



THIRD SESSION - TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

(HANSARD)

Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Don Toth  
Speaker



**MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

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

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>	<b>Constituency</b>
Allchurch, Denis	SP	Rosthern-Shellbrook
Atkinson, Pat	NDP	Saskatoon Nutana
Belanger, Buckley	NDP	Athabasca
Bjornerud, Hon. Bob	SP	Melville-Saltcoats
Boyd, Hon. Bill	SP	Kindersley
Bradshaw, Fred	SP	Carrot River Valley
Brkich, Greg	SP	Arm River-Watrous
Brotten, Cam	NDP	Saskatoon Massey Place
Chartier, Danielle	NDP	Saskatoon Riversdale
Cheveldayoff, Hon. Ken	SP	Saskatoon Silver Springs
Chisholm, Michael	SP	Cut Knife-Turtleford
D'Autremont, Dan	SP	Cannington
Draude, Hon. June	SP	Kelvington-Wadena
Duncan, Hon. Dustin	SP	Weyburn-Big Muddy
Eagles, Doreen	SP	Estevan
Elhard, Wayne	SP	Cypress Hills
Forbes, David	NDP	Saskatoon Centre
Furber, Darcy	NDP	Prince Albert Northcote
Gantfoer, Hon. Rod	SP	Melfort
Harpauer, Hon. Donna	SP	Humboldt
Harper, Ron	NDP	Regina Northeast
Harrison, Hon. Jeremy	SP	Meadow Lake
Hart, Glen	SP	Last Mountain-Touchwood
Heppner, Hon. Nancy	SP	Martensville
Hickie, Darryl	SP	Prince Albert Carlton
Higgins, Deb	NDP	Moose Jaw Wakamow
Hutchinson, Hon. Bill	SP	Regina South
Huyghebaert, Hon. D.F. (Yogi)	SP	Wood River
Iwanchuk, Andy	NDP	Saskatoon Fairview
Junor, Judy	NDP	Saskatoon Eastview
Kirsch, Delbert	SP	Batoche
Krawetz, Hon. Ken	SP	Canora-Pelly
LeClerc, Serge	SP	Saskatoon Northwest
Lingenfelter, Dwain	NDP	Regina Douglas Park
McCall, Warren	NDP	Regina Elphinstone-Centre
McMillan, Tim	SP	Lloydminster
McMorris, Hon. Don	SP	Indian Head-Milestone
Michelson, Warren	SP	Moose Jaw North
Morgan, Hon. Don	SP	Saskatoon Southeast
Morin, Sandra	NDP	Regina Walsh Acres
Nilson, John	NDP	Regina Lakeview
Norris, Hon. Rob	SP	Saskatoon Greystone
Ottenbreit, Greg	SP	Yorkton
Quennell, Frank	NDP	Saskatoon Meewasin
Reiter, Hon. Jim	SP	Rosetown-Elrose
Ross, Laura	SP	Regina Qu'Appelle Valley
Schriemer, Joceline	SP	Saskatoon Sutherland
Stewart, Lyle	SP	Thunder Creek
Taylor, Len	NDP	The Battlefords
Tell, Hon. Christine	SP	Regina Wascana Plains
Toth, Hon. Don	SP	Moosomin
Trew, Kim	NDP	Regina Coronation Park
Vermette, Doyle	NDP	Cumberland
Wall, Hon. Brad	SP	Swift Current
Weekes, Randy	SP	Biggar
Wilson, Nadine	SP	Saskatchewan Rivers
Wotherspoon, Trent	NDP	Regina Rosemont
Yates, Kevin	NDP	Regina Dewdney

[The Assembly met at 13:30.]

[Prayers]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

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

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce some individuals seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are the Intercultural Grandmothers Uniting, which is a nationally recognized network of grandmothers of many cultures whose purpose is to build bridges of understanding, respect, trust, and friendship among races and generations.

We have with us today June Mitchell, no stranger to this legislature — her mother was one of the pioneering female MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly] in this Assembly. Veteran Florence Wuttunee, if you could please give us a wave, Florence. We have Carole Taylor. We have Sadie Jimmy; good to see you, kohkom. We have Phyllis Kretschmer, the Chair of the Intercultural Grandmothers. Hello, Phyllis. We have Helen Linton; we have Liz Cooper, past Saskatchewan award of merit winner and notable educator. We have Ellen Gillies, Ida Grosse, Mary Saso, and we're particularly honoured to have Reona and Sheila Brass with us. Reona is the daughter and Sheila is the widow of the late Dr. Oliver Brass who was at one time the president of Saskatchewan Indian Federated College.

Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in welcoming these kohkoms to their legislature.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Silver Springs, the Minister Responsible for Enterprise.

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce a guest seated in your gallery who has come to watch the proceedings today. Virginia Fletcher has made the trip to Regina from Swift Current and, Virginia, if you wouldn't mind just standing up. Virginia is the general manager for SaskEnergy southwest area which includes Swift Current, Moose Jaw, Kindersley. Next month Virginia will be celebrating 31 years of service to SaskEnergy and, before that, SaskPower. Virginia has worked at a number of positions throughout the company and became the first woman general manager at SaskEnergy.

As members will know, her hometown of Swift Current will be hosting the 2010 Ford World Women's Curling Championships on March 20th to 28th, Mr. Speaker. Many SaskEnergy employees are volunteering their time to make this event a success, as SaskEnergy is the champion of volunteers. Virginia will be representing the corporation, giving a keynote address to many special volunteer appreciation events.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask all members to join me in welcoming Virginia to her legislature and thanking her for the excellent work that she's done for SaskEnergy and the people of the province.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly two members of the Regina Catholic School Board who are with us here today in your gallery. We have Donna Ziegler, the Vice-Chair of the school board, as well as Jerry Adams who are with us here today. And we know they do the heavy lifting in keeping our schools organized, the separate schools in the city. I want to welcome them here, and look forward to meeting you later.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce two guests seated in the east gallery. Mr. Speaker, we have Brian Pastuch, who is the membership development representative for IBEW [International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers] Local 2038 based out of Saskatoon. Welcome Brian.

And seated right next to Brian is a long-time friend of mine — and a friend of many us in this Assembly — Gunnar Passmore, who heads up the political action group for the Saskatchewan buildings trades. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members to welcome both of these guests to the Assembly.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to all members of the Assembly I would like to introduce a group of student representatives from the First Nations University of Canada who are seated in your gallery. With us today, Mr. Speaker, is Diane Adams, president of the First Nations student association. We also have Thomas Benjoe, vice-president of finance. We also have a number of other representatives: Shannon McNabb, Katelyn Ironstar, Angie Ironstar, Robert Whitehead, as well Desarae Eashappie.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals have come here as they continue their important work for an institution they care about and love very deeply, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask all members in this Assembly to join me in welcoming them to their Assembly.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Saskatoon Greystone, the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you I would like to join the members opposite in welcoming President Diane Adams and the other students at First Nations University of Canada. Certainly we're working diligently on this side of the aisle to ensure that these students and their academic futures remain promising.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all members to welcome these students to their Assembly.

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

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave for an extended introduction.

**The Speaker:** — Pardon me. Sorry about that. My apologies. I got caught. The member from Regina Walsh Acres has asked for leave for extended greeting. Is leave granted?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you someone who is a very familiar face to the Assembly. His name is Tory McGregor and he's seated in the east gallery. He's a gentleman who's 30 years old and has frequented the Legislative Assembly often with us, sitting through speeches that many of us wish sometimes that we didn't have to listen to. But he's been very diligent and interested in the political process that takes place here in Saskatchewan.

He was born and raised in Yorkton, Mr. Speaker, and attended of course the local schools in the province, Yorkton Regional High School. He attended the University of Regina and obtained an economics degree. He's been with the Armed Forces for nine and a half years and served with the Royal Canadian Artillery.

Now up until this past month, Mr. McGregor was the Deputy Leader of the Green Party of Saskatchewan and is currently a candidate in the NDP [New Democratic Party] nomination race in Regina Coronation Park. He's very active in community eco-groups and involved in environmental advocacy and activism. And it's very nice to have him with us here in the legislature as often as he is, and I'm sure he looks forward to someday sitting on the floor of the legislature and not just observing from the gallery. So I'd ask all members of the legislature to please welcome him to the Legislative Assembly today.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I just would like to extend a welcome to our guests as well and just to let our guests know that while their presence in the galleries is appreciated and the opportunity to come to the Assembly, we ask you not to participate in any of the debate in any form, as we move on from here. Thank you very much.

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to have the duty to present a petition in support of First Nations

University of Canada. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to recognize the importance of the First Nations University of Canada, to restore the funding to that institution, and to call upon their federal counterparts to also restore funding to the First Nations University of Canada.

This petition is signed by individuals from the city of Regina, and from Balcarres, Mr. Speaker, and I proudly present.

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

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of concerned citizens of Saskatchewan who are concerned about the safety of our highways across this great province, in particular Highway 310. 310 Highway, according to this petition, has deteriorated significantly and is in a condition now where it is a potential safety hazard for the residents who have to travel on that highway each and every day. And the prayer, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the Sask Party government to commit to providing the repairs to Highway No. 310 that the people of Saskatchewan need.

And in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by the good folks from Regina and Ituna, Saskatchewan. I so submit.

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

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce a petition that was started by the Saskatchewan Student Coalition. Said petition is regarding the implementation of the Saskatchewan scholarship fund, the same fund that was promised by the Sask Party in the last general election. The petition reads, the prayer reads, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to implement the promised Saskatchewan scholarship fund.

These petitioners are from Regina and Saskatoon. It's my honour to submit them.

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

**Ms. Junor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a portion of the over 20,000 petitions that were delivered to me yesterday in the legislature representing citizens deeply concerned about the possible cuts to chiropractic care funding in the upcoming budget. And this is a new form of the petition,

so I'm going to read the whole thing.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Order. It's been a long-standing tradition that we give maybe a general comment about the petition and then move into the prayer. And I'd ask the member to do that. The member from Saskatoon Eastview.

**Ms. Junor:** — Yes, it's just reworded the way we usually hear it. So this is about the possible elimination of government funding for chiropractic services. And we, in the prayer that reads as follows:

... respectively request that the Government of Saskatchewan honour the agreement negotiated between the Ministry of Health and the Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan.

Now the signatures today, Mr. Speaker, I went through all of these, which are about — I divided the pile into fifths — so this is about 4,000 signatures. So I went through them and wrote out the towns that they were from. So I'm going to say the signatures on these petitions are from Crooked River, Rose Valley, Conquest, Francis, Tribune, Kyle, Swift Current, Waldeck, Herbert, Lafleche, Success, Neville, Shaunavon, Admiral, St-Denis, Spring Valley, Wynyard, Elrose, Krydor, Kelliher, Bethune, Stornoway, Wroxton, Pelly, Birch River, Okla, Togo, St. Louis, Paddockwood, MacNutt, Bellevue, La Loche, Air Ronge, Cudworth, Cochin, Meota, St. Walburg, Glaslyn, Maymont, Battleford, Medstead, Paynton, Leoville, Mayfair, Rabbit Lake, Loon Lake, Weirdale, Canwood, Henribourg, Mervin, Plenty, Bjorkdale, Abbey, Webb, Tribune, Creelman, Trossachs, Scott, Big River, St. Gregor, Kenaston, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Clavet, Martensville, Warman, Dundurn, Milden, Radisson, Ituna, Outlook, Delisle, Punnichy, Macrorie, Hudson Bay, Wiseton, Perdue, Asquith, Borden, Grandora, Osler, Langham, Young, Dalmeny, Melfort, Nipawin, Annaheim, Tway, Kelvington, Weldon, Unity, Wilkie, Naicam, Pleasantdale, Carrot River, St. Brieux, Star City, Cudworth, Kenaston, Aberdeen, Viscount, Rosthern, Waldheim, Hafford, Prud'homme, St. Benedict, Biggar, Clavet, Lake Lenore, Waterhen Lake, Christopher Lake, Blaine Lake, La Loche, Meadow Lake, Goodsoil, Rapid View, Speers, Kindersley, Hepburn, Turtleford, Stoughton, Ceylon, Senlac, Moose Jaw, Radville, Weyburn, Arcola, Gull Lake, Canora, Sturgis, Yorkton, Melville, Norquay, LeRoy, Invermay, Endeavour, Preeceville, Pilot Butte, Bredenbury, Buchanan, Springside, Canora, Rama, Manor, Churchbridge, Calder, Willowbrook, Kuroki, Ituna, Theodore, Estevan, Kenosee Lake, Langenburg, White City, Bienfait, North Portal, Macoun, Frobisher, Bromhead, Beaubier, Alameda, Oxbow, Gainsborough, Carievale, Pangman, Meath Park, Shellbrook, Spalding, Quill Lake, Humboldt, Spruce Home, White Fox, Macdowall, Birch Hills, Muskoday, Hoey, Domremy, Holbein, Shell Lake, Leask, Simmie, Val Marie, Cabri, Raymore, Rocanville, Kipling, Aylsham, Fort Qu'Appelle, Beatty, Eyebrow, Holdfast, Southey, Dilke, Tuxford, Fife Lake, Shamrock, Hazenmore, Hallonquist, Rush Lake, Ernfold, Frontier, Orkney, Main Centre.

I'm sorry if I missed any. It was a fairly onerous job going through them, and I'm sorry if I mispronounced any. I worked at the post office. I think I did a pretty good job. I so present, Mr. Speaker.

[13:45]

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am honoured to present a petition in support of the middle school for Warman. The petition indicates that the school presently was built for 350 to 400 students and there are now 700 students enrolled in that middle school. I understand from the petition that over 70 more students are expected to be enrolled in school in Warman in the fall of 2010 and that Warman is a fast growing town, and they soon expect it to be a city. So the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to recognize the urgency of a middle school for the fast growing community of Warman.

As in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, all of these petitioners are from Warman.

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

**Mr. Forbes:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition in support of affordable housing for Saskatchewan's seniors. And we know that living costs including housing is having a major impact on Saskatchewan senior citizens and that more affordable housing options would significantly help these seniors cope with the cost of living here in this province, especially those on fixed incomes. I'd like to read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to act as quickly as possible to expand affordable housing options for Saskatchewan's seniors.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from the good city of Saskatoon. Thank you very much.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Cumberland.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise today to present a petition in support of a new long-term care facility in La Ronge. With a waiting list of almost one full year for our seniors to have to wait to get in there, I'd like to read the prayer as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately invest in the planning and construction of new long-term care beds in La Ronge.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

It is signed by the good people of La Ronge and area. I so present.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand today to present a petition that has been circulated by the Saskatchewan Student Coalition, a petition in support of affordable undergraduate tuition and a request that the Sask Party government's actions match its rhetoric. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to implement a long-term tuition management strategy in which tuition is increased by an average of 2 per cent or the most recent increase to the consumer price index.

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

Mr. Speaker, I so present.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Prince Albert Northcote.

**Mr. Furber:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition being circulated by the Saskatchewan Student Coalition. The petition is in support of students that are paying the highest amount of interest on fixed-rate loans in Canada at prime plus 2.5 per cent. And the petition reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately reduce the interest on fixed-rate student loans to the prime rate of borrowing so that students can accumulate less debt and focus their finances on building their lives here in Saskatchewan.

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

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by the good folks from Saskatoon. I so present.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Regina Walsh Acres.

**Ms. Morin:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand and present a petition, a petition on behalf of rural residents of Saskatchewan dealing with yet another water issue. In this situation, a government ministry has directed that customers may no longer treat non-potable water using methods approved by Sask Health and that Furdale residents dealing in good faith with SaskWater for over 30 years have paid large amounts for their domestic systems and in-home treatment equipment. The alternative water supply referred to by the government ministry is a private operator offering treated, non-pressurized water at great cost with no guarantee of quality, quantity, or availability of water. And the prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to withdraw its order to cut off non-potable water to residents of the hamlet of Furdale causing great hardship with no suitable alternatives, to exempt the hamlet of Furdale from further water service

cut-offs by granting a grandfather clause under *The Environment Management and Protection Act, 2002* and *The Water Regulations, 2002*, and that this government fulfills its promises to rural Saskatchewan.

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

Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by the good residents of Furdale and Saskatoon. I so present.

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

**Mr. Taylor:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased today to rise to present a petition in support of eliminating poverty in Saskatchewan. The petitioners note that freedom from poverty is an enshrined human right by the United Nations and that all citizens are entitled to social and economic security. Mr. Speaker, the petitioners call upon the Legislative Assembly to:

... cause the government to act as quickly as possible to develop an effective and sustainable poverty elimination strategy for the benefit of all Saskatchewan residents.

Mr. Speaker, the petition has been circulated by the Saskatoon Anti-Poverty Coalition and signed by residents of the city of North Battleford and the town of Battleford.

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

**Mr. Quennell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again to present a petition signed by residents of Saskatchewan concerned about this government's disregard for legal and constitutional rights. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to direct marriage commissioners to uphold the law and the equality rights of all Saskatchewan couples, and to withdraw the reference to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal that would allow marriage commissioners to opt out of their legal obligation to provide all couples with civil marriage services.

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

The petition today is signed by residents of Swift Current, Val Marie, and Saskatoon. And I so present.

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

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise today, as I have every day throughout session, to present petitions on behalf of concerned residents from across Saskatchewan as it relates to the unprecedented mismanagement of their finances by the Sask Party. They allude to the shameful \$1 billion deficit . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I would ask the member to move to the prayer of the petition. I recognize the member from Regina Rosemont.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — With reference to the shameful deficit, the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the Sask Party government to start managing our provincial finances responsibly and prudently to ensure that it does not continue its trend of massive budgetary shortfalls, runaway and unsustainable spending, equity stripping from our Crowns, and irresponsible revenue setting.

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

These petitions are signed by concerned residents of Saskatoon, Swift Current, and Eyebrow. I so present.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition in support of the expansion of the graduate retention program. This petition is about fairness and about ensuring we maintain the best and the brightest graduating from our universities here in Saskatchewan. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable Legislative Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately expand the graduate retention program to include master's and Ph.D. graduates.

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

Thank you. I so present.

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel:** — According to order a certain petition regarding the management of provincial finances presented on March 16th, 2010 has been reviewed and pursuant to rule 16(4) is found to be irregular and therefore cannot be read and received.

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Saskatchewan Rivers.

#### Saskatchewan Tourism Awards of Excellence

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This past Monday evening, Tourism Saskatchewan presented awards to outstanding contributors to our Saskatchewan tourism industry at their Awards of Excellence gala in Saskatoon. Awards were presented in 18 categories.

The Rookie of the Year Award went to Chief Whitecap Trail, the newly named tourism corridor on Highway 219. Awards for excellence in service were presented to Debbie Aldous-Ibbotson of Tourism Saskatoon and to Tourism Moose Jaw. Awards for promotion and marketing went to Shearwater Cruises of Saskatoon, the Moose Mountain Tourism Association, the

Western Development Museum, the Yorkton Film Festival, and Auto Clearing Motor Speedway's NASCAR [National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing] race event.

A travel journalism award was won by D. Grant Black for his book *The Saskatchewan Book of Musts*, 101 places everyone must see, and the Creative Excellence Award by Suzanne Paschall of Saskatoon for her musical accomplishments and her recent book *The Birth of a Boom: Lives and Legacies of Saskatchewan Entrepreneurs*.

There were two awards to businesses of the year. The one for the business with fewer than 50 employees was the Cypress Hills Vineyard and Winery. The one for over 50 employees was Prairieland Park of Saskatoon. Other award recipients were Claude-Jean Harel, the Redberry Lake Biosphere Reserve, and Canoeski Discovery Company. Congratulations to all.

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

#### Canadian Red Cross Month

**Ms. Junor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. March is Canadian Red Cross Month. Saskatchewan has a unique history connected to the Red Cross. Dr. George Sterling Ryerson, a regimental surgeon of the Royal Grenadiers, created a British chapter during the 1885 Northwest Rebellion in what would eventually become Saskatchewan.

To protect wagons carrying medical supplies, he sewed two pieces of red fabric into the shape of a cross on a white piece of fabric, creating one of the first Red Cross flags seen in Canada. In 1915 Saskatchewan registered nurse and school teacher Miss Jean Browne organized the first official Junior Red Cross charter in the world at Northgate, Saskatchewan. Approximately 400 children assisted adult members during the Great War effort.

Today the Red Cross works with governments and humanitarian organizations to provide rapid, large-scale, and cost-effective community-relevant programs. The Canadian Red Cross assists vulnerable communities nationally and internationally in cases of natural disasters, debilitating health issues, and war. The organization's support is based on volunteers and donated dollars.

The Red Cross has a strong presence in Iraq and Afghanistan and has responded to the horrific earthquakes in Haiti and Chile in a matter of hours. Locally it provides extensive education and first aid and CPR [cardiopulmonary resuscitation], and for 60 years has been involved in swimming and water safety programs.

I ask all members to join with me in commending both the Saskatchewan and the Canadian Red Cross for the wonderful work that they do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Lloydminster.

#### Saskatchewan's Economy

**Mr. McMillan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the great

honour to rise in the Assembly and share more good news about Saskatchewan's economy. It seems like a daily occurrence that members can stand and bring forward new examples of our province leading the country. I know that it pains the opposition to hear good news about our province, but please bear with me.

According to StatsCan, Saskatchewan's wholesale sales registered an amazing 18.4 per cent increase, the highest in the nation. This growth is attributed to a diverse sector which includes agricultural supplies, recyclable materials, and wholesale distributors, just to name a few.

StatsCan has yet to create a category for the production of hot air and doom and gloom. But, Mr. Speaker, if it did, I'm sure that there would have been a rise since spring of 2009 from the NDP caucus office. But I digress.

More good news is a wonderful thing for our province, Mr. Speaker. The new numbers show that this is the largest rise in wholesale sales in the province of Saskatchewan since July of 1993. Back in 1993, the singer Meat Loaf would do anything for love, but today he won't vote for that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Saskatchewan Tourism Awards of Excellence

**Ms. Chartier:** — Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of attending the 21st annual Saskatchewan Tourism Awards of Excellence on Monday. These awards offer an opportunity for all of us to celebrate our province's shining stars in the tourism industry — entrepreneurs, employees, volunteers, and businesses that set the bar just a bit higher.

Although it is certainly an honour to be nominated, I would like to especially recognize the winners of the tourism awards: Cypress Hills Vineyard and Winery, with whom I had the pleasure of sitting that night; Prairieland Park, Gabriel Dumont Institute publishing department, Suzanne Paschall, Claude-Jean Harel and Great Excursions, Shearwater River Cruises; the Western Development Museum in Moose Jaw, North Battleford, Saskatoon, and Yorkton; Moose Mountain Tourism Association, Yorkton Film Festival, Auto Clearing Motor Speedway's NASCAR; Canadian Tire series, Chief Whitecap Trail, Tourism Moose Jaw, Debbie Aldous-Ibbotson, CanoeSki Discovery Company, D. Grant Black, Jim Yuel and Adventure Destinations International, and Janet Olsen.

[14:00]

One organization in particular deserves extra accolades. The Redberry Lake Biosphere Reserve received the Land of the Living Skies Award for its innovative efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of its operations. But unfortunately it sounds like the Sask Party government has cut its funding. Recognized for its good work by its peers, this organization certainly deserves proper provincial funding.

I ask all members to join with me in congratulating the winners of the 2010 Saskatchewan Tourism Awards of Excellence.

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

#### North Saskatoon Business Awards

**Mr. LeClerc:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I have the pleasure to rise and congratulate all the winners of the North Saskatoon Business Awards. Last night's evening event was a program meant to honour our own.

Mr. Speaker, the awards handed out were as following: Credit Union Centre won the Management Quality Award; Horizon, the New Direction Award; Regency Advisory Corporation, the Job Creation Award; Pronto Airways LP won the Team Building Award; Reed Security, the Small Business Award; PSI Technologies Inc., the Export Award; Saskatoon Custom Powder Coating Corporation, the Green Award.

The Leadership Award went to Handy Group of Companies. Travelodge Hotel Saskatoon won the Safe Employer Award. The Member of the Year was Bryan McCrea and the Business Builder Award went to North Ridge Development.

Mr. Speaker, the highlight of the evening was a presentation of a Lifetime Achievement Award to Shirley Ryan. Mrs. Ryan was the NSBA's [North Saskatoon Business Association] long-time executive director who started her career with the organization in 1990 and retired at the end of 2009. Because of hard work and dedication from great people like Mrs. Ryan, Saskatoon is becoming recognized as one of the top places in Canada to do business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all of the award finalists and the biggest winners of all — the people of Saskatchewan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Prince Albert Northcote.

#### St. Patrick's Day Luck

**Mr. Furber:** — Today is the day everybody wishes for a bit of the luck of the Irish. The Finance minister's been a little short of the green so he's looking over a four-by-four leaf clover to solve his budget problems. That's bad luck for ordinary people, Mr. Speaker. But for the very few that are friends with the Saskatchewan Party, the favours are flowing like a swift current of green beer on St. Paddy's Day.

Take Corey O'Soup, Mr. Speaker. After his wearing of the green and yellow in the Riversdale by-election, he's found himself appointed superintendent in the Ministry of Education. Or Garnet Garven. He used his golden parachute to make a soft landing at a half-million dollar think tank of the Sask Party's creation. Or Doug Emsley. He must have a golden horseshoe somewhere because he's got a third of a million dollars just for reading a few extra emails.

Not everyone is so lucky, Mr. Speaker. Not front-line health care workers looking for fair treatment, not students worried about the future of their education, and certainly not Saskatchewan families being asked by the Saskatchewan Party to pay more and make do with less. But for friends of the Sask



Party, Mr. Speaker, there's always a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from Estevan.

### Rural Saskatchewan

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, today is St. Patrick's Day, a day where people dress up in green, and some people pretend that they are Irish even though they are not. However after St. Patrick's Day is over, those people resume their daily lives and no longer to pretend to be something that they aren't.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are some people in this province that continue to pretend to be something they are not. There are 20 people on the opposite side of this House that think they are friends to people in rural Saskatchewan. These people pretended for 16 years that they were the friends of those folks that live in the rural area, all the while closing down hospitals — 52 to be exact. These 20 people . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I would ask the members to give the member the same opportunity to present her statement without interference as the members have given other members in the Chamber today. Member from Estevan.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, these people pretended for 16 years that they were friends of rural Saskatchewan, all the while closing down hospitals — 52 to be exact. These 20 people pretended to be friends to agriculture producers in rural Saskatchewan, then tore up GRIP [gross revenue insurance program] and never replaced it. These are the people that decimated rural infrastructure, highways, hospitals. You name it, Mr. Speaker, and they ignored it.

Now in 2010 they are still pretending that they listen to rural Saskatchewan families. Mr. Speaker, there is a better chance of catching a leprechaun and having him lead you to the pot of gold than finding something good that the NDP have done in rural Saskatchewan. Thank you.

### QUESTION PERIOD

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

### School System Funding

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. And for weeks now, parents with children in the Catholic school system have been calling on the government to correct the inequity of funding that exists under this government's administration. And during these months, they've asked that the government come forward with an equitable form of funding so that the children who are in the public school and the children in the Catholic school system are treated equal. There are people and a number of the trustees who are in the gallery today who have indicated to us that, in the Regina Catholic school system, the difference in funding between the public school and the separate school system is \$275 per student.

I want to ask the minister whether or not, whether or not he is correcting this inequity in next week's budget. Will that happen?

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

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the question that the Leader of the Opposition raises is around funding across all of the province of Saskatchewan. We had a system in place that existed from 1972 under the foundation operating grant. It was a system that many people indicated was flawed. It had outlived its time, and it was a need to develop a new funding formula.

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we're doing. We're developing a funding formula that will replace the old formula. So, Mr. Speaker, right now in this current year, what the Ministry of Education did was to take the former budgets of all of the school divisions, add to them the cost of the teacher salaries, add to them the cost of inflation, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, we're still using the exact same formula that the school divisions had in place until we replace it.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, new question to the minister and for his information, by his own numbers, the numbers that he has shared with the Catholic School Division in Regina, the inequity amounts to 2.6 million for Regina alone. So you can imagine what that amounts to across the province. The fact is the Regina Catholic School states, and I quote, "If this inequity continues in 2010 and beyond, the Regina Catholic School Division faces the possibility of program and/or staff cuts that will affect all students . . ."

Mr. Minister, you can talk all you want about how you're not responsible and how this government isn't responsible, but the fact of the matter is you've been in government two and a half years, and we want to know what you're doing to correct this inequity.

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

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — What this government recognized was that under the former NDP government, we had come to the point where Saskatchewan taxpayers, Saskatchewan property owners were paying the largest amount of tax to fund education. That's reality, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan led the way. We knew we had to address that, Mr. Speaker. And in fact . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, and in fact the members opposite will realize that we added \$241 million to fund programs to make sure that the Northern Lights School Division, that the school division in Ile-a-la-Crosse, that the school division in Creighton, Mr. Speaker — who spend on average well over \$12,000 per child, Mr. Speaker — is quite a bit different than the programs at Regina Catholic where the expense there is a little over \$9,000 per student, Mr. Speaker. That's reality.

We've also, Mr. Speaker, changed the amount of funding. The

government used to fund about 51 per cent in '08-09. Currently, Mr. Speaker, we're projecting that to be at 63 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. And he can yell all he wants, but it doesn't take away from the fact that he is putting the onus and the burden of cost on Catholic families in the province of Saskatchewan and that's not fair. That's not fair.

The question to the minister is: when will you come to your senses and make the system equitable? It's not about cutting taxes. We all want our taxes cut. The question is . . . We all want lower taxes. There's no doubt about that. But the question is: why the inequity between the public school students and Catholic families in this province? Why the inequity?

**The Speaker:** — Before I recognize the minister, just to remind members again that the questions are to be placed to the Chair and to the ministry or department, not at individuals. I recognize the Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, and if the opposition allows me, Mr. Speaker, I'll make sure that my voice is kept very quiet.

Mr. Speaker, the programs that are delivered cost Saskatchewan, in separate school divisions, in public school division . . . are different. Mr. Speaker, there is a cost per student that is different right across the province. The Prince Albert Separate School Division will have a different cost per student than does the Regina Separate School Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have put in place an advisory committee. Mr. Speaker, it's becoming more and more difficult for the opposition to hear me. Mr. Speaker, we have put in place an advisory committee. We have put in place technical committees. We have sub-committees that involve all of the stakeholders, Mr. Speaker. And they're bringing those very concerns that the Regina Catholic Board has brought up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in fact right now, the two separate boards in Regina and Saskatoon, the two public boards in Regina and Saskatoon, the chief financial officers of those four boards are getting together to in fact ensure that our ministry is able to compare apples to apples because we need to have the same kind of reporting period.

**The Speaker:** — Next question. I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, while I don't agree with the minister on most things, he is correct in one thing — that the discrepancy in Prince Albert is even greater than Regina. He's right on that. While the discrepancy between public school students and Catholic students in Regina is 275, the discrepancy in Prince Albert is even greater than that. And that's a mistake and it's wrong, and the minister should correct himself on this.

I want to ask the minister as well. You have appointed the committee, the provincial advisory committee, to deal with new funding formula, and you've neglected to include any member of the separate school, the Catholic school divisions across the province. Here again, inequality and inequity. When will you correct that part of the formula as well?

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

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, the member raises two points. I think the member is suggesting that it wouldn't matter whether you're the Regina Public Board of Education, the Regina Catholic Board of Education, or the Northern Lights School Division. Somehow the cost of educating that child in any one of those three areas has to be the same.

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. I'd ask the members of the opposition to allow the minister to respond to the question. I recognize the Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the question then is, from the member opposite, is whether or not the cost of educating a student in Prince Albert Separate is the same as educating the student in Saskatchewan Rivers because, Mr. Speaker, that's the difference.

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. The Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, what the government currently is doing for this fiscal year is we took the budgets that had been in place under that government for years and years. We took those budgets, and we added to the inflation costs. We added to the teacher salary cost. If those budgets, Mr. Speaker, if those budgets in fact were wrong in terms of funding, they were wrong under the NDP because that's the budgets that we're using, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to spend the next while addressing those concerns. Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, in rural school divisions we have something called schools of necessity, and maybe the Leader of the Opposition would understand that term. We fund schools of necessity in rural school divisions. We don't fund schools of necessity in Regina Public or Regina Catholic. Regina Public also has programs that the Regina Catholics don't have, Mr. Speaker. And there are different costs.

[14:15]

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister — and I'll repeat and I'll try to be brief — the question is, in terms of the provincial advisory committee dealing with the funding formula, you forgot to include any members of the Saskatchewan Catholic School Boards Association. Will you correct that?

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Again remind the members to

place their questions to the Chair. The member . . .

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I think the Leader of the Opposition has spent enough time in the Chamber to know what the rules are, whether it was this Speaker or previous Speakers. I'd ask the member to follow the rules. I recognize the Minister of Education.

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. The Leader of the Opposition has also sat on the government benches as a minister and knew what parameters ministers had. They could answer directly. They could . . . whatever response that applied to the question and to their ministry. I recognize the Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

**The Speaker:** — Order. If the member from Regina Coronation Park wants to allow the question period to roll by and members to not answer questions . . . Order. It's up to you. Do you want to have question period, or do you want it to go by? Minister of Education.

**Hon. Mr. Krawetz:** — Mr. Speaker, the members on committees, we ask our stakeholders to appoint members. We asked the Saskatchewan School Boards Association, which all 29 school boards belong to that association. Mr. Speaker, they put people on all of our committees that represent all of the trustees, all of the students in the province of Saskatchewan. We don't put a person on there to represent the three northern boards. There isn't a person on there to represent the public boards and the Catholic boards. Mr. Speaker, we rely on the Saskatchewan School Boards Association. That's who is putting the people on the committee.

There has been great work on the committee, Mr. Speaker, because we've had officials from the Saskatchewan school . . . School business officials have been very good on the technical side to be able to identify that, Mr. Speaker. In fact the 29 budgets that we have currently to work with are all different, Mr. Speaker, so we need to ensure that we can compare the same things, so that when we do develop this formula, it's going to last for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### First Nations University of Canada

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Advanced Education, and it's regarding the First Nations University of Canada. I want to quote from a letter written to *The StarPhoenix* of March 11th. It's entitled "Grandmas support [First Nations University]," and it's from the Intercultural Grandmothers Uniting. I quote:

FNUC is a unique creation. Among other things, it has a

unique linguistics department that teaches the five languages of Saskatchewan's First Nations. That this, the first university of its kind in the world, was established in Saskatchewan speaks well of our province.

Mr. Speaker, what will it say of our province if that minister and that government presides over the closure of this university?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, thanks very much for the opportunity to provide an update on this most important file. First and foremost our focus has been and remains on the students, Mr. Speaker.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, as we came into office, we were asked to ensure that assistance went to that institution. We provided \$2 million. We took care of the collective bargaining agreement that had been outstanding since 2005. We provided additional operating funds, Mr. Speaker. And we ensured that there was a blueprint put forward in the form of the Hanselmann standing report, Mr. Speaker, so that the institution could actually proceed on a path to progress, thereby protecting the current and future students, Mr. Speaker.

Instead of seeing that progress, Mr. Speaker, we saw that agreement broken, and we saw backsliding by that institution. Mr. Speaker, we are diligently working with other members of the working group to ensure that the interests of these students are taken care of, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to quote further from the letter from the Intercultural Grandmothers Uniting. They say and I quote:

To close the university now is to go back in time. We stand to lose the ground that many of our elders and academic leaders gave years of their lives to gain. Their efforts, along with those of FNUC's world-class faculty, must not be forgotten.

What is that minister saying to those grandmothers, to those elders, to those academic leaders at this, the eleventh hour when that university is in a very precarious position thanks in large part to the actions of that government opposite?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education and Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll also quote from a recent letter, the Aboriginal Grandmothers Caring for the Grandchildren support network. And in that letter, it quotes:

The irresponsibility of some uneducated FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] chiefs, vice-chiefs, and their unqualified collaborators has been taking its toll on the First Nations University of Canada for the past five years. What a shame nothing was done

sooner.

Mr. Speaker, it speaks volumes, Mr. Speaker. As we focus on the students . . . what I'd like to do, what I'd like to do, Mr. Speaker, is highlight in February 2005 when the first crisis began, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't more than October 2005 before the members opposite stroke a \$150,000 cheque of one-time funding that allowed the mess to continue, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. McCall:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister can get up on his high horse, but you know perhaps I'd like to find out what he thinks of the following quotations. This one is from the chair of the academic council of the First Nations University, Randy Lundy, somebody who's been intimately involved in this file for a number of years. And it's in response to what the minister had to say yesterday about how proposal-based funding is going to carry First Nations University forward somehow. He said that that approach by that government is "disingenuous at best and dishonest at worst."

The current president of the students' association, Diane Adams says ". . . how can you plan academically for four years degrees on a proposal-driven system? That's absurd." When is that minister going to stop playing games with the First Nations University of Canada and come to the table as a helpful partner, not as one who wants to hurt the institution?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education and Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, as we've said, in early February after years of controversy — after a vice-president was fired, after a CEO [chief executive officer] was fired with allegations that trips to Las Vegas and Hawaii and luxurious and excessive compensation packages — Mr. Speaker, in early February, this government took a decision. That decision was not to renew funding. Mr. Speaker, what we did say is those dollars are available, Mr. Speaker, through a partnership . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Mr. Speaker, the notion of what the member opposite is speaking, that relates to federal funding. And I'll let the federal minister respond.

But this is curious, Mr. Speaker, because on February 4th of this year, the new board was appointed, and I want to applaud Chief Lonechild with what he's doing. On February 6th and 7th the former president said in an email, in fact the board authority was still contested. On February 8th, what did the NDP do? They called for restoration of funding. That's not acceptable today and it certainly wasn't then, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Mr. Speaker, the sanctimonious denial of his responsibility is appalling in this situation. The students, the staff and the faculty know that the minister should be their biggest supporter at this point. He should be going to Chuck Strahl and insisting that the \$7.2 million be reinstated. At a time of billion dollar deficits and funding cuts here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, this minister should be working to bring funding

dollars into the province instead of chasing them away.

My question to the minister: since he's been so successful in chasing away those federal dollars, will he commit to increasing provincial dollars in order to cover the difference?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, we've seen from the members opposite a blank cheque approach, and that is while they were in office, just throw money, Mr. Speaker. And certainly, certainly today, Mr. Speaker, what we've said, Mr. Speaker, what we've said, Mr. Speaker, what we've said is clear. And that is, our dollars for this institution . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I think the members are aware of the fact that sometimes it's hard to hear in the galleries where there's a loud, boisterous response. And I'd ask the opposition members to allow the ministers to respond, so the visitors can hear the response. I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, what we've seen from this government is principled and responsible decision making. We've provided additional support. We offered additional time. We offered a blueprint, Mr. Speaker. And what we saw instead, we saw backsliding. There is responsibility from this government. And that is to the taxpayers of this province who have quite rightly said, can we not have a post-secondary institution based on the best practices of this province and across the country?

And the answer is of course, Mr. Speaker. That's why we continue to work with a variety of stakeholders at the working group level to see if we can actually work our way through to a new model of accountability and also student success, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Mr. Speaker, this minister's bungling of the file has set First Nations University up for failure. He demanded that the U of R [University of Regina] and the FNU [First Nations University] hammer out the details of an MOU [memorandum of understanding] over the weekend. Maybe this works for Sask Party budget deliberations, but it does not work for such a valuable institution.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that his track record is one of mixed messages, unrealistic timelines, and a deliberate strategy of divide and conquer?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, we've been very clear, and that is we are not going to renew funding to this institution, Mr. Speaker, but there is an opportunity for a partnership. We've said from the start, the nature of that partner is completely dependent on First Nations stakeholders. What we've said is a publicly funded, post-secondary educational institution within

the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what we've said. That's what we're working towards, Mr. Speaker. As far as the nature of the partnership that's being worked out, certainly the Ministry of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour is there to help foster and facilitate that. We've been working diligently with a number of partners, Mr. Speaker, but in the end, the partnership, that was selected by Aboriginal stakeholders . . . [inaudible] . . . Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Mr. Speaker, the member talks about partnership. He says partnership in the public . . . [inaudible] . . . to people. And he goes to the media. He says actions. He does other things in public, and he does the complete opposite. It's doublespeak, Mr. Speaker. That is not accurate when he says he is wanting to engage in a successful partnership. It's clear the minister was in cahoots with the federal government in the decision to yank millions from the province. As Randy Lundy said yesterday, all they're trying to do is lay the failure of the FNU at someone else's doorstep, namely the University of Regina and Vianne Timmons. Unlike the minister, the U of R has been at the table advocating for the students, advocating for the First Nations University.

Will the minister admit that he has been in cahoots with Minister Strahl from the get-go and now he's using the U of R as a scapegoat?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, the policy put forward by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour and the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan has been independently formulated. We came out in front of this. We said we're here to protect the students, but we're also here to protect the taxpayers of the province, Mr. Speaker. We said that from the start.

Mr. Speaker, we then said, in addition to not renewing, we would work through a partnership. We offered that, Mr. Speaker. We've been very active through the working group, Mr. Speaker. As far as relationships with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, that dialogue remains open. What we've obviously learned is there's a different model coming, Mr. Speaker. We're going to need a signed, legally binding agreement, Mr. Speaker, in order to move forward, and I await that arrival.

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

**Mr. Broten:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister stands in the Assembly. He goes in a scrum and spins a story about partnership and good faith negotiations, Mr. Speaker. But when you get out into the community, Mr. Speaker, when you speak with student groups, when you speak with individuals on the campus, Mr. Speaker, when you speak with individuals that want the best for this institution and want to see success in the years going ahead, they tell a very different story, Mr. Speaker.

[14:30]

Will the minister just finally admit, Mr. Speaker, that he's forcing Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan students to pay for this government's own incompetence and their own desire to make up for budget shortfalls?

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Advanced Education, Employment and Labour.

**Hon. Mr. Norris:** — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has a very proud track record of post-secondary education, a vision that precedes the creation of this province. Premier Haultain actually was one of the first ones to make sure that post-secondary education was going to be a priority. And we've seen through the ages, Mr. Speaker, some of the best practices and examples, Mr. Speaker.

Today, Mr. Speaker, across Saskatchewan there are more than 13,000 First Nations and Métis students in a variety of programs and institutions. Mr. Speaker, this institution has struggled since 2005, and when it comes to pointing fingers there will be fingers plenty to point in all directions, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're working diligently on behalf of the students to ensure, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the students (a) have an opportunity to finish this academic term; (b) make it through the summer; and if a partnership can be penned, Mr. Speaker, then to continue on in this form or in others that are accessible across the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Minister Responsible for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport.

#### New Provincial Cultural Policy

**Hon. Mr. Duncan:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a significant announcement that reflects who we are as a people and as a province. After intensive period of research, dialogue, and discussion, I am proud to announce Saskatchewan's first cultural policy in more than 25 years.

Culture is a fundamental cornerstone of our Saskatchewan quality of life. It plays a great role in growing our economy and building pride in our communities. Culture shapes our identity and articulates our dreams. A vibrant culture, Mr. Speaker, attracts talented and creative people, promotes business development, spurs population growth, and revitalizes our communities, making them destination points for citizens and tourists and magnets for business. Mr. Speaker, we find talent, creativity, and innovation in those who work in the culture sector.

Current sociological research tells us that these creative qualities affecting the quality of life in our communities serves to attract newcomers as much as economic factors. For that reason we've titled our new plan *Pride of Saskatchewan: A Policy Where Culture, Community and Commerce Meet*.

Pride of Saskatchewan has a plan to foster the development of a vibrant culture sector. It is a framework that encourages collaboration, guides our decision making, and recognizes that culture is the heart and soul of this great province. It is a foundation for working together to foster artistic excellence,

creative expression, shared stewardship, access and engagement, community capacity, and commercial viability.

Pride of Saskatchewan is based on extensive dialogue including a discussion paper, two online surveys, and fourteen face-to-face dialogue sessions that were held across the province. Hundreds of people participated, including strong representation from First Nations and Métis communities, and I want to thank all of those involved who participated in the process.

As we move into the implementation phase, my ministry will be working with other ministries, communities, and organizations to use the policy as a planning tool. Implementation will require the commitment, creativity, and collaboration of all those involved in the sector. Pride of Saskatchewan will guide us through more challenging economic times and ensure that we are ready to grow as our economy strengthens.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened and we have acted. With this policy we have created a blueprint that will benefit future generations and all of us who call this beautiful province home.

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

**Ms. Chartier:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say thanks to Minister Duncan for sending over your statement prior to sitting here. That was very helpful.

I couldn't agree with Minister Duncan more that a vibrant culture attracts talented and creative people, promotes business development, spurs population growth, and revitalizes our communities, and that we find talent, creativity, and innovation in those who work in the cultural centre.

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't use Duncan's name.

**Ms. Chartier:** — I'm sorry. Anyway there's a couple things I just want to flag here in thinking about . . . I think that this is great that we're moving forward with this cultural policy, but we need to keep in mind that this was referred to as a foundation for working together to foster artistic excellence. So a foundation is great, but you need to have financial commitment. So I do have some concerns that you have words, but you don't have financial commitment. So we'll be making sure that, or watching to see that, this isn't just lip service.

As well there's some concerns in the arts community and cultural community, having met with many, many stakeholders who are concerned about this upcoming budget and potential funding cuts, so I hope that that doesn't have negative impact on here.

As well we have to keep in mind that we have a great system here in Saskatchewan where we've invented arm's-length system where we fund organizations and there's no political interference. So I trust that this new model doesn't impact that. And again I haven't seen the policy yet so I don't know precisely what it includes, but broad motherhood statements don't help in situations where artists still earn half the median income. So I just want to keep those things in mind, but I think it's definitely a step in the right direction. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — Why is the member from Cannington on his feet?

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member from Cannington can state his point of order.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, during question period when the Deputy Premier was on his feet, the Leader of the Official Opposition was hollering from his feet that the minister should be truthful, be truthful, Mr. Speaker, implying that the minister was not being truthful. You're not allowed to impugn a member's honour and you're not allowed to do indirectly what you cannot do directly, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw those remarks and apologize unequivocally.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — If I said anything in question period to upset or impugn the minister, I apologize for it. There was no intent to do that.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, to request leave of the Assembly to move a motion under rule 59.

**The Speaker:** — The Leader of the Opposition has requested leave to move a motion under rule 59. Is leave granted?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Leave is not granted.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the Government Whip.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to order the answers to questions 752 through 769.

**The Speaker:** — Questions 752 through 769 are ordered. I recognize the Government Whip.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table the answers to questions 770 through 792.

**The Speaker:** — Questions 770 through 792 are tabled.

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

**Bill No. 121**

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Heppner that **Bill No. 121 — *The Environmental Management and Protection Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased this afternoon to enter into the debate on the environmental protection Act, Bill No. 121.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important Bill to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. The citizens of our province take the environment very, very seriously. They are watching the government and watching, quite frankly, governments across Canada to see how seriously governments are dealing with the issue of environmental protection in our province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, or Mr. Speaker, pardon me, this Bill is a very broad-based Bill that's dealing with the clean air and the environmental management and the protection of 2002, but it also encompasses the litter Act and the state of the environmental report and consequential amendments as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government has promised to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions by 2010 and it didn't. The government said, when they were coming into power, that they would stabilize the greenhouse gas emissions by 2010. Mr. Speaker, we're now in 2010. We have seen no direct action by this government to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions in our province.

Mr. Speaker, it was nice to say in an election platform and nice to say as they were moving to convince people of this province that they should be the government, that they would in fact stabilize greenhouse gas emissions in the province of Saskatchewan, not at some point in the future, but by 2010, Mr. Speaker, and they simply haven't done it.

This is a government that has promised the people of the province of Saskatchewan in its last election platform that it would in fact implement the targets that were put forward by the previous NDP government, targets that would have seen the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. But, Mr. Speaker, they later admitted that they would break that promise.

They told the people of the province of Saskatchewan going into the last election that they would meet the targets put forward by the previous government, that they were going to be as good as environmental stewards for the people of the province of Saskatchewan as the previous government. And in fact they were going to be, not just as good, Mr. Speaker, but they were actually going to implement the exact targets of the previous government.

Mr. Speaker, that was a promise that many in the environmental community in the province of Saskatchewan wanted to hear. They wanted to hear an environmental package, an environmental promise, an environmental direction from the Sask Party government if they were in fact going to be the

government. And they heard it. And they believe they heard something that they could work with and live with, that they would in fact live up to the targets and the promise of the previous government. Mr. Speaker, the reality was not the same as the promise. The reality wasn't the same as the promise, Mr. Speaker, and in fact the reality was much different.

So now we are in 2010. The government said they would stabilize greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2010. Mr. Speaker, we're now in 2010. We aren't seeing action on behalf of the government. We're not seeing a plan that in fact would reduce the growing greenhouse gas emissions in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, what are we seeing? Well, Mr. Speaker, we're seeing a piece of legislation that doesn't do anything. Mr. Speaker, it is a piece of legislation, but it's the actions that come from the legislation that in fact would result in reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker, if we have a government that was serious about reducing greenhouse gas emissions, they could've already started to implement strategies and to curb the growth of greenhouse gas emissions in our province, to show a path which the citizens of our province could in fact get behind, a path that we could follow towards stabilizing the growth of greenhouse emissions, Mr. Speaker.

But what are we seeing? We aren't today seeing anything but a piece of paper that in fact doesn't do anything for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We haven't seen a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. We haven't seen a stabilization of greenhouse gas emissions. So, Mr. Speaker, what is the true plan of the Saskatchewan Party? What is the true plan of the government?

Mr. Speaker, they were quick to jump on what was seen to be at the time a popular promise by the former government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — a target that although many would say was not a bold initiative, that still had a great deal to be desired — but nonetheless a target with a plan and with money attached to the plan, some \$350 million attached to a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker, the new government, the Sask Party during their election said, look we will in fact meet those targets. And they told the people of the province of Saskatchewan, as they went around from the election in 2007, that they would stand behind the targets of the current government and they would meet those targets, Mr. Speaker. And people believed them, Mr. Speaker, people believed them.

[14:45]

And what do we see today, Mr. Speaker? We see a reduction in those targets. We have a government who says that their original promise can't be met and won't be met. Mr. Speaker, we see a government who, we believe, never had any intention of meeting those targets, never had any intention of stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions by 2010, Mr. Speaker.

And here we are, two and a half years later in 2010, Mr. Speaker, and reality is here. We haven't seen the stabilization of greenhouse gas emissions, but we're finally seeing a Bill talking about the issue of our environment. Mr. Speaker, we see

a government instead that's, quite frankly, ragging the puck — taking its time, trying to stall any implementation of environmental protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's shameful when you will go and run an election campaign saying that you will meet specific targets. They weren't bold or creative. They didn't say that they would do better than the previous government, all they said is they would accept those targets and they would meet those targets.

Mr. Speaker, just days after the election they said it wasn't possible, and in fact those targets were not going to be their targets. Mr. Speaker, in order to do that in the manner in which this government did, Mr. Speaker, I think it becomes obvious to many in the public that that was a good election promise, Mr. Speaker, but it was no more than that. Mr. Speaker, now two and a half years later as we examine what the government's done on this very issue, Mr. Speaker, I think it's one situation where many people in this province look upon it with disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, the environment's important to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It's important to parents. It's important to grandparents. It's important to children because the decisions and changes we make today are going to impact the world we live in in the future. And, Mr. Speaker, as a parent and a grandparent, I have a grave concern for the world in which my grandchildren will have the opportunity to live in, the environment in which they will have to grow up in, Mr. Speaker, the types of terrain that will be left for them to enjoy, whether we'll have the forests and the great prairies that we have today, or as a result of environment change, they will have to live in a much different world. Perhaps their water and other valuable resources that you need to have a quality of life may be in much greater demand or, Mr. Speaker, much less quality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't know what the new environmental code that the legislation talks about will look like. It sounds like an intriguing idea. As the government notes, there are other examples like the National Building Code.

But, Mr. Speaker, without a greater and more information on this particular piece of legislation, it's like buying a farm that you never saw or buying a home which you never walked through. And, Mr. Speaker, so why should the people of the province of Saskatchewan, after hearing the government say that they were going to accept the targets of a previous government, we're going to undertake to stop the growth of greenhouse gas emissions by 2010 — and they've done neither, Mr. Speaker — why would we believe that some code that they're going to bring forward for the protection of our environment is in fact going to enhance the protection of our environment?

Mr. Speaker, the government is asking us to pass a new environmental management protection Act without knowing what the new minimum standards will be, without telling us what they will be. Who's going to write these? What criteria are they going to use? Who are they going to consult with? What do they want to accomplish with their targets?

And, Mr. Speaker, without all this type of information being provided to us, what are we actually agreeing to? What would we be agreeing to without knowing what they want to

accomplish, what their targets are, what their goals are, what the code will say? Without that very detailed information, Mr. Speaker, they're asking us to support an environmental protection Act without substance, Mr. Speaker.

And without that substance, Mr. Speaker, how do we know that the new environmental protection management Act will in fact protect anything? How do we know that it will provide a greener and brighter environment for our children and grandchildren — the things that which we all desire to have?

The government claims they'll be setting new baselines and that there'll be emission requirements for major industrial emitters and a number of so-called new air management standards and systems that they're going to require. But they don't give you any detail. They simply want you to buy that house or that farm without ever seeing it, Mr. Speaker.

And I don't think many of us in this Assembly would buy a home without going through it, without seeing what it contained, without understanding what the flaws and the things that need to be improved in that home would be, Mr. Speaker. But that's what they're doing with this piece of legislation. They're asking us to buy new standards and buy into new standards and new codes without identifying what they are, Mr. Speaker.

A government that would introduce climate change legislation that contains no year when greenhouse gases will be stabilized, no baseline year against which reductions of greenhouse gases can be measured, and no greenhouse gas reduction targets in the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker — so what are we buying? Why are we going to support or buy into a piece of environmental legislation that does nothing to protect the environment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, it also anticipates a number of things like industry self-regulation, Mr. Speaker. Industry needs to be consulted, needs to be part of decisions about strategies and technologies to help establish a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. But first you have to stabilize them before you can even talk about reducing them, Mr. Speaker. But the regulator, the agency which in fact enforces the legislation needs to be independent from the industry itself, Mr. Speaker, so that it's not seen as a responsibility of the very perpetrators of the environmental damage to have to go and regulate itself.

This was a principle that although, Mr. Speaker, industry may or may not take seriously their own self-regulation, Mr. Speaker . . . In some cases they may but some they may not. But in cases where they may not, Mr. Speaker, who's watching over them to ensure that they . . . to catch and to make sure that they do adhere to those standards put forward, Mr. Speaker? And if you have a total self-regulation model, Mr. Speaker, that does very, very little to help the environmental protection in our province.

There is merit in the government's proposal, however, to establish a series of baseline objectives that industry would be required to meet. But we need to know what those baseline objectives are. We need to know what standards are going to be established before you know if this is going to be good legislation, whether rigorous enough to be meaningful in some way, or they're simply there, simply there, Mr. Speaker, so that



they can say that they have some baseline.

Mr. Speaker, the principle is good but without some detail, some meat to it, Mr. Speaker, it has very little or no meaning. But what the government is trying to do here is to hand off the responsibility of protecting our environment to a third party, to industry. And the protection of the environment is something that is very, very important to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and shouldn't be handed to third party private interests, Mr. Speaker.

The protection of our environment needs to remain within the control of government because, Mr. Speaker, the environment is about the air in which we breathe, the earth or the land in which we live, Mr. Speaker, the water which we drink. Mr. Speaker, those are important things to the very sustainability of life on our planet, Mr. Speaker. And so the environment is so very important to be protected that it needs to have the government taking the major responsibility in protecting that environment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one recommendation in February of 2009 reported by Clifton Associates suggested that, for example, permits to construct facilities would be discontinued except in certain extraordinary cases. So, Mr. Speaker, this would be a significant departure from past practice and the implications are potentially very troubling, particularly given the current government's track record on environmental issues.

The Clifton report noted, and I will quote that, "Saskatchewan does not have . . . [the current staff] capacity or capability to monitor and regulate the current industry and oversee the social license," and notes that the Environment ministry is short of certain important skill sets of engineers, hydrogeologists, water quality and air quality specialists, toxicologists, epidemiologists and risk assessment specialists in order to properly be able to assess the risk to the environment by industry. In other words, the Ministry of the Environment doesn't have the people to do the job.

So what's this government doing? Instead of ensuring that the Department of Environment has the people to do the job, they're cutting back and reducing the number of civil servants in the province. They're putting our environment at greater risk, Mr. Speaker. They are deciding that these issues like environmental protection aren't important enough to put new resources into, Mr. Speaker. Instead they're saying, well we'll develop a self-regulatory model that in fact pushes out the responsibility away from government into industry itself.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with that is, what requires industry to have those same specialists? What requires businesses to have specialists to ensure that in fact what they're doing meets those standards? Mr. Speaker, it doesn't say. How do we know that there will in fact be an assessment of the various industries and businesses, whether or not they're meeting those standards? Whether or not there are changes in the air quality or water quality and what impact does that have on the air we breathe, Mr. Speaker, or the water we drink. And what impact does it have on the aquifer?

And, Mr. Speaker, these are all very important questions that without somebody out there with the responsibility to examine,

to regulate, and to protect we have no idea what the future outcomes will be for our children and grandchildren. Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, the actual outcomes could be more catastrophic in nature than that and may impact us in this lifetime.

Many of us in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, think many of these things may not have an impact well beyond our time here in this House or well beyond maybe our time on this Earth. But, Mr. Speaker, we all have family. We all have children and grandchildren, and the decisions we make today will impact the quality of their lives. And that's very important that we consider that the decisions we make today are going to impact the quality of our children, the quality of our grandchildren and their children, Mr. Speaker.

And hopefully many of us will have the opportunity to live long enough to see our great-grandchildren and, Mr. Speaker, be able to tell them that we took the steps today in 2010 to protect our environment, to ensure that they would have a world in which to live, a province in which to live that had a healthy environment, that had adequate protection laws in place, adequate regulation to ensure the air quality, Mr. Speaker. To ensure the water quality, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we're not contaminating our great province at a rate greater than necessary, Mr. Speaker, that the ozone layer isn't depleting faster than necessary, that we took steps today to deal with greenhouse gas emissions, whether it's to reduce the actual emissions in a meaningful way or even to stop the progress of increasing greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's fairly well known that Saskatchewan is one of the larger emitters of greenhouse gas emissions because we use coal-generated electricity. As we know, coal generation electrical plants are huge emitters of greenhouse gases. Mr. Speaker, what steps are we taking today to try to reduce that?

Mr. Speaker, in 2005 and '06, the previous government . . . Between 2000, pardon me, and 2006, the previous government took great steps to increase and develop wind-generated electricity in the province of Saskatchewan. Since then we haven't seen any new wind power generation, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's well known that you can increase the demand on your baseload up to about 12 per cent from wind power generation, Mr. Speaker. Today we're at about 4.

Mr. Speaker, we can do significantly more. We need to do significantly more. We need to increase renewable energy utilization, Mr. Speaker, and electrical generation in the province of Saskatchewan so that any new generation that we require isn't increasing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions that we're putting forward in the province.

Mr. Speaker, if the Ministry of the Environment doesn't have the people to do the job, they need to hire the people to do the job. They need to hire the people with the specific skills in order to ensure that we have environmental regulation in our province that allows our province to move forward, protecting the environment for future generations, for our children and grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment, the Ministry of Environment, needs to develop a long-term relationship with the private sector who would help

the government to keep capacity if they can't in fact do it themselves.

[15:00]

The preferred option would always be to ensure that the regulators are in fact free of outside interference, Mr. Speaker, work for the government of the day and, Mr. Speaker, don't have to rely on being responsible to a private company which they work for. That would be ideal, but that may not be possible in all cases, Mr. Speaker. But at least if it isn't possible, let's develop the expertise within companies in the province of Saskatchewan to ensure that in fact we can deliver environmental protection. We can't afford to have baseline requirements being put forward, Mr. Speaker, that don't help sustain our environment, don't help move forward the environmental protection of our province for the people of the province and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk for a minute about the environment of Saskatchewan and what proponents think about our needs as a province to move forward with environmental protection, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we read today in the chamber of commerce *Action!* magazine put forward by the chamber of commerce that the chamber of commerce is very supportive of the new results-based regulatory environmental model put forward by the department.

However with that support comes the need for two-way dialogue with clarity on the government's new vision. Because, Mr. Speaker, what's being said even by the chamber of commerce is they don't understand. They welcome the movement of the work out of the Department of the Environment into the private sector, Mr. Speaker. But they also, Mr. Speaker, say that there needs to be dialogue because they're not clear what the vision of the province of Saskatchewan is, of the Government of Saskatchewan is, Mr. Speaker. So even those who are proponents to do away with the current regulatory environment, which is done through the Ministry of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, even those proponents who are in favour of pushing that work out into the private sector say they don't have any idea what the government would like to accomplish.

They go on to say that:

Effective change management involves dynamic and strong communication with stakeholders. In business, communicating changes to external clients is critical to a seamless . . . transition both for the business and its clients.

However it seems that the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment has missed the boat on this . . . [Mr. Speaker].

So even the proponents who want to see the change are saying the Ministry of the Environment has totally missed it. They don't know what they're doing, Mr. Speaker. They missed the boat, Mr. Speaker, so they're not even on the lake. They're in swimming, Mr. Speaker, and they're in over their heads and they aren't doing very well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem with that analogy is this. It's the people of the province of Saskatchewan who ultimately pay

a price for the government — this government or for that matter any government — not taking the time to fully understand the environmental standards that they need to bring forward to accomplish the results that the people of this province want to see.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is important to the people of this province. We have seen a deterioration in air quality and water quality in parts of the North as a result of particles and airborne particles being blown from the tar sands in northern Alberta into the waterways of northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And we've seen a deterioration in the air quality in parts of northern Saskatchewan. We've seen a deterioration in water quality, Mr. Speaker.

But what are we doing to monitor that? And what are we doing to ensure that those who are causing that pollution are paying for that pollution? And what steps are being forced upon them to reduce that pollution, Mr. Speaker, that is actually coming from sources in other provinces that gets up into the wind, Mr. Speaker, the trade winds, and blows it across, Mr. Speaker, into Saskatchewan.

And the effect is on northern communities, northern waterways. It affects both the hunting and fishing industries in northern Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, it's being done by Alberta companies. They may pay compensation to the Alberta government, but certainly none of that compensation is coming to where the end result is occurring, which is within the province of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, we need to spend some time examining what was intended by the government to deal with this particular problem within our communities, within our province, Mr. Speaker. But there's not clarity within the Bill. It talks about targets. It talks about a new code. It talks about new baselines, Mr. Speaker, but it's not there. They aren't there. So without those targets, without those new baselines, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, it's like buying a house without going through it.

It's about buying a direction without any substance, Mr. Speaker. It's like being said, walk 60 paces ahead, and you're further ahead, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, it's like wandering around in circles, Mr. Speaker, not knowing where you're going to end up. So, Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation may talk about providing new direction for the Ministry of the Environment, may talk about providing new codes and standards, Mr. Speaker. But without those codes and standards being brought forward, Mr. Speaker, to buy a new direction that's going to see industry self-regulation, see a reduction in government involvement in the protection of our environment, I think it's quite serious, Mr. Speaker. What it's doing is off-loading the responsibility of government to its citizens and to the province, Mr. Speaker, to private third party interests, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, self-regulatory regimes have worked in some jurisdictions on items other than the environment. But, Mr. Speaker, our environment — which controls the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land in which we live — is something far more important than many, many other

self-regulated issues, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to say that all businesses would not be responsible corporate citizens because we all know that many, many of the businesses in Saskatchewan — if not, I would say, probably the vast majority — would be good corporate citizens and live up to their responsibilities in the issue of industry self-regulation. But, Mr. Speaker, without the government being there to be examining whether or not industry is in fact living up to its commitments, Mr. Speaker, how do we know?

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, it only takes one bad apple in a bag to cause significant problems for the entire bag of apples, Mr. Speaker, over time. And, Mr. Speaker, in that analogy it only costs or takes one bad apple, Mr. Speaker, to cause significant environmental damage if left unchecked for any period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it becomes even more important for us to ensure that as we examine environmental protection legislation, we're not only examining it from our immediate needs, what we'd want to see today, but also, Mr. Speaker, what we'd want to see for our children and grandchildren and what we would actually want to see for future generations, Mr. Speaker.

Many of the members of this Assembly are parents, if not all members of this Assembly are parents and grandparents and have a keen interest in seeing that our children, grandchildren, the world in which they get to grow up has the opportunities that we have today, if not better opportunities, to go and visit a provincial park where you can in fact, Mr. Speaker, wander on trails through the pine forest, Mr. Speaker. Or visit, Mr. Speaker, the rolling plains of southern Saskatchewan — be able to drink the water, be able to enjoy the natural environment of our province, Mr. Speaker. A good example one of my colleagues wants to remind me of is to be able to eat the fish right out of the lake, Mr. Speaker.

And those are all important things that we've all had the opportunity to enjoy. I know myself when I had the opportunity with one of my now-colleagues to, in northern Saskatchewan, to go fishing and catch a number of fish on a creek, a river just off Dillon, Saskatchewan, we had a great time. Caught some fish, had the opportunity to eat the fish, Mr. Speaker. And those are the opportunities that you remember that we'd like to have available for our children and grandchildren, Mr. Speaker. So we have to be very careful that the steps we take today to protect our environment actually is going to protect our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill we have before us has no targets. It doesn't have baselines for us to criticize, to question, to talk about, Mr. Speaker. It in fact misses the target, Mr. Speaker, I guess to put it bluntly, in showing us what type of direction the government will take in order to protect the environment moving forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that takes me back to a point that I started with originally. During the last provincial election, 2007, or lead-up to the election on November 7th, 2007, the members of the current government went and told the people of Saskatchewan that they would live by the environmental emission reduction targets put forward by the previous

government. And, Mr. Speaker, those were targets that were at the time far more progressive than anything the government has said today. But before the election, those were their targets too. They were going to live up to the targets of the previous government, and they were going to put a plan forward in order to meet those targets, Mr. Speaker. In fact they were going to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions in the province of Saskatchewan by 2010.

Well flash forward to 2010, as I stand here now in the legislature in the year 2010. What have we seen, Mr. Speaker? I've seen them reduce their targets, saying no. A few days after they got elected, no we can't meet those targets, Mr. Speaker. We're not going to attempt to meet those targets. And the outcome of that is going to be, Mr. Speaker, a scenario here where now we have a new piece of legislation forward, we still don't have targets.

Mr. Speaker, when we pressured the government about not keeping their commitment to those targets, we didn't even have the government actually attempt to answer the questions. They sent out officials from their ministries to answer the questions because, Mr. Speaker, we had ministers who didn't know what they wanted to say. We had ministers who didn't have, Mr. Speaker, any idea what their new targets would be.

And then a year and a half later, Mr. Speaker, we get a piece of legislation talking about the environmental management protection Act; a new environmental management protection Act, Mr. Speaker. No targets in it. No stabilization of greenhouse gas emissions. All it talks about industry self-regulation and control of the environmental protection targets, Mr. Speaker, that may or may not be a good idea, Mr. Speaker. But the minister hasn't outlined for us, with any clarity, what she intends to do. What her new environmental code will be, Mr. Speaker. What her baseline for monitoring emissions will be, Mr. Speaker. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, it's like buying that house we never walked through.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are people, there are people who may look at a picture of a house and say, oh I want that house, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to pay for it regardless. In fact I think that's exactly what happened with the Premier when he bought a house in Arizona, Mr. Speaker. He saw a picture of a house and he bought it because, Mr. Speaker, it was listed for \$99,000. And he paid 105,000 for it, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why you'd do that. But, Mr. Speaker, the majority of people won't do that. The majority of people, Mr. Speaker, want to walk in, they want to see it, and they want to know exactly what's contained within that house, Mr. Speaker. The Premier may buy a \$99,000 house for \$105,000. Okay. Worth \$69,000 today, Mr. Speaker. But the majority of the people wouldn't.

And that's the same with an environmental protection Act, Mr. Speaker, that I have before me today. Why would I buy this without having any of the content that's necessary for me to understand what it'll do for the people of the province of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, I need to understand what this Bill is about before I can accept it. Mr. Speaker, I don't have that. The people of Saskatchewan don't have that information. If we had that information, we could actually analyze, Mr. Speaker, what's intended. But without it, Mr. Speaker, we can't do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish the minister had included her new environmental code, her new baseline predictions in her legislation, Mr. Speaker. But that's not there. And without it, I don't know, how do I buy the house? I can't buy the house. How do I buy the legislation? It's analogy, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's really a practical analogy that most people in this province would understand.

I wouldn't buy a house by driving by it or looking at a picture, so why would I buy a very important piece of environmental legislation without knowing what the substance of it is? What it contains. What it's designed to do. What it can do. What it can't do, Mr. Speaker. Whether the windows leak, Mr. Speaker, or whether the air will get better. As a result of this legislation, the air quality will improve.

Without that very important information, Mr. Speaker, why would I in fact, why would I in fact decide to move forward with this, Mr. Speaker?

[15:15]

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues I think want to take an opportunity to speak about this and many, many other pieces of legislation. But before I wrap up, I probably have 15 or 20 more minutes, I'd like to talk about the environment in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and just to recap some of the very, very important things to the people of our province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my children, my grandchildren, and the children and grandchildren of my colleagues on both sides of the House care about the environment. They may not understand why they care about the environment today because it's very difficult for a child to tell you why they care about the environment, Mr. Speaker. But they love to swim in the lakes you go visit, Mr. Speaker. They love to go camping and walk through the pristine forests of northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They love to see the wild elk and moose and deer, Mr. Speaker. They love to see the beaver dams, Mr. Speaker, across the province as they walk along the creeks in either southern Saskatchewan and across southern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. They love to see those beaver dams. They love to see the beavers splashing in the water.

Mr. Speaker, they love the wildlife. They love the trees, and they love the water to swim in, Mr. Speaker. They know they like that. Now do they know that that's part of the environment that needs to be protected by their government and by the leaders of the province of Saskatchewan? I would say that they probably don't understand in detail that that's what needs to be protected, Mr. Speaker. But nonetheless they know it's important. They know that they want to see that wildlife. They know that they like to see deer. They like to see antelope in southern Saskatchewan. They go to northern Saskatchewan where into the forest you love to see the moose, and you love to see, Mr. Speaker, the bears. And you know children are fascinated by the things that they don't get to see everyday in the wild, Mr. Speaker.

And sometimes it's as simple as a gopher in the prairie field, Mr. Speaker. Other times it's something that you see maybe once or twice in a lifetime like a cougar or something in

Saskatchewan, or a wolf, Mr. Speaker. Some children just absolutely love to see bears. But, Mr. Speaker, they exist today in our environment because there's been steps taken by people to try to protect those species, and to allow them to move forward within the province of Saskatchewan, and to have an environment in which they can both live and thrive.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we also want to ensure that the air in which we breathe isn't filled with particles and pollutants that make it more difficult for us to breathe, the things that could actually shorten your lifespan without you never knowing is shortening your lifespan, Mr. Speaker.

So governments have an obligation to protect the air quality in our province to ensure that the quality of the air we breathe in fact enhances our ability to live, Mr. Speaker. Governments are elected to be responsible to the people of Saskatchewan to ensure that we look to provide an environment which includes air quality, water quality in the land in which we live, which enhances our lives, is not a detriment to our lives.

Mr. Speaker, many people live off the land as well, and they have the opportunity to fish and trap, Mr. Speaker. Many of us eat the fish that are caught by commercial fishermen in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Many people eat the wild meat that comes from the moose and elk and deer in our province, Mr. Speaker. And we want to see them continue to flourish.

We want to see an abundance of growth within the various species in our province so that we can continue to thrive and that those who make their living and eat from these sources, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity to do that for many generations to come. Because many times, Mr. Speaker, it's a way of life as much as it is any type of recreational activity. Many families use the meat that they catch, the fish that they . . . pardon me, the fish that they catch, the meat that they hunt, Mr. Speaker, in order to sustain life. They use it as the fundamental staples of their diet, Mr. Speaker. And for that, we need to have an environment, Mr. Speaker, that in fact provides for the continued growth of these species in our province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's my responsibility, it's a responsibility of all members of this Assembly to continue to promote . . . It's our obligation to continue to ensure that our environment is protected, that we take what steps are necessary to protect the quality of our water, the aquifers in which our water flow, Mr. Speaker, the lakes and streams and rivers which our water flows through, Mr. Speaker, to be as free of contaminants as possible, Mr. Speaker, so that future generations can also drink that water, and so that our children and grandchildren have the opportunity to have clean water that doesn't have to be treated with more chemicals and artificially made pure, Mr. Speaker.

The best possible scenario is that you can drink the water from the river, from the lake without any form of purification, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, if we can maintain that in our northern communities and across the province for generations to come, Mr. Speaker, we are working to protect our environment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is important to consider that many people in our province look at our environment differently. Those who are from northern Saskatchewan may hunt and trap as a way of

life. They may in fact feed their family as a result of the income made from trapping, Mr. Speaker. I am led to believe that in the last while we've seen the price of fur as an example go up, and so trappers in northern Saskatchewan in fact would have the opportunity to enhance their economic well-being as a result of having a very vibrant environment, Mr. Speaker, that needs to be protected by those of us who are entrusted with that responsibility as part of our obligations as members of this Legislative Assembly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time to talk about the environment and what is our responsibility to the people of this province and what our responsibility is to ourselves, to our colleagues, to our families, Mr. Speaker, but also to future generations, Mr. Speaker. We need to consider all legislation as it comes through this Assembly from the point of view as what impact does it have on people, Mr. Speaker? Not just industry, but what impact does it have on people?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I begin to conclude my remarks, I would like to say that over the last hour or so I have had the opportunity to talk about the importance of our environment to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but I haven't had the time I will need to spend on considering this Bill, Mr. Speaker. So at a later date I'd probably like to once again join in this debate and talk about this Bill again, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to move adjournment of debate on Bill No. 121, *The Environmental Management and Protection Act*.

**The Speaker:** — The member from Regina Dewdney has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 121. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Speaker:** — Agreed. Carried.

### Bill No. 123

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Heppner that **Bill No. 123 — *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2009*** be now read a second time.]

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

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm back again today by popular demand. And once again, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter into the debate in this House, and to be able to participate particularly in this debate, and to do so on behalf of the fine folks in Regina Northeast, Mr. Speaker. I think it's fair to say that all of us would agree that it's truly an honour but also a privilege to be able to represent folks in this great province of ours in this legislature and to be able to represent them in this and other debates.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am truly honoured to have that privilege to enter into this debate, the debate on Bill 123, the forest management Act, 2009. Well that's the short title. I guess the

correct long title is Bill 123, *An Act to amend The Forest Resources Management Act and to make related amendments to The Parks Act*.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's obviously an important Bill. I say it's an important Bill because it's an Act that is I guess intended to promote sustainable use of our forest lands for the benefit of current and future generations by balancing the needs of the economy, the social and cultural opportunities, with the need to maintain and enhance a healthy forest land. And I think that's fair to say, Mr. Speaker.

And I think if you look at this great province of ours, you will see that forestry is very important to the economy of this country, of this province, I should say. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that we want to start out by fully understanding that the forest area in this great province of ours covers about 55 per cent of the province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we do have a very large province in area, and over half, over half of that area of this province is covered by forests. Now somebody once compared it to the country of Germany, and I believe this is a correct comparison, is that we have more area of our province covered by forests than the area that makes up the entire country of Germany. So, Mr. Speaker, that gives us some indication of the large, large, vast areas that are covered by forest and how important the forest industry is to this province, having such a significant amount of it.

I believe it's a little over 36 million hectares of land that is covered by our forests in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we maintain that forest. It plays a major role in our economy, but what's also important is that we maintain the balanced use of that forest. I know that at first blush when you mention the word forest, you think of trees, and trees means lumber and that's it. Well no, Mr. Speaker, the forests bring a lot more to our economy than just the lumbering aspect of it.

There's many, many usage in our forest, and if you looked at the makeup of the forest or the forest boundaries in this great country and then you look at the other opportunities that present themselves within the forest, and if you did so through a lens of licence and permits, you would see that there is an overlapping of services and an overlapping of opportunity within that forest boundary to support other occupations and other industry within this province other than just lumber.

For example in — I believe it's still in practice today — but in the days gone by for certain it was a practice that the forest area would be also doubled in the summer months as pasture. There was available in the forest and the forest areas grazing leases to individuals who lived along the forest fringe and who were involved in the livestock and cattle industry. And they would be able to, for a reasonable fee, be able to permit an area of the forest, and they would be able to run their livestock herd in that forest and supplemented their grazing opportunities, I guess you would say. And in many cases it was a major part of the farming operation.

And having been one of those, Mr. Speaker, who in the past enjoyed the ability to permit an area in the forest reserve to run then my cattle in there — and it was a great opportunity

because the fee was a reasonable fee — the ability to use that land in the summer months to offset the need to purchase land outside the forest was certainly a benefit to my farming operation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I guess the point I want to make here and make it very clear is the multiple usage of our forests. And this is why it's important that we have a forest management Act that will do exactly that: will manage the forest to the best of our abilities to ensure that there's a good balance between the utilization of that forest and through support of our economy, but also to ensure that it's not damaged in any way through wrongful use or overuse and that there is a balance so that we can maintain on a long-term basis a strong and healthy forest industry in this province and a strong healthy forest in this province.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the area that I had a grazing permit on, a good neighbour of mine also had a trapline lease permit or a licence to trap in that same area in the winter months. So while I would utilize the forest in the summertime to raise my cattle there, he would in turn utilize the forest for maintaining the wildlife within that particular boundaries. And it was really probably coincidental, but his trapline boundaries much mirrored that of my grazing lease boundaries. So we had a fair amount in common. But he would utilize that forest to be able to trap fur-bearing animals, and he used that revenue to offset his income each and every year. And that was again something he enjoyed from the forest, a forest that was available to us because we lived along the forest fringe and it was readily available.

[15:30]

That same area during the fall months in particular, the area would be well utilized by people from right across this great province. Not only local people, but people from all across this great province would use that area for hunting, the hunting of big game. They would be . . . Some hunters who had been in the business for some time had established cabins in the forest reserve which was, that practice was done away with by the department several years ago. But anyone who prior to the change in the regulations, anyone who had a cabin in that forest reserve and who had paid — again had paid — a permit to have a hunting cabin in that area were able to utilize that cabin for the purposes of hunting big game in that particular area.

As well as those who of course didn't have cabins to stay in would be able to, you know, drive in in the morning and, in many cases, drive as far with their vehicle, as far as the road conditions would permit, and then would go either on foot after that or sometimes snowmobile. Or ATV [all-terrain vehicle] vehicles would be used to transport the hunters.

I believe there is regulations, hunting regulations that doesn't allow the use of an ATV before noon. And I don't know if those regulations are still in place. I'm not an avid hunter any more, Mr. Speaker, so you'll have to forgive me. I'm not up to date on those rules and regulations. But the point here is that there was an opportunity for those to use that forest, the same area. The same forest, the same area, it was multi-use.

There was also the opportunity for outfitters who had that area

set aside as part of their outfitting area. They again paid a permit, paid a fee on it, and they were, had exclusive rights to use that area for their outfitting clients. And they would use that, again, in hunting season, in the fall primarily. I guess they'd also be using that earlier on in the season for bear, etc. But those were the multi-use facets of our forests.

So when we talk about the need for our forest management, we talk about a lot more than just something that's going to manage the harvesting of our trees and something that's going to look after the well-being of that forest in its entirety. Because it is a multi-facet use area that certainly benefits the economy on a number of fronts and, Mr. Speaker, not the least to say, of course, it's the forest. We need to maintain that forest and maintain it in a healthy condition because really, Mr. Speaker, it's the last bastion of wilderness. It's the last opportunity I suppose that we can have wildlife roaming in their natural state, in a natural way, and enjoy our wildlife herds and the wildlife herds of various species throughout our forest. And there's a need to maintain that and, I say, a need to maintain it. It's not only a need based on the economy. It's not only a need based on the economic factors that drive that decision-making process.

I think we, as this generation, have a duty. A duty to ensure that generations, next generations and generations to come into the future, will have the same privilege and opportunity to enjoy that wilderness, to enjoy that beauty that is a part of that wilderness. And it is necessary for us to ensure that we are able to provide that for those future generations. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that a part of the forest management plan here would be to ensure that we were able to get the maximum benefit from the use of our forests — a multi-facet use of our forests — to benefit the economy but not to do so at the price and the cost of losing that forest.

We must be able to find a way to be able to balance the usage so we can ensure that there's opportunity, economic opportunity within the resource of that forest boundary, but at the same time would be able to ensure that we will be using that forest in a way that's reasonable and a way that will ensure that into the future we will continue to have a forest that our children, our grandchildren, and their children and their grandchildren will continue to enjoy.

I think we're obligated to do that, Mr. Speaker, because in this forest of course, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot more than just the trees. I mean, usually yes, that's the common thread I guess you could say when one mentions forests. You think of trees. You think of trees; you think of lumbering. You think of plywood. You think of building material and that sort of stuff. But within that forest is also the cradle of life for our wildlife species, whether they be big game, whether it be birds, whether it be waterfowl, whether it be, you know, coyotes. And as I understand, Mr. Speaker, I know that the coyote population in the province is down this year over what it was in previous years, but I don't think that had anything to do with the forest. It probably had something to do with other management policies of the government.

But what we need to do is ensure that those areas stay as they are, stay as pure as . . . to stay as fresh, to stay available, and be able to be harvested in a sustainable way to ensure that, yes, we

enjoy the economy from the forest areas, but we do so in a manner to ensure that we will have the ability not to damage that forest but to ensure that that forest will continue in its present form and be able to support life well into the future for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, when the government in this particular Bill suggested the purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable use of our forest lands for benefit of the current and future generations, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more. I think that should be the purpose of our . . . One of the major purposes of our existence in this House and participation in this House is to ensure that we create a society that we enjoy the economic benefits, we enjoy the economic prosperity, but we also ensure that we create a society that will protect, will protect our environment and protect our forests so that they would be available there in the future for economic purposes, continue to support our economy into the future on an economic basis so that our children and our grandchildren would have a part of that as their economy, a part of that as the makeup their economy of the province at that time, but to also ensure that they have a forest that they can enjoy the same way as we have enjoyed it and past generations have enjoyed it.

And to do that, Mr. Speaker, the government needs to work at finding a balance that will ensure the continued economic benefit from that forest as well as the social and cultural opportunities, and that this will be done so in a manner that will maintain a healthy forest. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to do this, I would think that the government would need to consult with those individuals, groups, communities that have a significant investment in the well-being of the forest.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that I would have of the government here is I would like to know to what extent was there consultations in regards to putting together the proposed changes as housed in Bill 123. I know that I've gone through the notes that they sent along with the Bill here and, Mr. Speaker, I haven't yet been able to find any information that would give me a degree of comfort that the government has done a meaningful job of consulting with the forest industry, done a meaningful job of consulting with those other users of the forest, whether it be the trappers' association or whether it be the grazing association.

Have they talked to them? Have they talked to the communities who much of their commerce depends on the forest industry itself? Have they talked to others who use the forest on an ongoing basis? The sportsmen? Sportsmen who use the forest as an area for hunting in the fall time, whether it be waterfowl but primarily the big game hunters. Have they talked to the hunters or the hunting association as to their input into what needs to be done to ensure the balance and the management of the forest? Have they talked to those communities whose economy of the community depends largely on the forest and the activity around that forest? One of the communities I'm thinking of is Hudson Bay. I've had opportunity to be in Hudson Bay many times in the past. I've had even some relatives living in Hudson Bay.

And it was, when you were in that community, you quickly recognized how important the forest was and the activity surrounding that forest was to the economy of that particular

community. And it not only was the ongoing harvest of wood from the forest of course, which was very important, an ongoing mainstay of the economy of that particular community and area, but also the other activities such as hunting and fishing. Talking to those people in the service industries in those communities, they would tell you that hunting and fishing would play a very important part in their entire year's revenue, so it was certainly important. And that was obviously a noticeable one.

I'm just wondering if the government has taken the time to have a meaningful conversation, a meaningful dialogue with individuals or groups that represent individuals such as the business people in these communities. Has the government had those discussions? And if they did, then I would like to know who they met with. I would like to know what these discussions, really, where did they go and what was some of the responses of those people who were involved in the discussions? Were they positive? Were they negative?

Did they meet with the Outfitters Association and discuss these possible changes with the Outfitters Association and what would that mean to their business? It may not mean anything. It may not affect them at all. I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'm just wondering if the government knows. I'm wondering if the government has carried out those consultations, had those discussions, and if the government . . . what the government learned and how they took those discussions and the messages within those discussions and how they incorporated them in this Bill. And what were the changes in this Bill that's come about as a result, a direct result of those discussions, Mr. Speaker?

So those, those are just a few of the questions right off the top of my head that I would like to know because I believe a role of government, a role of any government . . . And I think this government, Mr. Speaker, as well as any other government in the past or perhaps even governments in the future, the fundamental desire by a government is to make life better for the people they represent, for the people they govern. There's no question about that in my mind, Mr. Speaker. And I think in the political realm of things it's that we all differ on how we would achieve that. We all have our different ideas of how to go about achieving that.

But I think fundamentally, if you want to really make changes that benefit the people out there, you need to talk to those folks who are on the front lines who are those folks that face the problems each and every day. An old schoolteacher of mine once, I remember in high school, one of the many messages that he would put across to us was that if you have, if you're looking for a solution to a problem, if you're looking for a solution to a problem, you go to where the problem is. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if you're looking for a solution to a problem, you go to those people who have the problem and you talk to them. Because they have the problem and they understand the issue. They also know what it takes to solve that problem. They also know the answer to that problem.

So if you want good advice, you go to the people who are on the front lines of the issue that may be at hand. In this case it, of course, it would be the forest management. So I would suggest that if you want to find out solutions to some of the questions or some of the issues that may be presenting themselves within the

forest management issue, you're going to talk to the people on the front lines, the people who are involved in the industry, whether it be the forest industry, you talk to the foresters. You talk to the large companies which, yes, we need them. They make jobs, and they do a good job of harvesting our forest and do a good job of forest husbandry. I know that they spend thousands if not millions of dollars in reforestation projects, and this is good. I think this is really good.

But there's also little independent operators throughout our forest, Mr. Speaker, that do, I think, also an excellent job. They're smaller operators. They're more selective, I guess you would say, in their logging practices. And I think we need to talk to them to find out from them what might be incorporated in this Bill that would affect them in a positive way. Perhaps the government has done that. I don't know. What I'm asking is if the government has done that, if they would make that information available to us so that we would be able to, in our consultation process, would be able to know what level of consultation the government had actually carried out.

[15:45]

Mr. Speaker, there are so many various aspects of the usage of the forest. And this is why it's very important that we do have a Bill, that we do have a Bill that addresses the needs to have a forest management and we do have forest management here because the forest is a multifaceted operation. It provides services to so wide and varied parts of our economy that it's very important, and it's important that when we make changes to the Act that we make the right changes to the Act.

It's very important that we talk to those people who are on the front lines, to those people who are involved in the forests in some aspect of the forest, that we find out from them what it is that they would recommend be changed and how those changes would benefit them and/or their industry, and take those changes and incorporate them in the Bill so at the end of the day we produce, we produce a product here that is beneficial to the people of Saskatchewan, beneficial to those people who are involved in the forest industry. And that we must, Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that we get things right. And I'm hoping that a part of that process, that the government has carried out meaningful discussions, meaningful consultation with the various users of our forest.

We do have of course the government department which is the overarching protector of the forest which supervises the use of the forest, which ensures that the rules and regulations as set forth by the department to protect the forest, to make sure that the forest renders its maximum economic benefit to the people of the province, but at the same time ensuring that it doesn't do so in a manner that's going to have long-term and significant damage to our forest.

And I want to take my hats off to those people who do that because I have had in the past experience to be able to share some time with many of these people, and they're truly professionals. They're truly professionals. They take a special interest in that forest. It reminds me of an individual who, perhaps looking after his house in the city, he takes a special interest in it, a special care for it, or go the extra mile to make sure things are done right. Well those people who oversee the

operations in the forest and are supervisory capacities to ensure that our forests are well maintained and that those who use our forests do so within the regulations set forward, they do so with just a real passion and it's because they feel that that forest is really a living being; it's a living, live being, and they're proud of it. And they're proud of their work, and they should be because they do a good job, Mr. Speaker.

But the forests offer so many, so many different services, I guess you would say, that we enjoy. One of the things that I can think of, Mr. Speaker, that often goes missed when you use the word forest is that deep in our forest we often have very, very lucrative — as far as fishing is concerned, I guess — it's lucrative lakes. They have very good lakes as far as fishing is concerned. They're beautiful lakes. They're fresh water, they're pure. And they offer the sports fisherman really an opportunity to have a great experience and going out and spending time on those lakes.

And I have, I've spent, you know, not a lot of time — I'm not a great fisherman, I'll be the first to admit that — but I have had the opportunity to spend some time on McBride Lake and Parr Hill Lake and Saginas, Pepaw, Townsend, Smallfish, Spirit Lake, Smallfish Lake, many of these lakes that certainly are bountiful with fish, various species of fish. And it provides a great opportunity for individual sportsmen. It's also a great opportunity for families to enjoy the great outdoors, and they do so by spending time in one of many of the great camping grounds that do exist within our forests.

So, Mr. Speaker, once again, this is just one more example of why it is important to have a forest management Act in place that will ensure the protection of our forests but also ensure that the fine people of Saskatchewan and travellers will be able to utilize the forest to its extent.

And as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, there is no one user of the forest. It's a multi-faceted operation and many people use that forest. In some cases the usage is overlapped, the bounties are overlapped, but in principle, Mr. Speaker, it benefits all that use that forest. Some use it for economic purposes, others use it for sports purposes, and others use it for simply recreation purposes.

But it's a very valuable resource and we need to ensure that it is protected, looked after, well used in a balanced way, but looked after for our own present use now, Mr. Speaker, but so that we have the ability to pass it on from generation to generation with the same level of usage, the same level of protection, the same level of beauty, and that other generations should inherit from us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would trust that the government has taken the opportunity to carry out meaningful discussions with the various users of our forest so that they would be able to gather the information so that when they do make changes and drafting changes to the Bills and changes to the Bills, that it's perhaps more than just a housekeeping or perhaps more than just window dressing. That the changes to the Bill will have been meaningful to those who use our forests for the so many different, different purposes.

And I have no reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the



government did not do this. I have no reason to believe the government did not do this. I also have no way of being able to prove that the government did do it. There is no evidence in the notes here, no schedule of meetings, no list of those who were met with, no information in regards, no notes in regards to what the discussions were with the various groups. There's none of that that's available to us, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't detect any of it in the minister's second reading speech either although I will admit I didn't read it thoroughly. I just sort of had the opportunity just to glance at it here.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that the government did because I think the government members over there would agree with me that the . . . and they fully recognize the importance of our forest and the importance that the forest plays within the economy of our province. And also the wonderful opportunities that it provides for the present generation to use that forest, not only in an economic way, but in a recreational way.

And, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that within the Bill there's proposed amendments that will really cause a moving away of the department, of moving away from the present process of licensing organizations, individuals, and activities within the forest — moving that away from that licensing routine that we've had in the past to more of a self-regulated method, I guess you would say, within the forest.

And that, Mr. Speaker, then causes me a little bit of concern. It caused me a little bit of concern because I don't see any explanation in the notes provided to us here that would indicate that the government has thoroughly thought this process through. And my concern of course immediately would be that the movement away from licensing organizations, companies, from certain activities within our forest, would that then cause perhaps the government to have less ability to supervise those activities? If the government then has, and the government officials has less ability to supervise those activities, how can we be assured that those activities aren't going to have a damaging effect on our forest? How can we be assured that a continuation of those activities might have a long-term negative effect upon our forests?

My concern here, of course, Mr. Speaker, and one of those would be the perhaps weakening of the environmental protection rules and regulations, Mr. Speaker, and . . .

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

**Ms. Schriemer:** — To request permission to introduce guests.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — Is leave granted?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Schriemer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce a friend of mine in the Speaker's gallery. She's a school friend — we went to school starting in kindergarten together — and her name is Jeannine Fournier from Montmartre, Vibank, Saskatchewan.

I just want to comment that the member from Lloydminster had made a comment about casting down a bucket to venture into entrepreneurship in our great province. And I'd like to just say that my friend Jeannine has done just that, opening a new bistro in Montmartre.

Welcome. I'd like to ask all to welcome her to her legislature. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — I'd like to thank the member from Saskatoon Sutherland for the introduction. And the member from Regina Northeast has the floor.

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

#### **Bill No. 123 — *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2009*** (continued)

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to welcome our guest here too. I hope she enjoys her time in this legislature. It's a unique place. And I hope she enjoys the time here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue on in expressing my concerns over the proposed amendments that are embodied in this particular Bill that has a tendency to shift the responsibility, I would think, the responsibility away from the ministry to a more self-regulated process within our industry and . . . within our forest, rather. And as I indicated earlier, it is a bit concerning because the present system, certainly if you want to carry out an activity in the forest, whether it be grazing or hunting or trapping or forest harvesting, you need to go to the department and you need to get a licence or a permit to carry out such activities.

Well by doing that, then the department officials know, you know, who's in the forest. They know where they're at and they know what activity they're carrying on. And it makes it, I would think, a lot easier for them to be able to supervise those activities, to ensure that the individual or group or company are carrying out their activities within the regulations as set forward within the Act. And I think that's a fair and reasonable approach.

After all, Mr. Speaker, that forest doesn't belong to me or to you or to any one group. It belongs to all of us. There is a opportunity for us to utilize that forest through a permitting system where we can explain to the department, we want a permit because we want to maybe harvest some firewood or maybe we want to harvest some wood for other reasons that is not encumbered by some other agreement.

And that we can . . . Or we'd want to maybe have a trapline, and we'd purchase a trapline and want to go trapping furs. As my colleague tells me, the fur prices are starting to come back. I didn't realize that, but I understand the fur prices or at least some of the fur prices are starting to come back where probably now it starts to make some economic sense to get back into the fur-retrieving business. And if that's the case, well then there's the opportunity there.

But in order to do that under the present system, an individual, group, or company would have to approach the department and receive permit or permission through a licence or through a permit in order to carry out that activity in the forest. That's fine, and I think that's great because then those people who are hired by us, the people of Saskatchewan, to ensure that the forests are well looked after and that they are safeguarded against misuse or improper use, have the ability to know who's in there and know where they're at, what activity they're supposed to be carrying on. And be able to go out and then gauge their activity, their actions of their activity against their permit and to ensure that the forest is not being misused or abused or harmed in any manner, shape, or form.

But when we move away from that, we go to a self-regulated system. And I would think, Mr. Speaker, that probably in most cases that would not be a problem. Probably in most cases the individual or the group or the company that might be carrying out those activities within that forest would do so in a proper manner, would do so in a manner that ensures the safety and health, the good health of our forest continues on.

My concern is, Mr. Speaker, is that one that might not, that one bad apple in the barrel that can spoil it for the rest of us. And without having some mechanism to supervise those activities, we won't know. We won't know that that bad apple, that one particular instance isn't operating within the regulations of the forest and that is in the long run doing some significant damage to our forest. That we won't know that activity is happening until it's too late, until the damage has been done. Until we recognize that afterwards, after perhaps the individual or group is long gone, then we come upon this problem because the regulations were not followed properly and the damage has been done.

[16:00]

So that is one of the reasons why I think it's important that we have a management plan in our forest, but a management plan that is effective and efficient, that does ensure at the bottom line that our forests are protected, that our forests won't be damaged to the point where they're damaged beyond repair, that we have the ability to maintain those forests in a good, healthy condition for today's use, for tomorrow's use, and for the use of generations to come.

I think that, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line. And I'm concerned when I see that this Bill has a tendency to move away from the permitting process, move away from the licensing process to a more self-regulated process. And that is a concern to me because I wonder if that just doesn't weaken our ability to ensure that we maintain on the long term, on the long run, a healthy forest — not only for ourselves but for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, on that same line, moving away from licence and licensing and permitting for various activities within the forest certainly creates a problem. Like who is going to determine what activities will be licensed and what activities won't need to be licensed any more? It will be self-regulated. Who is going to determine what activities? Who is going to determine whether it be the sportsmen? Are we going to say that sportsmen will now be able to hunt big game in our forests

without having to have a licence? If that's the case, then how are we going to be able to regulate the population of our big game? We won't know who is in there. We won't know what has been taken out.

Who is going to regulate the trapping industry? The fur prices are coming back and likely that'll cause a greater interest in getting involved in the trapping industry. And if that's the case, then who's going to regulate that to ensure that the harvest of for example beavers is at a level that is sustainable so that the population will be sustained over a period of time and not be overtrapped and therefore perhaps trapped into extinction?

Who's going to ensure that the park spaces, the overnight camping spaces, the weekend camping spaces that are along many of our great lakes are properly used and aren't abused, that the damage isn't done, that they're being looked after so that it's a beautiful area, it attracts people who want to come there and spend the weekends or perhaps even spend their holidays in many of our beautiful, beautiful facilities that are in our forests?

Who is going to make that determination, Mr. Speaker? How is that going to happen? Who is going to decide what activities have to be licensed, what activities have to be permitted, and which ones will be just simply left to be self-regulated? Simple question, Mr. Speaker, and I would have hoped that the government has given some thought to this. I would have hoped the government would have had as part of their consultation process, one of those items on the agenda to be talked about, would be who was going to make these decisions. And I don't see that. I don't see it in the information they've provided us.

I haven't heard of any of these consultation processes taking place from the people across this great province that I've had a very narrow opportunity to talk to because I just . . . a number of responsibilities, and this particular one is one that I haven't been able to get to covering all of the bases. But from those people that I've talked to, they quite frankly weren't even aware that these changes were about to be brought to this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, if audits are going to be the way that the government wants to move in this particular Bill — and that's what it seems like — if audits is going to be the way that the government wants to move on this issue, then who will do it? Who will do the audits on the various activities that take place in our forest reserve? Who's going to make those audits and who's going to pay for them? Will the users have to pay? Will the department pay? Will the taxpayers as a whole pay? Who's going to have to pay for these audits that the government is talking about implementing?

And if they do an audit, Mr. Speaker, and they find that some individual or group or company is breaking the rules as set forward, breaking the regulations as set forward, will there be a penalty? And if there will be a penalty for not following the rules after perhaps a reasonable warning, reasonable discussions, certainly ensuring that the individuals are aware that what they're doing is wrong or the group or the company is aware that what they are doing is wrong — and if they continue to do that and the department has to step in — what will the penalties be? What will the penalties be? What will the penalties be to those who are not following the guidelines as set

forward to protect our forest and to ensure that our forest will be looked after in a well and balanced way into the future? What will those penalties be, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like the government, through this Bill, their intention is to move to more of a results-based regulations and put some more control in the industry's hands and less control in that of those who supervise and look after our forests on our behalf. And if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, once again it raises the issue with me as to how can we ensure, how can we ensure through this activity that the self-regulated industries are doing so with the fundamental principle in mind of protecting the forests for future generations? And they are willing to do that even if it means a reduced profit for them or perhaps increased costs for them. And how can we be assured that they are going to put that first and foremost ahead of the profits that they perhaps want to make? Or the ability to utilize and overutilize a certain aspect of that forest that will do long-term damage and significant damage, and maybe damage that we won't be able to recover from and therefore we'll lose that activity or lose that part of the forest for future generations.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's just one of the many questions that come to mind. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we have seen most recently the situation where perhaps the rules and regulations weren't clear enough or weren't meaningful enough or perhaps weren't enforced enough to ensure that the forest was looked after. And we've seen instances where, in the past, overharvesting of our timber for example caused damage to the forest that will take generations for it to recover from. And that means there's generations that will be lost to the usage of that particular area of forest. It will be lost to the using of that forest, whether it be for economic purposes or recreational purposes.

So, Mr. Speaker, since 55 per cent of our province is covered with forest, it's obvious that the forest is a major, major important part of our economy, major important part of our province, a very important part of the future of our province, and a very important part for our future generations to be able to utilize.

So, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that when we make changes to the Acts that govern the management of our forest, we must be careful in making those changes. Those changes can only come about after reasonable and extensive consultation with those involved in the forest industry and those whose livelihood depends on the activity within that forest and for those people who simply enjoy the opportunity to get out and enjoy the wilderness, enjoy our forest, enjoy the recreational opportunities that presents itself within that forest, Mr. Speaker.

And I think we have an obligation. We have an obligation as elected members of the legislature to ensure that when we do make changes to an Act that those changes at the end of the day will result in a positive result for Saskatchewan people. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that goes without saying, that we have that responsibility.

Now I say, we. I mean members on both sides of the House. It's not isolated just to the government. It's not just the government's responsibility. It's also the opposition's responsibility. It's the opposition's responsibility to ask the questions of the government. It's the opposition's responsibility

to hold the government accountable, to ensure that the government has done due diligence, to ensure that the government has done its homework, to ensure that the government has talked to those people who are the front-line people in our industry. And this particular industry is the forest industry.

We must make sure that we've heard from those folks because, Mr. Speaker, it's been my experience throughout life, if you want to get the best possible information on an issue, you talk to those people who are affected each and every day by that issue. As I said before, I had an old high school teacher that used to say that if you want an answer to a problem, you look at the problem. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if you want an answer to the problem, you talk to the people who've got the problem. In other words, if you want an answer to an issue in regards to the forestry, you talk to the people who are involved in the forestry, particularly those whose livelihood depends on the activity within that forest.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important that we hold this government accountable. It's very important that we hold this government to task, that we hold this government up to its commitment for transparency and accountability, which, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see the action that is reflected in those words. I know that during the last election this government campaigned on many, many, many promises. Unfortunately when you look at the list, Mr. Speaker, you see just as many promises not kept.

So, Mr. Speaker, it concerns me when the government brings forward a Bill that has significant changes in it, significant changes to the forestry management of our great forests in this province, and they do so without having supporting documentation that will provide us the information and the comfort to know that the government has done due diligence, that the government has done its consulting, that the government has talked to those people on the front lines, and that they have brought forward recommendations of management changes that will be positive in the long-run, that will cause the forest to be probably even a healthier industry, a stronger industry, to cause the forest to continue to be a healthy part of our province for many years to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of other questions that I could get into on this particular Bill. But I do know that I have colleagues in this Assembly who wish to enter into this debate and debate on other Bills. So I will limit my comments today to what I have already outlined and reserve the opportunity to revisit this particular issue at some point in time in the future, Mr. Speaker, so that if I have even more questions I wish to ask of the government, I would have the opportunity to do so. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will move adjournment of debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — The member from Regina Northeast has moved adjournment of debate on Bill No. 123, *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2009*. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — Carried.

**Bill No. 119**

[The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Morgan that **Bill No. 119 — *The Ticket Sales Act*** be now read a second time.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — I recognize the member from Athabasca.

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to take a few minutes just to familiarize the audience with what the important point is on Bill No. 119, *The Ticket Sales Act*. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's only appropriate that I explain to the people that may be listening what is this whole notion behind Bill 119 and what is your position as an opposition member on what Bill 119 is all about.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to a news release issued November 24th, 2009. And the headline of the news release . . . And I'm quoting to ensure that we follow the rules properly. I'll read press release so people know exactly what Bill 119 is all about. I think it's important they know what it's about so we could certainly . . . or they can make sense of what we're trying to talk about as an opposition, and what some of the concerns are. I think that's only appropriate.

[16:15]

So I'll begin, and I quote:

Province introduces legislation to protect consumers by regulating ticket sales

The Government of Saskatchewan today introduced *The Ticket Sales Act*, following extensive consultations with industry and the public. The Act will ensure that Saskatchewan people have a fair chance to purchase tickets to an event by limiting the activities of secondary ticket sellers, also known as ticket resellers.

"People deserve a fair chance to buy tickets to events and entertainment at the time they are offered," Justice Minister and Attorney General Don Morgan said. "There have been too many situations where tickets have sold remarkably quickly and then [they] have been offered for resale at extremely high prices. This Act will level the playing field and make it fair for Saskatchewan consumers."

The legislation will prohibit the primary seller from having links on their website to reseller websites, prohibit secondary ticket sellers from selling tickets to an event that are primarily being sold by a company legally associated with them and prohibit advertising the sale of tickets by a reseller until 48 hours after the tickets go on sale to the public. The Act also makes it illegal [to use a computer, or] to use computer software to automatically buy tickets. The accompanying regulations will contain reporting requirements to allow the Minister of Justice to get information from venues about the numbers of tickets that were available for public sale.

The Act does not address secondary ticket sales where

consumers who purchase tickets and are unable to use them sell or trade . . . [these tickets.] It also does not limit the price that can be asked for a resale ticket.

The Act allows for fines of up to \$5,000 for individuals and [up to] \$100,000 for corporations for a first offence, and up to \$10,000 and \$500,000 respectively for subsequent offences, as well as the potential of up to a year in jail for a convicted individual.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the intent here would be with the Bill, Bill 119, is they're simply trying to have some sanity about how tickets are being sold and how the public has access to tickets. And that automatically when a venue is being proposed or a concert is being held, that there isn't this process in place where the public don't have access to it and right away a block of tickets is being shipped off to some other company or some other corporation that can then turn around and, I'm assuming, can sell it a greater price.

So in theory having the regulations around ticket sales and making sure this doesn't become a major problem, I think in theory that that's not a bad concept at all. But we have to really be very careful here because while you want to do that and ensure the public is not being thwarted in terms of having access to these events, you also want to make sure that the intent is followed through as sensibly and as thoroughly as you can. Because I, like anybody else, you want to have the opportunity to attend a Roughrider game or go to a concert or go to some venue. And that's something that's every family's wishes to do. Absolutely every family wishes to have this opportunity.

The anger and the frustration by the public, when a venue's being proposed and they go to buy tickets, all of a sudden all the tickets are gone very quickly. And they say, well how does that happen? Are people phoning in? Are people calling? Like how could you sell that many tickets in that short of a time? What was happening is some of the people were getting a bunch of tickets and sending it down further down the line to some of the resellers. And that's kind of what the public was quite upset about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that we look at the whole notion of people that sell tickets to venues legally, responsibly, and certainly fairly. That's not the target of what the Bill's about. The Bill quite frankly is saying that, in those venues, in that circumstances, we believe from opposition that there are some very responsible people such as Ticketmaster that does good work and certainly has helped craft the Act to make sure it follows with its intent.

Now one of the things that should be pointed out, and I go to a website notice from CBC [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation] News, and this is dated November 24th, 2009. And the headline says, "Saskatchewan has introduced legislation to curb the resale of concert tickets." And again I go back to the quote:

But Joe Freeman, a spokesman for Ticketmaster, says the government is targeting his company for something he claims it isn't doing.

"I think it's predicated on a notion that Ticketmaster is

somehow diverting tickets to the reseller or allowing brokers preferential access to tickets,” Freeman said. “That simply is not the case.”

Mr. Speaker, I end the quote there. So on one hand, in the press release the minister talks about collaboration, communication, and co-operation with Ticketmaster. So we assume, okay fine. It is one of the people, one of groups and organizations that most people have exposure to. Ticketmaster’s pretty well known; they’re a very, very, very professional company. And the minister says, well we also have some advice from them. And so we assume if he puts it on paper, that the assumption is that he did have advice from them. But as the CBC story says, Ticketmaster’s saying no, no, no. They are targeting us, and we’re telling them we’re not doing this.

So I get a bit confused, Mr. Speaker, as to what’s going down here. What’s going on? Because if the intent is to stop, stop this practice of having a bunch, a whack of tickets going to resellers right now, as opposed to having the public have access to them, then obviously we support that notion. And then when the government says we’re trying to do this in co-operation with some of the bigger names of people that do sell tickets to many, many venues, and the name that was mentioned was Ticketmaster. And you say, well that’s good. They’re collaborating and co-operating and asking advice.

But then we hear from Ticketmaster that it’s not the case, that they’re simply not working together. So I’m trying to figure out from my perspective is, while the intent is there, why isn’t there good collaboration from a very important player called Ticketmaster? Why isn’t Ticketmaster part and parcel of the successful note that the minister talks about on this Bill? Because I don’t believe that the minister actually totally had the level of co-operation and collaboration from Ticketmaster that he claimed in his press release.

So, Mr. Speaker, you’ve got to be very, very careful here. When you do things that you tell the public you want to do and you’re at odds with one of the biggest players involved in this — in this case, in ticket sales, in Ticketmaster — then it becomes a bit confusing. Because the public’s saying, good, something’s being done about it. And we’re assuming something’s being done about it. After all, they’re talking to Ticketmaster. But then Ticketmaster’s saying, no, no, no, there’s some problems here. We’re being accused of that and that’s not the case.

So then I go down to the Bill. I look through the Bill to try and see what exactly are they talking about? Like what’s their target? And I’ll just give you a quick notion. There are a bunch of definitions that the minister has. And some of the lines in this, and I’m quoting from *Hansard*, it says:

... a person, other than a secondary seller, who is engaged in the business of making tickets available for sale, and includes the owner of the place to which a ticket provides admission, the promoter of the event occurring at that place and any agent or broker of those persons.

So that’s the definition of a primary seller. That’s the definition that the minister has in his Bill. And the second part, again, it lays out in this section:

... a primary seller and a secondary seller are associated if they are associates within the meaning of *The Business Corporations Act*.”

So we understand what a primary seller is. We understand what a seller and a reseller is. If they’re connected through *The Business Corporations Act*, then that makes them basically one and the same kind of a person or company.

And other codes that are important here is that:

No person, other than a primary seller, may sell, advertise or list for sale, in any manner, any tickets to an event in Saskatchewan until at least 48 hours after the tickets to the same event were made available to the general public by a primary seller.

Again makes sense because, obviously, you don’t want to have a big block of tickets that — say, 60, 70 per cent of the tickets — going out to all these resellers when the concert is announced for the first hour. And all of a sudden, all the tickets are gone and John Q. Public has no access and opportunity to buy those tickets. So the intent is there, and I think the people of Saskatchewan want it.

And if you’re going to do something, the only message that we have is, do it right. Collaborate with industries. Don’t say you have collaboration with industries when Ticketmaster is saying there is none. We’re being accused by this government of doing that, and we’re not. We’re not doing that. We think it’s a responsible way to, responsible position to put that forward.

So in theory, the legislation says you can’t be having tickets and doing things in the past . . . that you’ve done in the past in terms of hosting events. And you got a big ticket, say for example an AC/DC concert. You have a big venue and people want to get tickets. You can’t be taking a big block of those tickets as a ticket seller or a sponsor of that event and shipping it to a bunch of your affiliates and telling them, okay here’s a bunch for you, here’s a bunch for you, here’s a bunch for you. You can sell them at whatever price you want. And therefore, the people of Saskatchewan don’t have any opportunity through us, but they can buy it from you guys at a higher price as a reseller. So you know, it makes sense in the sense of, you know, that’s not fair at all to the people of Saskatchewan.

So how do we deal with this? How do we stop it? It’s one of the ideas the minister says, well we collaborated with Ticketmaster. Not so, but we’ll set that argument aside.

But they’re saying that they can’t resell those tickets until 48 hours after the fact, after the venue has been advertised by the primary ticket seller, which in this case could be Ticketmaster. Now what’s to stop Ticketmaster from saying, okay 48 hours we have to wait. So we’ll give you a whack of tickets now, you guys. We’ll give it to you now, but you can’t give those tickets out for 48 hours’ notice. Is there provisions within the Act that says (a) they can’t specifically do that? Is there a number attached to the amount of tickets that these guys can, say for example, say to their resellers, we’ll send you a whole bunch but don’t sell those tickets until 48 hours have expired. We’ll keep some over here and you guys sit on yours because that’s the new law, that’s a new rule. So is there legislation to that

effect in the Bill? And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't see any of that that would preclude that from happening.

Now they've identified the fines. And it's very clear, like fines are there to act as a disincentive for that practice to continue, and they're fairly significant fines. You've got to make absolutely sure that again the intent here is followed. You want to stop that activity from occurring, and fines are a good disincentive for that to continue. Fair enough.

So they've identified the primary seller. They've identified how a partnership could be viewed as one and the same, whether you're two individual people or two companies. They've identified the fines. And just to let you know, the first fine somebody has is up to 5,000 for an individual and 100,000 for a corporation. And then the second offence, the subsequent offences may go as high as 10,000 for an individual and 500,000 for a corporation. So they've identified the penalties. They've identified the business arrangements. They've identified the practice.

Now to regulation. They want to make sure this is going on and the intent is followed. So the minister says, well we still don't know if this is going to work. We still don't know if it's going to work. He's told the media that. And we're trying to figure out, okay, you know it's a work-in-progress because again it goes back to the intent.

So my point being on this whole Bill is that if you're going to craft up a Bill, you're going to advertise it through Saskatchewan, you want to be their big hero in stopping families from having access to all these great events, these concerts, these shows, then you ought to make sure that the intent is followed through. You don't just say it. You actually have processes. You have well thought-out strategy. You have collaboration by and through industry to make sure that this is followed through as best in meeting its intent as possible. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any of that in this Bill. I don't see any of it.

What is to stop Ticketmaster from saying, okay you guys wanted to put a lid on what we're doing. Fine, we will. And the people from North Battleford or northern Saskatchewan or Weyburn, they have just as much opportunity as somebody from Saskatoon, Regina, where these events may be hosted, as having access to a ticket. I don't believe this legislation's going to solve that problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I really don't believe it's going to solve the problem because quite frankly there's ways and means you can work around these rules and regulations.

[16:30]

So right away the minister puts up these huge fines and said, this is the deterrent, and here is the information on the definition of a seller and a reseller. And here's how we're going to view whether they're connected or not. And oh you can't use technology or computers to have any kind of connection with these two entities to allow reselling. And you have to wait 48 hours before you're allowed to have resellers sell those tickets at a, I'm assuming, a greater price. But your still allowed to sell tickets on an individual basis, either through Kijiji or through the newspapers or whatever the case may be.

Say for example I buy a ticket and — normally purchased through the normal practice and through the proper channels — and I can't go. Say I can't go to a certain event because I'm going to go to a huge NDP fundraiser, let's use that as an example, and so I want to give my ticket up. Nothing's stopping me from advertising on Kijiji or at a newspaper that I want to sell this ticket that I have. They're not going after those people, which is fine and that's fair. But what's to stop this thing from turning around and having individuals buy a whack of tickets and doing this at a greater price?

So the resellers would lose the opportunity attached to the profits of those tickets, and all of a sudden it becomes more individual, from a thousand people as opposed to one or two main companies that do their reselling now. So there's a lot of things that I look at, and I think to myself, you know, you've got to make sure that when you propose a legislation or you want Acts in this Assembly passed that you're very thorough in your work. And as I mentioned at the outset, I see the definitions of a seller, reseller. I see the fines. I see the supposed collaboration with Ticketmaster. I see the press release. I see all the fanfare with the intent of the Bill.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you've got to make sure, you've got to make sure that it is hitting the right target, its intent is followed through. And that quite frankly when it comes to curbing this practice and backing up the families or the people who want to go to these events, and having them the fair opportunity for them to buy tickets, then you've got to do your work. You've got to do your work and make sure that's what you want to do.

And I see this Bill, it is absolutely full of holes in terms of how they're going to deal with the issue. There is opportunities left and right for people to manipulate the process. And at the end of the day, at the end of the day you're simply going to have people that are going to get around the rules and regulations, and the intent is not going to be followed. There's still going to be people that are going to be circumvented when they're trying to buy tickets to a major concert or to a major event.

I want to pick up a bit on the whole notion of my colleague who spoke about the court system and how important is the process to get these bad guys that are doing this and how much money will that cost to go after them. How much time in the court system can you actually commit to dealing with the issues? And how will you determine who is doing things wrong? Who are the people that are guilty? Because people are not going to simply sit back and say, okay, I'm guilty of reselling before 48 hours. Oh yes, my company's connected somehow. Yes, go ahead and charge me. They're going to fight this all the way through because the Bill is not thorough enough and some of the potential problems that could occur.

And that's exactly my point. You've made the press release — which is typical of the Saskatchewan Party government — saying, oh we're going to take care of this problem for you. But in theory and truth, the Bill is very, very weak. It is very, very weak. And you can put as much fanfare as you want on definitions, on the fines and the intent, but if you don't have the proper rules and regulations, you don't have the proper process and collaboration by industry, you are running yourself into a major problem.

And yet already the minister's out there telling folks, oh we took care of that problem for you. Aren't we a wonderful, wonderful government to do this? Well quite frankly, if you're going to do something, then you ought to follow through 100 per cent with the intent of the Bill. And I see right from looking at this Bill and looking at it thoroughly that there are some significant, some significant problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, some of the other things that people talk about was the intent of the Bill is the reselling practice, the notion of all the scalping that happens at some of these events. You and I know that you can go to any event and you're going to bump into scalpers no matter what. And I see as an example here that this is not going to prevent scalping in any way, shape, or form. I don't see any evidence whatsoever that it would curb it. In fact I believe that given the nature of the opportunity attached with reselling tickets, valuable tickets, that I think this will only enhance the scalping opportunity that we see happening around many of these major venues throughout our province.

So this in a sense, I think, helps scalpers if they're individual people that are outside of these events. They're outside the facilities. And it's the same notion. Either you get it from a reseller or you get it from a scalper, but either way the public is not going to be protected.

So they dress up the Bill 119 to make it appear that they're going to deal with the problem, when absolutely everybody that I know and everybody involved with the industry says this is not going to work. It is not going to work. They're simply doing this to window dress because how in the heck could you control all the possibilities around ticket reselling? You simply cannot do it because either Ticketmaster sells it as a primary seller or they transfer a block of tickets to the reseller. Or if the reseller doesn't do it, then a bunch of individuals can buy it individually and they resell basically without having to follow the 48-hour rule. Or scalpers could buy a whole whack at the time that the event is announced, and they could make the money.

So the choices quite frankly are clear. You either have the process individually with Ticketmaster and the resellers or you simply go push it underground and have people individually buy these tickets and resell at a greater price. Because I could claim I'm going to go to Timbuktu. And I have four tickets for sale, so I put it on Kijiji and say, look, I've got four tickets. I can't make it.

What's stopping 100 other people from doing that, or 1,000 other people from doing that? Because if I've got four tickets and I want to make an extra 50 bucks off them, I can go on Kijiji saying, look, I've got these tickets for sale. So can I get an extra 50 bucks for them because I can't make it? That practice will flourish. And since the Act itself says we won't do anything to stop that, then you begin to really wonder, well what the heck's going on here? I thought this whole exercise was to stop that activity from happening.

So all the minister is doing is taking the legitimate operation of Ticketmaster and then penalizing them for the reselling opportunity that they at one time had, and turning that and saying, okay, resellers, you can't get these block of tickets. But it's open to the public. It's open to scalpers who might want to

go on Kijiji or outside the venues that these events are happening, and they will make the profit. But there is no charges against them. It'll only be charged against Ticketmaster or the resellers if they don't follow the rules or if they're connected by the Internet or if they're connected through the business corporation branch or if they do this before 48 hours.

And the penalties are fairly severe — half a million dollars for the second offence. And again do the courts have time for all these other activities that Ticketmaster's industry's involved with? I don't think so. The courts are fairly busy. So you look at all the notion, everything from the process of definition, which are just deflections of what the Bill hasn't been able to do. They're good at putting in definitions and we look at that and we understand what the definitions are. They're good at identifying the penalties, but boy, in terms of trying to follow through with the intent of the Bill, there are some significant, significant problems with the structure of this Bill.

Now the minister, give him his due in a sense saying, well it's a work-in-progress. We can't figure this out on our own. We've got all these things that we want to make sure happens. Well my point to him is, well why did you go with great fanfare to make a press release saying that you're going stop this problem? And then a month later after you make this announcement and the public says, good, good, he's doing something about it, then all of a sudden we find out, well it's a work-in-progress. He still can't figure it out.

So that's kind of what I think the whole notion around the ticket sales issue is that the minister, in his haste to appear to be doing public good and to try and look his party look good, didn't do the proper homework, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Didn't do the homework because based on what I see from the Act itself, all you're simply doing is driving the ticket sales to these events underground.

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

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Ask for leave to introduce a guest, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — Is leave granted?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — The member from Yorkton has the floor.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. To you and through you to all the members of the Assembly, I thank the hon. member for taking a seat for the introduction. In your gallery is another, a person very special to me that has been here many times, but I always feel the need to introduce her — my wife, Leone. I'd ask all members to make her welcome to this Assembly.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — I recognize the member from Athabasca.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## SECOND READINGS

**Bill No. 119 — *The Ticket Sales Act***  
(continued)

**Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And certainly I take every opportunity to work with the member from Yorkton and at the quick moment there I thought that was his daughter, but I stand corrected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, getting back to the notion of the Bill, we look at the whole intent. And I want to shift my gears a bit on the actual court system itself because we know that the court system itself is overworked. And I want to pick up on that point.

If there 's clear fines attached to the Bill, which is . . . They're clear. If they're meant to really act as a deterrent, then you'd better have the penalties handed out and the collection of those fines undertaken.

Now what happens, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if some lawyer comes along and some of the companies or one of the entities or the resellers is being charged, and the reseller or the primary seller comes up with the arguments that we're making in the Assembly in relation to this Bill? If they say no, no, what you've done is you have displaced legitimate businesses, business practices that we've done over time, just to look politically attractive to a lot of people, and you've driven that particular practice of reselling to the individual basis or underground to the scalpers.

And how is this going to affect the whole notion of the court system? I think any judge or any sharp lawyer is going to debase the argument. So once again what's going to happen is I think at something as simple as trying to stop the reselling of tickets, if you don't do the fundamental work, you don't put the proper intent in place to make sure the intent is very clear, then obviously the Bill itself is not well thought out of. But since the minister has made all the announcements already with great fanfare and the public is saying good, somebody's doing something about it.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the practice is going to continue whether Ticketmaster or the resellers do it or whether the scalpers do it or whether individuals do it. The practice will continue. And the whole notion of 48 hours that they have to hold back on any selling of tickets to the same venue if they're connected, well that's not going to be much of a deterrent. When you go to court and you get these fines, well that's not going to be much of a deterrent as well.

All you're doing is you're exacerbating the challenge that the legal system have in dealing with all these other issues. And we all know that the justice system itself is overworked, overbooked, and just stressed to a point where it's going to create many, many, more problems in the future if you keep adding penalties and offences and charges that this Bill has identified.

So again I would point out that there are many families out

there — and I appreciate this, I appreciate the intent — but the work has to be done if you want to protect what the people of Saskatchewan want. And that's the primary difference, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I see from an inexperienced government, from a very inexperienced government, because you do the fanfare, you do the announcement, you do all these things, but underneath is the work being done? Is the base of the intent of the legislation, is that solid? Is that thorough? Has that been vetted through a number of processes? Has that been built from the ground up? And the answer that I see from this Bill, and many other Bills, the answer is, quite frankly, no. The answer is no.

[16:45]

And for them to drag the people along, believing that this is done with this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that's not a very fair practice of any government. I think the government ought to realize that they made a mistake on this, they ought to rejig what they're trying to, and really look at what they're trying to do. If they want to get the people of Saskatchewan's support on this then they ought to really look at this whole Bill, Mr. Speaker, because it does not follow through what the intent and the desire of the people of Saskatchewan to curb the activity of not having access to tickets.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I looked at some of the other things that may occur in relation to this Bill. You know, you're going to have junior sports events. You're going to have rodeo events. You're going to have all these other events. And a lot of people use these events for fundraisers, and it's just a phenomenal amount of activity that people have in their home communities. And it's not just big venues and big-name bands. It's a lot of local organizations that do a lot of really good events and big events. Are they going to be monitored and are they going to be looked at with a magnifying glass when they have to do some of these events? Are they now worried about what's going to happen with this particular Bill?

And I can remember a number of years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the hockey draft, the Kenaston super hockey draft. You know, people know in Kenaston they raised a lot of money. They'd done this online hockey draft and people would be buying tickets, or be putting in their team names in with their money to try and win a fairly big, significant prize with Kenaston. And we know that the NHL [National Hockey League] may have complained. There may have been other groups that had complained about the Kenaston Super Draft.

And what happened was they made a lot of good money. There's a very good cause, and they had done everything on the up and up and everything was . . . Actually, Kenaston Super Draft was getting pretty famous, and they were doing really good work. But somewhere along the line, there was a rule and a process that had to be followed and there was that breakdown. There was a breakdown. And had there been some good collaboration at the time with the government, then perhaps the Kenaston Super Draft might have continued. Now I'm assuming that there is some NHL problems with how Kenaston was doing their draft, because obviously there's a connection there.

So I go back to that point, is that there is a good idea, a good



example of how that draft was making money for the community of Kenaston, the fine community of Kenaston, and somewhere along the line a rule or regulation that was not well thought out nor intended actually put a demise to that program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think *The Ticket Sales Act*, Bill 119, is just fraught with a lot of problems. There are a lot of problems. And we have to make sure that we look thoroughly at these Bills, to make sure as an opposition that you do two things: do the work right; do it as thorough as you can. And if you have an intent on a Bill, make sure you have the rules, regulations, procedures, collaboration — everything in place. Because if you don't do it right, you're going to create more problems.

And before you get it right, before you figure this thing out, don't go out to the radio and TV stations and say, look we solved a great problem for you. Because the fact of the matter is from our perspective, from the opposition's perspective, they have not, they have not done their work. They have not figured out that base of rules and that good design of this Bill because quite frankly they don't have the experience. They don't have the experience.

And what happens now is the minister says we solved the problem, but it's a work-in-progress. Well how does that work? How do you solve a problem and yet you say still have a work in progress? Because what's going to happen now is you pretty much made the move to drive the reselling of these tickets underground. That's going to be more individualistic in terms of people buying up tickets and selling them on Kijiji, and it's going to be more of the scalpers that will benefit from this Act.

And the people that actually will follow the rules, will submit to your provincial sales tax, will forward the information to our provincial revenue agency, and they'll do all the different reporting that is required of them. But now they're going to stand by and they're going to watch all this activity happening in their communities and their cities and maybe even around their venues, and not being able to do a darn thing about it because in the Bill there's been nothing to address scalpers and it doesn't do anything to address individual sales of some of these tickets.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to point out that there are people out there that really, truly want to follow the rules. There are people out there that really, truly are committed to their community. There are organizations that count on venues and big concerts and community events for their fundraising. There's a huge pile of people out there, they're as committed as heck, and the only problem is, is they want to follow the rules to make sure that there's good accountability, transparency, and that the money that they generate from these events is going to a good cause. All that is pure. That's good. Some solid, pure arguments that the people of Saskatchewan have.

Now the government comes along through this Bill 119 to talk about ticket sales. And it's confusing, not just to Ticketmaster, but to the resellers, to the scalpers it helps, and to the individuals' ticket sales, that people that might want to sell their tickets, that will help them as well.

So these people have to make sure they follow the rules, the good groups and the good people. And if they're one step out of

line — they make some mistake somewhere, an unknowing mistake somewhere — and then, bang, the big hand of justice will come along and slap them with a \$10,000 fine or a \$100,000 fine. And then what do they do there as a group, as an organization? And that's why I use the example of Kenaston. They're doing good work. Now as a Super Draft, it's not as super as it once was because all of a sudden there's all these rules in place.

Now is that going to happen with some of the venues that we hold in our communities as a result of this Bill? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is. I think it is. You're going to take the hard work and good intent of people on some of these venues and some of these events to try and make a good, solid amount of profit for their community, for their cause or for their project, and you're going to make them do a report, report what they've done and how they're going to sell their tickets. And if they make one small, innocent mistake, not to the benefit of anybody individually, bang, the \$10,000 fine. Or if you're a group or an organization, a \$100,000 fine.

Now if you look at that and you translate all that information and all those rules and regulations and fines right across the board to every single community, every single municipality, every single group in every corner of this province, you can see how this Bill 119 was not well thought out.

Again the minister admits — and it's been an admission that we've been seeing pretty steady from the Saskatchewan Party government — it's a work-in-progress. We haven't figured this thing out yet. Well if you haven't figured it out, why go announce it? Why go announce it? Aren't you putting the horse before the cart? You know, if you haven't figured this thing out yet, why are you going out to the public and saying hey, the great hero, the great new government, has solved this problem for you?

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this whole ticket sales Act, Bill 119, has not been well thought out. The research is poor. The intent is not going to be followed through. It's not going to help the people of Saskatchewan or their families that want to buy tickets to these venues and these events. It's not going to do what the minister said three or four months ago to stop this practice. In fact it's going to be done in such a way that scalpers and people that want to individually profit from some of these events, simply buying up these tickets at a rapid pace and reselling those tickets at a tidy little profit for the individual, Mr. Speaker, that is going to occur as a result of the Bill and how it has not been properly thought out.

But, Mr. Speaker, we in opposition certainly see that time and time again. We have a government across the way that can't manage a two-car parade, and they're running our finances. And, Mr. Speaker, well they're only a billion, \$1.05 billion off. You know, that was the mistake they made. Okay. And now we're finding out, not only from the financial prospective they're not thinking things through, but Bill 119's another example. So no matter how small the issue or how grand the financial plan is, they're making mistake after mistake after mistake. And that's why we on this side of the Assembly say, these guys don't know what they're doing.

So Bill 119, despite the bravado of the minister and the great

amount of explaining he's been doing to the public that he solved the problem, there's nothing in this Bill that would solve the problem of people not being able to access tickets to an event in a timely, fair way. There is simply no way that this Bill can be implemented. There's no way this Bill could be followed. There's no way this Bill could hold up the prosecution of people that continue to do this.

All they've done is they put Ticketmaster and the resellers on notice, and that's not going to do anything to curb the activity. They have in a sense empowered the scalpers and empowered individual ticket sales. And that, I think in the long run, is why I think they got no collaboration publicly from Ticketmaster even though the minister identified in his speech, in his presentation that Ticketmaster collaborated with him.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's quite clear that this minister needs to rethink what he has said to the public. He needs to get up and he's got to say, yes we had this thing figured out, but I didn't have it figured out. It's like that story in the one commercial, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where the referee goes in the middle of the rink and turns to the public and says, I missed that call and I'm sorry. It's my fault. I'm not going to give the other team a penalty to make up for that call I missed. I'm sure we all seen that commercial.

The minister ought to do the same thing. He ought to get up and take a mulligan on this Bill because he's not properly thought this out. But yet he's gone out and he said, he said he is going to solve the problem. What he ought to say is . . . What he ought to do is same thing as a referee, go in some venue and say, look, I had this intent and I told you guys I was going to take care of the problem, but I can't. I didn't think this through. I'm sorry. I just wasn't thorough enough in my job as minister, and yet I already made the call and said we were going to do all these wonderful things.

So I think the minister ought to get up and take a mulligan on this one and say, yes we made a mistake. We empowered scalpers. We empowered individual sales. We penalized Ticketmaster and the resellers. And at the end of the day, there aren't going to be anybody in the province of Saskatchewan are going to get better treatment as a result of this Bill when it comes to trying to buy tickets at certain venues and certain events.

So I think the minister ought to do that and stand up and say he made a mistake. He didn't think this thing through and he ought to do so. And if he doesn't, I think he should resign, Mr. Deputy Chair. I think one of the things that he has to admit is that his work has not been thorough enough and that he's taking credit for something that the Bill is in no way, shape, or form ever going to be able to achieve.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out again in terms of what the other provinces are doing. has the minister at least gone to other provinces and said, what are you guys doing to curb this activity? And I think what's happening is that the minister has not. The minister has not.

And there's an old phrase that I often use and I used many times on my own, is that half of being intelligent is knowing what you're dumb at. So I'll always ask for people's advice because

there's a lot of things that I'm dumb at. But I want to point out that the best thing to do is, when you're in trouble, you're not sure what you're doing, then seek advice from those that are much more advanced in certain areas or much more knowledgeable in certain issues than you are. And that makes you a very smart person if you do that.

So I would encourage the minister to see what the other jurisdictions are doing and to see what they can do to help him out because he needs help. And something as simple as this, not thought out thoroughly, not developed properly can have some negative ramifications. And as much as they want to spout off about solving the problem of ticket reselling and hurting the public, Mr. Deputy Chair, he has not achieved any one of those objectives.

This Bill is contrary to common sense. It's contrary to the intent of what he said he is going to do and it's fraught with problems. And it's wide open for any and many legal challenges that I think people in Saskatchewan will see through and will not see the purpose and the intent of this Bill being followed through.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I . . .

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Elhard):** — It now being 5 o'clock p.m., the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

[The Assembly adjourned at 17:00.]



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

McCall .....	4283
Cheveldayoff .....	4283
Lingenfelter .....	4283
Trew .....	4283
Broten .....	4283
Norris .....	4283
Belanger .....	4284
Morin .....	4284
Schriemer .....	4305
Ottenbreit .....	4311

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

McCall .....	4284
Harper .....	4284
Trew .....	4284
Junor .....	4284
Atkinson .....	4285
Forbes .....	4285
Vermette .....	4285
Broten .....	4286
Furber .....	4286
Morin .....	4286
Taylor .....	4286
Quennell .....	4286
Wotherspoon .....	4286
Chartier .....	4287

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel .....	4287
-------------------------------------------	------

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Saskatchewan Tourism Awards of Excellence</b>	
Wilson .....	4287
Chartier .....	4288
<b>Canadian Red Cross Month</b>	
Junor .....	4287
<b>Saskatchewan's Economy</b>	
McMillan .....	4287
<b>North Saskatoon Business Awards</b>	
LeClerc .....	4288
<b>St. Patrick's Day Luck</b>	
Furber .....	4288
<b>Rural Saskatchewan</b>	
Eagles .....	4289

#### QUESTION PERIOD

<b>School System Funding</b>	
Lingenfelter .....	4289
Krawetz .....	4289
<b>First Nations University of Canada</b>	
McCall .....	4291
Norris .....	4291
Broten .....	4292

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

<b>New Provincial Cultural Policy</b>	
Duncan .....	4293
Chartier .....	4294

#### POINT OF ORDER

D'Autremont .....	4294
Lingenfelter .....	4294

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Weekes .....	4294
--------------	------

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**SECOND READINGS**

<b>Bill No. 121 — <i>The Environmental Management and Protection Act, 2009</i></b>	
<b>Yates</b> .....	4295
<b>Bill No. 123 — <i>The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2009</i></b>	
<b>Harper</b> .....	4301
<b>Bill No. 119 — <i>The Ticket Sales Act</i></b>	
<b>Belanger</b> .....	4308

# GOVERNMENT OF SASKATCHEWAN CABINET MINISTERS

---

**Hon. Brad Wall**  
Premier of Saskatchewan  
President of the Executive Council

**Hon. Bob Bjornerud**  
Minister of Agriculture  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Crop Insurance Corporation

**Hon. Bill Boyd**  
Minister of Energy and Resources  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Power Corporation  
Minister Responsible for Uranium  
Development Partnership  
Minister Responsible for Innovation Saskatchewan  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Research Council

**Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff**  
Minister of Enterprise  
Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated  
Minister Responsible for Trade

**Hon. June Draude**  
Minister Responsible for Crown Investments  
Corporation  
Provincial Secretary  
Minister Responsible for Information Technology Office  
Minister Responsible for Information  
Services Corporation  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Government Insurance  
Minister Responsible for the Public Service Commission

**Hon. Dustin Duncan**  
Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport

**Hon. Rod Gantfoer**  
Minister of Finance

**Hon. Donna Harpauer**  
Minister of Social Services

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison**  
Minister of Municipal Affairs

**Hon. Nancy Heppner**  
Minister of Environment  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Water Corporation

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

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

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

**Hon. Don McMorris**  
Minister of Health

**Hon. Don Morgan**  
Minister of Justice and Attorney General  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Telecommunications

**Hon. Rob Norris**  
Minister of Advanced Education, Employment and Labour  
Minister Responsible for Immigration  
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan  
Workers' Compensation Board

**Hon. Jim Reiter**  
Minister of Highways and Infrastructure  
Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan  
Transportation Company

**Hon. Christine Tell**  
Minister of Government Services  
Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan  
Liquor and Gaming Authority  
Minister Responsible for the Capital Commission