch of rhetoric from the opposite. We are not going to back down just because they don't have any position to put forward for themselves, Mr. Speaker.

They are high on rhetoric and very low on substantive policy, Mr. Speaker. They have offered nothing by the way of what they would propose. It's simply an opposition to everything that this NDP government is doing in proud defence of the workers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Members, debate continues on both the motion put forward by the member for Martensville and the amendment put forward by the member for Regina Wascana Plains. And I recognize the hon. member for Humboldt.

Ms. Harpauer: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's always interesting to listen to the member from Regina Walsh Acres tell me how I think and how I feel in her perspective with whatever they tell her that she is supposed to think and feel herself. She isn't interested quite frankly in how other people think or feel and certainly isn't open-minded enough to get any understanding of what the opposition party is even all about. But you get desperate. You get nasty. You get downright personal when you have something that quite frankly you need to be ashamed of and you need to defend it and it's indefensible. This tired, old, NDP government should be ashamed of the way that they have dealt with this issue and they can sit there and pass judgment.

But one of those victims was working through my office when I was the representative for the constituency of Watrous. I spoke with one of those victims. I heard what she went through and I heard her pain and I felt helpless to be able to help her because there was nothing that I could do to help her at that time. And obviously there was nothing that this NDP government was going to do to help these women as well, because the way they have been treated is absolutely disgusting. It's absolutely appalling.

The NDP government do not share the values of the Saskatchewan people. They have lost their sense of right and wrong. And I cannot believe they sit there day after day and defend what has happened in this particular scandal.

There can be no doubt that Murdoch Carriere is a friend of one of the ministers that's sitting, a very good friend of at least one of the ministers that's sitting here in this Assembly today. He was a relative of a past minister. And I think that has a lot to play in this whole scandal and I think that has a lot to do with why there's such an enormous coverup going on.

But you know what? They couldn't have ever, this story would never, ever, ever have been known if the Gillies report had not been made public. They would have kept brushing it under the rug, brushing it under the rug, covering it up. Moving Murdoch Carriere around was their tactic at the time. Let's just remove him from the office that's causing the trouble. Let's move him into another office, and let's just keep covering it up.

And it's interesting that they did that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because in a letter from one of the victims she said, and I quote:

A number of female employees who work in the Regina office ... have also experienced incidents with Mr. Carriere ... We feel as employees that the females of 3211 Albert Street are being placed into an unsafe environment.

That's how these women felt. That is the message that they were ... [inaudible] ... to their superiors. And what happened? They moved him to the Regina office. They said, that's how we'll solve the problem. Let's just take him and move him somewhere else and let's keep him on employment and let's just keep covering it up and covering it up.

How else were the victims treated in this whole situation? Well we have nine victims that came forward. I think, I think there is more. But we have nine that we know of today, because the

NDP government refused to answer as to how many actually filed complaints.

But we have nine that were assigned one lawyer. They were brought together in a room and they were told that the offer was \$15,000 each and that was the only money that would be offered them. They were told that they couldn't just go and discuss it with their friends and come back with a decision at a later day. They were told they had to make that decision and sign the agreement that very day.

They were told if any one of them did not sign the agreement, none of them would get any money. That is so disrespectful. I can't even imagine how it's possibly legal to have that type of negotiation-type setup. Those women had no individual rights whatsoever. They were tied to one another without individual rights. That's how this government treats the women.

The bill that the women received for the legal counsel that the government arranged for them because ... I notice that the minister from Nutana is beaking away, you know, they had a lawyer; they had a lawyer. Well my understanding was that was arranged by the government and the bill states that it is for, I quote: "services rendered in connection with potential claims against Murdoch Carriere and the Government of Saskatchewan."

Why was this government protecting Murdoch Carriere? They were understandably trying to protect themselves from any future lawsuits, but why Murdoch Carriere? Why was it in their interest to protect Murdoch Carriere and future lawsuits against him?

In the end of the day, Murdoch Carriere gets awarded \$275,000. What does that tell these women — these women that were put in a room and told that if any one of them refused to sign the agreement, the agreement was taken off the table? They were told that that was the only settlement that was going to be offered them. It was that or nothing. And then they find out that Murdoch Carriere is awarded \$275,000, plus his pension's topped up. We always forget that part, but his pension was topped up. And how are they supposed to feel? We've just seen the harasser rewarded and the victims were further victimized.

The settlement agreement that was signed by Murdoch Carriere on January 9 — the cheque was for \$275,000 as I mentioned — was sent to Murdoch Carriere on January 26 and the women in the public weren't told until seven weeks later, on February 27. Why did the government not at the very least give the women that much respect? Why didn't they give them that much respect to give them a heads-up that this was going to be hitting the headlines in the newspapers? And they didn't even have that much respect for those women. And what does our Premier say? Well the Premier says, and I quote, "it's responsible government." Later he said, and it's in *Hansard* on March 8, "Would I do it again? You bet I would."

An Hon. Member: — Do what?

Ms. Harpauer: — That's the Premier. That's the Premier.

The Minister of Finance wants to know, do what? I suggest he go to *Hansard* on March 8, page 760 and read it if he likes. If

he likes, he can read it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. Order. Now members on both sides of the Assembly . . . Order. Members on both sides of the Assembly are not demonstrating respectful behaviour and we are not continuing this debate until there is silence in the Assembly. Please ensure the clock is stopped so that the member who's speaking does not lose her time in any way. And I recognize the hon. member for Humboldt.

[12:00]

Ms. Harpauer: — Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there isn't near enough time to talk to this subject in just 10 minutes. We'll talk about the consulting with the victims. And the member from Nutana said, "my understanding from the Justice officials is that the complainants were checked with before this was given to Mr. Carriere." That wasn't what happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They were not consulted with.

Later the Premier said . . . And I probably could find the pages. The Minister of Finance wants to check this out too. But I quote, "It is in my view that subjecting these nine complainants again to another civil process, another public exposure, is the wrong thing to do."

Did he ask them? Did he give them enough respect to just ask them? But no, no. He didn't at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it just goes on and on and on. What are the NDP hiding? This is riddled with situation after situation from 1994 where this has been hidden and covered up again and again and again. The ministers have not answered any questions in this Assembly.

The NDP refused to table the legal opinion that they supposedly obtained, that they defend, that they defended. If it is so defensible, table it. If you can defend it, if it indeed says that he is entitled, if they are so incompetent and if they screwed up that badly in just firing someone, let's see the legal opinion. Because obviously it was a major mismanagement of how they fired him in order for him to be entitled to that kind of money.

They refuse to table the copy of the agreement signed by the victims which . . . By the way, the victims cannot have a copy themselves because, oh, unless all nine agree to it, none of them can have a copy of the very agreement that they signed. And I'd like to know, does Murdoch Carriere have a copy of the agreement he signed? And I bet he does. I have no doubt that he has a copy of what he signed. But the women aren't entitled to have a copy of what they signed.

They refuse to release a copy of the agreement with the victims. They refuse to tell us how many victims reported harassment prior to the nine that came forward. They refuse to tell us who knew. Who knew? So we need an investigation.

They talk, okay, let's correct the loopholes in the legislation. I said, bring it on. I would be more than happy to support it. But how do we know what we're going to fix if we don't know everything that went wrong? How do we fix what we don't know went wrong? It's just crisis management. That is all it is. This is crisis management because they got caught. They got

caught.

And so now they're going to say, oh the opposition won't support it. I will absolutely support it if it does strengthen and if I know what went wrong. So let's have that investigation. Let's find out what went wrong here. Who knew? Who knew? Who knew and why are they still employed? If it's zero tolerance, is it okay with these members that people that covered it up are still employed. Is that okay? Is that zero tolerance? And I don't think it is.

Talk to these victims and see how they feel. And they still feel that way today — today . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . You know, the member from Regina Walsh Acres, someone needs to take her to the back room and give her the . . . all the whitewash that they tell her that she can come up with.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. Order. The member's time has elapsed. The member's time has elapsed. I recognize the hon. member for Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm extremely pleased this morning to enter into this debate. Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with a very serious issue. An issue that should not be made a political skeptical, but an issue that should be looked at and dealt with for what it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this province led the nation — I want to repeat that, Mr. Deputy Speaker — this province led the nation in putting in anti-harassment policies and legislation in place. In this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government takes this issue very, very seriously. But even with the very best legislation, and even with the very best intent, you're not going to be able to stop all harassment. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government believes very, very strongly that every employee has the right to work in a workplace free of harassment.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it does no good to drag a particular issue through the mud for months or weeks. What we need to do is fix any problems that may exist. Because with any policy or procedure or legislation, there is never a perfect solution. We need to continue to amend and to improve the legislation or the policies as new situations arise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there isn't a single member on this side of the House that isn't concerned about what these nine women faced. There isn't a single member on this side of the House that wasn't disgusted with what these women had to go through. And there wasn't a single member on this side of the House that if they had any other way would have paid Murdoch Carriere a penny. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the law is the law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is not a single member on either side of this House, there's not a single member on either side of this House that likes what happened. There is not a single member that likes what happened. But can we change that? We can't. All we can do is improve the future. All we can do is improve the future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and ensure that no, and ensure that no other individuals have to deal with the same situations, the same circumstances, and the same affront that those nine women faced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to continue to improve the

situation for employees across the province, both in government and in the private sector. But most importantly, we need to know that we have a desire to do so. Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this side of the House we do have a desire to do so. We have a desire to deliver workplaces where people are free of harassment, where they have the opportunity to work in an environment they feel safe and secure, and that they have the opportunity to work in a respectful and dignified workplace.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've heard the members opposite try to make this particular very serious situation a political skeptical for days and weeks now, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I've heard them attack the credibility of individuals who've dealt with this issue. I've had them attribute motive to the Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission. I can tell you that the Minister of the Public Service Commission is every bit as concerned about what happened to those nine women as is any member of this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Yates: — And I can tell you when this government was first looking at implementing anti-harassment policies and legislation, I represented the largest union in this province. And I can tell you that member was one of the key individuals that pushed — that pushed — to ensure that we put legislation and policies in place to protect the people in their workplaces.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very, very important that we not make something of a very serious situation that it isn't and that we work instead to improve the future for employees in this province. And we're going to work to improve the situation for people in this province.

I want to repeat, there isn't a single, there is not a single member in this Assembly on either side of the House that would have liked to pay Mr. Carriere \$275,000 — not a single member. But we can't, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can't not follow the law. Mr. Carriere had been disciplined prior to the political level understanding. Mr. Carriere had been disciplined prior to anybody at the political level understanding or knowing the details of his actions. And when his actions became known to the members of this Assembly, the right, the right decision was made. Mr. Carriere was fired. The right decision was made.

And at that time, at that time we all in this Assembly knew — we all knew — it was going to cost us something because we knew he'd already been disciplined. And we knew that double jeopardy did not allow us to fire him. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members of the opposition knew.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Order. I apologize to the member for Regina Dewdney. I'd ask the member for Wood River to please stop yelling remarks across the House. And I recognize the hon. member for Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All members in this Assembly who sat here in 2003 knew and fully understood that what we did would cost. Because when, when you terminate an individual after he's already been disciplined, it's double jeopardy. But it was still the right decision. And members of the opposition urged the government to fire him. And yes, yes, we fired him.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to look forward now. We need to improve the situation for men and women, employees both in the private and public sector in Saskatchewan. We need to ensure that no other women ever face this type of situation.

But even in the best, in the best situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot guarantee, there is no way to guarantee that people will not face harassment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wish we could. Every single member of this Assembly wishes that we could guarantee that no other woman would ever face harassment and no other individual in our society would face racism, harassment, or abuse in any form. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can't guarantee that. All we can do is put in place the best policies, and procedures, and legislation possible in order to ensure that we can deliver the best possible outcome for our employees and for all the citizens of the province.

And yes, I will be very frank and very candid. There were decisions that could have been made differently and should have been made differently, and every member of this Assembly will agree with that — every single member. But you cannot go back and change decisions that were made by others and in many cases none of us, none of us in this House were aware of. Those decisions were made within the bureaucracy. They were made at levels other than here. We can't go back and change those decisions. All we can do is focus on improving the future.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to concentrate on improving the future. We can't continue to dwell in the past. We need to understand that these women faced a very horrific situation. And we all feel for what they had to go through.

But we need to ensure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need to ensure that we do everything we possibly can to ensure that no women face these situations in the future. That's our responsibility. And then once we put the policies and legislation in place, we have to leave it up to those who are responsible for managing the civil service on a daily basis to implement. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must change.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's an important topic that we're addressing in the seventy-five minute debate today. And unfortunately I think we've got a little off the important and germane issues that give rise to the particular motion before the House today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problems I have in having listened to the debate so far is the way that the heart of the matter has been avoided. The several troubling issues as they relate to this particular situation and the motion that we're debating today, one of them of course . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I apologize to the hon. member but the time for . . . the 65 minutes for time to debate has now expired, and we go to the 10 minutes for questions and answers. And I recognize the hon. member for Estevan.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question is to the member from Regina Walsh Acres, and I would simply like to know why her government refuses to let this issue go to the Crown and Central Agencies Committee.

[12:15]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the hon. member for Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Mr. Speaker, this government has put forward a very good position on this issue in terms of making sure that we address that this situation doesn't happen again in the future. And we are committed to doing that, Mr. Speaker. What those opposition members are not going to be forthright about and haven't been forthright about so far is their position on the issue with respect to supporting the amendments that we would have to bring forward because those amendments, in order to be able to expedite them, would have to be supported by those members. So they're not being forthright about that, Mr. Speaker.

And you know, it's very interesting because in the past they've shown that they don't support the legislation regarding harassment under occupational health and safety. When we were bringing forward amendments in 1993, the members wanted harassment removed from the Act. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they also wanted to have another mechanism in there for people who did bring forward complaints under harassment. They wanted to give employers extra power to sue employees if they brought forward false claims, and that is an intimidation tactic if I ever saw one, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the hon. member for Regina Wascana Plains.

Ms. Hamilton: — Well procedurally we all know that it takes all of the support of all of us to put forward solutions. Are the members opposite — and I would ask for the member of Kelvington-Wadena — are you prepared to ask your caucus to support any changes that would come forward to occupational health and safety regulations to protect Saskatchewan workers from sexual harassment?

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

Ms. Draude: — I would love to see the amendments that have been spoken about so many times in this House. They keep asking us if we're going to support amendments that we haven't seen. We'd like to see what happened. It's been stated clearly that we'll look at any amendments that will help.

What I want to know is what this government is doing about enforcing the legislation that's in place at this time. We have a concern about the issues that happened in the past. We want to know what happened. And if there's something we can do to improve it, we will definitely do it. But my question is, this government is so worried about what's happening in the future, they're forgetting to look at the past as well. And we can't improve it until we look at the past.

So my question is to the member from Walsh Acres. For 10 long minutes in her not-so-accurate version of the Sask Party's history . . . and she didn't want to talk about the things, about things like people on social services . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — The member for Kelvington-Wadena has answered the question, but she needs to be recognized before she asks another. And I recognize the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question is to the member for Walsh Acres who did speak about her version of the Sask Party. And she didn't talk about the fact that if it wasn't for the Sask Party, there wouldn't have been an increase to people on social services. There wouldn't have been a Project Hope. There wouldn't have been a recognition day for people with FASD [fetal alcohol spectrum disorder].

But my question . . . But she did want to say that she's a proud defender of workers of this province. So my question to this member is, does she believe for some reason that bringing this issue to the Crown and central agency would in some way not be in the best interests of the women who were harassed?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the hon. member for Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — Well, Mr. Speaker, once again we have the Sask Party distortion on what the facts are. And the facts were stated in my speech, Mr. Speaker, so people can decide for themselves which version, I guess, they want to believe — the distortion or the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I'm curious as to whether or not the member from Kelvington-Wadena . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Once again I ask the member to be recognized for the asking of a question. I take it she's completed answering the question? You're still answering? I apologize to the member. I recognize the hon. member for Regina Walsh Acres.

Ms. Morin: — I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if she would be so bold as to say the drive-by smearings that they do on a regular basis from that side of the House . . . outside of privilege in this House where they don't have immunity from the law and then would have to substantiate what they say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Heppner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it interesting that the member for Regina Wascana Plains wants to talk about equality considering the record of her government.

According to the victims of Murdoch Carriere, they were herded into a room and forced to sign a settlement. And if they weren't going to sign the settlement, if one person disagreed with this, they were going to get nothing. And at the end of the day, this government offered them \$15,000. Murdoch Carriere, on the other hand, received \$275,000, and the government

bumped up his pension so that he could retire well. Can the member from Regina Wascana Plains explain to us where she sees the equality in that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the hon. member for Regina Wascana Plains.

Ms. Hamilton: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite are doing their very best to conjure up a scandal in this case. And every day they come forward and they drag in a gag order for the women. There was no gag order, Mr. Speaker. The hard drive was erased. The hard drive was not erased. The member from Athabasca was a personal friend. That was not the case. The Premier golfed with somebody. Well we all golf with people from time to time when we're doing . . . Time and time again they drag in incorrect statements, so I have no doubt that I would need time to check on their statements.

The other incorrect statement, and I addressed it in my remarks was, would we settle with Murdoch Carriere if we had the choice to do that? We're very sad that we have to do that. We know this settlement was not for harassment. They pose it to be a settlement for harassment. They know by their statements it was for . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I apologize to the member for Regina Wascana Plains who was being constantly interrupted during her comments. And I recognize her in case she would like to finish her remarks.

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We all know that it's really misleading, and it's unfortunate that members opposite want to pose the settlement for Murdoch Carriere as something that's a reward.

Would it be a reward that members opposite in the '80s, when they were convicted of fraud, received their pensions, received the benefits that were coming to them? You can characterize these issues the way you want, but in the best interests of the women, I think we have to come to some control in debate and look for solutions into the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I recognize the Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission.

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — This question is to the member from Martensville. She has said that the women were herded into a room and forced to sign. Can she indicate to this House who herded these women into the room? Was it the women's lawyer? That's question number one.

Question number two. She has said . . . And the second part of my question is, she has said that the member from Athabasca was a personal friend of Murdoch Carriere. I ask her, what evidence does she have?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Ms. Heppner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, these nine women, we've spoken with them. They were brought into a room and they were told to sign this. They signed this under duress. And this was the culmination after years of harassment that was allowed to happen under the watch of this NDP government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I apologize to the member from Martensville, but she was being interrupted during her comments. And I recognize the hon. member from Martensville in case she wants to finish her answer.

Ms. Heppner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These women . . . This is one of the last steps in a long journey that these women had to go through. They were harassed by Murdoch Carriere. They went to their supervisors. They went to assistant deputy ministers. They went to deputy ministers. They wrote the Premier of this province, and nothing was done for them. That minister sits there with a smile on her face day after day, and these women, their lives have been destroyed because of this. And this government has refused to stand up for them.

The former NDP Justice minister said that they would fight this vigorously in court and let the courts decide. And you all backed down and completely abandoned these women when they needed you most.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — Time for the seventy-five minute debate has elapsed. I just want to say — excuse me — I just want to say before we leave this debate, I am going to review the record of this debate with respect to comments that are alleged to have been made on both sides of the House. I'm going to be reviewing the record and reporting to the Speaker on this matter for Monday's session. Members came . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, for Wednesday, thank you for correcting me. I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I'd ask the Government House Leader to state his point of order.

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm not sure exactly what you were thinking when you just made your statement, and if it's included then I accept that. I do want to ensure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in reviewing the remarks of the members that the Speaker would pay particular attention to the remark made by the hon. member for Humboldt while she was on her feet and made the remark — and as best as I can recall, very close, if not exactly this — that the member for Walsh Acres should be taken out behind the woodshed and given a good . . . and then she caught herself.

On that, I would ask that attention be paid to that specifically on the grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is highly improper in parliamentary debate for members to question either the motivations or to be demeaning of others in the Assembly in their remarks. It was made on the record and surely will be clearly heard by Hansard, and I would ask that that be specifically referred to unless the hon. member wishes to withdraw the remark and apologize now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I will be reviewing those transcripts. But I recognize the hon. member for Saskatoon Southeast, I take it, on this matter.

Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're confident that a review will show that the member from Humboldt did not say anything improper. She stopped midstream through a sentence. And if the members opposite want to infer something else, that speaks something about where they're at with their particular mentality. But there was nothing intended or impugned by the member from Humboldt. And I'm sure that listening to the record will satisfy the Speaker or yourself that there was no improper statements made nor any improper intent by our member.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble): — I thank the hon. member for Saskatoon Southeast and I thank the Government House Leader. I will review the transcript from Hansard on this matter, and we'll address this on Wednesday. We turn now to private members' motions, and I recognize the hon. member for Regina Coronation Park.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Motion No. 4 —Equalization and an Energy Accord

Mr. Trew: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be making a motion on behalf of not only my constituents but the people of our great province, Saskatchewan. I am distressed that we have to enter this debate, Mr. Speaker, because what this debate, my motion, is really about is a matter that goes right to the very heart of our democracy, and that is the matter of trust of elected individuals — trust in their word. In this motion I am speaking directly to the ability, the electorate's ability, to trust our Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, and to trust the 12 Conservative MPs [Member of Parliament] that we have elected.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will be moving, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon Massey Place:

That Saskatchewan's 12 Conservative members of parliament provide an apology to the people of this province for breaking their election promise on the issue of equalization; and further, that this Legislative Assembly call upon the federal government to immediately negotiate a Saskatchewan energy accord.

Not yet, I'll be doing this before my remarks end, Mr. Speaker — the Pages are ever, ever efficient. And my little aside, I want to say the Easter Bunny came early, and I want to thank the Pages for dropping off the little chocolate Easter eggs at my and my colleague's desk. Thank you very much for that. It's much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of trust that Canadians must have in our Prime Minister and must have in our politicians really goes to the heart of democracy. I want to build a case that is clear and logical. I don't want to get into the details of equalization

although I'd be happy to do so, but I know that many people's eyes glaze over. It's not a question of what the heck is the formula. It's a question of what the heck is the Prime Minister's word worth. What the heck is 12 MPs' words worth?

And, Mr. Speaker, what I have is some quotes. I'm going to start with quotes from my own MP, Tom Lukiwski, who in *Hansard*, February 21, 2005, says and this is a quote for Mr. Lukiwski:

Mr. Speaker, last Friday several Conservative MPs, myself included, met with Premier Lorne Calvert and other political leaders from Saskatchewan.

During that meeting we were all united in calling for the elimination of oil and gas revenues from the equalization formula, but the government, and the finance minister continue to ignore and betray the people of Saskatchewan.

[12:30]

Tom Lukiwski, in the federal *Hansard*, February 21, 2005. I want to go fast forward two months — February, March — one month, March 22, 2005, and Mr. Lukiwski says again in *Hansard*:

By my understanding, if Saskatchewan were allowed to keep 100% of its non-renewable natural resources, it would mean an estimated \$800 million yearly and perhaps even higher than that.

From my MP, clearly set the bar. Eight hundred million, perhaps even higher, he says. And this is an hon. member. He then goes on a few days later again *Hansard*, March 9, 2005, Mr. Lukiwski says, quote:

This money belonged to the people of Saskatchewan. Simply put, the failure of the government to eliminate the clawback provisions on non-renewable natural resources is a betrayal to the people of Saskatchewan.

Will the minister stand today, stop betraying the people of Saskatchewan and commit to the elimination of the clawback provision?

Tom Lukiwski, *Hansard*, March 9, 2005. One more quote from that MP, my MP, and this one goes to *Hansard*, October 2005. On October 6 Mr. Lukiwski says, quote:

In fact, if Saskatchewan had a proper, fair and just equalization formula right now, at today's oil prices Saskatchewan would be receiving, by my calculations, anywhere between \$800 million and \$1.5 billion in additional revenue each and every year. Of course we do not have that agreement . . .

Tom Lukiwski, *Hansard*, October 6, 2005. Well, Mr. Speaker, what this speaks to is the credibility of all politicians in a democracy. We can't have politicians so clearly stating, outlining very eloquently . . . Mr. Lukiwski is an eloquent person.

An Hon. Member: — Short memory.

Mr. Trew: — Short memory, short memory perhaps. I think not. I think, actually, my MP remembers very much these statements. And I think he's troubled by it. In fact he's so troubled by it that twice in the last week in the *Leader-Post* we've had reports of my MP, Mr. Lukiwski, saying, well perhaps we weren't as clear as we should have been or could have been around the exclusion of resource revenue.

Well there's nothing much more clear than the quotes I just gave — nothing much more clear. Unless maybe we want to go directly, Mr. Speaker, to the Conservative, federal Conservative election plan that they printed and published and distributed to the best of their ability to every household in Canada — in Canada. And what do they say? They say the federal Conservatives have the plan. The Conservative government will . . . and I'm going to go straight to the third bullet of the plan that deals with equalization:

A Conservative government will [they say before they got elected]: Work to achieve with the provinces permanent changes to the equalization formula which would ensure that non-renewable natural resource revenue is removed [they say] from the equalization formula to encourage economic growth.

It goes on:

We will ensure that no province is adversely affected from the changes to the equalization formula.

This is their promise in writing, distributed widely to virtually every household in Canada. If some got missed, it was purely by accident. I can assure you of that. And that was in 2006 federal Conservative platform. A platform that Prime Minister Stephen Harper would most surely have endorsed; most surely he campaigned on it. Most surely the now 12 Saskatchewan Conservative MPs would have said, absolutely, this is what we believe in.

Every statement that we can find prior to the election said, absolutely, we're the ones, they said. We, the Conservatives, are the ones that will deliver on this natural resources equalization formula. We're the ones, they said. They moaned and they cried about the Conservatives. And they moaned and they cried about the lack of action. Give them the opportunity. They said, give us the opportunity and we'll deliver. Well they've had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are, 14 months after many of these quotes, and what have we got? We have got Conservative politicians saying, well maybe we weren't as clear as we should have or could have been. Maybe the fine print is coming out now. Isn't it a shame, Mr. Speaker, because I again repeat, you cannot run an election campaign that is so crystal clear what you stand for and less than 14 months later you're saying, well no, that isn't really what we meant.

I remind everybody, we didn't write the Conservative federal election platform. We didn't write it. We don't agree with much of it in the first instance. But we didn't write it. This was an opportunity for the brain trust of the federal Conservative Party to put as clearly, as succinctly, as plainly as they possibly could to the people of Saskatchewan, what it is they believe in, what it

is that they would do.

But in typical right wing fashion, Mr. Speaker, what do they do? They say anything before an election and deliver nothing or worse after. Say anything before an election — deliver nothing or worse after. What a shame. And I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan know this.

The people of Saskatchewan know that we were promised very, very clearly — minimum \$800 million a year. A minimum \$800 million a year by the federal Conservative now MPs. A promise made. A promise that they couldn't run further from.

Let me say how far they've run from it. Mr. Speaker, next year you know what we're going to get under the equalization energy accord? Zero. Not one nickel. Not one penny. Zero.

Across the way the Sask Party apologists say, oh but, you know, really you've got to give them a chance. Really they may have misspoken. Really our federal cousins, you know, they're just not real experienced. And by gosh, you know, I hope that they'll eventually maybe come somewhere close or in the neighbourhood of what they promised.

Well what a shame, Mr. Speaker, because right wingers have always been the same. It doesn't matter whether they call themselves federal Conservatives, provincial Conservatives, provincial Sask Party — right wingers are right wingers are right wingers. They'll say anything before an election — anything at all. Whatever it is you want to hear, they're first to say it. After the election what do they deliver? Nothing or worse.

And this motion speaks directly to the credibility of the Canadian Conservative government, the MPs, and our Prime Minister, and it speaks to the credibility of right wingers everywhere. Say anything before an election; deliver nothing or worse after.

Mr. Speaker, yes, here we go. I want to just read . . . There is some who do want to stand up. Some like Mr. Fitzpatrick, who's, I believe, announced he's not going to run again for the federal Conservative Party. He wrote to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Finance, the federal Minister of Finance on July 25, 2006. And he wrote, and I quote the letter directly:

Dear Prime Minister Harper and Minister Flaherty:

We held a Saskatchewan Caucus on July 19th. In our roundtable discussions, many issues were discussed. Clearly, the dominant issue was the matter of equalization.

All members present believed that anything less than substantial compliance with our commitment will cause us no end of political difficulty during the next federal election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, I think that Mr. Fitzpatrick was quite prophetic. I say that not because I have an opportunity to vote for him or not — it's up to the voters in that riding — but what I do have an opportunity to vote for or against is my federal MP. And believe you me, I will. I will because my MP, as eloquent as he is, clearly is not standing up for what he said

he was going to stand up for before the election.

It is disgraceful or worse, Mr. Speaker, for any government to get elected on a . . . It's disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, for any government to get elected on something that is misleading. They should be . . . It is an obligation all politicians have, to the best of our ability, to describe a situation the way it is. On a rare occasion you might have a world war or something that interrupts and delays. But tell me what's happened in the last 14 months since Prime Minister Harper and the 12 Saskatchewan MPs got elected. Tell me what's happened.

They're bringing in extra billions of dollars in revenue, Mr. Speaker, into the federal treasury. They've having difficulty spending all of the money, budgeting to get rid of all the money. That's the situation that the federal Conservative, the Stephen Harper federal Conservative government find itself in. And what do they do? They take our energy accord equalization money — by their own statements, Mr. Speaker, a minimum of \$800 million a year — and they distribute it where they think the votes are needed. They distribute it across the rest of Canada. They distribute it hugely.

An Hon. Member: — Is that why you closed the SaskPower office in Rosetown?

Mr. Trew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, my former neighbour, the member for Rosetown-Elrose says, is that why we closed the SaskPower office in Rosetown? I want to tell you, for \$800 million we could run SaskPower for an entire year and not send anybody a single bill, and we wouldn't need all kinds of things. We could do that. \$800 million a year would allow us to provide free electricity throughout the province, period. \$800 million would allow us to double this year's record expenditure in our provincial highway and road system. We could double it, double it. We could wipe out . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Exactly. The education portion of education property tax. We could absolutely eliminate that and still have money left over.

We could still do . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes it's not quite as good as what Grant Devine and the right wingers say — oh Saskatchewan . . . He said in 1981 and '82, oh Saskatchewan's got so much going for it you can afford to mismanage it and still break even. Well he got his chance and he actually passed eight successive, he actually passed, he actually passed eight successive deficit budgets. He didn't pass the last budget. And I remember it all too well because I was sitting right behind where the member for Melfort was.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have got to, we have got to hold politicians accountable to their word. We have got to, we have got to, we have got to push for an energy accord for Saskatchewan. That's what this debate is all about. It's about, how do we deliver for Saskatchewan? How can we deliver and what can we deliver for \$800 million? And that's really the crux of the issue.

You know, Mr. Speaker, on our side of the House we're fond of kind of chuckling. Tommy Douglas who . . . Yes, he is an icon of ours. He's voted as the greatest Canadian. But Tommy used to say, when somebody tells you it's about the principle — it's not about the money, it's about the principle — he said you can always be sure it's about the money.

[12:45]

Well I want to tell you right now this is an issue around money and principle, but it's the money. Show us the money. Show us \$800 million. Man, can we do amazing things for Saskatchewan people — \$800 million each and every year, Mr. Speaker. And imagine how great it would be for us to be able to stand up and say, you know, Prime Minister Harper kept his word. You know, Tom Lukiwski kept his word . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I heard a heckle, Mr. Speaker, that we'd like to see that.

I will guarantee you that I will at my very first opportunity stand on my feet and thank them if they deliver on the energy accord. I will thank them. I will include in my MLA report — my newsletter — my thanks to Prime Minister Stephen Harper and my MP and others. I will be generous with praise, Mr. Speaker. But I hope and I pray that I can be generous at some point. It looks dark right now. It looks to me like what we have is a Conservative federal government that said anything they wanted that they thought we would want to hear before the election, and deliver exactly the opposite when it's done. And for that, I say shame.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, I'm just going to go from a quote from *The StarPhoenix* on June 10, 2006. And this one is . . . again I referred to Prime Minister Harper and I just want people to know that it's not just my opinion. I'm entitled to my opinion — so are others — but what matters is what he says and what is reported that he says. And I quote *StarPhoenix*, June 10, 2006 on page A8:

In an interview with a Calgary radio station, Harper again refused to commit to, and downplayed the significance of, the Tory pledge to exclude natural resource revenues from the equalization formula and [to] move to a 10-province standard — which would mean an estimated \$900 million in extra federal funding for Saskatchewan annually.

Well there we have it. The number went to 900. I'm sticking with 800. But you know, 800 million to one and a half billion . . . I'll say thank you when it hits 800 million. No question about that.

Leader-Post, June 15:

It seems Prime Minister . . . Harper is about to renege on his campaign promise to remove Saskatchewan's oil and gas resources from the controversial equalization formula.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, just so that we are crystal clear about the complicity of all here, let me say I'm going to quote from the *Prince Albert Daily Herald* in October 5, 2006 where they say:

As much fun as it might be to watch Tom Lukiwski, Carol Skelton, Brian Fitzpatrick and the rest of the federal Conservatives with ties to the Saskatchewan Party squirm a bit, Harper has already made it abundantly clear that losing a seat or two in Saskatchewan isn't a big deal to him. He'd much rather remain in control of equalization and fiscal imbalance file so that he can use it as a tool to appease Quebec and Ontario.

Well I think we've now got the Conservative agenda. Saskatchewan has three and a half — roughly — per cent of Canada's population. We do have representation by population. We've got our appropriate ... If you exclude one of the founding provinces, Prince Edward Island, which has a different formula ... But we have arguably a fair number of MPs for our population. What we lack is a federal government that would be straight with us before, during, and after election with respect to what it is they believe should happen, say should happen, and don't deliver. They should be delivering on their promises, on their written promises.

Mr. Speaker, I have here ... We actually have a federal Conservative MP who's in the cabinet. One out of the 12 in Saskatchewan is in cabinet. That would be, that would be Ms. Skelton from Saskatoon. Now I just, I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've got a few things that she said before and after, and I want to just see how this circle might be squared and who might be trying to square it.

Federal *Hansard*, March 22, 2005, quote, "Saskatchewan is simply not getting its fair share out of equalization — Carol Skelton." Well fast-forward to September 9, 2006 and Carol Skelton says that she rarely hears about equalization in her conversations with her constituents. Before and after.

Mr. Speaker, March 22, 2005, quote: "... we cannot afford to wait forever for this federal government to attend to this problem," says that member in federal *Hansard*, March 22, 2005.

In September 2006, the member

... doesn't see equalization as a politically critical issue for her Saskatchewan caucus colleagues. In fact, [in fact] she doesn't even see it as an issue of much import to Saskatchewan people because "the average person in the street doesn't understand it," she said.

Well imagine that. The average person in the street can't understand it, according to Saskatchewan's lone Conservative MP. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you the average person in the street in Saskatchewan does understand this. They do understand, Mr. Speaker, that a promise should be kept. They understand that a commitment made before and during an election campaign should not be ignored, downplayed, or eliminated like Stephen Harper and the federal Conservative Party are doing with this one.

They understand when they have been misled, to put it as gently as I can. They understand. The people of Saskatchewan are much brighter than Ms. Skelton gives them credit for. The people of Saskatchewan understand.

In March 22 that member said in *Hansard*, quote:

We need ... [an] NDP government in Saskatchewan to be supportive of our efforts to get a better deal for Saskatchewan ... At the very least we need a provincial government that will hold the federal government to its constitutional obligations [says Carol Skelton].

I think that's pretty unequivocal.

September 9, September 9 she then says ... That was then. Now she says,

I don't know. I guess I haven't thought about ... [equalization] that much. I haven't heard anything about equalization. I get piles of e-mail and it's just not a big issue.

Well from "we need an NDP government in Saskatchewan to be supportive of our efforts" to "it's not really much of an issue" — well which is it? What is it that Ms. Skelton says that we can believe? What has credibility?

Is she going to have us believe that the people of Saskatchewan, her constituents, her riding constituents, vacillate that much? I don't think so. That's not been my experience. And I've never had one of my colleagues tell me that their constituents have flip-flopped to that, anything close to that. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. I've got a *Hansard*, March 22, 2005, I've got a quote.

Just last week Prime Minister Harper visited Saskatoon but refused to substantially negotiate or disclose the equalization matter with our Premier — that from the same Saskatoon Member of Parliament, the same Conservative member, she said that. But when Stephen Harper came to Saskatchewan and refuses to discuss equalization now, the silence is deafening. The silence is absolutely deafening.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how is it, how is it that in 14 months or less, that a position can change so drastically? Is it a case of perhaps the Canadian economy has hit the skids? Well maybe, maybe there's an argument to be made that the Canadian economy might be hitting the skids. I can tell you that's not our experience in Saskatchewan. I can tell you that our experience here is one of record 20,000 more jobs March this year over March last year; record employment, 494,000 people working in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we've got reports of housing prices skyrocketing throughout Saskatchewan.

The point I'm making is simply — and everyone knows this, almost everyone knows it, almost everyone knows it — that the Saskatchewan economy is hotter than a Saturday night pistol. Things are just going great here, Mr. Speaker. We are doing incredibly well. Now federally, federally what we have is a situation where the federal government had things going their way. They'd won the election. They said some things before the election. Now they're saying something different.

And they have ... well, Mr. Speaker, I want to move to one more Tory MP before the time runs out on me. And I want to go straight to a letter that was published in the *Leader-Post* December 21, 2006. What it says, this letter is from Brad Trost, the Conservative MP for Saskatoon-Humboldt:

To the province of Saskatchewan, this would mean \$800 million a year according to Library of Parliament estimates. What could 800 million do for the province of Saskatchewan? What could it do for the people?

I invite people ... Because I'm advised that we're in some ... I'm advised that the opposition want to stop the clock, but if I don't second this motion it might wind up lost. And I am

therefore going to move straight to the motion in the interest of allowing my colleague, the member for Saskatoon Massey Place to take his place. I invite people to contact me; I have much more to say on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon Massey Place:

That Saskatchewan's 12 Conservative members of parliament provide an apology to the people of Saskatchewan for breaking their election promise on the issue of equalization; and further, that this Legislative Assembly call upon the federal government to immediately negotiate a Saskatchewan Energy Accord.

I so move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — It has been moved by the member for Regina Coronation Park and seconded by the member for Saskatoon Massey Place:

That Saskatchewan's 12 Conservative members of parliament provide an apology to the people of this province for breaking their election promise on the issue of equalization; and further, that this Legislative Assembly call upon the federal government to immediately negotiate a Saskatchewan Energy Accord.

Is the Assembly ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatoon Massey Place.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to second the motion by my colleague, and I'll have a few minutes to speak to it today. And then the opposition can rest assured, because they seem quite anxious to hear what I have to say, that I'll certainly be continuing next week, Mr. Speaker, with a lot of material that I've compiled.

But I want to start, Mr. Speaker, by saying that yesterday, I was quite surprised when I was listening to the radio because I had been reading the Regina *Leader-Post* early in the morning, and in the *Leader-Post* I read in an article by James Wood that Mr. Lukiwski, one of the Conservative MPs, three Conservative MPs elected in this city, Mr. Speaker, along with 12 MPs in total from the Conservative Party.

But this is what he had to say, Mr. Speaker, about the promise by the Conservatives to deliver an equalization deal, a fair deal to the people of Saskatchewan which, as my colleague said, they said before the election, he said this, quote, and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, "If you want to say we didn't fulfill the commitment or keep our promise, fair enough." That's what he said — not me, not my colleague, Mr. Speaker. This is what the Conservative MP from Regina said, Mr. Lukiwski. He said, "If you want to say we didn't fulfill the commitment or keep our promise, fair enough." Because of course everybody knows they didn't keep the promise.

But do you know what they were doing simultaneously, Mr. Speaker? In the *Leader-Post* he admits he didn't keep the promise, and at the same time on the radio which I heard

driving in my car over here yesterday, they say this among other things. They have a very pleasant woman's voice on the radio, and she says, "The Conservative Party kept their promise."

Now imagine this, Mr. Speaker. In the newspaper, Mr. Lukiwski says, we didn't keep our promise, and on the radio he is running an ad that says the Conservatives kept their promise. I mean, there's dishonesty, Mr. Speaker, going on even the same day — one thing said in the paper and another thing on the radio.

And I'm going to have a lot more to say about it, Mr. Speaker, and in the course of my remarks as I continue, I'm going to be quoting from a very good book that I just started reading. And do you know what it's called, Mr. Speaker? It's called *Lies and the Lying Liars Who Tell Them: A Fair and Balanced Look at the Right*.

And I'm really looking forward to reading some quotes from this book, Mr. Speaker, because this is what the author Al Franken has to say about Conservative politicians, and I intend to detail this, Mr. Speaker. He says this:

We have to be more than vigilant. We have to fight back. We have to expose those who bear false witness for the false witness bearers that they are. And we have to do it in a straightforward, plainspoken way. Let's call them what they are: liars. Lying, lying liars.

That's what the book *Lies and the Lying Liars Who Tell Them* says, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to refer to this book, and I'm going to talk about what the Conservative MPs who now represent this province supposedly in Ottawa had to say before the election and what they say after the election. And I'm going to talk about what Mr. Lukiwski says in the *Leader-Post* which is that they are not keeping their promise at the same time as those Conservative MPs, Mr. Speaker are running ads on the radio that tell the people of Regina that they're keeping their promise which, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order please.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — It now being past the hour of 1 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Wednesday, pursuant to an order of this Assembly, at 1:30 p.m.

I take this opportunity also to wish all members a little break from their intensive debate and a very, very happy Easter with their families and friends.

[The Assembly adjourned at 13:00.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Toth	1201
Elhard	1201
D'Autremont	1201
Draude	1201
Hermanson	1201
Stewart	1201
Harpauer	1202
Weekes	1202
Cheveldayoff	1202
Huyghebaert	1202
Allchurch	1202
Brkich	1202
Morgan	1202

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel	1203
---	------

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on the Economy	
Yates	1203
Standing Committee on Human Services	
Junor	1204

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 3 — The Fuel Tax Accountability Act	
Thomson	1203
Bill No. 15 — The Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 2006	
Thomson	1203
Bill No. 14 — The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2006	
Thomson	1204
Bill No. 6 — The Youth Drug Detoxification and Stabilization Amendment Act, 2006	
Addley	1204
Bill No. 39 — The Tobacco Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act	
Addley	1204

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Harpauer	1205
Brkich	1205
Eagles	1205

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Yates	1205
Belanger	1205

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Easter Wishes	
Toth	1206
Spring and Rebirth	
Hamilton	1206
Kenaston Pee Wees Win Northern Finals	
Brkich	1206
Paragon Awards	
Morin	1206
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
D'Autremont	1207
March Job Numbers	
Yates	1207
Carriere Questions Remain Unanswered	
Huyghebaert	1207

ORAL QUESTIONS

Location of Saskatoon Youth Facility	
Morgan	1208
Addley	1208
Plans for Recruitment and Retention of Health Care Professionals	
McMorris	1209
Taylor	1209

Compensation for Forestry Secretariat Executive	
Harpauer	1210
Lautermilch	1211
Management of Harassment Complaints	
Heppner	1211
Atkinson	1212
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	
Saskatchewan Records Second Highest Land Sale	
Cline	1212
Stewart	1213
ORDERS OF THE DAY	
WRITTEN QUESTIONS	
Iwanchuk	1213
SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE	
The Murdoch Carriere Case	
Heppner	1213, 1224
Draude	1216, 1224
Morgan (point of order)	1216
Hamilton	1218, 1224
Morin	1219, 1224
Harpauer	1221
Yates	1222
Elhard	1223
Eagles	1224
Atkinson	1225
Hagel (point of order)	1225
Morgan (point of order)	1225
PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS	
Motion No. 4 —Equalization and an Energy Accord	
Trew	1226
Cline	1230

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