



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 13:30.]

[Prayers]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's again my privilege to present petitions to the Assembly in regards to the need for a dialysis unit in the Broadview and surrounding area. And I read the prayer. 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 implement a 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 petition I present today is signed by a number of folks from the communities of Broadview and Whitewood. I so present.

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

**Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition regarding the water levels on Pasqua and Echo Lake. 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 work with and to lobby the federal government to put in place a long-term agreement that deals with the issue of the water structure at Fort Qu'Appelle.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed from people from Fort Qu'Appelle, Regina, Lebret, Indian Head, Osage, and Qu'Appelle. I so present.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have yet another petition signed by people who want the government to maintain full service of the SaskPower office at Rosetown. They are concerned that the banks cannot accept payment if the customer doesn't have documentation of service that the office supplies. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition reads:

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

And as in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, the signatures on this petition are primarily from Rosetown, but I also see Zealandia and Swift Current noted. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again today I rise with a petition of citizens concerned 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 Sunset Estates and St-Denis.

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

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to present a petition on behalf of constituents of mine who are very concerned about the government's plan to discontinue the basic education classes at the Southeast Regional College in Estevan. 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 ensure that basic education classes continue to be offered at the Estevan campus of the Southeast Regional College.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, this is signed by folks from Estevan. I so present. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to present another petition from citizens of Wilkie concerned about their 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 Wilkie Health Centre and special care home maintain at the very least the current level of services.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by the good citizens of Wilkie and Landis and district. 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 of southern Saskatchewan that are extremely concerned that the withdrawal of lab services at the Lafleche and District Health Centre would cause undue hardship 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 of Lafleche, Gravelbourg, and Glentworth. 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 today to bring forth a petition signed by citizens of Saskatchewan that are concerned with the potentially dangerous situation that's happening in the Shellbrook, Spiritwood, Big River, and Hafford areas. 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 improve timely access to medical treatment.

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

Mr. Speaker, signatures to this petition are from Canwood and Shellbrook. I so present.

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

**Mr. Kirsch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to read a petition presented by Saskatchewan people who are deeply concerned about the presence of sexual predators that present a threat to our communities. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take all steps available to speed up the public disclosure process so that communities are alerted to the presence of known sex offenders in their community as soon as possible.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is signed by the good people of Wakaw and Cudworth. I so present.

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

**Mr. Brkich:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition here with citizens that are concerned about the underfunding for school divisions:

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 Imperial, Govan, and Nokomis, Drake schools remain open.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This particular petition is signed by the good citizens from Nokomis, Lockwood, and Watrous and Drake. I so present.

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

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to rise in the House today and present a petition calling for mandatory drug and alcohol testing. Mr. Speaker, I received these petitions from all across the province. I will 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 ensure that the public is protected from operators of motor vehicles who are involved in an accident causing injury or fatality and that those operators be required to undergo mandatory drug and alcohol level testing.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by citizens from Humboldt and Muenster. I so present.

## 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.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

**Hon. Mr. Addley:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my great pleasure to introduce some guests from Saskatoon today from Evan Hardy Collegiate, the home of the Souls.

And these students are part of the international students program, and Evan Hardy is the focal point for that program in Saskatoon, and that program is quite important. It helps Canadian students gain knowledge about cultures and countries with which Canada's likely to have social and business ties in the future. Participants include people from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, Mexico, and Brazil.

And we're very pleased to have 32 grade 9 to grade 12 English as a second language students in the gallery today. And they're accompanied today with their teachers: Mrs. Charington, Mrs. Bandula, Ms. Mancusi, and Ms. Molaro. And I'll be meeting with them after question period and answering any questions that they may have. And I'd ask all hon. members to welcome the students here today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to members of the Assembly, it's a pleasure to introduce my constituency assistant who has joined us from Swift Current today. Crystal Martens is in your gallery. It's a good chance for me as well to acknowledge the good work that she does on behalf of the people of Swift Current, dealing with their concerns and questions on provincial government matters. So I'd ask all members to join me in welcoming her to her Legislative Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

**Hon. Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have two introductions today. First of all I would like to introduce to you and, through you, to all members of the House 19 grade 10 students from Winston Knoll Collegiate here in Regina in the constituency of Regina Qu'Appelle Valley. And they are accompanied by their teacher, Tana Mitchell, and I'm looking forward to meeting with them following the session here. I expect we'll have some good discussion about life and politics, and I look forward to that time. I'd ask all hon. members to join me in welcoming them to the House.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wartman:** — And while I'm on my feet I would also like to introduce to you and, through you, to all members of this House a recent addition to my staff. We have in the west gallery, accompanied by two of my administrative support staff, the summer student in our office, Tenille Baudu. And Tenille was raised on the family farm near the town of Wawota. She has just completed her arts degree with a major in psychology from the University of Regina, and her plan is to return to university in the fall to obtain her social work degree. Please join me in welcoming Tenille to the legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the member for Saskatchewan Rivers.

#### Outstanding Organic Farmer of the Year

**Mr. Borgerson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, every year the Organic Crop Improvement Association presents the Outstanding Organic Farmer of the Year Award to a talented producer who certifies to the OCIA [Organic Crop Improvement Association] level of excellence. I am proud to say that this year's recipient is Saskatchewan's very own Marc Loiselle of Vonda.

Mr. Speaker, the Loiselle organic family farm is an intergenerational farm that has been certified since 1985.

Together with his wife Anita, Marc is a mentor for others transitioning to organic farming. They practice responsible stewardship to meet both consumer demands and environmental concerns.

Mr. Speaker, Marc and Anita grow cereal, oil seed, pulse, clover, and hay crops. And in particular they grow Red Fife wheat, a heritage wheat that was grown by Marc's great-grandfather. The Loiselles are therefore continuing a family tradition in agriculture that began in the Vonda area 100 years ago as of this year. As they save and grow crops like Red Fife wheat, they keep genetic diversity intact to preserve an important part of our agricultural heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all members to join with me in congratulating Marc Loiselle for winning the 2007 OCIA Outstanding Organic Farmer of the Year Award and for furthering the practice of organic agriculture in this great province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

#### Snowbirds Acceptance Air Show

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This morning I had the distinct pleasure of attending the formal acceptance show for the 2007 Snowbirds along with the member for Moose Jaw Wakamow. This show is performed for the approval of Major General Bouchard and Canadian and US [United States] air traffic regulators.

431 Air Demonstration Squadron, better known as the Snowbirds, represents a tradition of excellence. As ambassadors, this group demonstrates the skill, professionalism, and team work of the men and women of the Canadian Forces. The Snowbirds are a Canadian institution, flying Tutor jet aircraft adorned with the colours of the Canadian flag.

The team represents a vibrant spirit of this nation, thrilling audiences across the continent with precision formation flying and crisp solo aerobatics. Requiring the highest degree of piloting skills and maintenance expertise, the team flies their nine-plane formations with distances as close as four feet of wing overlap at speeds ranging from 100 to 320 knots during their exciting show which is comprised of more than 50 different manoeuvres.

Now in their 37th season, the Snowbirds have flown in more than 2,000 shows for more than 120 million spectators. The 2007 team will fly in 58 shows at 35 locations across North America from May to October. I would like to congratulate Major Rob Mitchell and his 2007 team for an excellent acceptance show and would ask all members to join me in congratulating the 2007 Snowbirds and wishing them a successful season.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

### Umoja Performance

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recently had the pleasure to attend the Umoja drum group's Children Helping Children benefit concert at the Western Christian College here in Regina. Also attending was my colleague, the member for Regina Rosemont, who is a drummer herself and well acquainted with the talented adult drummers group of Regina who practise at Jack MacKenzie School.

Mr. Speaker, Umoja is a world drumming group made up of grade 7 and 8 students from Jack MacKenzie School in the constituency of Regina Wascana Plains. They have enjoyed a very successful history even though it was only formed three and a half short years ago. Thanks to the efforts of artistic director Marlene Hinz; group manager, Joanne Patron; and Andria Moller—Umoja has performed at provincial and national conferences as well as numerous school concerts in Regina, Moose Jaw, Lumsden, White City, and Pilot Butte. And, Mr. Speaker, their school's namesake, Jack MacKenzie, is still very involved attending concerts and rehearsals and providing a very positive inspiring role model.

Umoja's motto is One Heart, One Beat and they certainly lived up to it at last week's concert. All proceeds went to the Regina branch of Save the Children Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to invite all the members to join me in congratulating Umoja on another spectacular performance, and Marlene Hinz, Joanne Patron, and Andria Moller for making the group possible. It's cultural groups like Umoja and the people that support them that help to ensure that Saskatchewan remains the best place to live, work, and raise a family.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[13:45]

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

### Promoting Heritage, Culture, and Recreation

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a week ago my colleague, the member for Souris-Cannington, and I had the privilege of attending the South East Saskatchewan Association for Culture, Recreation and Sport 23rd annual awards program. The purpose of the southeast awards program is to acknowledge the work of the many volunteers in the region in the areas of heritage, culture, and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, this year there were 15 recipients who received awards thanking them for their work in promoting heritage, culture, and recreation in the southeast corner of the province.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, time will not give me the ability to present all the names of the award winners. But my colleague and I and the members of our caucus would certainly like to extend our appreciation for the many volunteers across this province who donate their time to support culture, heritage, and recreation. We want to congratulate the winners in the southeast awards program and say thank you to the board of directors for all their hard work in promoting this worthwhile awards

ceremony. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

### Celebration of Physical Therapy Education

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to let members of the legislature know about and at the same time offer congratulations to Cherie Illingworth of North Battleford who, on Saturday, April 28, was recognized by the Saskatchewan Physiotherapy Association to receive the Clinical Instructor and Physical Therapy Clinical Education Award (Rural).

Ms. Illingworth, who has worked in North Battleford since 1992, is the very first recipient of this SPA [Saskatchewan Physiotherapy Association] Award presented for outstanding contribution to the clinical education of physical therapy students.

Her nominator said, "she acts as a role model in her interaction with patients, peers, physicians, and other caregivers."

The award was presented at the SPA annual banquet which this year also celebrated the 10th anniversary of the association's permanent office and new organizational structure, the 10th anniversary of the continuing physical education therapy program, the 40th anniversary of the first graduating class from the school of physical therapy, and the 100th anniversary of the University of Saskatchewan.

The event was hosted by the Saskatchewan Physical Therapy Association, the Saskatchewan College of Physical Therapists, and the school of physical therapy, University of Saskatchewan.

I should also mention and celebrate the fact that Dr. Liz Harrison of the U of S [University of Saskatchewan] school of physical therapy is the 2007 recipient of the Canadian Physiotherapy Association's Enid Graham Memorial Lecture Award, the national association's highest honour. Congratulations all around.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

### Sigma Polling

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the very end of an article in today's *Leader-Post* is a tiny paragraph that bears some repeating. The article, entitled "Calvert will lead party into next election" finishes with the following paragraph:

One NDP MLA, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said Monday that while the poll has raised concerns among some government members about Calvert it is far too close to an election to change leaders.

This quote of course is referring to the recent poll by Sigma Analytics that reports 6 out of 10 people surveyed do not want the current Premier to be the premier after the next election. This is the same poll that reported 9 out of 10 people surveyed rate the NDP [New Democratic Party] government's handling of the Murdoch Carriere scandal very poorly.

Mr. Speaker, this small paragraph is not the only one provided by an anonymous source from the NDP that appeared in today's paper. In one article an anonymous NDP source goes to bat for the former NDP caucus chief of staff, Jim Fodey, implying he was hung out to dry by the very people he had worked for for a number of years. In another column another NDP source reveals a detailed accounting of the NDP caucus's meetings and retreats where the NDP caucus fraud scandal was given a full airing.

It sounds like the Premier doesn't have a lot of company in terms of confidence in his government. Mr. Speaker, the NDP has a very leaky ship and makes one wonder if they can make it to an election — next election before the ship sinks completely.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

#### Climate Change

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, former Vice-president Al Gore's visit to Saskatchewan received plenty of criticism from members of the Saskatchewan Party, and that was not a surprise to me since the Saskatchewan Party has consistently opposed the Kyoto Protocol and its targets.

The United Nations has very recently issued an intergovernmental panel report on climate change which is a consensus document, Mr. Speaker, supported by representatives by the world's governments and drawing on the work of over 1,000 scientists from across the globe. And this report reinforces and confirms, Mr. Gore's message.

A consensus report requires cautious wording, Mr. Speaker. Yet the UN [United Nations] report predicts the average surface temperature of the earth will rise from between 1.8 degrees centigrade and 6.4 degrees centigrade by the end of the century. It says quote:

Projected climate change exposures are likely to affect the health status of millions of people through increases in malnutrition and consequent disorders, and through increased deaths, disease, and injury due to heat waves, floods, storms, fires and drought.

Mr. Speaker, this consensus United Nations document backs up Vice-president Gore's message and our Premier's resolve to do our share to address climate change in a substantive way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

#### Response of Caucus to Misappropriation of Funds

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader's story becomes more unbelievable every day. Version one was that they turned over all the documents to the police in 1992. Well that wasn't correct. So version two is, Jim Fodey told me we turned all the documents over to the police in 1992. And that's what he thought for 15 years until last Friday night. Mr. Speaker, that version's pretty shaky as well.

According to a column in today's paper, the Ann Davey situation was discussed in detail at two meetings in the summer of 1994 — a staff retreat meeting at Madge Lake and later at a caucus retreat in Prince Albert. The minister was at both of those meetings and would have been involved in those discussions.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that he knew in 1994 that the relevant information had not been turned over to the police in 1992?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — Order please. This is a matter which is not under the administrative responsibility of the executive government. I rule the question out of order but any minister may exercise the option to respond. The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, as Government House Leader I will voluntarily accept that question. Mr. Speaker, I made a statement in the House here yesterday correcting a statement that I had made in error in the House previously, and I stand by that.

Mr. Speaker, let me once again just reiterate the facts. The facts are that in 1992, hired by a false name of Ann Lord, an employee advised the caucus chief of staff that she had misappropriately received funds. The caucus chief of staff presented that information to me. Together we decided that she should be fired, the matter should be referred to the police. An investigation was done, including an audit. That information, to the best of my knowledge, was communicated to the police and there were no charges pending.

That whole matter, Mr. Speaker, was revisited in 1994 as a result of some concerns that were expressed and all of that information then subsequently taken to the police with no charges pending, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, last week the minister could not recall detail about meetings, about

letters. And let's look at the newspaper column of today. It indicates that the meeting at Madge Lake was a pretty memorable one according to the NDP sources. It ended with several people crying, Lorjé demanding to clear the air, and the Government House Leader pressing to keep a lid on the issue. It's pretty hard to believe that the minister wouldn't remember a meeting like that.

Mr. Speaker, what discussions took place at that meeting regarding Ann Davey? And does the minister still expect us to believe that he had no idea that Jim Fodey had withheld information from the police?

**The Speaker:** — Order. Once again I just wish to advise the Assembly that the line of questioning is out of order but I will not interrupt again if the minister is willing to answer. The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, as a result of a personnel matter expressing concerns about relationships within the office and question of the actions of different people within, a decision was made in 1994 to revisit the issue. And all of the information including, then, as a result of discussions a request by a concerned employee to document, to write out her concerns that her statement of concerns was taken along with the letter from Ms. Lord in 1992, along with the audit, the special audit done by Mintz & Wallace in 1992 — all of that was taken to the police for their consideration.

After reviewing that information the caucus office was advised, Mr. Speaker, that there were no charges pending, and the matter was dealt with as a personnel matter within the caucus.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if everyone in the NDP government truly believed that all the information was turned over to the police in 1992, why did they think it was necessary to turn it over to the police again in 1994?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the master of innuendo is at it again. And that's no surprise, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when issues are, personnel issues are brought which do suggest that some action may have been appropriate in the past, in order to ensure that appropriate action was taken or if it was not, that appropriate legal action then would ensue, and in order to achieve that, Mr. Speaker, then the information related to the accusations by an employee, as well as the audit, as well as the letter from Ann Lord in 1992, all of that was taken to the police so they could review it and judge it in its entirety with any possible implications regarding violations of the law. Mr. Speaker, that was done in order to protect the integrity of the operation of the office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has obtained a report to the government caucus administration committee by former NDP MLA Pat Lorjé, dated September 11, 1994. It says, and I quote:

During the June Caucus Office retreat, members of the Administration Committee became aware of significant problems . . . within the Government Caucus Office. It appeared that most of the problems stemmed from outstanding matters related to the departure of the former Director of Administration, Ann Lord, in September of 1992 . . .

Glenn Hagel and I met with staff on July 6th to inform them that the concerns raised at the retreat would be dealt with as fully and completely as possible.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that the Ann Davey departure and the disclosure or non-disclosure of information to the police was discussed at that meeting?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, there were discussions about personnel concerns related to operations within the office. And Mr. Speaker, as part of that it was determined that, by the admin committee, that the appropriate course of action was to ensure that any accusations that were made were properly considered, including the possibility that perhaps the matter was not appropriately handled in 1992.

Mr. Speaker, it was specifically as a result of that, that the decision was made to pull together the information, including the written allegations about improper conduct made by an employee, and together with that, the audit and the letter from Ms. Lord in 1992. All of that was taken to the police for their review and their consideration, with the request that they would simply review it and take appropriate course of action.

Mr. Speaker, we were subsequently advised that there were no charges pending and that, Mr. Speaker, the appropriate thing to do was to deal with it as a personnel matter.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[14:00]

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let's clear some things up. Is the minister saying that Jim Fodey was instructed to take all the relevant documents to the police in 1992, and that until last Friday the minister believed Jim Fodey had taken all the relevant documents to the police in 1992, and every other NDP MLA had the same understanding? Is that what the minister wants us to believe?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House



Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I can only relay the facts. That's all I can do. And I point out again, Mr. Speaker, that a personnel matter was dealt with. And the way it was dealt with was to turn it over to the police — all of the documentation. That I've already said several times, okay. The facts are the facts.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, the caucus office was advised that there were no appropriate charges pending, that what the caucus had was a personnel issue, and that it should be dealt with as a personnel issue. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the fact of the matter.

Now the hon. member will know that the Conflict of Interest Commissioner is reviewing the matter and will have opportunity to talk to, will talk to all people who have input including, I assume, the hon. member, and will be interested in knowing where he got his information from and from whom and how long he had it. All of those things will be part of that. And, Mr. Speaker, we'll await the results of that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like the minister opposite to know that I had a meeting with the Conflict of Interest Commissioner this morning at 8:30, and we talked about a lot of the material that is present.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has also obtained a copy of the 1994 Regina police investigation report. In the report, Pat Lorjé told investigators, and I quote, "Complete disclosure to the NDP caucus regarding the Ann LORD situation and the current problems was made in Prince Albert during the week of September 11, 1994."

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat: "Complete disclosure to the NDP caucus regarding the Ann LORD situation was made in Prince Albert during the week of September 11, 1994."

Is the minister still sticking to his story that he had no knowledge that information was concealed from police until Chief Johnston's news conference last Friday?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the chief of police saying that information was concealed. I recall the chief of police saying that they did not have record of having received information referred to. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference. There is a difference. And as a result of that disparity between the comments of the chief of police and the advice I had received prior to the comments I made, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised.

And consequently because of the . . . in the incomplete briefing provided to me by the chief of staff, he did the honourable thing and he resigned. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this

matter in 1994 was revisited in its entirety and was turned over completely to the police for their reconsideration and their conclusion that there were no charges pending to anyone, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister wants us to believe that Jim Fodey was acting on his own, but the police report says something quite different. The report says, and I quote, "LORJE advised that it was the intention of Caucus to conceal the fact that LORD had committed fraud." Let me repeat: "LORJE advised that it was the intention of Caucus to conceal the fact that LORD had committed fraud."

Mr. Speaker, this very clearly shows it wasn't an accident. It wasn't an oversight. It wasn't even Jim Fodey disobeying orders. It was the intention of the NDP caucus to conceal fraud. Mr. Speaker, why did the NDP caucus intentionally conceal fraud?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may wish to table the document and we'll be happy to review that. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if there is an intention to conceal fraud, turning over the complete package of information is an odd way of doing that. Mr. Speaker, in 1994 all of the information, all of the information that was available including accusations — unsubstantiated accusations but accusations made by an employee — all of that was turned over to the police for their consideration. And, Mr. Speaker, that was the fact of the matter as to what was done. The conclusion is clear that at the end of that, Mr. Speaker, the police advised that there were no charges forthcoming and that the matter would be dealt with as a personnel matter.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that phrase again. It says, "LORJE advised it was the intention of Caucus to conceal the fact that LORD had committed fraud."

It appears that the reason Pat Lorjé took this information to the police in 1994 is that she thought her own NDP caucus had intentionally concealed fraud in 1992. She goes on to tell investigators, and I quote: "One factor that influenced this decision was a previous budget leak that was embarrassing for the government."

Mr. Speaker, note that she calls it a decision — not an accident; not an oversight. She calls it a decision and says it was the intention of caucus to conceal fraud. Why was it the intention of this NDP government to conceal fraud?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can continue to ask the same question, and the answer is the same answer. He may not like the answer. In fact I know he doesn't like the answer because he would much be rather talking about statements of innuendo and talking about a time 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, than to be talking about what's going on in the world of Saskatchewan today — or, Mr. Speaker, even more to the point for this apparent government in waiting, talking about what they would do if the people of Saskatchewan were ever inflicted with them as the government of Saskatchewan.

It's an interesting approach, Mr. Speaker, that we've seen by the hon. member and by the Saskatchewan Party in this session where they would much rather talk about matters of some time ago rather than to talk about what's going on in Saskatchewan today and what's going on in Saskatchewan for the future that the New Democratic Party is a part of building for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I'll keep talking about the innuendo from the police report. Mr. Speaker, Pat Lorjé told police it was the intention of the NDP caucus to conceal fraud. She told police they made this decision because of a budget leak.

Mr. Speaker, we now know that the NDP withheld crucial evidence in 1992. According to the police report, Pat Lorjé used these words — intention and decision — to describe this cover-up. She does not blame Jim Fodey for acting alone. This is very different than the minister's version of events.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister finally admit that he knew evidence had been withheld from the police in 1992?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no reason to believe that that occurred. The information that I received from the chief of staff back in 1992 was information that I trusted to be true — in the same way, Mr. Speaker, that I trusted to be accurate the briefing that I received from the chief of staff of last week in response to the question raised by the member.

Mr. Speaker, I have explained already that it has been clearly the intention of the New Democrat caucus to ensure that the police would have full access to all matters when they were raised, suggesting that there was a possibility that the matter had not been appropriately handled the first time around.

It was once again brought to the Regina city police for their consideration. They looked at that material and concluded at the end of that, Mr. Speaker, that there were no charges pending — that what we had was a personnel matter to deal with. And that's the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the financial statement tabled yesterday by the minister in fact had not been given to the police as it was quoted as fact. Mr. Speaker, Lorjé goes on to say she believes, and I quote:

... that FODEY and Glen HAGEL attempted to deal too quickly with the LORD situation. A more complete audit should have been completed in 1992.

Those are the words of Pat Lorjé, NDP caucus Chair at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is mounting that the minister tried to sweep this under the rug in 1992 and that the NDP caucus intentionally concealed fraud. Will the minister do the right thing today — take the responsibility for his role in this cover-up seriously and resign?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member either isn't listening or prefers not to listen or prefers not to hear. Mr. Speaker, what I said was, what was provided to the police in 1994 was the audit from 1992. Now the hon. member says that the accusation is that it was done too quickly. He says that's the problem; it was done too quickly.

Well I don't know if that's a legitimate accusation or not, Mr. Speaker. But what was done was done and what was done was this: is that the matter was referred to the police in 1994 and subsequent to that as well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, at the advice of the police, a full audit of the caucus operations was done by the firm, Peat Marwick. And, Mr. Speaker, that has been tabled in the House. That is what has happened.

The hon. member wants to get on to anything but talking about the present — anything about talking, anything but talking about the future in Saskatchewan because he knows that this party, that the Saskatchewan Party, is a party that Saskatchewan people are afraid of if they know what their real agenda is all about. And that's what this is about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, you know what's really unfair in this entire matter is that the NDP decided to make Jim Fodey the scapegoat for this whole cover-up. Pat Lorjé didn't say it was the intention of Jim Fodey to conceal fraud. She said it was the intention of the NDP caucus to conceal fraud, Mr. Speaker. So why does Jim Fodey lose his job when none of the NDP MLAs are willing to take responsibility for their role in this cover-up?

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fodey did an honourable thing. When he gave advice to a minister who was responding to a question raised, that was proved to have been incomplete, he resigned. That's what happened. And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, in this House yesterday I made a correction because I stand by my words.

It is the obligation of all of us when we come to this House to bring the information to the best of our ability and honestly as we can. That's what this House has a right to expect of us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, and I think I understand more clearly what this is about all the time. Because this is all about politics. This is all about raising an issue of 15 years ago, which was subsequently documented to have been properly investigated the first time when reconsidered in 1994. Because this is all about politics; it's all about the pending election. It's all about the Saskatchewan Party wanting to deal with anything but the real political agenda, getting on with the questions that people of Saskatchewan want to . . .

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the minister's story just doesn't hold up. Yesterday in this House he said, and I quote:

... it was my understanding at the time that the information related to the letter and to the audit was communicated to the Regina city police. That's why I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear Chief Johnston on Friday [night] say that that was not the public record.

Let's compare that to Pat Lorjé's statement to police. Lorjé said, "It was the intention of Caucus to conceal the fact that LORD had committed fraud." Lorjé said this decision was influenced by a budget leak. And Lorjé said, and I'm quoting now: "... that FODEY and Glen HAGEL attempted to deal too quickly with the LORD situation."

Mr. Speaker, why is the minister's story so vastly different than what Pat Lorjé told the police?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

[14:15]

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked that question earlier. I've already answered the question. The answer's the same. Same question, same answer.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, back in 1992, the brand new NDP government was dealing with a financial basket case that Saskatchewan had become because of the predecessors of the Saskatchewan Party, the Conservative government. That's what we were dealing with, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, and since that time things have improved for the people of Saskatchewan, and the last thing that the Saskatchewan Party wants to talk about today, the last thing they want to talk about today is a buoyant economy. The last thing they want to talk about today is jobs for people — more jobs than people. The last thing they want to talk about is young people coming home. The last thing they want to talk about is stringent financial requirements put in place by this New Democrat government to determine that the basket case that his predecessors had left with us will never happen again. The last thing they want to talk about is a positive future for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the political agenda in this province — the people of Saskatchewan deserve it — is to get on with building the province of Saskatchewan for a place for young people to build their futures. And that's what this is all about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

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

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the cover-up of this NDP caucus in the 1990s. Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling all of the documents the Saskatchewan Party has obtained related to this matter.

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order. Member for Canora-Pelly.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling all of the documents the Saskatchewan Party has obtained related to this matter. And earlier today I sent this same package of information to the Regina Police Service and the RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] commercial crimes division, together with a cover letter requesting an investigation. And I also indicated to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner this morning at a meeting that I had with him that I will be tabling these same documents with him.

Mr. Speaker, if the police decide to launch an investigation, will the NDP government provide full co-operation instead of concealing evidence like they did in 1992?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Chair recognizes the Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, it is a significant accusation the hon. member makes and it's unfounded and he knows that I've answered that question. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Conflict of Interest Commissioner can count on the full co-operation and any police investigation can count on the full co-operation by this caucus, by this government, as it has had in the past, Mr. Speaker. As it has. And I point to . . . It

was the New Democrat caucus that brought this matter back to ...

**The Speaker:** — Order please. Order please. Order. The Government House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may want to tell us if he's had information that should go to the police that he's held for a long time too. He may want to explain that.

But I'll tell you one thing that won't happen, Mr. Speaker. This New Democrat government will not stop governing. This New Democrat government will continue to work for the people of Saskatchewan to ensure that what happens in the future of this is a good place for young people to build their futures, to build strong futures in a strong Saskatchewan. That's the agenda of this party. This is a party that works for the people of Saskatchewan. That is a party that works for the Saskatchewan Party. And that's the bottom line, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## 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 written responses to written questions no. 1,298 and 1,299. And, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I'll be converting return no. 21 to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — Order please. I'd just prefer to deal with these one at a time. Responses to questions 1,298 and 1,299 have been submitted. And now we go to motions for return. The Chair recognizes the Government Whip.

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

#### Return No. 21

**Mr. Iwanchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, again on behalf of the government we'll be converting return no. 21 to motion for return (debatable).

**The Speaker:** — This is no. 21. No. 21 has been converted to motion for return (debatable).

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill No. 44

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Quennell that **Bill No. 44 — The Class Actions Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi sur les recours collectifs** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise in the House to participate in the debate regarding The Class Actions Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an increasingly global and complex economy. As part of our litigation system over the last 100 or more years, we've seen a variety of class actions taking place. And the courts have introduced rules and pieces of legislation to allow for litigation to take place where there are common plaintiffs, common defendants, and common causes of action. This Bill is an attempt to try and codify and make for uniform types of procedures to allow for claims to be dealt with in a class action method.

Most litigants in small claims dealing with consumer goods, where there are many of them, are unable to bear their high cost of litigation and the cost of proving what would be a relatively small claim in the global context of things. On the other hand, there are large corporations that have to deal with many small claims in a myriad of different jurisdictions.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow for those class actions to be certified as a class action, to be dealt with in an appropriate jurisdiction, and to allow people to participate in the cost savings that result from having their actions pooled in a common class action. This Bill allows for people to opt in or out of the process as it takes place. It also deals with the issue of forum shopping and ensuring that there's an appropriate jurisdiction to deal with the action as pending.

There are two current or fairly recent issues. One is the issue with the tainted pet food that was spread across North America. This is a type of legislation that will allow for owners of pets to have their actions brought in one jurisdiction, or allow them to participate in a meaningful class action where the damages would be insufficient to allow an individual pet owner to participate one action at a time.

Another more local situation was a few years ago when there was the tainted water in the city of North Battleford. It allows people that would have a cause of action arising out of identical circumstances but may have individually provable damages that may be different, this Bill deals with many of those actions and those issues and tries to deal with those in a way that is appropriate.

The Bill will now go to a committee, Mr. Speaker. We have done some consultation with members of the bar that are going to be affected by it, and have no objection to this Bill being voted off and to proceed to committee so we can consider the deliberations and perhaps have some consultation with government officials to determine the type of consultation that they had with members of the bar, consumer groups, and other people that would be affected. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 44, The Class Actions Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Justice.

**Hon. Mr. Quennell:** — I move that Bill No. 44, The Class Actions Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 44 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

#### Bill No. 49

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Quennell that **Bill No. 49 — The Mortgage Brokerages and Mortgage Administrators Act** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Morgan:** — Mr. Speaker, we have in the past had a very poor and inadequate regulatory system to deal with mortgage brokers and mortgage brokering. We had bits and pieces of other legislation that provided inadequate or incomplete definitions. We had one piece of legislation that dealt with financing corporations. It precluded a financing corporation from dealing with certain types of mortgages, but there was no prohibition from an individual providing those services in their individual capacity.

We had an administrative quagmire in allowing for any kind of meaningful regulatory process. What we want to have and want to ensure in our province, Mr. Speaker, is a system that would allow for inflow of money and other resources so that there is a vibrant mortgage market, so that we can have homeowners, developers, builders have access to a good capital pool. And we want to ensure that we have a safe investment climate for people that are investing money that will go into mortgages or other forms of security.

What we should be doing and what we hope to do in subsequent pieces of legislation is have a standardized practice with other jurisdictions across Canada and in particular Western Canada. We want to ensure that a broker that became licensed in one jurisdiction could carry on in other jurisdictions with a minimal process to go through, a standardized licensing and bonding process that would take place so that we would ensure that there would be safety of investors that are putting money into

mortgage-backed securities. And at the same time there would be reasonable facilities available so that somebody that wanted to become licensed and deal with mortgage securities would be able to do so in a relatively straightforward way so that our capital markets are not adversely affected.

This Bill is a relatively complex and lengthy piece of legislation, deals with many different aspects. We will have questions that we will deal with in committee, from the government officials dealing with how the Bill was structured, what other jurisdictions were compared with, and in particular what problems were existent in this province before this Bill was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, it would be appropriate at this time for this Bill to be voted off and be forwarded to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 49, The Mortgage Brokerages and Mortgage Administrators Act be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the minister.

**Hon. Mr. Quennell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 49, The Mortgage Brokerages and Mortgage Administrators Act be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Justice that Bill No. 49 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. This Bill stands referred.

#### Bill No. 50

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thomson that **Bill No. 50 — The Municipal Employees' Pension Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure today to rise to address Bill No. 50, An Act to amend

The Municipal Employees' Pension Act.

This Act has three main sections in it. The first, Mr. Speaker, relates to the terms of the Chair and the Vice-Chair. Changes are introduced to coincide with the municipal employees' pension plan fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, we have consulted stakeholders in the province and they've advised us that they have no problem with this. The dates coincide with the end of the calendar year of '07, December 31, '07. And this indeed, Mr. Speaker, does make sense and it is recommended.

The second area deals with the Canada Revenue Agency. There is some changes to requirements that affect the municipal pension plan. What are deemed to be flexible benefits of the municipal pension are no longer allowable, and that they need to be removed. We trust that the government has consulted with stakeholders like SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association] and SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities]. We have indeed circulated the Bill and have not heard any real negative feedback from it.

[14:30]

The third area is a provision that allows for the pension allowance to be paid to a new spouse attained after a member's date of retirement. Again we have consulted with individuals across the province and have found that there is no real opposition to this clause. Indeed it just reflects the changing culture of our society. So at this time, Mr. Speaker, we have no problem with the main tenets of this Bill and we would concur that it move to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 50, The Municipal Employees' Pension Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Thomson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 50, The Municipal Employees' Pension Amendment Act be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 50 be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. Bill 50 stands referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

### Bill No. 51

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thomson that **Bill No. 51 — The Public Employees Pension Plan Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter into the debate on the Act to amend the public employees pension plan, Bill No. 51. This Bill introduces changes that allow members to contribute to the pension plan during leaves of absence after the age of 65. We understand that this is something that was necessary to allow for changes that have taken place, especially in the area of the changes to the mandatory retirement legislation in this province. This is something that's necessary to reflect other changes that have taken place and indeed, Mr. Speaker, we would agree with those changes.

A second area is the active and inactive members being allowed to move their money to the public employees pension plan. This is a significant change and this is something that again we have taken it upon ourselves as an opposition to consult with people across the province, and during that consultation we did hear back from people and not everyone was supportive of it.

What we did hear back was some concern that the government didn't choose to consult with them. We heard that many individuals and many people who operate private pension plans had some concerns about this and they were very appreciative that the opposition chose to consult with them in light of the government's lack of consultation.

And there was concern from private pension funds or private pension plans that indeed this would encroach upon their area of specialty. And we listened to many concerns. And we debated and talked about it, and I even had the chance to ask the minister a number of questions in estimates last year about changes in this regard. And at the end of the day we agree that this is something that is probably necessary in light of a competitive environment, that the private stakeholders that we consulted with are willing to compete with whatever pension plans — be they public or private out there — and that they're going to indeed do that.

One concern regarding this legislation is it was written before the budget, and it talks about individuals that cannot be reached or cannot be contacted for whatever reason, and at the age of 69 that the government is able to enact certain rules. That would have to be changed to 71 to make sure that it is consistent with changes that have happened at the federal level. So we'll leave that with the government to choose when they make that change. They could make it in an amendment sooner rather than later. That's the area that we would choose to follow to make sure that it is indeed consistent.

At the time, Mr. Speaker, we have no further concerns

regarding this legislation, and we recommend that it would move to committee. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 51, The Public Employees Pension Plan Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Thomson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 51, The Public Employees Pension Plan Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 51 be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. Bill 51 stands referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

### Bill No. 56

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen that **Bill No. 56 — The Municipalities Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member for Wood River.

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to stand and talk a little bit about The Municipalities Amendment Act, Bill 56. In general terms this is a housekeeping Bill making some housekeeping amendments. A couple of items of note in this Bill. It makes a decision of the Saskatchewan Municipal Board binding on the minister regarding municipal restructuring, whether it is denied or approved. It takes pressure away from the minister to reverse a decision of the Saskatchewan Municipal Board. This amendment also gives councils the ability to reimburse electors who challenge the validity of the election of a mayor or councillors.

Also included is an amendment that allows councils to establish bylaws for public reporting of theft and fraud, similar to the one adopted by the provincial government recently. And I'd like to repeat that. It allows councils to establish bylaws for public

reporting of theft and fraud, similar to the one adopted by the provincial government recently. It supports local accountability and transparency.

This Bill also makes changes to who owes taxes on their trailer homes when the owner of the land and the trailer are different. The owner of the trailer is now currently responsible for tax arrears assessed on that trailer.

Without the written declaration that a property tax payer wishes to support the separate school system, his or her taxes will be directed to the public education system. This clarifies the Act and reconciles it with The Education Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is some changes included in this Bill but in general terms it is housekeeping. So any questions that we have on this we can ask in committee, so I recommend that this Bill be forwarded to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Government Relations that Bill No. 56, The Municipalities Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Government Relations.

**Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 56, The Municipalities Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Government Relations that Bill No. 56 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — The motion is carried. Bill 56 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

### Bill No. 57

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen that **Bill No. 57 — The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again I'm pleased to rise and make some comments on Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act. Again this Bill is mostly of a housekeeping nature and makes changes from previous amendments.

One of the questions that will come up in . . . later on on this Bill is how did this Bill get generated? Was it the stakeholders that asked for this, for this legislation? Or what prompted this legislation and these amendments to come into being? And the reason I say that because again it appears that the NDP are off-loading costs of SAMA [Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency] onto the municipalities and the school divisions.

So it really makes one wonder how much consultation was done with the school divisions and/or the municipalities or either. Or is this just another case of the NDP and their consultation process? They talked to their seatmate or talked to one other person and that constitutes consultation.

And this is one that really looks very iffy because it really does look like it's off-loading onto school divisions and municipalities. And the school divisions will end up having to pay out of the foundation operating grant and thus is reducing funding for school programs.

And another question that comes up, and again it brings into play the consultation process because many large cities do not participate in SAMA yet still have to pay for its operation. And so I'm sure that the cities that do not come under . . . participate in SAMA, why would they be wishing to pay for SAMA if they're not using the SAMA services?

And it's also interesting to note that SUMA had offered a suggestion to the NDP government to have the province pay 60 per cent of SAMA costs, 20 per cent to the municipalities, 20 per cent to school divisions. And SARM offered one that is similar at 50 per cent from the province, 25/25 funding split for the school divisions and the municipalities. But in this Bill we see that the NDP government has opted for a 40/30/30 split which is really not very close to what the other agencies are asking for — the school divisions and the municipalities.

So it really leads one again to wonder how much consultation was done. And it clearly, it clearly is an indication of off-loading. And the government has basically ignored the options and concerns, and increased the amount with the 40/30/30 that cash-starved municipalities and school divisions have to pay. So the big question here is, who generated this Bill? Where was the consultation done? And how did the NDP government arrive at these figures of 40/30/30 for SAMA costs?

That being said, Mr. Speaker, questions that we have can be dealt with in committee, so at this time I would like to forward this Bill to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Government Relations that

Bill No. 57, The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Government Relations.

**Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 57, The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Government Relations that Bill No. 57 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. Bill 57 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

### Bill No. 58

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen that **Bill No. 58 — The Municipal Revenue Sharing Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Well thanks again, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and talk to Bill No. 58 for a couple of minutes, An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act. This Bill will be well-received by municipalities because it lays out what amounts the urban and rural municipalities will receive from the 2007-2008 budget for revenue sharing. And in this Bill it states that the cities will receive 46.8 million; towns, villages, and resort villages will receive 20.62 million; rural municipalities will receive 49.6 million.

The issue with this Bill, or lack of within this Bill, is a long-term plan for revenue sharing. Municipalities, both rural and urban, have been talking about long-term funding plan for revenue sharing, and they are now going year to year with hat in hand, coming to the government saying, how much money are we going to get next year? Who knows? There's nothing in this



Bill or nothing from this NDP government that ever talks about long-term, revenue-sharing plan.

[14:45]

We have been stating all along that revenue sharing should be tied to own-source revenues. And with own-source revenues as revenues go up, as we are now within the oil and gas sector, revenue sharing should automatically go up. The municipalities should benefit from increased dollars from oil and gas, not just the provincial government that they can go out and try and buy an election.

Why is this not a standard formula whereby a base funding could be created and then revenue sharing where when oil and gas prices, own-source revenue prices, rise that automatically the municipalities would receive more money. Thus if they go down, there would be base funding, but it would go down in the time of base funding.

What does the government do now? Oh no, we can't do that. We want to take in all of the money, and then we'll dole it out to whoever we think and how much we think is necessary. In other words, it's another way that the NDP government can grab this pot of money and try and buy votes with a pending election.

And we know, if you look at what's happened in this past number of months, how much money has been spent trying to buy votes. Now it would almost appear that they're trying to do that within the revenue sharing in Bill 58 — \$46.8 million to cities. Now one can debate and say, oh boy, what are they trying to do with that? Pacify the cities because an election is coming?

But we suggest they have chronically ... the NDP have chronically underfunded municipalities and again we've seen when they chronically underfund municipalities, guess what? Property taxes increase, crumbling infrastructure is more prevalent, and there's higher user fees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know the municipalities are going to be pleased with receiving some of their own money back but there is still no plan for long-term revenue sharing by this NDP government. Mr. Speaker, that being said, any questions we have on this Bill can be dealt with in committee, so I recommend this Bill be now sent to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Government Relations that Bill No. 58, The Municipal Revenue Sharing Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — 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:** — Second reading of

this Bill.

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Government Relations.

**Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 58, The Municipal Revenue Sharing Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Government Relations that Bill No. 58 be referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt that motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. Bill 58 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

#### Bill No. 60

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thomson that **Bill No. 60 — The Revenue and Financial Services Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today to speak to Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Revenue and Financial Services Act. The main purpose of this updates record-keeping requirements for business to include electronic record keeping. Something in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, I think which is quite reasonable that we ask businesses to keep records in an electronic format so they can be recalled in a timely and orderly fashion, Mr. Speaker.

Another element of this Bill is the \$25,000 cap is being removed for a penalty when a tax is assessed as a result of an audit. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a change that is just in keeping with the times. Although \$25,000 is a lot of money in this day and age, it is time to remove that cap to ensure that fines will reflect indeed what the penalty should be for non-compliance.

It also increases the penalty for taxes collected and not remitted as required. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious area. If any business or anybody would accept a tax as a payment and then not turn it over to the Crown, it is indeed something that is very serious and we would agree that a change in this area has to be made.

This Bill also allows the Department of Finance more flexibility to share information where it will assist other departments in gathering information, other departments and agencies. Again this is something that allows more power for the Department of Finance. I know I was speaking about this matter to my colleague from Indian Head-Milestone just the other day. And

we were discussing it and it is indeed something that should be addressed.

But what we did discuss was that this also adds responsibility to the government, to the Department of Finance, and to the Minister of Finance. These extra powers indeed cannot be abused where information is shared. We are well aware of the Privacy Commissioner and concerns in that regard. While we agree that the Department of Finance should have more power to share this information, indeed again we call upon the Minister of Finance and the Department of Finance to be very judicious in the way they share that.

It allows for taxing agreements to be reached with First Nations. This is an area, Mr. Speaker, that again is very important. We have taken it upon ourselves, as we do with almost all Bills, to consult all stakeholders across the province, and we have indeed initiated consultation with First Nations groups. We haven't heard back in the entirety of the information that we requested. We haven't heard back from all First Nations groups, but we are satisfied at this point, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue that consultation process and bring up any concerns at the committee stage. So at this time, we will recommend that this Bill do indeed go to committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 60, The Revenue and Financial Services Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Thomson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 60, The Revenue and Financial Services Amendment Act be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 60 be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. This Bill No. 60 stands referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

#### Bill No. 61

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed

motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that **Bill No. 61 — The Vital Statistics Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to join into the debate on Bill No. 61, An Act respecting the Keeping of Vital Statistics and making consequential amendments to other Acts.

Mr. Speaker, this was introduced not very long ago. But it was interesting. I was looking at the press release by the minister just after they introduced this piece of legislation, and it talks about this is one of the oldest pieces of legislation in the province, and it needed to be looked at. It has been looked at, at other times, going back to 1995.

But I also look in the press release, and I find it interesting. It says that in 1998 the Act was looked at as well, but it was unproclaimed. And I, you know, it does I guess kind of draw some questions as to why the Act was passed in the legislature; it would come into effect on proclamation, but it never was proclaimed. So there really hasn't been any change in this Act for about 12 years. The last change was in 1995 even though changes were proposed in '98, but they weren't proclaimed.

But after talking to a number of the stakeholders regarding this Act, which really just allows for electronic transfer of records — be it births or deaths, marriages, electronic transfer of those records — I was interested in a bit of correspondence. We did hear back from some of the stakeholders. And they were saying that Saskatchewan is currently the only province that does not have the ability to register deaths or marriages online, but hospitals can register births. So there is . . . We're kind of lagging behind in this area.

When we talk to the stakeholders in this area though, they do feel that it is a good piece of legislation. In fact also talking to some of the stakeholders, there has been some preliminary work done in this area. Many of the people that are affected by this have done a lot of upgrading in their IT [information technology] and are equipped to be able to function once this Bill comes into place. And they have been working towards that for the last number of years in pilot projects, I do believe. So I think most of the technology is in place.

What needs to happen now is this Bill needs to . . . after it's gone through its proper scrutiny through adjourned debates, which we feel it has. We haven't heard any other concerns. I guess the only concern that we have heard is that it's been a long time coming. And the stakeholders are interested in seeing it passed. And hopefully we don't run into the stumbles that happened in 1998 when the Bill was passed and not proclaimed.

When this Bill is passed and once it goes through the committee stages, hopefully it will be proclaimed so that the stakeholders can reap the benefits of this legislation change which has been, in some cases, probably 12 years in the making. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move this Bill to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Health that Bill No. 61, The

Vital Statistics Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 61, The Vital Statistics Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Health that Bill No. 61 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — The motion is carried. Bill 61 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

### Bill No. 62

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that **Bill No. 62 — The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 portant modifications corrélatives à la loi intitulée The Vital Statistics Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again it's a privilege to rise and talk about Bill No. 62, an Act respecting consequential amendments resulting from the enactment of The Vital Statistics Act, which I just finished speaking about. And what this Bill does is just change other legislation that the previous Bill that I spoke about will . . . These changes need to be made because of the previous Bill that I spoke about.

I guess really the only thing it affects, The Adoption Act and The Change of Name Act, Mr. Speaker, but as I had mentioned in the previous Bill, the stakeholders are more than welcome to see this Bill go through the House and then be proclaimed once it's gone through the proper channels. So I would move this Bill to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion proposed by the Minister of Health, that Bill No. 62, The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendment Act, 2007 be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried.

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Health.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 62, The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendment Act, 2007 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Health that Bill No. 62 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Motion is carried. The Bill 62 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

### Bill No. 64

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Atkinson that **Bill No. 64 — The Graduate Tax Exemption Act** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter into the debate about Bill 64, The Graduate Tax Exemption Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's ever an area in this province that legislation was long overdue, it would be in an area where we can retain our graduates in Saskatchewan. We are all aware of the statistics of young people leaving Saskatchewan at a record rate — young people, students, graduates leaving our province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we have had the worst retention rates of this group over the last 15 years, the worst in the country, Mr. Speaker. And to be clear, that's a statistic that none of us are proud of. I'm sure none of us on this side are proud of it, and I'm sure none of the people over on the government side are proud of the lack of retention of our young people in Saskatchewan.

[15:00]

So, Mr. Speaker, this opposition would certainly support any effort, any effort, how small, how large, any effort whatsoever by this government to try to reverse this trend. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say we've been very reasonable when it comes to dealing with this legislation.

For too long in this province young people, post-secondary graduates have had to leave the province because of a lack of job opportunities in Saskatchewan. Graduates did not want to leave our province. They wanted to stay here. They wanted to make a career here. They wanted to raise their family here, but the economic situation was such that they could not find a job opportunity here at all. So, Mr. Speaker, because of that I would argue, because of many of the policies of the government opposite, they had no choice but to leave our province.

Mr. Speaker, in meeting with students across this province, both when I was the post-secondary education critic and now in my present responsibilities, students have a lot of ideas on this. They have many, many, many, many recommendations. And most of what we have heard, they want something that is tuition based. They have not seen that from this government.

In fact what we have seen . . . And students commented on budget day and after they learned more about the program. They said, are savings of \$1,100 per year enough to keep our young people here? This will do . . . and I'm quoting. This is from students and their comments on budget day: "This will do precious little to encourage students to return to Saskatchewan." And again the overall theme — students want something that is related to tuition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote once again in this House something that has been quoted many times in the media and in this House. And it comes from the University of Regina external affairs VP [vice-president] Kathleen Wilson who, as it has been outlined in this House, also serves as the Saskatchewan Young New Democrats secretary on their provincial executive. And she was quoted on CTV [Canadian Television Network Ltd.] as saying, and I quote:

Students don't take tax credits into consideration. I mean it's a pretty small detail and especially students who haven't paid taxes before really. I don't think it's a big consideration. I mean students are going to be going where the jobs are.

Very telling words indeed, Mr. Speaker, something that I'm hoping that the government listened to, but I'm not sure if they did because not long after the budget we had the report from the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre come out. And it's like the Finance minister didn't talk to the member from Regina Elphinstone-Centre about his report because we saw very little of the recommendations.

And this was a report that was long overdue. It was supposed to be presented in January. We were told that it couldn't be presented at that time, that it would be presented three, four months later. We in opposition said, okay we'll wait for the report. And when it came, the report was there, but the information that went to the Finance department was not included in the budget. So we have some very serious concerns, both about the timing, the lack of coordination between the author of this report and the Department of Finance, and the lack of results. We seem to be spinning our wheels again, Mr. Speaker.

Again I'll reiterate that this is legislation that is long overdue. The Saskatchewan Party will support this initiative. But, Mr.

Speaker — and here is the important part — we will continue to work with students, to listen to students, to develop a much better program than the one that the government has put forward here. It will be better because students will be a part of it. They will be consulted. And their ideas on tuition . . . We're all aware of the program that was implemented in Manitoba to receive a 60 per cent rebate on tuition fees. Many students, many students say that this is a superior program to what was brought in here in Saskatchewan.

With that being said, Mr. Speaker, we will indeed consult with those students and work as an opposition as we always do to not only, not only criticize, but to come up with alternatives. And the students of Saskatchewan can rest assured that they will be able to choose a program between what the government offers and what this opposition offers, based on the consultation that takes place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recommend that this Bill now be moved to committee.

**The Speaker:** — The question before the Assembly is the motion moved by the Minister of Advanced Education and Employment that Bill No. 64, The Graduate Tax Exemption Act be now read a second time. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Question.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

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

**The Speaker:** — To which committee shall this Bill be referred? The Chair recognizes the Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Thomson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move that The Graduate Tax Exemption Act, Bill No. 64 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

**The Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 64 be referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — The motion is carried. Bill 64 stands referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

### Bill No. 65

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Thomson that **Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter into the debate on Bill 65, The Income Tax Amendment Act. I am happy to enter into this debate and to talk about changes that are necessary in The Income Tax Act.

This Bill is largely housekeeping in nature. It is quite standard in its recommendations to make sure that changes to The Income Tax Act are fully compatible with other initiatives initiated by the government, in particular the graduate tax exemption initiatives that I just spoke about, Mr. Speaker.

Also this Bill has provision for the indexing of The Income Tax Act. It's something that members on this side of the House have been advocating for quite some time and are happy to see that it's coming into legislation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, investment tax credits for manufacturing and processing in certain types of non-renewable energy and energy equipment between certain dates, that's something that, again something that needs to be done to make sure that Saskatchewan laws within Finance and with other laws in other departments are compatible within the province and also with the federal income tax system.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have taken it upon ourselves to consult stakeholders across Saskatchewan to ask them for their input, to ask them if indeed these changes are necessary, or something in their view may be offside. And I'm happy to report that we've had a favourable response from those stakeholders. And we ask that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at this time that this Bill now be referred to the committee. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I thank the hon. member for Silver Springs. Members of the Assembly, the motion before the Assembly is adoption of second reading of Bill No. 65, The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2007. It's moved that, it's resolved that this now be read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — To which committee will this Bill be referred? I recognize the Hon. Minister of Finance.

**Hon. Mr. Thomson:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 65, The Income Tax Amendment Act be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — It's been moved by the Minister of Finance that Bill No. 65 be referred to the Standing Committee on the Economy. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried. This Bill stands referred to the Committee on the Economy.

### Bill No. 53

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 53 — The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. It's a pleasure to speak to Bill No. 53, An Act to amend certain Environment Statutes with respect to matters concerning Inspections and Investigations.

Upon research, we see that it's mainly a housekeeping Bill and it's standardizing terms and wordings throughout the Bill. It also allows for additional inspection powers of the conservation officers in various areas in the Bill and changes words in areas to better understand constitutional challenges, and also understand officers are made to be liable for wilful damages that may be caused when entering on land in The Forest Resources Management Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's interesting to note though even though they're mainly housekeeping Bills, it's certainly the, it needs to be clarified what conservation officers can and can't do, their rights, their legal rights, and also what liability may be incurred when they carry out their job. Certainly in the past we've seen where there has been, when visiting regional parks, that there's bans on alcohol, and certainly officers need the powers and the proper authority to deal with those areas when a disturbance breaks out and there's a ban on alcohol.

It's unfortunate. Many people are law-abiding and go to parks with their families and may want to consume some alcohol but there's always people that overdo it and disturbances break out, so certainly we need the officers given the right to deal with those issues. And also issues throughout the province when they're dealing with hunters and fishermen and other people that are generally law-abiding, but the conservation officers need to deal with any infractions that may exist.

As an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the changes in the Bill, Bill No. 53, I'd just like to refer to clause no. 6. The explanation says:

The inspection provision is expanded to provide inspection of vehicles for compliance with regulations. Part of the regulation is modelled after the federal Bill C-45 [which is the] (Fisheries Act, 2007) to better address the issue of constitutional authority respecting the inspection of places or vehicles where one of three conditions is met. Officers may also request the production of items to which the Act applies and inspect anything required of the Act or regulations including electronic documents. Wording is standardized for [the] four Acts.

So that basically standardizes the wording.

Two or three other things of interest. Clause no. 7, the explanation is that:

This section is repealed. Instead of including separate provisions for stopping vehicles in both the inspection and investigation sections, one provision has been proposed to address both purposes. A warrantless search [or] (investigation) of a vehicle may still be done where conditions for a warrant exist, the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that there is evidence in the vehicle of an offence against the Act and a delay in obtaining a warrant would result in danger to human safety or loss of evidence. [And then the] Similar wording is applied to four Acts.

And it goes on to other things that are just trying to standardize the wording across these four Acts. And this in clause no. 9 as another example:

This section is repealed and replaced with an expanded "Obstruction" section that sets out what constitutes an obstruction of an officer in his or her duties. [And again the] Words are standardized across four Acts.

So that's the examples of a various number of items in various clauses that are being standardized in the Bill and across the four Bills which relate to officers and the work that they do in the conservation and in environment. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have sent out some information; we're still waiting for some reply from the stakeholders but we don't really see any problem with this. But we'd like to keep this Bill for a little while longer just to wait for some more information. So I'd like to move to adjourn debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member has moved that debate be adjourned on Bill No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

### Bill No. 31

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that **Bill No. 31 — The Regional Health Services Amendment Act, 2006 (No. 2)** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Elhard:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. It's a pleasure for me to participate in the debate on this piece of legislation this afternoon because it's of considerable import to the people of Cypress Hills and I think some of the concerns they have regarding the delivery of services related to health care will be addressed in this Bill. But there are issues that have been noted as part of this legislation that we have some reservations about — not only we as an official opposition, not only some of the people from the constituency of Cypress Hills, but others who have had a chance to look at this piece of legislation, particularly SEMSA [Saskatchewan Emergency Medical

Services Association], the organization that provides delivery of emergency services through the private sector. And I want to raise some of their concerns in our discussion today.

[15:15]

This particular piece of legislation I guess is a mixed bag. It has some very positive and beneficial elements to it and it has some other areas that, although potentially negative, I guess I wouldn't go so far as to say that just now. The problem is that some of the areas of this piece of legislation are problematic for the private sector service delivery group, and we really would like to see that area of contention worked out and resolved between these service delivery individuals and organizations and the Department of Health before this piece of legislation in fact becomes the law of the land.

And so I'd like to review a little bit of the history of this piece of legislation and some of the issues surrounding the Bill for those people who provide emergency health services in the form of ambulance care. Mr. Deputy Chair, this legislation formalizes provisions of services provided by affiliates and other health care providers that are not actually designated as health care organizations, and I specifically refer to ambulance services.

The auditor, as we understand it, has over the last number of years made a request of the regional health authorities that they enter into formalized agreements with these private sector health care providers as part of the overall delivery of health care in the regional health authorities. And I think that's good advice. I think the auditor has struck kind of an important point when he recommends that. Because in this day and age it's important to have formalized agreements, details of which are understood by both contracting parties. And I think the habit has been in the past to require a much less formalized agreement and, in some cases, just a verbal agreement to provide services.

But the auditor says in this very complicated area of service delivery, and in other areas of services that health regions require, there really needs to be a pretty clear understanding — a formalized arrangement — as to how those services are going to be provided, how they'll be paid for, how they'll be treated going forward. And so as part of the legislation here today, the auditor's recommendations are being addressed by the Department of Health and the provincial government. And I think we, as an official opposition, acknowledge the requirement of the Provincial Auditor as a needed part of this particular legislation so that everybody, all parties to the agreements, know what their obligations and responsibilities are.

Formal agreements, Mr. Deputy Chair, will actually ensure performance standards that can be met or ought to be met by the service providers. They'll outline responsibilities much more specifically and clearly, and they'll really ensure that at the end of the day Saskatchewan Health is accountable for the services that it contracts the providers of these services — that it contracts from, I'm sorry, the providers of these services.

So clarity will be provided but so will accountability, and I think that that is especially important in this particular area. In

this respect these types of formal agreements are I would say overdue, and as I mentioned earlier the auditor has been suggesting that these kind of agreements be entered into for some time now. And it's just as a piece of this legislation, as part of this particular endeavour, that the effort to meet the auditor's recommendations has been complied with.

However there remain, Mr. Deputy Chair, some concerns with this Bill, and as is our duty as the official opposition we want to consult with some of the stakeholders that would be affected by legislation of this nature, and we have done that. And in some instances the concerns of some of the stakeholders have been addressed, and we recognize the good work that has gone into making these contentious areas finally resolved. But I regret to say that there are still some outstanding issues, and from what I understand discussions have been going on between Saskatchewan Health and SEMSA, which we indicated earlier is a group of private sector emergency service delivery organizations and/or companies.

And given the history of this government's intentions when it comes to ambulance providers or ambulance service providers, as I would recall the introduction of The Ambulance Act a number of years ago, probably four or five years ago, brought a great deal of upheaval and concern to this sector. There was tremendous resistance to the efforts of the government when the concept of The Ambulance Act was brought to the public — especially in rural Saskatchewan, but not reserved or exclusively in those areas of the province. There are other areas that depend heavily on private sector ambulance service delivery that found that Act objectionable. And it would appear almost that what the government wasn't able to accomplish in The Ambulance Act a number of years ago, that they are trying to accomplish with this piece of legislation.

So there remain concerns among the Saskatchewan emergency measures services association, the acronym for which is SEMSA. And I know that there have been meetings from time to time between this organization and the deputy minister, where they've tried to resolve the outstanding issues. But there do remain two specific outstanding concerns, and I'd like to detail them for the House today. And for the sake of this debate, I think it's important that this be on the record.

In section 36.1 of Bill No. 31, there's the matter of compensation for termination or non-renewal of a written agreement. And I think this is a particularly problematic area for the ambulance operators because what it says here is that an evaluation of the business — that would be the ambulance operator, the business of providing this ambulance service — under a fair market value concept is based on the fact that contracts for one year's duration or 12 months will be the basis on which the business is evaluated. That might sound reasonable from the perspective of the casual observer, but rarely would a business operator say that the business I undertook or conducted in the last 12 months, the contracts that I had in place in the last 12 months, would substantiate the amount of my investment overall in this business.

The fact of the matter is that a 12-month duration and the amount of money and revenue you can generate over a 12-month period may not come anywhere close to reflecting the true value of the business. And in many instances you can have

ambulance operations with two, three, four, maybe half a dozen expensive ambulance vans, fully equipped ambulance vans, that would amount to literally millions of dollars. And in a situation like that, is the true value of that company reflected in the contracts they had in place in the previous 12 months? Well I would argue, not likely. And I think most of the people in the business of providing ambulance service in that situation would make the same argument. And they find it particularly difficult for them to accept that the fair market value for their business would be based on the previous 12 months of business.

And I think that that particular stumbling block is going to prevent a resolution of this difficulty unless of course somebody's willing to move. And I think if you want to come to a resolution on this, the government is going to have to address that particular issue because it's unfair to the existing operators in this province.

The second area that is of major concern is section 37 where it talks about cessation of payments if a dispute arises. The time allowed for dispute resolution under this particular section is a period of 14 days. And, Mr. Deputy Chair, I'm sure that you would concur, given the experiences we all have in the world that we know of which is filled with complications and legalities and sometimes lawsuits — whatever comes to bear on our contentious issues these days — 14 days to resolve the dispute seemed highly and wholly inadequate. And the legislation in this particular Bill only allows for 14 days to resolve disputes, and that's simply not enough.

And if in fact payments are stopped to the service delivery company or organization, it could mean that the payroll of that company couldn't be met. If pay is interrupted while this dispute is being resolved then the obligations of the service operator might be, well, unmet. And that means employees would possibly go without their paycheques; that other bills accumulated over the previous 30 days would be unpaid; that any number of other financial difficulties might ensue. And so that's a particularly problematic area for the members of SEMSA as well. And both the operator and staff would obviously be adversely affected by this type of consideration.

It seems that instead of The Ambulance Act which this government introduced or tried to bring to bear on the people of the province — they were unsuccessful then as I alluded to earlier — and now in order to accomplish the same purposes they tried with The Ambulance Act, ambulance operators and members of SEMSA are being thrown into the mix with other health care organizations under this new Act. And it's simply inappropriate to the realities of the companies that provide the ambulance services, and to the delivery of suitable ambulance response for the people of the province.

There remains concerns about how the clauses that I just alluded to will affect the ability of operators to make their businesses not only suitable and practical and operational on a day-to-day basis, but how it will impact their long-term viability. And, Mr. Deputy Chair, viability speaks to the heart of financial success. Viability speaks to whether or not they can meet payroll, whether or not they can meet their financial obligations.

They also need to be able to determine with some certainty, the

future. And if somebody comes to terminate your contract and wants to buy you out based on your 12 months of previous business, that's bad enough. But that very provision doesn't allow the ambulance operators today to plan too far in the future.

You know, if their business is always under threat to some extent, they aren't able to plan for the long term. They aren't able to make good business decisions about buying new and more modern equipment as expensive as that is. You want some assurance going forward that your business is going to be respected and that your financial requirements will also be acknowledged.

So we need a stable business environment for these ambulance operators. We need it for the sake of the continuum of service that they have provided, for the certainty of service. We need it so that they can plan their own business future, so that they can offer stability to their employees, and so that they can obtain financing if they need it. If they need financial backing from a financial institution, if they need a line of credit, if they need a loan, that given the stability of their enterprise, their business enterprise, they can make an application that would be well received by a financial institution.

It's really a shame, Mr. Deputy Chair, to pass legislation such as this when significant stakeholders have . . . Maybe they've been consulted, but maybe there hasn't been enough effort to find resolution to these very troubling parts of this legislation. And we need to see a resolution achieved where both the Department of Health and the members of SEMSA can live with the new legislation.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sold farm machinery for a long time, and if I . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well the question becomes what kind, automatically. And I was a John Deere salesman and very proud of it. But when I was selling equipment, you know, if I arrived at a deal with a customer and he wasn't satisfied, I likely wasn't able to have that customer as a repeat customer in the future.

There was an elderly gentleman that used to own the dealership. After he retired, he'd come around and he'd give us advice free of charge. And one of the things he said to me that stuck with me over the years is, you know, when you've completed a deal, if both the salesman and the customer go away a little mad, there's probably a pretty fair deal. If both parties feel they didn't get everything they wanted, it was probably a pretty fair deal.

And in this case, I think I'd like to extrapolate to this particular piece of legislation. If the Department of Health and the operators of SEMSA can come to an agreement where both of them feel that they've had to give up a little bit, it's probably a pretty reasonable deal. But if one side feels it has to give up a lot more than the other side, it's pretty likely that it wasn't a fair deal at all.

And I think the Department of Health and the minister should consider that in their discussions with the SEMSA operators because they have very much at stake in this particular piece of legislation. And we really would appreciate that kind of co-operative approach to finding resolution to this stumbling

block in this particular piece of legislation, rather than have the government use the heavy hand of law to move legislation forward that really isn't going to benefit anybody.

[15:30]

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order for the two parties to come to consensus on this particular piece of legislation, in order to give them some more time, and in order for the negotiations to continue, I would move that we adjourn debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Cypress Hills has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 31. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

### Bill No. 37

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Quennell that **Bill No. 37 — The Court of Appeal Amendment Act, 2006/Loi de 2006 modifiant la Loi de 2000 sur la Cour d'appel** be now read a second time.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Indian Head-Milestone.

**Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a privilege to stand today and enter into the debate on An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act, 2000.

It's really a very brief Bill. There's only, I think, about a page and a half — one page. So the Bill is quite brief. But what it does do, and in the explanatory notes it just talks about the amendment of section 3 will reduce the size of the Court of Appeal from nine judges to seven, effective as vacancies occur. So that's pretty much it. That's the whole intent of the piece of legislation.

We've had the opportunity to talk to people that are stakeholders in this area and see whether that is a good move, moving from nine to seven. But I think before I get into what a number of those stakeholders have said, I think it's important to realize that a number of years ago — two years ago at least — our Justice critic, the member from Saskatoon Southeast, talked about this very thing in estimates. He had suggested at that time that we should look at reducing the Court of Appeal from nine judges to whatever the number should be to be able to facilitate the workload that they're receiving.

The government of course at that time, I guess probably because it was an idea that came from the opposition . . . Generally that is the case, if we come up with the idea, they better just sit on it for a little while because if they implement it too quickly, it looks like they're just taking another one of our ideas. So I guess they sat on it for a couple of years before they then decided to change the legislation. Now they're changing the legislation to encompass pretty much exactly what our excellent critic of Justice had said a couple years ago — the member from Southeast. Well, some of our members are saying



maybe not excellent but . . . But anyway, he had definitely brought this idea forward.

And it's always interesting to see the lag. You know, as I said, we had talked about it . . . or the member from Saskatoon Southeast had talked about it in committee a number of times, and then nothing was done for a couple of years until now the introduction of the Bill.

We've had the opportunity to talk to the stakeholders and to see that . . . Is seven the right number? Is the workload for seven the right number, or should it be six? Should it be eight? Should it have remained at nine? We had heard already from a couple of years ago that we had realized that it needed to drop, and now that the government has finally moved on that, we're happy about that.

I do know though that there are a number of other members on our side of the House that would like to speak to this Bill. Maybe they've had issues with the Court of Appeal and the number of judges in the Court of Appeal. I know I haven't had any issue that way. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, until we give all members on this side of the House — such as the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood may want to enter into the debate — until we give all members on this side of the House time to speak to this Bill, I would move to adjourn debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Indian Head-Milestone is moving adjournment of debate on Bill No. 37. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

#### **Bill No. 43**

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Quennell that **Bill No. 43 — The Payday Loans Act** be now read a second time.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood.

**Mr. Hart:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am certainly pleased that I'm able to enter into the debate on this particular Bill. This is a new Bill; it's not an amendment to an existing Bill. It's a Bill that deals with regulating an industry that is a fairly new industry of very short-term loans as the name infers, payday loans. And to the industry's credit, I believe there was some initiative taken by the industry to ask for some regulation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I certainly concur with that opinion.

I think statistics will indicate that those people who are clients of the short-term payday loans are quite often people who may for whatever reason have some difficulty in managing their finances, whether that be due to lack of long-term, permanent employment, or perhaps it's a situation of a case where particularly young people never really received the type of information that would enable them to manage their salaries and their income.

And so I think, speaking in generalities — I know when you generalize there's always exceptions to the generality — but speaking in generalities, I think the vast majority of clients of this particular industry are very vulnerable and can be easily taken advantage of, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And therefore I think it is incumbent that governments act and set up safeguards so that the individuals are protected and also the industry knows what the regulations and rules of their business is. And that's what this Act is attempting to do.

The minister outlined in his second reading speech a number of things that this Bill does. It requires the payday lenders to be licensed. It sets maximum limits as far as the costs. And the cost can be made up of a couple, at least a couple of things: interest rates and fees. And these can be very prohibitive. I understand that under certain . . . I believe it's under the Criminal Code that the maximum interest rate cannot exceed 60 per cent. Well if you think of 60 per cent as a maximum interest rate, I mean that's prohibitive. I don't know of anyone that could possibly service a loan that is 60 per cent even though it may be very short, and I think in most cases these loans are very short.

So it also prevents lenders from making more than one loan to individuals which would minimize the risk to individuals. It also indicates that companies who have multiple places of business within the province, each one of those places of business must be licensed.

There is quite a number of provisions within the Bill. As you might know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's quite a lengthy Bill. And from reading the Bill, it looks like, it appears that this Bill is the framework, but there are a lot of the detail which really will indicate the effectiveness of the Bill, will be developed in regulations, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that certainly leaves us with some concern because, as the saying goes, the devil is in the detail.

And until we have some of those details . . . and I know there are some concerns both from the consumers but also from the industry. As I said, this is a new Bill, and I think there is more time is required, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to look into the various sections of the Bill, so that the stakeholders need, I believe, a bit more time to make their thoughts known, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And so at this time I would move to adjourn debate on this Bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood is moving adjournment of debate on Bill No. 43, The Payday Loans Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — It's carried.

#### **Bill No. 46**

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cline that **Bill No. 46 — The Crown Minerals Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a Bill that's called The Crown Minerals Act, and it deals with minerals in Saskatchewan that are owned by the Crown — not the Crown corporations, but the Crown in right as the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There are some interesting items in this particular Bill I think need to have some exploration done with them as to why they're in place and why the changes are taking place within this Act. The one in particular that caught my eye was called acquired oil and gas rights. Now in Saskatchewan traditionally we've had two different kinds of oil and gas rights. We've had freehold rights which are held by individuals that in most cases acquired them with the homestead rights when they acquired land or purchased land initially. And in the main, that is in the southeast corner of the province up along the Manitoba border because they acquired their mineral rights when they purchased their homestead rights.

The rest of the province I'm told, at one point in time back in approximately the mid-1930s, individuals had the right to buy the Crown minerals at that time. And it may have been the time when the province actually acquired the Crown minerals from the federal government that the individuals had that opportunity as well.

I know one farmer out west. I know one farmer out west in an oil field that I worked in, in the Swift Current area near Hazlet, said that he had the opportunity to acquire the mineral rights on his land at that point in time, and he said, but in the mid-1930s, who had any money?

Well when I worked there — and this was in 1970 — that particular piece of property was still making, at that time, 2,500 barrels of oil a day and had been in production since 1952. So it had been producing at that point in time for almost 20 years and was still producing a very significant amount of oil. But while he had had the opportunity to purchase the mineral rights, those mineral rights rested with the Crown. And that's the case across most of Saskatchewan.

So when this Bill talks about acquired oil and gas rights, you have to ask yourself: acquired from who? Under what circumstances? I do know of circumstances that the Crown has acquired mineral rights because there's a capital tax in place on mineral rights. And I believe what it is, is if an individual or corporation holds a million acres or more, there's a 2 per cent capital tax on those acres, and that's a significant amount of money if there is no production on that land.

So I know that in the past the government has picked up some considerable amount of what we would call freehold land from corporations in the past because they have not wanted to pay the capital tax on those mineral rights. And in one particular case I know of, where there was a company called Freehold oil and gas as well as Farmers' Mutual, that farmers in the late 1940s, early 1950s had entered into an agreement where they turned over approximately 80 per cent of their mineral rights to this to someone like the more co-operative organizations, Farmers Mutual, which in turn — through some means that I don't understand all the legalities of or the confusion that resulted in this — that land, those mineral rights were turned over to a private corporation even though they were supposed to have

been held in co-op.

And then a significant amount of that land was non-productive as far as oil at that particular point in time, and the Crown acquired those Crown mineral . . . the mineral rights on those, and so it would have become acquired oil and gas rights. So that's the one area that it may take place. I suppose an individual, if they wanted to, could turn over the mineral rights that they own to the Crown, free and gratis. I think that would be the extremely rare occasion that that would happen because these are all seen as assets or at least potential assets at some point in the future. We all hope that the diamond mine is found on our particular piece of land although it may be astronomical that it would happen. But nevertheless people always have dreams.

[15:45]

The other area that was pointed out by a colleague, that you could also acquire, the Crown could acquire these mineral rights in the case where land is being subdivided for urban development, that the urban municipality may not want to have to deal with potential production in their jurisdiction because of some of the complications that can arise in that area, particularly if the area might have sour gas. And so there would be concerns about safety, and some municipalities would not want to have to deal with it.

So to develop a piece of property, the Crown may very well acquire those mineral rights at that point in time so that the urban development could proceed. And then there would be no concerns about any mineral development occurring on the same property because if two separate owners have the surface and the mineral rights, both owners have right to access their property. And so the owner of the mineral rights can acquire access through the Surface Rights Arbitration Board, if necessary, to be able to access their property, the value of their property, which in this case would be the mineral rights. So an urban municipality may not want to have to deal with this, so that's perhaps where acquired oil and gas rights become a part of this particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

But yet the changes that are occurring in this, I'm not sure how it affects the Bill that's already in place. I know the government has said that this is worthwhile legislation, and yet it doesn't given any rationale as to why the change needs to take place, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And so that's a bit of a curious entity that the government has provided no real good rationale as to why it wants to — at least from what I've heard the government talk about — provided no real good rationale as to why this needs to take place other than to give the government more access to these acquired lands and others, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So I think in my own mind I need to have some more explanations dealt with on this. And I think I see one of the ministers at the back who is prepared to say he's prepared to provide me with some assistance in providing that information, although he is an urban member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and may not be totally familiar with mineral rights and how they affect people in Saskatchewan because in my area there is a significant impact to the mineral rights.

The government gathers a huge volume of dollars. I think the

Finance minister could elaborate on that, probably more than a billion dollars. And while those monies are collected by the Crown through royalties on those mineral rights, very little of that money in turn is put back into the areas where the production takes place to support the infrastructure that's needed to provide for this production, Mr. Speaker.

So I think it would be very worthwhile if the ministers opposite were to give some consideration to that, that while they're extracting this huge volume of dollars at the present time from the oil and gas industry, that some of that money needs to go back into the local infrastructure where the actual production takes place, where the roads are taking that damage, and where the other infrastructures such as schools and hospitals need to be maintained to provide employment opportunities. So I'd like to give the minister the opportunity to do that, so at this time I would move adjournment of debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Cannington has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 46, The Crown Minerals Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — That is carried.

#### Bill No. 48

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cline that **Bill No. 48 — The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This Act is a corollary to the previous one, the Crown mineral Act. This one deals with explanations on what freehold lands are. Freehold lands are mineral rights owned by individuals or corporations that acquired them either at the time they homesteaded or acquired the land at first settlement or have purchased the mineral rights of someone who had acquired them in that manner in the beginning.

And I had mentioned in my previous speech about Farmers Mutual, Freehold oil and gas, how they had acquired the mineral rights from the original homesteaders, from the original people that had settled the land and had received those mineral rights in that manner and how they had joined together to put in place an organization, the two organizations that I mentioned, to share co-operatively the revenues that would have come from those surface rights — excuse me, not the surface rights — from the mineral rights, and collectively they would be distributed amongst all the unit holders. Well that failed to happen.

That carried on into the mid-1950s, late 1950s when changes occurred with the board of directors there and the land, the mineral rights were sold to Scurry-Rainbow at the time. And there was a good many people in this legislature that were aware of it — in the province of Saskatchewan, in Regina in

particular — that were very aware that there was some concerns at that point in time about how those transactions had taken place and to the legalities of them. Nevertheless they went ahead, and those farmers and those landowners who had put their mineral rights into Farmer's Mutual and freehold oil and gas lost the value of those mineral rights.

While they did receive in exchange non-voting shares in the corporations that had bought those from Farmer's Mutual and freehold oil and gas, there was never any dividends paid, to my knowledge, on that. There was never any appreciation in the value of those shares. So over time while the oil and gas was produced off of that land, the original owners of those mineral rights received no benefits because of that. They simply received the shares that were originally issued to them in exchange for the mineral rights that had been held previously.

Also it created a huge problem because there were others who were interested in developing the oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan but couldn't access the land because it was held by Scurry-Rainbow or other companies at that particular point in time. And it stifled the oil development in Saskatchewan, particularly in the southeast corner of Saskatchewan at that time.

So freehold oil and gas is generally more particular to southeast Saskatchewan than it is to the rest of Saskatchewan but it's a direct benefit to a good number of the communities in my constituency and the individuals that benefit from them. And many of those individuals are now very, very strong supporters of their community, providing philanthropic support to the rinks, to the hospitals, to the schools, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And so it becomes of great interest and value to the people of Saskatchewan.

So again I look forward to what the ministers can provide in enlightenment as to why these changes are needed. I know that some of my colleagues are also interested in addressing these particular issues, so at this time I would like to move adjournment of debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Cannington has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 48, The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion for adjournment?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

#### Bill No. 45

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wartman that **Bill No. 45 — The Agricultural Societies Repeal Act** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in

responding to and speaking to Bill No. 45, An Act to repeal The Agricultural Societies Act and make consequential amendments to other Acts, I just want to raise a few issues as I enter into this debate.

In the minister's opening comments regarding Bill No. 45, The Agricultural Societies Act, he acknowledged the fact that agricultural societies, the first agricultural societies Act was first drafted before Saskatchewan became a province which, Mr. Speaker, we all know — or Deputy Speaker — that's some 100 years ago, which speaks to the importance that agriculture has played in this province for the past 100 years.

The minister also mentioned that since then Saskatchewan has developed a much more advanced economy. And some of the changes that we've seen in our economy certainly reflect the fact that, while agriculture has played and continues to play a significant role, we also recognize the fact that this province is a province that's been blessed with the resources of abundance. I believe we're the third highest in oil and gas in the country, one of the largest in potash. We certainly have uranium sources that a lot of jurisdictions would dearly love to have, given the issues surrounding the environment.

And I believe one of the members from Saskatoon spoke today about a recent meeting of a former vice-president in regards to the environment. And as we look at the overall impact of agriculture and we talk about the environment, no doubt some of the issues that are surrounding the whole issue around global warming and the concerns that are being raised . . . And I would add, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in some cases some of those concerns certainly on one hand will have, a group of scientists will really belabour the fact that we're on a spiral downward, and yet on the other hand you'll have other scientists pointing out that there's research indicating that the issue is not as desperate as we're led to believe.

But when we talk about environment — bringing this back to agriculture and agricultural societies — the agriculture community is quite well aware of the impact of how we conduct ourselves, how we farm, the way we farm, and the way we produce commodities. Even that can have an impact on our environment. I know that through the years we've all been warned about the fact that as we remove trees and part of the landscape has certainly changed, as the minister indicated.

We've seen new technologies advance in the area of agriculture. We've seen new economies grow on the province of Saskatchewan. And when we talk about agricultural societies and agriculture in particular, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think back and I look at what the community agricultural societies that are currently active in my constituency are representing. And when you attend a number of their fairs — and no doubt many members in this Assembly have attended an agricultural society fair in some form or another whether it's in rural or urban centres — these groups of individuals who have set up these societies, in many cases they set up the agricultural society for one reason and that was to promote agriculture as an economic engine in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I would suggest today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it might be needed even more than it has been in the past for the simple reason that has been pointed out. Certainly our economy has

evolved. While we're not as reliant on agriculture and agriculture production in our economy in the province of Saskatchewan because of the place that oil and gas exploration has taken in the province, because of where the potash industry has now moved, and of one of the largest fertilizer companies in the world now has its headquarters here in the province of Saskatchewan or even the whole economy that is developing around uranium.

So in some ways those economies have diminished the role of agriculture. But the facts are we can have all the oil and gas we want. We can heat our homes. We can derive revenue through the sale of potash and that'll put revenues into the coffers of the province of Saskatchewan. But as individuals, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all are very reliant, we're still very reliant on the agriculture community because potash, outside of the use in agriculture, doesn't put food on the table. Oil and gas outside of generating, creating job opportunities, unless there's an agriculture community creating and growing the food, oil and gas doesn't necessarily put food on the table except for the fact that it may be used to transport that commodity from the field to the urban communities and into our large urban centres through our local grocery stores.

So we see that while the ag societies have diminished — and I believe that's where the minister was going when he suggested that this Bill is not very long. I understand that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You look at the Bill, it's a one-page Bill and it's not only repealing The Agriculture Societies Act, it also was repealing The Auctioneers Act, The Cities Act, and The Municipalities Act.

[16:00]

While it's a fairly short Bill, it also reminds us of the fact that in 100 years, yes we've moved quite a ways from being a strictly agricultural-based economy to being a very broad-based economy as far as the revenue that is generated from other sources. But I trust, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we do not forget the role that agriculture continues to play in the province of Saskatchewan.

One of the concerns I know that many of my constituents raise in view of the fact that a lot of my constituency is agriculture and the fact that we are seeing diminishing numbers of people in some of our rural communities because of the challenges the agricultural community has faced over the past number of years with low commodity prices. And then as we saw last year we had quite a diversity in weather conditions in the province of Saskatchewan in the Southwest of the province. We had an area of the province where the agricultural community was facing a significant drought and had to cut back on what they could do because of the impact drought had on them.

When yet on the other hand, in the northeast part of the province many producers got less than 25 per cent of the crop in the ground. And then the bit they did get, by the time fall rolled around the rains came again and they were unable to harvest that grain. And so that left producers . . . On one hand producers were dried out and on the other hand producers were drowned out. And then you had an area of the province where actually producers had an excellent crop.

And for the consumer in the province of Saskatchewan, they were fortunate that we didn't have a total calamity or catastrophe in the agricultural community. And one would say well it really, it really doesn't matter that much because we're . . . In the big scheme of things we're still a small player in the overall world agriculture production.

But the facts are I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I look at some of the numbers and I see that the supply of food — what's on hand if there was a total catastrophe in this world — there's something like 60 or 90 days carry-over. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's not very much when you look at the seasons and how long you move or it takes to move from that time of harvest back into seeding and back into harvest.

So I think it points out the fact that agriculture continues to play an important role in the province of Saskatchewan, and I'm concerned in some ways with regards to the fact that this Bill is almost sending a bit of a signal that agriculture isn't as important any more. Some of the minister's comments almost leave us with that thought.

And I know that people across Saskatchewan, especially rural Saskatchewan, are feeling that they have not been listened to very carefully, that some of the challenges they've been facing have not been heard very clearly, and that they, well they are a smaller number in proportion to the overall population.

And I believe nationally we're less than 2 per cent now. The agricultural community or people in food production is less than 2 per cent. That's a significant number, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but that less than 2 per cent still is providing more food than we can consume in the country of Canada, which talks to the ability of agricultural producers right across this country to produce. And it speaks to the heart and soul, not only of our province but the agricultural community in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I look at, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the comments the minister made, and we look at what some of the concerns that have been raised by the agricultural community, and I know many of the volunteers who are parts of agricultural boards across this province lament the fact that we have moved so much in a significant way from agriculture being a priority in this province, and it has been a concern.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many members in this Assembly will know that many of the members have actually a background and have come from rural communities. And many can go back to their rural communities and what they see is a dramatic shift in population. They've seen their communities, the communities that they grew up and used to call home, how that community has slowly lost population and as a result they've lost businesses in the communities.

And part of the reason for that loss: you just look around, and you look at the farm sizes. What was it 20 or 30 years ago? You still had farms with a half and three-quarter sections or a section. Nowadays, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to survive you're looking at 2 to 3 to in some cases 10,000 acres being farmed by one farm family or by a company.

And what that has done has reduced the number of people that continue to be part of the agriculture community. And also with

the ability we have to commute from point A to point B and the economies of scale, even in the farm communities, many times just to help the farm survive, you're looking even outside of your local community because you can get a better deal. If you save 10 cents on a commodity here by volume, it can make a significant impact to the bottom line on your farm and on its survival.

So there are and will continue to be significant challenges in Saskatchewan, in the agriculture community. And it's an issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where people will continue to have the debate in the coffee shops as to what's happening to rural Saskatchewan.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk about rural Saskatchewan, we're all aware of the Save Our Schools committee, and we're also . . . And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaks to a couple of things and directly related to agriculture. It's the fact that many rural communities are finding that, as their population has decreased, so has the number of students in schools and the challenge to keeping these schools open. And there again, when I was growing up, it wasn't uncommon for most families to be four or five and six members to a family. In my parents' generation, it wasn't uncommon to have families of 11 to 14. And so you can see how it was fairly easy to fill a school, a schoolroom or classroom. But nowadays, it's becoming a challenge.

So the issues around agriculture are actually very broad and very far ranging. And while this piece of legislation is actually fairly small and minute, I think it is a fairly significant piece of legislation as well. And I would trust that in all of this, that this government, while we've had issues raised before about the lack of consultation, that there has been actually some significant consultation. And we've taken the time or the government has taken the time to talk to leadership outside of the larger urban centres, not just the department or some of the larger groups within the province, but they've actually met with leadership from across the province.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to first of all say how proud I am of the work that has been done by the many agriculture societies across our province. And it's certainly a pleasure to attend the agricultural fairs in the constituency, just to observe how these groups and these societies, through their fairs, continue to promote agriculture and its importance in the province of Saskatchewan and the role that agriculture serves in ensuring that the large grocery stores and grocery chains have the product on the shelf so then when people go shopping to feed their families they can know that there will be a commodity there for them.

And as I mention that, I think to myself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think to myself of some of the pictures we've seen in other parts of the world. When we go to the grocery store — whether it's a Safeway, whether it's an IGA [Independent Grocers Alliance] or a Superstore — we walk in and we just see lines of produce, lines of canned goods. And those shelves are filled to the limit. And yet I'm reminded of the fact there's other parts of the world where we've seen pictures of people going to shop and there's hardly anything on the shelf.

And I think that again speaks very well of how the agriculture

community has responded to meet the needs and to provide the commodities and the food goods that people look for, for sustenance on a daily basis. And I think at the end of the day, one of the other things that speaks well of the agriculture community is how many places across our province, where we have food banks — and the Canadian food bank for one — where farmers have donated a quarter section and then equipment dealers and chemical companies and fertilizer companies have worked together on that quarter section to grow whatever commodity. And then they sell, and they then give the return from that commodity to provide food for people in other parts of the world who unfortunately, due to the circumstances beyond their control, are lacking and are in desperate need of having food sources supplied to them.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe when we look at the agriculture societies and their role and their endeavour to ensure that people of Saskatchewan do not forget the importance in the role of agriculture in this province, it's important for us to remember that there is a role for agriculture communities. We want to acknowledge the role the agriculture societies have made and continue to make in this province. And I know some of my colleagues would also like to speak to this Bill as well, so I therefore at this time move to adjourn debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Moosomin has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 45, The Agricultural Societies Repeal Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

### Bill No. 52

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 52 — The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la faune** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a privilege for me to stand and make a few comments regarding Bill No. 52, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007. And I believe this Bill is just An Act to Amend The Wildlife Act of 1998.

As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my voice is somewhat different. It is a little hoarse. My colleague from Cannington said he was going to give me a present, and he give me his cold. I've had it for a few days, and I would like to pass it on to somebody else. But I have many comments to make. I don't know if my voice will hang out, but I'll do my best, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just in some of the comments regarding this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe just in looking at the Bill, in summary, this wildlife Act or amendment to The

Wildlife Act gives the deputy wildlife officers the same power as our wildlife officers. And in addition it gives the additional inspection powers to these deputy wildlife officers.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, anybody that's a hunter or a fisherman in the province of Saskatchewan knows the role that COs [conservation officer] play. And you have to work with them because they are the ones that enforce the management of the wildlife and the environment.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not that long ago that I remember that the COs that are today were known as DNRs, and it was part of the Department of Natural Resources. And still today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no matter where you go in the province of Saskatchewan, many people still refer to our COs as DNRs. It just kind of resembles them, and they know what they're talking about.

For COs nowadays, there are many names. They're SERM [Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management] officials. They're Cos. They're wildlife managers, whatever. But when it comes back to DNR, when they're referred to DNR, everybody knows who you're talking about. And maybe that should be back what they should be because COs a while ago looked after the natural resources of our province. And we have in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many, many natural resources which the nowadays COs have to look after.

One of the things I wanted to mention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding COs is back in I believe — correct me if I'm wrong, if I've got wrong in the year — was I believe in 2002, and that's when the present government decided that, through budget cuts, they were going to do away with 200 COs in the province of Saskatchewan. Two hundred COs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a lot of COs. Most of which, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were from the North, and most were from the rural, but the biggest majority of them were from the North. Now can you imagine up in the North as we have today . . . we have lakes. We have wildlife. It's in abundance. But we have no managers. There were very few COs in the area managing our wildlife and our habitat.

[16:15]

In fact just to give you an idea, I believe it is in Buffalo Narrows, there is only one CO up there today that looks after a huge area. Where does he start? We need more COs in our province. When you take 200 out of the system, what's going to happen? So maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the minister's indulgence to do this — to allow for deputy COs to have the same power as COs — that's a good thing. If it's some way of building up on our enforcement and wildlife management through deputy COs, hey, that's great. I'm sure every one of the COs out there welcome this news to allow deputy COs to have the same power.

But also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can go overboard. When we allow the COs to carry firearms, because they deal with people with firearms, that's a good thing also; it gives them protection. But now you run a point where do the COs have the same power as our police? One begs to ask the question. And in many cases, some people say they do, or almost they do. But there's sometimes a problem with that. If the COs are going out and just doing the investigation on areas that they feel need to be

looked at, that is fine. But under this Act I believe it gives more power for them to do investigations. And sometimes you can take your job too far and go overboard, so it may cause some problems. Time will tell.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding the COs and our wildlife management in the province of Saskatchewan, I look at the Environment minister's role as we speak now. And I know in the last two or three years, there has been a real push for a green strategy. You've heard it. We've heard it. There's been a real push. In fact I think if I remember right, the amount of dollars going into this budget alone was seven and a half million dollars, if I'm correct, that went into the green initiatives or green strategy. And that's all well and good. Everybody will applaud that to a point, but the point I'm trying to make is what's happening with our resource management side of the equation?

In talking with many COs, which I have, they have totally forgotten about the resource management part of our province. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan we have an abundance of wildlife. We have abundance of issues regarding resource management, but you don't hear a lot about it. And I'm wondering why. When we were under the jurisdiction of the DNR, Department of Natural Resources, their mandate was to look after that portfolio, and they did a great job.

We have moved away from that. Ever since we brought Environment into the Department of Natural Resources, it seems that's taken precedence over the natural resource management part of that portfolio. And I beg the question: why are we going that far? It's okay to look after the green initiatives and the problems to accommodate what's needed to be done in the province of Saskatchewan and in the world regarding greenhouse gasses, but let's not lose sight of the resource management of this province. And we are doing that right now. This comes from, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lot of COs that have talked to me about this. They see it firsthand. They know it. And they said we need to move back to at least the centre to discuss that and do something with that.

One of the points I want to speak about just in regards to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a problem with a disease that we have in our wildlife, and that's CWD [chronic wasting disease]. What has the province done with CWD in the province of Saskatchewan? Well very little. This came about some half-dozen, ten years ago. And right now in the province of Saskatchewan, we are number one in Canada with the CWD problem. The COs have mentioned this to me, and we're doing little or nothing with it.

And I make those comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because if you look on the east side of the province in Manitoba, there is no CWD except for one case — one case that came to light in the fall of '06 where there was a CWD case. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that certain case in Manitoba is related back to a game farm in Yorkton. So now whether there's an investigation going on I don't know, but that still leaves the province of Manitoba free from CWD.

We also have a problem with the borders on the west side with Alberta. Alberta have stated over and over there is no problem

with CWD in that province except, except right along the edge of the border between Alberta and Saskatchewan. But what about in Saskatchewan? We're full of CWD, so why are we lacking in looking after our wildlife in our province? Well it's no wonder when everything looks at a green strategy, and the resource management is left alone. That's why problems like CWD have thrived in this province.

Here's another problem that's linking with the province of Saskatchewan and CWD, is the amount of illegal horns going out of the province and you hear this from COs all over, that we don't have the control. We don't have the manpower to control the amount of illegal horns going across the border, especially into the United States.

Well here's an option that they could look at and it ties with CWD and I've talked to the wildlife federation many times. I've talked to the president and directors of the wildlife federation regards to this, to talk to the government and try and come up with a consensus that would eliminate CWD in this province and also curb the problem with illegal horns. And here's an idea that may work and I hope the minister is listening.

We have a problem with CWD. The amount of illegal horns going across the province is growing. If the minister would look at every head, every animal head, that wants to be transported back out of the province of Saskatchewan — whether it's going to Manitoba, whether it's going to Alberta, or going to the United States which the most of the heads go because of outfitting — they could put a stipulation that all the heads going out are tested for CWD. Then they have control, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of somewhat of our problem, also can control the legal sale of horns coming out of the province.

It's fair to everybody. Doesn't matter what race you are because every horn going out of this province has to be tested. Then the ones that are legal are not going to go for a test because they're legal horns anyway. This is one way the COs said could curb our problem with illegal horns. You could help the COs with their problem of legal hunting. It could help with the problem of illegal trafficking. It would also help with the problem that we have with our CWD.

It's just one suggestion that I have in regards to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The minister can take it for what it's worth but I know the wildlife federation has talked to me about it and they've agreed that it's a great idea. It's at least a step forward because, in regards to CWD right now, there is very little going on with this present government in controlling the resource management of our province. And the COs will come out first and forefront in regards to that.

Another problem that I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's regarding with COs . . . I'm going to have to have a drink, my voice is starting to go. Thank God for tea, works great. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The problems that COs are having is . . . and that's in regard to last year when we had a problem in the Spiritwood-Shellbrook area, and that was predator problems. We had a huge problem with wolves, coyotes, and cougars — and I'm speaking two-legged cougars, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . or four-legged cougars, not two-legged cougars.

Anyway in regarding to predator problems, the government of the day and the COs in the area and the minister said that we are going to deal with the wolf problem. But they're not going to deal with the cougar problem, and we have many problems regarding cougars. But the COs at that time . . . And at the meetings we had, the COs that were there were not translating the information from that area to Regina where the minister could look at and deal with it.

And I do want to take this time to applaud the minister and his staff here for dealing with the problem. Even though it took a long time to come, he dealt with the problem, and it's working. It's working great, but it took a long time for it to get from my area to Regina. And why is that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? It's because the COs were not working with their counterparts to pass on the information to Regina where they can make the adjustments in the rules and the procedures.

Sometimes COs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, take it under the jurisdiction that the wildlife is theirs, that they don't need changes. We'll look after it. Well that's not right. There was a huge problem with the predator problem, and if it wasn't for the public outcry in that area and the meetings that we had that the minister finally came to the meetings, sat down with us and realized there was a problem, and through some of his deputy ministers realized the problem and made the significant changes that were needed to solve this problem.

Just in regards to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker — the minister I know is listening — there was a demonstration in late January, February to deal with the predator problems, especially with wolf and the trapping of wolves. There was nothing there regarding the cougars, but especially in the wolves and the coyotes where they had a demonstration. The COs were there. They promoted this. And it was very, very good to have that there because when these trapping demonstrations went on, people learned how to look after the predator problem somewhat on their own by learning how to trap the wolves and the coyotes and whatever have you.

The question that some of the people from the area made mention was the fact that timing may be wrong. Yes, let's have another demonstration. Let's do it again this fall; especially in the fall because the trapping season, even though it's started, is not a prime time for trapping wolves. November, December is a proper time for trapping wolves.

And if the minister would change his procedures a little bit to allow the demonstrations to go on in before Christmas and not after Christmas when a lot of farmers are dealing with their animals, with calving time, and also they're also out there trapping, other than that the meeting or the demonstration meeting was very, very good, and hats off to the minister and the COs in his department for doing that. It was mentioned that it was a very good thing and I wanted to pass that on to the minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Act that is before us, I made mention about the 200 COs that were taken away in — I believe it was year 2002 — and that time the then minister of Environment was the member from Athabasca. And I found it ironic at that time that the then minister would allow that to happen, especially in the North, right in his backyard, and still to date

from 2002 to 2007, we've seen no adjustment to those COs. In other words, there hasn't been an increase in COs. And I thought at that time, you know, over time we would've seen some improvements in that area. And I say to the minister, we need more COs. If the deputy COs are going to have the same empowerment as the COs, that is great, but we need more COs.

One point I want to make perfectly clear and that's in regards to the road that's being built from La Loche over to Fort McMurray. If and when that roads gets built, you're going to see a flood of Albertans coming across to Saskatchewan through that northern road to utilize their resource, especially in fishing, but also with hunting. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I mentioned before, there's only one CO in that area and that's at Buffalo Narrows. What can one member, what can one CO do in an area that big when you're going to have a flood of people coming across that border to Saskatchewan? The minister needs to address that problem, the sooner the better.

Now as long as the road's not being built, the problem's not going to be as . . . [inaudible] . . . as it is now, or it will be. But the point is that we need more COs in that area. If that needs to be addressed, it should be addressed. And if he needs more information regarding that, then talk to his own COs in that area. There are many COs from around the P.A. [Prince Albert] area that have told me this is going to be a huge, huge problem.

[16:30]

And regarding the 200 COs that was let go in 2002, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a gentleman from P.A. that wrote an email or sent an email, I should say, to my colleague, my seatmate. And he said in there, and he said, and I quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

I watched Yogi question the Gov't . . . [about] proposed changes A key point that he was making was that 200 CO had been let go, mostly rural and northern officers, were enforcement of various aspects of laws re Environment, wildlife, fishing and other resources WAS NOT a priority . . . [some] years ago. Maybe Al Gore will restore these CO positions!!

Mr. Speaker. I don't want to go down the road with Al Gore. But I do want to stress that there are people out there that watch this channel and see the comments made by opposition members regarding the lack of what this government is trying to do. And therefore they're voicing their opinion and they're sending emails and letters regarding this.

So in wrapping up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to the minister, we need more COs. We need more COs very soon, just like our police officers. And we need to further the Bill that's before us today regarding the deputy COs because that's a good thing. But we need more COs.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that there's some other people that would like to speak to this Bill. And at this time, I would like to adjourn debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — The hon. member for Rosthern-Shellbrook is moving adjournment of debate on Bill No. 52, The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?



**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — That is carried.

**Bill No. 59**

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hagel that **Bill No. 59 — The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 2007** be now read a second time.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Prebble):** — I recognize the hon. member for Arm River-Watrous.

**Mr. Brkich:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to get up to speak to this particular Bill on amendments to The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act.

Gaming has been, you know, very important to Saskatchewan. It's always been very contentious too. I can remember when the rules were changing and they were bringing gaming in through the '80s. I can remember the present Premier at the time raising quite a few comments and really condemning the present day government for bringing any form of gaming in.

And now gaming has become quite important to the present day government in revenues and also to the people of Saskatchewan, also the economies of Regina, Saskatoon, surrounding towns, and areas such as — new ones going up — Swift Current; another one, a new casino going up on the edge of my constituency. So gaming has grown quite substantially in the number of years through the '90s and probably will grow. I know that there's lots of interest in gaming especially with the new game Texas hold'em that seems to be tournaments . . . everybody holding tournaments. There's a huge, huge interest in gaming. So this is very important. So when they make amendments to this particular Act, you have to be . . . they should be very careful when they're doing it.

I noticed they're making amendments, moving this from a Treasury Board into CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan]. And under the Treasury Board I think that they . . . it was . . . be a little bit more transparent, it would be under CIC. I hope this government's moving cautious because you're dealing with gaming, and there has been some scandals in the past involved with gaming, that it should be as transparent as possible because it is a sensitive subject. It still is out in . . . throughout Saskatchewan. I mean, I still have people that come to me and say that, you know, that it should be scaled back; that there is, you know, problem gambling out there; a lot of money going out of communities, especially small communities with machines that are in the local establishments.

And I know that when I was on city . . . or town council years and years ago, there was . . . the government had sent out a particular questionnaire — that's when the first machines were coming in — of how to put the money back into the community. And I know one of the options was that they should get a share of . . . the town should get a share of the gaming — or a recreation board or whatever — because they did lose a lot of other avenues of gaming. One of them was bingos. Bingos were quite important throughout small towns. Kinsmen, Elks, lots of service clubs used to put them on. And with machines

coming in, they lost revenue with that.

And the government chose at that time not to give a share or portion back to the RMs [rural municipality] and towns and villages at that end of it. And I think that they should have at that time as they . . . especially if they've cut back the funding, whether it's your recreation facilities which a lot of town are suffering to keep open throughout Saskatchewan. You talk to any recreation board that's running a rink, a skating rink, a hall, a community centre, a senior centre, they're struggling with the bills that are out there. And I know that extra money from the gaming portion would have been quite helpful at that.

Dealing with this particular Act, moving it into CIC, I know this is only the second time this Bill has been up and I know that we're still looking at it and researching it and talking to people. But moving it to CIC, I don't know if that's such a great idea. The Treasury Board, I know that you had some avenues there. It was more transparent. Under the CIC it's going to give them a little more power. I know one of them is, you know, there could be some political overturns. The head office could be determined now by the provincial cabinet and more by CIC. And I believe that the Gaming Corporation is first of all now, before it puts its money in the Treasury Board, you have your audit, moves into general revenue. Now I think, the way I understand this particular Bill, the money from it is going to go through the Gaming and then from there, move to CIC and then moved into general revenue.

Now the question being asked is, is CIC going to take some administration money for it? How are they going to handle the money flow-through? Are they actually going to take some of the money out, or is it going to be a straight flow-through? Or are they going to say, well no, we have to, now that it's a CIC under us, that we have some extra people to hire; we're going to maybe do another audit; we're going to maybe take some more money out of it? So that's one of the questions and concerns that hasn't been answered yet on this particular Bill, on it.

With that there may be even less scrutiny. One, is it going to be able to come up in the legislature where you're going to be able to ask committee questions on it or be able to trace it? Because this is, like I said, an issue in the past has been contentious. And it is money and it's an industry that is growing, and there is quite a bit of money coming in. I'm not sure the last budget, I don't have right in front of me of what it was but I know it's quite a substantial part of the general revenue that's coming through at that end of it.

Also is, how much power is the CIC board going to be over the Gaming Corporation? Is it going to affect the way they pay out reimbursements for the board and the members and the committee board? Are they going to be making new board members? Is the government going to be appointing board members to it? Are they going to be appointing more of them? So there's quite a few unanswered questions on this, when this Bill or this particular is moved into CIC.

I mean, this is important. It's important to the First Nations end of it. That's always been an important part of their revenue coming in, the casinos that they run. The one casino that is being built at Whitecap, you know, is going to be quite extravagant. It's going to be an excellent casino.

That was my first constituency. That was in, before the border change is added. And I can remember sitting down with Chief Darcy Bear and him showing me the plans and laying them out. And, you know, he was quite proud of what they're building. And now that it's actually coming into force, you know, I'm looking forward for the grand opening and that end of it.

And also, the talk that he had of the money he wanted to use to help his people, you know, at that end of it, to provide jobs for them. And I think he did an excellent job, as I think all the other casinos have for providing work and job opportunities for First Nations at that end of it. So this is an, important amendments are being done. When you move this to CIC, you hope that FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] and SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.] are totally in favour of this if they've been consulted at that. Those are things that you want to be checking further down the line and that we'll be looking at, that there is no opposition.

But the main thing is you're dealing with this particular entity. You want to make sure it's transparent because if you've looked at other jurisdictions over the years, there has been trouble in gaming. A lot of scandals have been through because it can be quite contentious with money, so you want to make it as transparent as you can, that the public can scrutinize it, that the legislature can scrutinize it, that the money is going to the right places and being used for the right things for the benefit of the people.

And one of them I had mentioned was coming back to small towns throughout rural Saskatchewan. I don't think this government has did a good enough job in providing a share of that revenue because a lot of that money comes out of rural Saskatchewan, whether people driving in to gamble at Regina, Saskatoon — the casinos — or at the ones that are spread out in Yorkton, North Battleford, P.A. A lot of that money comes out of all of Saskatchewan and I think it comes out of all the communities, and I think there needs to be a little more money put back into them communities with the Gaming Corporation at that end of it — a responsibility.

Because like I mentioned before, a lot of the towns have lost gaming opportunities at that. They don't run as many break-open tickets. They don't do as many raffles because a lot of the people . . . Gambling, government gambling is so readily available whether it's VLTs [video lottery terminal] or your casinos or whatever. So a lot of that use is directed towards the government gambling rather than maybe the small town service clubs that used to do a lot of little things that helped to raise money for their, like I say, their rinks or all the little functions that they used to help the towns a lot in that area. I know that service clubs, that was one of their main focuses or main ways of making money was small gambling . . . [inaudible] . . . and they've said it's dropped off quite substantially over the number of years.

But back to the amendments, and I think this is pretty well the main amendment I can understand with this particular Bill is moving it into CIC. And there's a lot of questions that should be asked with that. And I think some more research to be done on this particular Bill. So with that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will move that we adjourn debate on this particular piece of legislation.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member has moved to adjourn debate on Bill 59, The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried.

### Bill No. 63

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hagel that **Bill No. 63 — The Royal Saskatchewan Museum Act** be now read a second time.]

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Recognize the member for Weyburn-Big Muddy.

**Mr. Duncan:** — Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I'm very pleased to be able to rise in the Assembly to speak on Bill 63, An Act respecting the Royal Saskatchewan Museum. And, Madam Deputy Speaker, when I first had a look at this Bill when it was introduced by the Minister for Culture, Youth and Recreation, I was struck by the fact that after over 100 years, 101 years that the Royal Saskatchewan Museum didn't have its own Act. And so I think it's good to finally to see that after a century in our province, serving our province it finally has its own Act recognizing and noting its importance, and not only that but setting out the policies under which it will operate.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it's interesting to note the Royal Saskatchewan Museum is actually, it was the first museum not only in the province of Saskatchewan but in fact in all three of the Prairie provinces. While it was formed in 1906 it actually goes back to December 1905 when a boulder — a large boulder that had a carved face on it — was actually donated to the province of Saskatchewan. And that's how the museum started, by that one single donation. In 1906, as I said, it was formed to, quote "secure and preserve natural history specimens and objects of historical ethnological interest."

And I think that as anybody in the province of, certainly of my age, I recall that my first trip to the Royal Saskatchewan Museum was a part of a school trip. In fact, Madam Deputy Speaker, I've said I think a time or two in the House I've mentioned my first visit to the legislature was part of a school trip. And also it was in fact that very same day where the students of Halbrite School visited after . . . I can't quite remember that far back but it was either before or after visiting the legislature that we went to the Royal Saskatchewan Museum.

And I would just say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that was always important for our principal, the late Doug Becker, who made sure that the students of Halbrite School came into Regina once a year and that we toured the tourism opportunities in the city of Regina in the provincial capital and he always made sure that the Royal Saskatchewan Museum was on that trip.

[16:45]

Madam Deputy Speaker, just getting back to a bit of the history. I do want to mention that for more information I think it's

important that people know about the resources for our tourism sites in the province. Royal Saskatchewan Museum, like most organizations, have a website and I would just like to say that for more information people can go to royalsaskmuseum.ca and find out what our, what Royal Saskatchewan Museum has to offer for the people of this province and for people outside the province that are interested in coming to Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan, our province, is rich in heritage and heritage opportunities and historical tourism. And as noted by the Minister for Culture, Youth and Recreation the day that he introduced this Bill and I just would quote from his news release:

The Royal Saskatchewan Museum contributes to the province's heritage, education, scientific knowledge and tourism and is an important asset and institution for the Government of Saskatchewan.

And if I would just add to that with . . . I don't mean a criticism of the minister for leaving it out but I think it's not only an important asset and institution for the Government of Saskatchewan but I think also for the people of Saskatchewan. And I think that it's important to recognize that we have incredible opportunities in tourism and historical tourism opportunities.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it's important — and I welcome the Bill that the government has put forward — especially the government's recognition of the importance of involving First Nations and the First Nations cultural community in working with the museum to establish policies in regards to sacred and culturally significant and sensitive artifacts that are part of the museum's collection or that will in the future become a part of the museum's collection. And I think that the government certainly needs to be commended for putting it into the legislation, not just putting it into the regulations that would follow or to the policies that the museum will follow or do follow currently, but to enshrine it into the legislation that will become the law once this Bill passes.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think at this point I would think that's all the comments that I would offer, but just to close I would just want to congratulate and commend the management and the staff of the Royal Saskatchewan Museum on all the good work that they do. And at this point I would move to adjourn the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member for Weyburn-Big Muddy has moved to adjourn debate on Bill No. 63, item no. 20, The Royal Saskatchewan Museum Act. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hagel:** — Madam Deputy Speaker, in order to accommodate the good work of the standing committees on the Economy as well as Crown and Central Agencies, I move this House do now adjourn.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Carried. This House does now stand adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.

[The Assembly adjourned at 16:50.]

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

Toth .....	1443
McMorris .....	1443
Hermanson .....	1443
Harpauer .....	1443
Eagles .....	1443
Weekes .....	1443
Huyghebaert .....	1443
Allchurch .....	1444
Kirsch .....	1444
Brkich .....	1444
Morgan .....	1444

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel .....	1444
---	------

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Addley .....	1444
Wall .....	1445
Wartman .....	1445

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Outstanding Organic Farmer of the Year</b>	
Borgerson .....	1445
<b>Snowbirds Acceptance Air Show</b>	
Huyghebaert .....	1445
<b>Umoja Performance</b>	
Hamilton .....	1446
<b>Promoting Heritage, Culture, and Recreation</b>	
Toth .....	1446
<b>Celebration of Physical Therapy Education</b>	
Taylor .....	1446
<b>Sigma Polling</b>	
D'Autremont .....	1446
<b>Climate Change</b>	
Prebble .....	1447

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>Response of Caucus to Misappropriation of Funds</b>	
Krawetz .....	1447
Hagel .....	1447

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Iwanchuk .....	1452
----------------	------

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

<b>Return No. 21</b>	
Iwanchuk .....	1452

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

<b>Bill No. 44 — The Class Actions Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi sur les recours collectifs</b>	
Morgan .....	1452
Quennell (referral to committee) .....	1453
<b>Bill No. 49 — The Mortgage Brokerages and Mortgage Administrators Act</b>	
Morgan .....	1453
Quennell (referral to committee) .....	1453
<b>Bill No. 50 — The Municipal Employees' Pension Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Cheveldayoff .....	1453
Thomson (referral to committee) .....	1454
<b>Bill No. 51 — The Public Employees Pension Plan Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Cheveldayoff .....	1454
Thomson (referral to committee) .....	1455
<b>Bill No. 56 — The Municipalities Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Huyghebaert .....	1455
Van Mulligen (referral to committee) .....	1455

<b>Bill No. 57 — The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Huyghebaert .....	1456
Van Mulligen (referral to committee) .....	1456
<b>Bill No. 58 — The Municipal Revenue Sharing Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Huyghebaert .....	1456
Van Mulligen (referral to committee) .....	1457
<b>Bill No. 60 — The Revenue and Financial Services Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Cheveldayoff .....	1457
Thomson (referral to committee) .....	1458
<b>Bill No. 61 — The Vital Statistics Act, 2007</b>	
McMorris .....	1458
Taylor (referral to committee) .....	1459
<b>Bill No. 62 — The Vital Statistics Consequential Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
<b>Loi de 2007 portant modifications corrélatives à la loi intitulée The Vital Statistics Act, 2007</b>	
McMorris .....	1459
Taylor (referral to committee) .....	1459
<b>Bill No. 64 — The Graduate Tax Exemption Act</b>	
Cheveldayoff .....	1459
Thomson (referral to committee) .....	1460
<b>Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Cheveldayoff .....	1461
Thomson (referral to committee) .....	1461
<b>Bill No. 53 — The Miscellaneous Environment Statutes (Inspections and Investigations) Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Weekes .....	1461
<b>Bill No. 31 — The Regional Health Services Amendment Act, 2006 (No. 2)</b>	
Elhard .....	1462
<b>Bill No. 37 — The Court of Appeal Amendment Act, 2006</b>	
<b>Loi de 2006 modifiant la Loi de 2000 sur la Cour d'appel</b>	
McMorris .....	1464
<b>Bill No. 43 — The Payday Loans Act</b>	
Hart .....	1465
<b>Bill No. 46 — The Crown Minerals Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
D'Autremont .....	1466
<b>Bill No. 48 — The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
D'Autremont .....	1467
<b>Bill No. 45 — The Agricultural Societies Repeal Act</b>	
Toth .....	1467
<b>Bill No. 52 — The Wildlife Amendment Act, 2007/Loi de 2007 modifiant la Loi de 1998 sur la faune</b>	
Allchurch .....	1470
<b>Bill No. 59 — The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 2007</b>	
Brkich .....	1473
<b>Bill No. 63 — The Royal Saskatchewan Museum Act</b>	
Duncan .....	1474

# 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