



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

**Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 22 – May 13, 2013**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-Seventh Legislature**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Warren Michelson, Chair  
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Doyle Vermette, Deputy Chair  
Cumberland

Mr. D.F. (Yogi) Huyghebaert  
Wood River

Mr. Rob Norris  
Saskatoon Greystone

Mr. Kevin Phillips  
Melfort

Mr. Warren Steinley  
Regina Walsh Acres

Mr. Corey Tochor  
Saskatoon Eastview

[The committee met at 15:00.]

**The Chair:** — Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We are meeting this afternoon in consideration of a number of bills. My name is Warren Michelson. I am the Chair of this committee. Along with me are the other committee members: Doyle Vermette is the Deputy Chair; Yogi Huyghebaert, Rob Norris, Kevin Phillips, Warren Steinley, and Corey Tochor.

Like I said, we have three bills to consider this afternoon: consideration of Bill No. 62, No. 86 and No. 90. This afternoon we will start out with Bill No. 90, *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013*. I'd like to welcome Minister Reiter and his officials. And Minister Reiter, if you have some opening remarks, you could introduce your officials and carry on with your opening remarks, please.

**Bill No. 90 — *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013***

**Clause 1**

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To my right is our deputy minister, Al Hilton. To my left is our assistant deputy minister, Keith Comstock. And other officials with me here today, behind me, are Ralph Leibel from community planning, Jenna Schroeder, also from community planning, and my chief of staff, Angela Currie. Mr. Chair, I now have some comments I'd like to read into the record, and then we'll entertain any questions.

Mr. Chair, as you know, Bill 90 amends *The Planning and Development Act, 2007*, which provides the legal framework for community planning and municipal land use in Saskatchewan. *The Planning and Development Act* empowers municipalities to facilitate local and regional growth and development in a manner that's appropriate for their situation.

Moreover *The Planning and Development Act* provides municipalities with tools for voluntary land use planning to promote economic growth, environmental stewardship, social and cultural development, and co-operative partnerships with other municipalities, governments, First Nations, Métis, entrepreneurs, and interested stakeholders.

Efficient and effective regional planning is essential to building the sort of collaboration and partnerships that are necessary at the local level to support the Saskatchewan plan for growth. As just one example of many, the members of the Mid Sask Municipal Alliance in the Humboldt region are actively working on a district, official community plan that will help guide the tremendous development opportunities that are afforded by potash expansion.

I'm pleased to report to you that I've recently approved the formation of two brand new district planning groups. First, for the Twin Rivers area involving three RMs [rural municipality] and six urban municipalities in the Rosthern area, and the new Weyburn planning district for the city and RM of Weyburn.

In most cases local councils find ways to co-operate with their neighbours and solve the issues and problems they encounter in a collaborative manner. However in some cases, this sort of intermunicipal co-operation doesn't occur. And perhaps predictably, we see this most often in high-growth areas and in particular around our cities where the challenges of economic growth are felt most acutely. There have been some well-publicized situations where a city and adjacent rural municipality have a strained relationship when it comes to regional planning. Our province can't afford that. After decades of being stagnant, we now have an opportunity to facilitate growth to ensure that it continues.

It's absolutely imperative that we have efficient, effective, and collaborative regional plans and planning structures around our cities. We would prefer it be voluntary, but there are instances where that isn't working. We can't afford to let problems with intermunicipal co-operation endanger the province's economic growth agenda.

That's why our government has decided to add a mechanism that will, when necessary, allow us to put in place collaborative regional partnerships between cities and rural municipalities that will build capacity, address urgent infrastructure and service delivery needs, and create certainty for investment in our growing communities and regions. At the heart of this initiative is the need to ensure development decisions are made in a climate of support for provincial growth, respect for the needs of neighbouring municipalities, and consistency with the interests of the province as a whole.

Bill 90 provides for the implementation of a specific budget proposal on funding regional planning authorities. Direct consultation with external stakeholders was limited as it was part of the budget process. However, extensive discussions with the municipal sector and development industry, respecting the need for more and better district and regional planning, have occurred over the past number of years in a variety of forms.

Also in February of this year, I met with representatives from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association to discuss regional planning issues. Both SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities] and SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association] appreciate the complexities of regional coordination between cities and surrounding rural municipalities. These two associations support a planning framework that encourages intermunicipal and regional planning.

With Bill 90, the province will provide technical and financial support to set up regional planning authorities in Saskatchewan. Funding will be provided to municipalities through the regional planning authority program. The regional planning authority program is focused on providing a means to get past difficult intermunicipal relation problems, not to address costs for province-wide regional planning. The funding associated with this program is considered to be sufficient to meet the start-up costs of a regional planning authority. The responsibility of planning for development is, and will remain, a municipal responsibility. It's therefore reasonable that municipalities contribute part of the associated costs for that planning.

*The Planning and Development Act* currently provides municipalities with several cost recovery options for funding a regional planning authority, including servicing agreement and development levy fees. Municipalities also receive significant unconditional funding from the province through revenue sharing, a portion of which can be allocated to planning services if the municipality chooses to do so.

Highlights of Bill 90 include the following. The amendments will not replace planning districts, but rather will create a new section which provides for regional planning authorities. When deemed necessary, and following consultation with the affected municipalities, a regional planning authority will be formed by minister's order that will set out the terms and conditions for its operation in a way that's similar to the current practice for establishing a planning district.

The composition and description of the regional planning area will be outlined in the order. A regional planning area may consist of all or any portion of a city and its adjacent rural municipality or municipalities. The regional planning authority would prepare a regional plan for the area it encompasses. The composition of a regional planning authority will be similar to that of a district planning authority. The regional planning authority would consist of at least one council member from each included municipality and one or more representatives from the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chair, creating investment certainty in our growth regions requires commitment from our cities and surrounding rural municipalities to work together in advancing essential infrastructure, services, and development decisions in a timely and efficient manner. This is something we've been hearing from the development industry who are looking for municipalities to establish a coordinated approach to development. Planning regionally in concert with neighbouring municipalities helps ensure that the benefits of economic growth are captured for the entire region and, as such, facilitates further economic growth and development.

In closing I'm confident that the amendments proposed in Bill 90 will do just that and most importantly keep the Saskatchewan advantage. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I look forward to entertaining any questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and welcome to your officials. We do have one substitution and that would be Mr. Wotherspoon is sitting in for Mr. Vermette. We are in consideration of *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013*. We will start with clause 1, the short title, and we will open questions from the floor. Mr. Wotherspoon.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — The minister has referenced the need for this based on the lack of co-operation between some communities, as he's put it. The vast majority of communities have a relationship where they work together and are involved in planning. If the minister could clarify what the impetus for this bill is and what specific conflicts, what regions is the minister concerned about.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — The legislation isn't directed at a specific municipality or municipalities. But there has been, you know, issues on the public record of strain between cities and adjacent

rural municipalities over the past number of months and probably couple of years or so, probably were the impetus for it. Not so much with the intent that, you know, the legislation's going to be needed for those. We'd still prefer that municipalities, and in all the cases I'll mention to you in just a minute, we'd still prefer that they come to some sort of agreement for district planning on a voluntary basis. But in the event that that just doesn't develop, we need a tool to deal with that.

And you know, the ones I'm going to mention, I don't think will be a surprise to you. There's been a fair bit of media coverage in the past over the situation with Regina and the RM of Sherwood, and there's been at varying times. And I'm hoping that those have been improved. But just for examples, there's been some issues in the Yorkton area and also the Swift Current area.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — As far as the impetus for this bill and that which you've just shared, what's the timeline for the creation of this bill? When was it initiated, and when did consultations occur?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Discussions around this have been going on, I know, certainly since I've been minister. And I just was speaking to officials. They tell me there's been discussions about this. Just as an example, one of the officials mentioned, in 2009 when there was consultations going on about changes to *The Planning and Development Act* at that time, upcoming amendments, there was discussions then whether there was a need for some other sort of district or regional authorities. So discussions have been going on a long time. I know since the time I've been minister, I've certainly made it a priority.

It concerns me because . . . I think you know my background; it's in municipal work. And no one has more respect for municipal autonomy than I do. The concern that sort of strains between neighbouring municipalities causes for me though is when there's opportunities lost because of it. This is one of those pieces of the puzzle I guess that you hope you never have to use. And municipalities will be given every opportunity to do things voluntarily, but if it ever becomes apparent that that's not going to happen, then a tool's in place.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — I appreciate the minister also identifying some of his concerns with the legislation that exists, as well his, you know, why he supports the changes. But I know many that look at the legislation have those concerns as well about how it's going to be utilized because it could certainly be utilized in an arbitrary way that could be very heavy-handed, very draconian, very much overriding the decisions of those locally elected to make those decisions. So I'm glad the minister's identified those concerns.

But my question might be, have you heard, Mr. Minister, or your office or your ministry, specific concerns either from SUMA or SARM or respective municipalities, urban or rural, as it relates to the potential heavy-handed nature of this legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — If I could just back up to your prefacing the comment though, I in no way indicated that I felt . . . Those words, draconian and heavy-handed, were yours, not mine.

[15:15]

There has been, in discussions that I've had with SUMA and SARM, I think there's a little bit at the start probably, a little bit of concern in what manner do you perceive these to be used. How would you do it? My summary of those meetings though, that by the time they ended, it was very well received from both parties.

You know you refer to it as draconian and heavy-handed, but in my mind, what this legislation will do, it'll give the minister the authority to compel municipalities to enter into a regional planning authority, period. There's a lot of provisions in the municipal Act that give the minister a lot more authority than that. There's a section in the municipal Act that allows the minister just simply to redraw municipal boundaries. That was not brought in by this government. That was something that was in place previously under the NDP [New Democratic Party] government. I would suggest there's a lot more authority in the Act than merely compelling municipalities to belong to a regional planning authority.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — But if they don't choose to come together and do so in a co-operative way, then government, yourself, would be intervening there and dictating those terms. And it would be a requirement by way of this legislation that the impacted municipalities comply with bylaws, make changes to meet the changes that are essentially put forward by government. And I think that's where there's some concern.

Certainly we recognize that there's some challenged relationships that exist. The minister highlighted specifically Sherwood and the city of Regina as I guess two municipalities that are a concern, or their relationship is a concern to you. My question would be why the ministry approved the disbanding of the joint planning board. I don't know what the proper term for it, if it was a district planning board that was in place. And I believe that was — I remember it goes back a few years; I think the member from Meadow Lake was the minister at the time — but that approval was granted at that time for those municipalities to disband.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Just to — before your last point, your question about the disbanding of the district planning commission — your first point about, and I think you were referring to bylaws and official community plans, you referenced changes put forward by the government. That's not how this would work. In the event that there is a regional planning authority formed, those sorts of decisions would be decided upon by the regional planning authority.

And just to give you an example. If you have a regional planning authority consisting of one member from a city, one member from an adjacent rural municipality, and one member from government, if you have a case where the two municipal representatives agree on something to do with zoning or community planning, that would carry the day as far as what's being put forward by the regional planning authority. So it's not a matter, as you had said, of government sort of instituting their will.

And your second point about why was it approved, why did the minister approve the disbanding of the district planning

commission? The Act at that time required it. As long as one party requested it, the minister had no choice but to do that.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Did the minister at that point identify the challenge in not having coordinated municipal planning? And in that particular file, what steps or activities did he engage in to encourage municipal, joint municipal planning at that point?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — First I should clarify. You mentioned the minister at the time being the member from Meadow Lake. If memory serves correct, I think it was the member from Prince Albert Carlton was the minister at the time. And while I can't speak to what thought process he went through at the time, I would suggest when it would have been put in front of him, if you have one of the member municipalities asking for it to be, you know, the district planning commission to be dissolved, and if the statute at that time required it at request, I would assume his thought at the time would have been, it's in the Act and there's no choice. So I think it would probably be as simple as that.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — It just seems there might've been an opportunity to listen, intervene, understand the issue, show some leadership because certainly now by statute there's a fairly regimented process laid out and also one that, you know, is certainly, that many have shared, seems to be awfully heavy-handed.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Why? I would disagree with you. It's not heavy-handed at all. It was at the request of one of the members, and the municipal Act required it. But I also know, and our officials just confirmed that with me, that there was all kinds of attempts made to help to facilitate there, including mediation between the municipalities that I believe was paid for by the ministry. It was paid for by the ministry.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Yes, I think the minister was distracted when I was asking the question. I didn't suggest that disbanding or dissolving the district planning commission was heavy-handed. The legislation itself that's before us here today appears to be heavy-handed. So just to clarify that point.

The minister highlighted that there's opportunities that are being lost by municipalities with the current context, with the current legislative environment. Just for sake of clarity, could the minister be specific about what opportunities have been lost?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Before I get to the point of the question, I just want to make reference to, in the prefacing, you referred to this again as heavy-handed. I guess the thing is I disagree with you on that. Most of this legislation pretty much parallels what's already in place for planning districts right now.

To your question though, while I'm not about to start getting into specific business development applications or anything like that, essentially what can happen and causes problems is if you have a city and an adjacent rural municipality where there are official community plans. If they're not in some sort of regional or district planning, if their official community plans aren't in alignment, that in turn causes sort of a chain reaction. You get problems with sort of conflicts in zoning. In many instances,

rural municipalities will rely on the adjacent city for servicing agreements. So to provide services to development, there can be subdivision issues.

All those are sort of an offshoot of the official community plans not being in alignment. That's why it's absolutely necessary that there's some form of co-operation between the city and the adjacent rural municipality to make sure that those situations are rectified.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Thank you. Through the consultation process, my question would be, did the Ministry of the Economy engage in this process and have a perspective or analysis to offer forward? Did they have a position, or did the Global Transportation Hub folks have any positions or thoughts on this?

[15:30]

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Through the review of the OCPs [official community plan] from both the city and the rural municipality, our officials have done a great deal of consultation with other ministries. And I should also note that again, this legislation as I mentioned earlier, while I think it would be ideal if it never actually has to be used, if it would be used, before the minister's order would ever be done, a great deal more consultation would be done as well.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Sorry, so just to verify the role of the Ministry of the Economy and their analysis, and the, as well the GTH [Global Transportation Hub] and for lack of a better term, if the new mayor of the GTH, what his perspective is on this legislation as well.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Well, Mr. Chair, I think as the member knows, he certainly did use the wrong terminology. But I would just reiterate that our officials tell me that, you know, in the past quite a while, as they've done a review on the official community plan for both the city and the rural municipality, they've had a great deal of discussion with many ministries, including the Ministry of the Economy.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — And do they have a position they support this? Were they a driver for this legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — They certainly wouldn't have been the driver. And I assume if they had any serious concerns about it, it would've been brought to my attention.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — The minister referenced just some of the district planning groups that he's recently approved. Are there others that have come to him recently that are awaiting approval? And what's that process look like?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — In the last two years, there's been five that have been approved: Twin Rivers, Weyburn, Twin Lakes, North of Divide, and Calling Lakes. But our officials tell me there's none in the queue right now.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Can the minister clarify what the actual process will be in engaging and formalizing or directing the formation of a planning authority, a regional planning authority, from his perspective, if the co-operation isn't there? What

processes, what tests will he have applied to give that opportunity to co-operate before he imposes the direction of the planning authority?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — First of all, Mr. Chair, you know, to clarify again, this only, these amendments only pertain to cities. So you know, you have a finite number there already. Also I will give absolutely every opportunity to municipalities. As I said, our government would be pleased if this never has to be used. It's a tool in case there are situations where there are just simply too much strain between municipalities; they won't enter into some sort of planning in fringe areas. They'll be given every opportunity, first of all, to do it voluntarily. Our ministry officials will work closely with them to try to get them to co-operate. And if it doesn't look like it's moving in that way, certainly we'll be more than reasonable as far as developing a minister's order and how that's constituted.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — And so what sort of more specific process? How would you objectively lay something out? Because of course this Act can be used by ministers moving forward. And I hear the sort of goodwill in the tone of the current minister and some considerations as to the important role of local governments.

The question can be that this is very . . . This can be applied in a real broad way and a very objective way moving forward. So is there anything built in, in a specific way, as to what sort of a test applies before government would impose with the planning authority or direct the planning authority? And what sort of a timeline does the minister envision? And is any of that made specific by this Act?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Yes. The timeline of course would be flexible, but to get to the specific point that you're making, it's very simple really. The criteria will be, is there a city and an adjacent rural municipality in this province that doesn't have some form of district planning? In those instances where there is already voluntary district planning, that's fine. Where there isn't, then the discussions will start and the minister and the ministry will be suggesting to the municipalities that it's incumbent on them to form some sort of district planning commission.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — You know, the previous legislation for regional planning authorities included and I believe directed that if there was local First Nations within the region, that they would be included in that planning authority. I see that that's been removed and there's no longer specific inclusion of the First Nations communities that may be impacted.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — That's actually not the case. The area that the member's referring to under current legislation dealing with district planning, that's not removed; it's still there. And in a situation for regional planning authority, if there'd be a significant First Nation or Métis interest in that area, if the member would go to section 119.4(2)(c), it references who may be appointed to the regional planning authority. And it mentions, "any other persons that the minister is satisfied have an interest or expertise pertaining to community planning." So certainly if that would be the situation, the minister certainly can appoint someone.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Now I respect that the minister could certainly add a member. And at the end if the minister was forming the planning authority, the minister can add as many government members as he chooses, I see in this legislation. But specifically as far as mention of inclusion of First Nations communities that are included within an authority and representation on to the planning board, I have the former Act here today. And I don't have the exact spot in front of me right now; it's a thick Act. I've gone through it there before. But I would ask the minister to maybe clarify and maybe let me know if I'm incorrect here, but when I have gone through that Act, it was specific and laid out that First Nations had representation in a planning authority where their lands, where their community was part of that inclusion. That's no longer laid out specific in the new legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I think the section that you're referring to is section 97. And if you look to clause (1), it references, “. . . the councils of two or more municipalities may, by bylaw, enter into an agreement . . .” And then if you go down to clause 2(a)(ii)(B), it references, it says:

the establishment of a district planning commission consisting of:

(B) [says] representatives of any Indian band affected by the establishment of a planning district, or any government agency the affiliated municipalities agree should be represented on the commission.

So it's not the case; it's a “may” right now. That piece of legislation isn't being changed. That will stay in place. Your concerns about if any bands should be represented on there, I would suggest that is . . . While I am minister, and I would think any subsequent ministers, would seriously consider whether there is an interest and would seriously consider appointing someone if it's deemed appropriate.

[15:45]

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Would the minister see it as an opportunity to strengthen this legislation and make sure that that's enshrined in law? Is this an area where he'd consider amendment to make sure that if the area, that the planning authority encompasses a First Nation, that it be specific and enshrine that they also receive a spot within that planning authority?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Are you referring to the existing legislation for the planning districts, or for the legislation we're discussing today for the regional planning authorities?

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — The legislation we're discussing here today.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I don't think that would be necessary because legislation clearly lets the minister determine who they appoint. The municipalities impacted would each have a representative and the minister would appoint whoever believed to be, to have a significant interest at that time.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Would the minister believe that if a First Nations community lie within that planning authority, would he

see that as a specific interest? I would see that as a specific interest and certainly inclusion would be vital.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — You know, every sort of situation is different and unique. It would have to be evaluated at that time. So without knowing what sort of what specific area you're talking about, it's hard to comment. But I would say if a First Nation is, you know, is encompassed by this, I . . . You know, I should point out though that we're talking about municipal planning. So really the First Nation wouldn't be encompassed by this. It may potentially be surrounded by it. In those instances I would say that that does seem like a significant interest. But each case would have to be evaluated on its own merit.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — I'm not sure what the minister's trying to say. The regional planning I would believe would have a direct impact on the First Nation as well that's encompassed within that. So I'm not sure why, where . . . The minister is maybe a bit dismissive of the First Nations. Certainly it's not specific. It seems that that should probably be laid out and specific and not left at this stage of the game for sort of arbitrary decisions of a given minister.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I wasn't being dismissive. My point was that a municipality, if it surrounds a First Nation, then obviously to me, sort of significant thought should be given to whether or not that First Nation should have representation on there. But every case is unique. My point I was trying to make is that the First Nation, even if it's completely surrounded by a municipality, is not considered part of that municipality. That was the point I was making, and I was not in any way being dismissive.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — So would the minister see this as an opportunity to strengthen the composition of what a planning authority would be in this circumstance, and would he look to make an improvement and make sure that there's inclusion of an impacted First Nation as well or a First Nation that's encompassed in that planning authority?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I would certainly consider, before any minister's order is done, I would consider the interests of everyone who could be affected by it.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — But by way of this legislation that's before us here, what's concerning is that this legislation is something that will enshrine this process, and certainly it seems to me that if the minister's moving forward in this direction, that it should be enshrined that First Nations also be included in that planning authority.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I think a distinction needs to be made here. Municipalities are a creature of the provincial government. First Nations are not. And what we're merely dealing with here is simply municipal planning issues. However, if there's a First Nations that, you know, the minister believes could be impacted, then I think absolutely you want to be a good neighbour and I think consideration needs to be given at that time.

But I think part of the benefit of this legislation is that, as I mentioned, every case is going to be unique and the fact that it's

done through minister's order gives, in this case, gives some flexibility to who should be on the regional planning authority, how it should be composed. I would think you're sort of trying to lead this down a path, that you're trying to tighten it up so much that it frankly takes away from the flexibility that it's intended to have.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Well I'm just trying to make sure there's a fair process, Minister. Certainly the intervention by way of this bill that's allowed by your government is significant and, as I've stated, I have concerns with how arbitrary the . . . what may trigger that is from this minister and also how broad the powers are, how sweeping the powers are to the minister.

But I do think it's fair and wise planning from an economic perspective to have a First Nation that's impacted involved in that. And I think that you have an Act that you're changing right now; I believe you have a responsibility to get it right. And I would urge the minister to maybe just hold off on this legislation just now before pushing this forward and make sure that you've done what you can to consult and make sure that the legislation is fair. But I certainly have concern with the removal of First Nations which are, you know, mentioned in the previous Act, something that should probably be enshrined or should be enshrined in a planning authority if they're encompassed with it in that planning authority moving forward.

So I guess I'd look to the minister maybe for his intentions. I've stated my concerns. My hope would be that he'll take a bit of time with this piece of legislation — I call for that — and not rush it forward here today, and maybe report back to this committee as to progress on that front at an appropriate time.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — First of all, I would like to clarify. Again you reference that in the existing legislation that somehow that the part you . . . that I read on section 95 was going to be changed. That's just simply not the case. That won't change for existing district planning commissions and authorities.

And to your point about, you know, would we hold this while we proceed? No. The answer is absolutely no. We think that this is a good piece of work that's done here and I think it's important that it move forward. And I would ask you to consider supporting it.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — I see no need to rush it here this afternoon, on a Monday afternoon, when we can certainly make sure we get this right. It has significant ramifications for communities across Saskatchewan.

But I've stated my concerns as it relates to this legislation. The minister has stated his position, and I'm understanding of the majority that can carry the day in these affairs. But certainly I have concerns as it relates to the broad and sweeping changes being brought forward by the potential use in a very heavy-handed way by government, in a controlling way by government, in a way that dismisses the important role and responsibility of those that have earned the right to represent their communities, those locally elected individuals, the concern with the lack of certainty to this legislation, how much of it is arbitrary and left up to the minister's purview, and certainly as well the lack of specific inclusion of the rights of a First Nations within a planning authority and the important role they

should be fulfilling as well to a planning authority.

But with that being said, I've stated the concerns. The minister has the ability to push this forward if he so chooses, and at this point in time I have no further questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Wotherspoon. Are there any other questions or concerns regarding Bill No. 90? Seeing none, we will proceed with the voting of Bill No. 90, *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013*. There are 15 clauses. Starting with clause 1, the short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.]

**The Chair:** — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts the following: *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013*. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Thank you. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 90, *The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2013* without amendment. Mr. Norris. Mr. Norris so moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. That concludes Bill No. 90. Mr. Minister, would you have any remarks that you would like to share at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank the member for his questions. I'd like to thank the committee for their time here today and also to all our officials for their time here today. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister Reiter. Mr. Wotherspoon.

[16:00]

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — I'd like to thank the minister for his time and certainly the officials for their time and their work.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. And I would like to thank the minister and the officials and Mr. Wotherspoon for your questions. We will now continue on with considerations of the bills. And we'll just allow a minute or two for the ministers to change in the committee room here.

You are tuned in to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice this afternoon as we enter into the consideration of Bill No. 86, *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act*. We will start with clause no. 1, short title. Welcome to Minister Boyd and your officials. Mr. Minister, if you are ready, you can introduce your officials and start with any opening remarks you may have.



**Bill No. 86 — *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act***

**Clause 1**

**Hon. Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, committee members. I am pleased to present Bill 86, *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act* for discussion here this afternoon.

Officials with me today are: on my right, Kent Campbell, deputy minister; on my left, Tony Baumgartner, acting assistant deputy minister, economic development; at the back, Ernest Heapy, executive director, strategy and competitiveness, economic development; Craig Abernathy, senior analyst, regulatory modernization, economic development.

As members of the committee are aware, the Ministry of Economy is focused on further improving the regulatory environment for Saskatchewan businesses and citizens while maintaining protections for public safety, health, environment, and worker safety. The government recognizes that regulations are necessary to ensure protection, safety, and evening a level playing field for activities in the province. However regulations are static instruments that, if left unchecked, will lose their relevancy and the effectiveness in meeting their public policy objectives as technology, the environment, and other external forces change.

That is why our government is rolling out the red tape reduction initiative, which was first highlighted in the October 2010 Throne Speech. This initiative will introduce measures to ensure our provincial regulations maintain their currency and effectiveness so that we can best support the public policies for which they were originally created for.

The reporting required under the proposed regulatory modernization and accountability Act is a critical element in the red tape reduction initiative as well as it will enshrine regulatory accountability and transparency into law in Saskatchewan. For the past four years, government ministries and agencies have been publicly reporting on their regulatory activities on a voluntary basis. With this Act in force, ministries and agencies will be required to report on all of their regulatory activities and agencies.

The intent of this Act is that we don't want public reporting of regulatory accountability to be a one-time event. Leaving it in policy could very well do this. Furthermore, public reporting that is entrenched in legislation will provide the business community with greater confidence in the government's regulations, stimulating greater interest in doing business or investing in the province, which will help to grow our economy, providing greater opportunities for Saskatchewan citizens.

As the public report will be prepared along the same timelines as ministries and agencies prepare their annual reports, it is anticipated that the natural streamlining of resources to prepare both reports will occur to help reduce costs to government while enhancing accountability and transparency.

Mr. Chair, with those brief comments, we're prepared to take questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and welcome to your officials. I would just remind the officials if they would, if they're answering questions to state their name for the purpose of Hansard. Mr. Wotherspoon, you've got some questions for the minister.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — Sure. Thanks, Minister, for taking time with us today and to your officials. Certainly we support removing the regulations that were built for a different time and place that are no longer relevant to activities in the province. Certainly we're for making sure we have an effective regulatory environment. That's important. So we just want to make sure that what's being brought forward today meets those needs.

One question. Of course regulation has an important role within a province in protecting the interests of people and communities and environment, but we want to make sure that, as I say, that we don't have regulations that are on the books that are no longer relevant. So the question is, when you're making this report and you're potentially removing regulations, what reporting mechanism will you utilize to make clear and specific the purpose of the regulation when it was enacted?

**Mr. Campbell:** — Kent Campbell, deputy minister. So in terms of the reporting requirements under the bill, there'll be two requirements. One is in accordance with *The Tabling of Documents Act* and, in the second, we'll be publishing it more broadly so that there's public interest. And we currently do that with the *Regulatory Modernization Progress Report*, which at this point is a voluntary disclosure, and this will just require it also to be tabled with the legislature.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — So it would make regulations that are being removed or there's regulatory changes, it would be enshrined that they would be made public, not in a voluntary fashion made public. And the purpose of that regulation in the first place would be made clear as well as the reason for the changes. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Boyd:** — There would be an explanation given of the regulation, what it's purpose was intended for originally, and then the reasons why we would want to change it. Yes.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — In many ways this is enshrining, through legislation, practice that's already occurring within government, but it's certainly a larger commitment by way of enshrining it in legislation, or if the minister could comment.

**Hon. Mr. Boyd:** — Well you could look at it that way I suppose. I think it would also . . . What we are going to be asking all government ministries and agencies is to go through the process of looking at their regulations on a timely and orderly basis to ensure that they're up to date. That's something that really isn't done in the past or hasn't been done — somewhat, but not as much as we would like to see. So this will enable that to take place.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — And certainly the minister I suspect will be ensuring that as legislation's being derived that it's reflective in looking back at what legislation, what regulations are on the books already so that you're not creating another layer of regulation that's redundant. I think what people would appreciate is regulations that have purpose, that are effective,

and that are clearly understood what their role is in serving Saskatchewan people.

**Hon. Mr. Boyd:** — Yes. What we want to do is ensure that we have as current of regulation as we possibly can to meet the changing and differing needs of the people of Saskatchewan and in the business community.

**Mr. Wotherspoon:** — I don't have any further questions at this point in time. I put some comments onto the record in my second reading speech. But thank you to the minister and officials for being here today. And just as long as, you know, we have the ability to have these discussions and dialogue in the public, that if there's regulation changes that the public is concerned about, that we'll have that opportunity.

But certainly I would like to put on the record, while I'm very much supportive of being as effective as we can and in modernizing our regulations, making sure they're relevant, I also very much support the role of regulations in a strong province and looking to the future and the role they play to provide protections to the public. But thank you very much to the minister here today.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Wotherspoon. Is there any other comments or questions regarding Bill No. 86, *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act*? Seeing none, we will proceed with voting. There are five clauses in this bill. Bill No. 86, *An Act respecting the Regulatory Modernization and Accountability*, starting with clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.]

**The Chair:** — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts the following: *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act*. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 86, *The Regulatory Modernization and Accountability Act* without amendment. Mr. Steinley moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. Thank you. Mr. Minister, did you have any finalizing remarks that you'd like to make?

**Hon. Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Chair, I just want to thank the officials and the committee members for their questions this afternoon, and we are pleased to be moving this forward.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister Boyd. This committee . . . Thank you, and thank you to your officials. This committee will recess for five minutes while we change officials to go into the

consideration of Bill No. 62, *The Parks Amendment Act*. We will be back in five minutes. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[16:15]

**The Chair:** — Well welcome back to the Committee of the Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We are continuing on with the consideration of Bill No. 62, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2012 (No. 2)*. We will start with clause 1, the short title. Welcome to Minister Doherty and his officials. Mr. Minister, if you have any opening comments, you may make them now.

#### **Bill No. 62 — *The Parks Amendment Act, 2012 (No. 2)***

#### **Clause 1**

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Well good. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to committee members. Good afternoon. Just before I get into some remarks, opening remarks, just let me introduce officials that are joining me here today. I have Wynne Young, deputy minister; Lin Gallagher, associate deputy minister. Seated behind me is Bob McEachern, director of park management services; Chris Potter, senior park planner; and Jim Nick, park planner and legislative analyst; and as well Margaret Huntington, chief of staff from my office.

So I want to thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to discuss Bill 62, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2012 (No. 2)*. And at the end of our session here this afternoon I believe that my colleague, Mr. Steinley, the MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] for Regina Walsh Acres, will be making a motion on two short House amendments to this bill.

Included in this bill are several different sections. I'll just go through them one at a time here just to outline very briefly what they are about.

The dangerous wildlife attractants. Parks, Culture and Sport proposes an amendment to allow park enforcement officers to remove attractants, such as food left on picnic tables unattended, in order to minimize the number of wildlife-human encounters in our parks. This amendment has been suggested by Justice who has been assisting the development of regulation regarding this issue.

Wildlife encounters have been a problem. In 2011 there were close to 1,000 calls regarding nuisance bears, with 850 of these occurring right inside our parks. Education of park users is foremost in minimizing wildlife encounters. Sometimes patrons cannot be found. They might be out fishing or boating or off doing other activities, or they choose not to comply with park regulations. So enforcement officers need the ability to exercise stronger authority for these few instances.

Another park amendment, Mr. Chair, is our government remains committed to developing new provincial parks, as they represent a cornerstone of Saskatchewan's tourism industry. Provincial parks generate significant tourism activity, setting yet another attendance record in 2012 with visits reaching 3.56 million, exceeding the previous record set in 2011 by 5.7 per cent.

In response to the growing use of our parks and to better protect the province's land and water, my ministry is proposing designation of a new provincial park in the Anglin and Emma lakes area. Métis support has been received from local Métis 108 at Fish Lake. There have been extensive First Nations consultations to date, and engagement with Aboriginal groups will continue as the park designation is complete and the park management planning phase begins.

Ongoing discussion with disposition holders in the proposed park area continues to occur in co-operation with the Ministry of the Environment who administer land and forest dispositions in the area. Results from the public consultations for Anglin and Emma lakes area indicate over 80 per cent support for establishing the proposed park. Interest in expanding the boundaries of the park beyond those proposed for discussion was proposed by supporters of the park.

The Danielson Provincial Park amendment. The boundaries of Danielson Provincial Park are proposed for amendment by excluding from the park 31 hectares of land along Coteau Bay of Lake Diefenbaker for cottage development, while adding 65 hectares of Crown land administered by Environment containing native prairie grasslands. This is double the amount of land being withdrawn.

Parkland is not typically available for new or expanded residential development. However in this case, the ecosystem has been significantly impacted by the construction of the Gardiner dam. There was an annual grazing permit on the land being added to the park. Parks, Culture and Sport plan to continue authorizing this activity. The Ministry of the Environment is supportive of this proposal.

Steele Narrows Provincial Park amendment. This is an administrative item that resolves discrepancies in mapping between the ministries of Parks, Culture and Sport, Agriculture, and Information Services Corporation in the Makwa Lake area. Slivers of land between the park and Makwa Lake have been identified as Ministry of Agriculture land instead of parkland. Both the Ministry of Agriculture and Information Services Corporation have agreed with the need to clarify that these slivers of land are indeed Steele Narrows Provincial Park land. Information Services Corporation has created abstract parcels which are now included in the description of the park.

This amendment also allows an orphan narrow strip of land adjacent to Highway 699 to be withdrawn and transferred to Agriculture. This will result in close to 1 hectare net gain to the park's area.

Now, Mr. Chair, House amendments of Bill 62 regarding the new park. Since second reading, the ministry has continued dialogue with affected interest groups and has worked to finalize the name and boundaries related to the new provincial park. This work has resulted in House amendments of Bill 62 which includes the following.

The new park name. The name of the proposed park is being amended from Anglin-Emma lakes provincial park to Great Blue Heron Provincial Park. During this past winter, consultation was initiated with local First Nations, Métis, municipal jurisdictions, and schools to provide an opportunity

to forward possible names for the new park. A review committee of representatives from the local area was assembled to review names submitted and provide their recommendation to the Minister of Parks, Culture and Sport for a final decision. Suggestions of names were also submitted to the ministry by individuals not part of the selection committee process.

The name Great Blue Heron Provincial Park was chosen as it is a bird that frequents the waterways and lakes of the area of the park and is considered a fitting emblem for the park, the main goal of which is to conserve more of the watershed and habitat of the Anglin and Emma lakes area.

Returning to original boundaries for the new provincial park. Mr. Chair, the outcome of consultations on park boundaries reveals significant interest in expanding the boundaries beyond those initially put forward during the general public consultation. Responding to those interests, an expanded park boundary was introduced in the proposed legislation with the intention of continuing to consult with the stakeholders and Aboriginal groups. Consultations continued over the winter on the expanded boundary. Through the continued Aboriginal and stakeholder consultations, it was determined that additional time would be beneficial to ensure that the interests of the groups were fully considered. This brought us to the decision to designate Great Blue Heron Provincial Park based upon the originally proposed boundaries.

We will continue to examine the potential to expand the park in the future and will work with the Ministry of Environment and with the forest management agreement holder to ensure that progressive forest management practices in the area maintain ecological and recreational values of the area.

Bill 62, section 5(2) is being amended to provide the legal description of the park as it was originally presented during public consultations, minus 48 hectares of Fairy Island, a designated wildlife refuge. Now the removal of Fairy Island, Mr. Chair, the amendment of Bill 62, will also remove Fairy Island from the description of the park.

Fairy Island is designated as a wildlife refuge under the wildlife management zones and special areas boundaries, 1990. The Ministry of Environment issues a lease to the University of Saskatchewan for the Lindner cabin, a provincial heritage site. Further discussion with the Ministry of Environment has led to the decision that the 48 hectares of Fairy Island is adequately protected as a wildlife refuge and should remain as such, allowing the Ministry of the Environment to also continue with their lease of Lindner cabin.

As well moving to proclamation, Bill 62 is also amended to change subsection 5(2) of clause 6 in order to have the new provincial park designation come into force by proclamation. Moving to proclamation allows the ministry to finalize land transfers and dispositions.

That concludes my opening remarks, Mr. Chair, and I'll be prepared to answer any questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and welcome to your officials. I would just remind the officials, just remind them that if they are answering questions, please state their name for the

purpose of Hansard.

We will now entertain questions on Bill No. 62. I recognize Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the minister and your officials for giving an opportunity to ask some questions on Bill 62. Can you just explain to me . . . And I know we asked this, and we looked at the different numbers, and you were going from 12 000 hectares to 16 000 hectares. Can you give me exactly . . . You have an idea . . . And I know you can go to maps and stuff, and I think that's going to be interesting. I've got some maps now. Can you explain to me just exactly how many hectares will this park be expanding or the boundaries changing? How big will it actually be from the existing . . . whether you're taking two and making it one. Just how much will it, I guess the larger park, encompass as hectares?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the member for the question. These are two recreation sites right now. It's not a provincial park there. So it's not like we're adding land to an existing provincial park.

So the two recreation sites, I'm advised, consist currently of 3189 hectares and we're going to add 8225 hectares, for a total of 11 414 hectares for the total provincial park, less 48 hectares for Fairy Island that I indicated would be coming out of the provincial park designation. So if math serves me correct, and I'll stand to be corrected because I did this quickly in my head, it should be about 11 376 hectares.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Can you explain to me, when you say you went from two parks and now you're going to go to . . . explain that a little better to me because to be clear what you guys are actually putting together. Because that's not my understanding I had. So I want to be clear I'm understanding what you're actually proposing with the legislation. I want to make sure.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm just going to send a map over to Mr. Vermette. And just what you'll see there, to the hon. member, is the slightly light green shaded areas called Anglin Lake at the north and then down below, just southeast, I guess, of Emma Lake is another shaded green area. Those are two existing recreation sites.

Now if you look at the green dotted line that encompasses all of those areas, with the exception of Fairy Island, which is in the middle of Emma Lake . . . So it runs along the border of Prince Albert National Park over to the east towards Highway 2 and then back up over to the west again, back up north, and encompassing the Anglin Lake recreation. That is now the proposed boundaries of the new provincial park.

[16:30]

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Thank you very much. That clears it up. Now I guess to . . . And I know there was comments made, and I know the member for Athabasca asked you some questions and I'll go into those later. In *Hansard* there were some comments from him and I'm going to go back into there. When you proposed . . . This park is coming forward and obviously somebody has requested. And who requested that it

be a provincial park versus from recreation from the two areas? Who's asked for a provincial park in that area? Just if you can tell me who.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — So, Mr. Chair, it wasn't that anybody asked for a provincial park. You may or may not recall in 2007, our party in our platform in 2007 — I wasn't a member of the government then nor was I running — but a promise was made to establish two new provincial parks in that platform.

So once the government was elected after the 2007 election, officials were tasked with identifying areas in the province where a provincial park or the two new provincial parks could be established. And I'm advised that there was five or six areas in the province that were identified as in the top five or six, and then the two that we put forward now, Emma-Anglin Lake . . . or Great Blue Heron Provincial Park area was one. And then over in the Porcupine Hills area was the second proposed site that we're doing further consultation work on with the folks over in that area of the province now.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. And that's helpful to know because I thought, my understanding, maybe somebody had requested it or . . . So that's clear. You cleared that up. No I appreciate that.

Now you're going into the park and I think for . . . You talked about in committee, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, your ministry had worked on that for about two years, maybe, consulting with different groups and trying to get support or understand what it is. And I believe you talked about surveys and all this information. You also talked in the minutes . . . And I'll refer to this because the member from Athabasca asked this and it was clear. Your opening comments you referred to was that I believe five Aboriginal, First Nations, and Métis groups, whether it's were consulted and you had met and your ministry was working with them, I believe that's in *Hansard* as well. I think it was five you referred to that you guys had consulted with, Métis and First Nations, in the area.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Mr. Chair, I'm not sure what it says in *Hansard*. I don't have *Hansard* in front of me. I'm not sure what you refer to when you say the member from Athabasca asked me questions. I've not had any questions on this. I gave a second reading speech, and I believe Mr. Belanger responded in his second reading speech. But there was no . . . We had not had an opportunity to ask questions or answer questions on this. And I don't recall my speaking notes offhand with respect to my second reading speech.

But what I can tell you is that the consultations we've had to date with First Nations and Métis groups include FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] lands and resources secretariat, the Prince Albert Grand Council, the Saskatoon and District Tribal Council; Montreal Lake Cree Nation, Little Red River; Lac La Ronge Indian Band, Little Red River; Wahpeton Dakota Nation; Sturgeon Lake First Nation; James Smith Cree Nation; Métis-Nation Saskatchewan; Métis-Nation Western Region 2; Fish Lake Métis local; and the Gabriel Dumont Institute.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay and just to be clear, yes, that's correct. I believe that the member was responding to second reading. You're correct and he just refers to your comments about that.

He goes back to referring about the five First Nations and Métis that you guys consulted with in the area. So that's what it is. So thank you. I just wanted to be clear for the record.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — I also want to be clear for the record. It's more than five, though.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes. What he was referring to your comments when I think when you talked about this, you referred to five areas in the *Hansard*. So just to be clear I think that's what he was referring to. But we can go through it. You're saying it's more. You're identifying more groups now, which is fine. That's okay.

So having said that, you in your opening comments, you talked about getting support for this park, and it wasn't that a certain group asked for it. I understand that. I appreciate you explaining that to me clearly, to understand how it came to be. But having said that then, that you, and you can correct me if I'm wrong here, but I'm sure you said you had some of the Métis local support, saying they supported the initial park and they were consulted, and I think it was 108 or something you referred to supported . . . Do you have any letters or documents from that local and the president from the local, saying he supports that?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — So, Mr. Chair, if I can just read into the record, it's actually an email received from Mr. Bryan Lee who . . . Well at the time — this is dated April 28th, 2011 — who at the time was the president of the Métis Nation of Saskatchewan, Local 108 Fish Lake. And just for the record it says:

Greetings from MNS Local 108 Fish Lake. Our local Métis community are very pleased to hear about the government's initiative to create a new provincial park in our Métis traditional historic territory. We have established a parks committee to address the initiative. We look forward to meeting with government representatives to further discuss our interests and we wish to make recommendations as to the geographic boundaries for the proposed park. Our Métis Nation Saskatchewan local are fully supportive of any efforts to preserve or protect the natural environment.

I can send this over to you if you want copies of it, Mr. Vermette.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes, if you could provide that, that would be great. Okay, so you have one of the Métis local and I realize Local 108 is saying as far as they're concerned to see . . . And when you talk about parks, I don't think anybody's opposed to a provincial park and protecting. I think people are, in general, support that. And I'm glad to see that there's support there.

Now there might be issues that have to be addressed by himself as the president, or Métis in the area might have a different view, which it's fine. I mean he's an elected official for the Métis Local and the people that are there. But I think individuals may have some different issues that might arise and that's fine for them to bring it forward to him or to the ministry if they've got concerns as we're going ahead, having said that.

Now you also talked about some of the First Nations, and you talked about I believe FSIN, that you consulted with the bands around the area. You named quite a few of them. Do you have

letters of support from those bands? You mentioned quite a number of them. Do you have letters from them supporting this and FSIN's letter of support for your . . . like you do with Métis now you have . . . Because their lands are traditionally protected under treaty rights, traditional lands, so it even goes a little further.

Like right now, the Métis will have their claims and we'll go through that legal process. And I know it's going to continue to have their argument for their land claims, but right now we do know that the bands in the area have traditional land claims on that land. And so I'd like to know how many letters you've got from FSIN, the different bands you mentioned as you consulted with them and you talked to them. How many letters of support do you have for them, and could you table those, please?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Mr. Chair, we don't have any direct letters indicating support from First Nations groups that we've met with. I can tell you that officials have met with the list of First Nations that I rhymed off there earlier. I can repeat it if you want. But neither letters of support, nor did they express any concerns to us at this particular time.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Mr. Chair, I think it's fair to say that Lac La Ronge Indian Band was one First Nation that did express some concerns. We've continued to meet with them to address those concerns. And I think that it's fair to say that we're quite a ways down the road in . . . One of their concerns is they want to expand the park even more so to the north, which we couldn't accommodate inside the boundary that was being proposed.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. Well I guess . . . And that's what I wanted to ask, finding out from yourself and the different groups because I think it was important. And I say about the traditional land and territory of First Nations, inherent rights to hunt, fish, gather when you talk about our trappers and you talk about I guess whether it's berry picking, mushrooms, medicines that they traditionally use every day, some of them. And it's a way of life that has to be protected.

I think that is the — you know, clearly from concerns I've heard — is an area where they want to make sure there is protection. And I mean you talk about I guess a park and a provincial park and going from recreation sites to areas to a larger . . . Well it's going to be a pretty large park. Now you say they had proposed, they wanted to expand the park?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — One of the comments made to us through Lac La Ronge Indian Band . . . And Lin Gallagher has been meeting, along with her officials, have been meeting with them. They were seeking an opportunity for us to expand further north to include . . . Which lake was it, Lin?

**Ms. Gallagher:** — Island Lake.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Island Lake. And we looked at it. It just . . . We couldn't accommodate that within the park boundary that we were looking to establish in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment. Mr. Vermette, your point about traditional rights is, as I understand it . . . And in every meeting

we've had with them, we've assured them that their traditional rights will continue inside the park boundaries.

**Mr. Vermette:** — And is that in the bill, in legislation? It's in there that they will protect them, that they have that reassurance that it's in the bill or this legislation that you're proposing? It will protect them? It's enshrined in there where somebody can't misinterpret, whether it be individuals who work for the ministry, whether it be the minister himself? It's a clear understanding that the protection's in there? Is that in this bill? Obviously if it's a concern they raised, I assume it's in here?

[16:45]

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — So, Mr. Chair, I'm advised that, in consultation with Ministry of Justice officials, that we have entrenched in all government legislation that inherent treaty rights will always be respected in government legislation. So the deputy minister met with Chief Cook-Searson from Lac La Ronge Indian Band and had that discussion with her and assured her that it's entrenched in government legislation as we speak, that that inherent right exists. Therefore Justice has advised us if we had anything, language to the contrary or language that . . . It's like having a double negative, if you will. It just reaffirms exactly what exists already.

**Mr. Vermette:** — And I want to go back because I think it's so important that traditional land users that are there, whether it's our trappers, the band itself, and the governance and everything else, and I think it's important to say. Clearly Montreal Lake is in that area, and I'm curious, you know, just . . . [inaudible] . . . When I think about the La Ronge Indian Band and their concern, and I know they have raised quite a bit of concerns. And they have a group that they have, lands and resources. It's a committee. And it's very effective, watching the way they're moving through the duty to consult and accommodate, and they really have taken that on. And I give them credit with the way they're handling that. I think it's a model that I think they'll go out, and I think other First Nations and Métis organizations will look on how to organize and utilize resources.

I know they're committing some of their resources from their own band to make sure that that process is done right, that when it impacts their traditional lands, whether it's industry, whether it's government, you know, that's coming up to say, we want to build a park. And you know, like you said, that was your commitment as a party. You weren't there, but I understand as the minister, you said in 2007 they will commit with two new parks, provincial parks, would happen in the province. They've selected. Now they're going ahead with that.

But having said that, I want to go back to this because I think it's important. When we look at the La Ronge Indian Band and the way they've taken this, of course you've had meetings with them obviously. You must hear their concerns. Because I'm going to get into some areas where I think and it's concerning to me that we're going ahead with passing legislation in Bill 62, saying you have no letters. You have an email from a Métis local, but you have no letters or support letters or anything other than you say you went out and consulted and talked to the First Nations. There's no document here. And I would think you would want that letter of support, not just verbal, and not just going out to an area and saying, well under the framework for

the duty to consult and accommodate that the current government has used and implemented, saying it's what they're going to use to trigger the duty to consult and accommodate.

I'm a little concerned, and here's why. If FSIN has rejected that process, the Métis Nation has rejected the so-called framework for the duty to consult and accommodate, then if they're concerned about the process that the government's using to allow industry or governments to come up with traditional territory that impact their lands without getting letters of support for that proposed park, which is . . . I'm not saying they're opposed to provincial parks. And I mean they're good and I think people are saying that you protect. But I think in their traditional territories, somewhere along the line, the ministry I think — and I'll get through this, and you can correct me here, but I believe I'm solid with knowing what I know — that they're very concerned about a provincial park on their traditional territory.

And yes, expanding it may be what is a good idea. They've seen that as a good idea. And that's fine if they wanted to say, let's move the park boundary even bigger. Obviously they had a reason why they wanted this. Maybe it was going to take in their traditional territory where their trappers are and land that they use, like I said earlier. Now obviously that has not been taken in consideration.

Here they go. They come forward with I guess an idea, you're saying, to expand it even. But you're not, whether it's La Ronge band or any other of the bands, you're not prepared to do that. And you're not prepared for some reason. I don't know why. I'd like to know why you wouldn't. If you want to consult with them and you want their input, then here's an idea they come forward with to expand it. And then the ministry says, well no, we're not going to do that. I'm a little concerned that way, just with the way it presents itself.

But having said that, the last thing I'll say on this one, I've got a letter dated, and I would like to see if you have that letter, where you sent it as the minister, and was your ministry sent from La Ronge Indian Band. So once we're done here, I'll ask you about that letter. But just so you'll be aware, I'll bring that letter forward when you're done answering these questions.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Well just on your letter, we did receive it. I said that they had expressed some concerns, and ministry officials have been meeting with Lac La Ronge Indian Band. You had asked earlier about letters of support from First Nations. And we don't have any letters of support, formalized letters of support, other than the face-to-face meetings that we've had with these First Nations.

When we received the letter from Lac La Ronge Indian Band outlining some of their concerns, we've undertaken face-to-face meetings with them. In meeting with their designated committee on this to address their concerns, one of them, as I outlined earlier, was that they had asked if we could consider expanding the size of the provincial park further north to include . . . I'm sorry, the lake again?

**Ms. Gallagher:** — Island Lake.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Island Lake. And we went back and

took a look at it with Ministry of the Environment officials, and it was determined that we could not expand that far out to include Island Lake. So have we had some concerns expressed by Lac La Ronge Indian Band? Yes. I think I've acknowledged that, and through letter and in response to the letter, either in responses from myself or from ministry officials, in dealing with the chief and council up there.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Would that letter you're talking about, would it have been dated July 9th, 2012? It's about four pages from Lac La Ronge Indian Band. It talks about the committee. It talks about their concerns. Would that be the letter?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Is this letter to Mr. Jim Nick? Is it addressed to Mr. Nick?

**Mr. Vermette:** — Yes, it is.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Yes.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay. You have a copy of that letter. In the letter that you have a copy of — now that we know that you have a copy of the letter, and I think it was dated 2012 — you're clear, you're clear that La Ronge Indian Band is opposed to this park, right? It's clear in there. They're opposed to it. So if they've served you . . . You've said you've consulted them. It's their traditional territory. They've served you with a letter telling you and your ministry clearly they are opposed to this.

Now I'd like to ask you, go further to the letter: are there any other groups that are opposed to this, letter or correspondence that you have received that you haven't shared with the committee? Because you say you weren't asked. And that's fine. Is there any other letters? And FSIN, are they opposed to this, or are they supporting this? And do you have a letter from them supporting it or not supporting it? I think it's very important we flush this out.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — So thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to again I want to clarify, I did not say earlier that we had no letters on the record from Lac La Ronge Indian Band expressing concerns. As a matter of fact, I think I said quite clearly that they had expressed some concerns. And we, in response to that letter, have had several meetings with the chief and their council, those responsible from their council in dealing with this issue.

I'm also advised we have not received any other letters, official letters, indicating concerns by First Nations groups. We've not received a letter from FSIN, although I understand FSIN has passed a resolution at their general assembly where they are opposed to any provincial parks, any new provincial parks in the province. That's the only communication we've had from FSIN opposing the establishment of any new provincial parks in the province.

So in response again to your question as to why wouldn't we have listened to Lac La Ronge Indian Band with respect to encompassing Island Lake up north when we looked at where the expanded provincial park boundaries were out to, after introduction of legislation and in consultation with several groups up there including the FMA [forest management agreement] holder, we realized that we needed to go back and

take a look at where we could possibly expand, in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment and stakeholders including Lac La Ronge Indian Band, the FMA holder, Sakâw, to determine where it would be possible to meet all of those different issues and initiatives, both from an ecological perspective, a conservation perspective, and the forest management perspective, as well as respecting traditional treaty lands.

So this is exactly why we've pulled it back to the original proposed boundaries. We continue to have discussions with Lac La Ronge Indian Band and others as we move along, and that possibility still exists into the future.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well I find it hard to believe that this legislation has moved forward and you are creating a new park when you say you know that FSIN has passed a resolution from their . . . the 74 First Nations have passed a resolution saying no parks. There must be a reason why. So again I go back to probably the duty to consult and accommodate is clearly where the issue is.

And I know La Ronge Indian Band, obviously that's where their issue is, otherwise you wouldn't be talking, referring to the letter. And you can talk about whether you . . . the issue of raising the letter or not, but I mean my concern clearly here is, you were supposed to consult, and there's an obligation clearly that you were supposed to consult First Nations when you impact their traditional territory, whether . . . And that doesn't mean going and have a meeting with them. That's not clearly what I think consulting First Nations is, on their traditional territory. So they have a meeting with you, and we'll have a talk. And behind the scenes we're going to go ahead and push this legislation, and we're going to come up with a park whether you like it or not. And they've clearly stated they're opposed to this.

So and then you share with me that FSIN passed a resolution that they're opposed to it, yet you're still bringing the legislation forward to go ahead because you said previously, your words were in the 2007 election, the Sask Party said they were going to have two parks. Doesn't matter whose territory, traditional territory they're impacting. They're going to go ahead and have two new parks. And that's the way it's sounding like to me when you have the First Nations saying clearly they're objecting to this park, without consulting, and then going through the process. So obviously they're not supporting it. There must be a reason why they're not.

Why has your ministry, why yourself as a minister, have you not taken it upon yourself and I guess your ministry to make sure in here that they were comfortable with supporting this? People are, and I know traditionally they would like to have more protected. There must be issues raised and I don't know, understand how we got to this, passing this, and you're going to go ahead and pass this new park when you have letters like that and the information you shared today with this committee. I find it hard to believe that you guys have moved ahead with this legislation.

[17:00]

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — So thank you, Mr. Chair. I think it's fair

to say that with respect to Lac La Ronge Indian Band in particular, they made a request to FSIN to pass a resolution at their assembly to oppose the establishment of any provincial parks, any new provincial parks in the province. What's been communicated to us in discussions with Lac La Ronge Indian Band is again they were concerned about the potential impacts on their ability to hunt, fish, and trap in traditional areas. And we've assured them in a couple of different meetings now that that will not be impinged upon at all. We've also offered up traditional land use studies for both Métis and First Nations, any of them that have requested it. Nobody came forward with a formal request for a traditional land use study.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well and that's fine to say nobody came forward. Because I've seen the process to get money and programs, the way the duty to consult and accommodate. The change that has happened when it comes to the organizations to apply for funding to help them to deal with that has not been an easy transition. And I know Métis are complaining about it, that I know personally, that are very concerned about the process and the way, the handling of that. So when you take away the resources to actually raise concerns about the duty to consult and accommodate, which is of course again we'll go back to this, individual rights, and an organization, whether it's Métis Nation, and the areas that would be impacted, First Nations, you have to make sure they have the ability.

And that's why I commented about La Ronge Indian Band. They have taken some of their own dollars to make sure that group works effective to protect their traditional lands. When they want to raise concerns, they want to work with the group, they'll do that. And as far as I'm concerned, they raised and sent you a letter telling you they were opposed to this park. You can sit and go have all the meetings with your officials, and you can send them off, and people can talk with them. That is not, at the end of the day, the process to say, well we're consulting you so we're going to go ahead with the park even though we're having a talk with you. That is not the duty to consult and accommodate that I think the intent of the Supreme Court in the ruling was.

Now I'm no lawyer. But I'm hoping that Justice has seen this. I'm hoping Justice has seen this letter and understands what FSIN has passed. And I hope the Justice department has copies of all this stuff to make sure it's clear. You said Justice was the one that was going to ensure. And I think the minister previous made comments in *Hansard* — and I'll double-check that — that Justice's role is to ensure that treaty rights, inherent rights of First Nations and Métis, are protected. And that's Justice's job to make sure when legislation comes forward.

So can you tell me, has Justice looked into this? And have they seen your letter, and are they aware of the concerns that La Ronge Indian Band and FSIN passed a resolution not supporting this? And is this going to trigger legal action on their part or a First Nations or Métis group to say they're going to challenge this? Is there, and have you checked out with Justice? Because I'm really concerned where this could head.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Well thank you, Mr. Chair. And I'm advised that we have shared all the information with Justice, including our process, the meeting dates and times, who's attended, and the correspondence we received. And Justice has

advised us that we have met the duty to consult requirement.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Okay, so having said that then, clearly a letter stating that they're opposed, the First Nations that's opposed . . . FSIN's opposed to it and you're going to go ahead with. Is there any consideration here in light of that concern that you have from the 74 First Nations that it passed at FSIN that they're opposed to a new park, La Ronge Indian Band's opposed to this new park, that you're . . . Bill 62. Is there any way for you to say whoa? Because I don't believe the homework was done on this file. You can say you feel it was. Clearly from what I'm seeing by the letters and now your own information you've shared, FSIN passed a resolution that clearly says they're opposed to this.

The homework's not done here and you're going ahead with legislation when a First Nations group that have a traditional right to the territories, you're going ahead and you're just going to push ahead with what you want as a park and it doesn't matter who likes it or doesn't. We're going to go ahead with it; it was a campaign promise we made as a party and we're going to push ahead with it. Like or don't like it. To me it's a sad day when that kind of thing happens in this province.

And to say that the process of consultation was done right, I don't know that I would agree with you. You may have had meetings and talked but when I see letters like this and I hear FSIN passing a resolution, it's really concerning to me the way this thing has been handled. And frankly I think there's more work to do on the file. I'm not saying that people are opposed. And we said that provincial parks are good. We want them there. They protect . . . But you'd better make sure you're consulting and you get support of the First Nations and Métis that are being impacted. And here in this case, I think clearly the First Nations are not in support. And I think you have more work to be done as a minister and your ministry, Mr. Minister. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Mr. Chair, I can respond to that. I mean I understand what the hon. member is saying. And I read off 10 other First Nations groups to you who did not send us letters of opposition nor support but did not oppose in any formalized fashion the establishment of this provincial park. I gave you a copy of an email from a Métis, a local Métis Nation president who indicates support for the establishment of the provincial park.

I can cite any number of different municipalities, businesses, and surveys that we've done where it came in at 80 per cent support for the establishment of this provincial park. So to suggest that because one particular First Nation, Lac La Ronge Indian Band, opposed it through this letter, that we'd been working with them, have been working with them since we received that letter, to meet their different concerns, and I think that it's fair to say that the conversations and meetings have been quite cordial. I don't know why FSIN passed the resolution that they passed opposing the establishment of any provincial park, not just this particular one.

So you know, I just would respectfully disagree with you, Mr. Vermette, that we've not done our homework on this file — using your words. This was a campaign promise in 2007. It's now 2013, some six years later that we have been working on



the establishment of these two provincial parks, one of which we've introduced in legislation to establish and have been working diligently with the stakeholders and the municipalities and the FMA holder and First Nations and Métis in that area of the province. And because one particular Indian band, Lac La Ronge Indian Band, opposes it, duty to consult and moving forward with these kinds of things does not mean unanimous agreement.

It means the fact that we need to sit down, understand, and accommodate where we can the concerns that are put forward by the particular First Nation. I think we're doing that with Lac La Ronge Indian Band. So I guess we'll just have to agree to disagree on this particular issue.

**Mr. Vermette:** — Well and that's fine to say that. But at the end of the day, I think clearly you talk about a number of different First Nations that you guys went and had meetings with and you consulted with, you talked to, and you presented your case. But there's no letters of support from them. There's no letters that say they do not support, is what you're telling me. But yet when they attend the I guess 74 First Nations that belong to FSIN, when a resolution passes there to say no to no new parks, there must be a reason why they passed that. There is something has gone on that has caused them to change. And you're right. You said in your own words to pass that. So there must be a reason, and probably because they are feeling that they're not being consulted as they are supposed to with a duty to consult and accommodate.

So clearly I think that's the issue and I guess we're going to disagree on the process and whatever. At the end of the day, I guess we're at the end of it. I'm hoping that you would reconsider and say no, maybe we have to do our homework before we pass this bill. And would the minister and your ministry consider that?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Mr. Chair, we're here to finish up the business of this particular piece of legislation. I think that we can continue on at length if Mr. Vermette wants, with respect to agreeing to disagree on this. But we're going to continue working with our partners up in that area, the stakeholders in that area — First Nations, Métis, business people, those that are recreational users, those that want to utilize this provincial park — and to accommodate them as best we can, including having them on the advisory committee for the development of that provincial park as we do right across the province in our 34 provincial parks. So I would reject the hon. member's request.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Vermette, this is not a forum for debate. It's a forum for consideration. I think you've made your point and I think the ministry has responded. Do you have any other, any questions?

**Mr. Vermette:** — I'll do some closing remarks because I know we're getting into the time of it. But I guess the concern was brought to my attention. I share that with you and at the end of the day it's . . . I guess we want to talk about Bill 62. And I have given you I guess as a committee member some concerns from First Nations, and I have raised those as a committee member, and also in that capacity to truly understand . . . And I think from the side that I heard that there is frustration, and the process of being consulted and accommodated has not

happened here.

And we can sit there and argue at the end of the day. I know we'll move forward with this bill, but at this time I just wanted to raise and for the record the points that needed to be raised and the concerns that were shared with me. I wanted to share those for the record, for the committee, and for the Chair. I thank you to the minister.

We have raised the concerns and that's about all we can do. We have had concerns from residents. You made it clear that it's a campaign promise that was made and your party is going to go ahead and do that, and that's fine. So at that point, I want to thank your officials and yourself for answering the questions. It's not always easy but as a committee member and to the Chair, thank you for allowing me to ask some tough questions.

[17:15]

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Vermette. Mr. Minister, do you have any closing remarks?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — If I might. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I want to thank Mr. Vermette for the questions and his suggestions. And we do take that very, very seriously. And when concerns are raised by any member of the Legislative Assembly regardless of where he or she, which area of the province they represent, we want to do our best to ensure that we listen to those concerns, that we engage the citizens that they represent as best as we possibly can. But regardless of what government does, from time to time there's going to be people opposed to it.

And what we are saying to the people of Saskatchewan is that we made a promise that we would do this in the 2007 campaign, as you alluded to. We're six years hence from that campaign. We're moving forward with this particular park. We've slowed down the process on the other park, precisely again because of some of the concerns we're hearing from, in particular, First Nations over on the east side of the province. And we continue to work with them. But, you know, I want to make it perfectly clear, while I understand you are raising these concerns, we will continue to work with those interested parties to accommodate them as best we can and meet their objectives as best we can.

With that, Mr. Chair, I just want to thank my officials. And if you'll just indulge me for one second, Mr. Chair, I mentioned earlier informally that Mr. Jim Nick is officially retiring here shortly, after this meeting I think. Mr. Nick is a career civil servant — 40 years — 32 years with Saskatchewan Parks. Mr. Chair, just briefly, some career highlights include working on the broad multi-year plan for tourism recreation development on the reservoirs of Rafferty and Alameda, which resulted in the creation of two new regional parks and additional private recreational developments, a lead role in the development of management plans for numerous provincial parks, and as a landscape architect, landscape design for developments in many parks including one of our landmark parks, Cypress Hills.

I'm advised by the deputy, because I don't know Jim all that well — I've had interactions over the last year or so as a committee cabinet — but his attention to detail, tremendous understanding of many aspects of Crown lands processes and

procedures, and leadership in the area of legislation are valued skills that come from many years of hard work and experience. Jim is a tremendous example of a public servant who has dedicated his life to bettering the quality of life for many of our citizens, and we just want to congratulate him on his retirement and wish him all the best, Mr. Chair.

With that, I thank you for indulging me, committee members. And I think there's a couple of House amendments to be made as well.

**The Chair:** — Yes. Thank you, Mr. Minister. Is there any other questions or comments on *The Act to amend The Parks Act*, Bill No. 62? Seeing none, we will proceed with the voting. Starting with clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.]

#### Clause 5

**The Chair:** — Clause 5. I recognize Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** —

**“(2) The description of the following Provincial Park is added after the description of Echo Valley Provincial Park:**

#### **‘Great Blue Heron Provincial Park**

Note: All plans referred to are plans of record in the Land Surveys Directory.

All those lands and water lying West of the Second Meridian and excluding the waters of Emma Lake and Christopher Lake as described below:

This area includes all undeveloped road allowance and excludes surveyed and unsurveyed portions of Provincial Highways Nos. 2, 952 and 953 throughout and further described as follows:

(a) in Projected Township 53, in Range 26:

(i) the north-west quarter of section 19;

(ii) the west halves of Sections 30 and 31;

(b) in Projected Township 54, in Range 26:

(i) the south-west quarter of section 6;

(c) in Projected Township 53, in Range 27:

(i) Sections 23 to 27 inclusive lying north and east of Highway No. 953;

(ii) all that portion of Section 28 excepting:

(A) the Murray Point Summer Resort Subdivision as shown on Plan Nos. 60PA04207, 61PA03380, 62OA12090; and

(B) the Murray point access road right of way known as Victoria Avenue and the right of way for Highway No. 952;

(C) out of the east half of Legal Subdivision 1, the access road to McIntosh Point and lands lying east of said access road;

(iii) Sections 30 to 36 inclusive, excepting the lands falling within Fairy Island in Section 32, Parcel ‘F’ as shown on Plan No. 98PA11846, the land lying between parcel ‘F’ and the waters of Emma Lake, and the surveyed road shown on Plan No. 74PA18365 in the south half of Section 34;

(d) in Projected Township 54, in Range 27:

(i) the south halves of Sections 1, 2 and 3;

(ii) the south half of Section 4 and that portion of the north-west quarter of Section 4 lying west and south of Highway No. 953;

(iii) that portion of Section 5 lying south and west of Highway No. 953;

(iv) Sections 6 and 7;

(v) the west half of Section 8 and that portion of the south-east quarter of Section 8 lying south of Highway No. 953;

(vi) the west halves of Sections 17, 20, and 29;

(vii) Sections 18, 19, 30, and 31;

(viii) those portions of Sections 32 and 33 lying north of Highway No. 953;

excepting out of Sections 29, 30, 31, and 32 the portions of the Anglin Lake Subdivision and not referenced in subclauses (ix) and (x) as shown on Plan Nos. CK5149, 101669687, 101669676, 101669698, 77PA21056, 69PA11214, Plan No. 101977533 and 70PA11141 in the following:

(ix) Parcel ‘A’ in the Anglin Lake Subdivision as shown on Plan No. CK5149, excepting that portion and taken out as shown as Plan Nos. 69PA11214 and 77PA21056; and

(x) Parcel ‘B’ as shown on Plan No. 69PA11214 and parcel ‘D’ as shown on Plan No. 77PA21056;

(e) in Projected Township 55, in Range 27 all lands lying west of Provincial Highway No. 2 as shown on Plan No. 72PA10086 and lying north of Highway No. 953 and

described as follows:

- (i) those portions of Section 2 and 3 that are north of Highway No. 953;
- (ii) Sections 4 and 5;
- (iii) the partial Sections 6 and 7;
- (iv) those portions of Sections 8 through 17 inclusive lying west of Provincial Highway No. 2 as shown on Plan No. 72PA10086 and lying north of Highway No. 953;
- (v) the partial Sections 18 and 19;
- (vi) Sections 20 and 21;
- (vii) the south half of Section 29;
- (viii) the partial south-east quarter of partial Section 30;
- (f) in Projected Township 53, in Range 28:
  - (i) the partial sections 25 and 36;
- (g) in Projected Township 54, in Range 28:
  - (i) partial Sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25 and 36 excepting Parcel 'A' as shown on Plan No. 71PA07450 in Section 25".

**The Chair:** — Mr. Steinley has moved an amendment to clause 5. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Is clause 5 as amended agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried.

[Clause 5 as amended agreed to.]

#### Clause 6

**The Chair:** — Clause 6. I recognize Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Steinley:** — Mr. Chair, I recommend that the committee vote against clause 6 as I plan to move an amendment that inserts a new clause.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Steinley. According to Erskine May, 23rd Edition, page 608, "An amendment to leave out a clause is not in order, as the proper course is to vote against the clause standing part of the bill." Clause 6, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No.

**The Chair:** — Clause 6 is not agreed. The clause is defeated.

[Clause 6 not agreed to.]

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Steinley.

#### Clause 6

**Mr. Steinley:** — Mr. Chair:

Add the following Clause after Clause 5 of the printed Bill:

#### "Coming into force

6(1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act comes into force on assent.

(2) Subsection 5(2) comes into force on proclamation".

**The Chair:** — Okay. Mr. Steinley has moved a new clause 6. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. Is new clause 6 as amended agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried.

[Clause 6 as amended agreed to.]

**The Chair:** — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and the consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts the following: *The Parks Amendment Act, 2012 (No. 2)*. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 62, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2012 (No. 2)* with amendment. Mr. Phillips. Mr. Phillips so moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. That concludes our bills. I would like to thank the minister and officials, and express our appreciation to Mr. Jim Nick for his long service with the government and the work you've done for the people of Saskatchewan. So thank you very much.

We will now continue on with the amendments . . . I'm sorry, with the estimates. I'm sorry. We will now continue on with the estimates. Mr. Minister, you and your executives can be excused from the committee meeting.

### General Revenue Fund Government Relations Vote 30

**The Chair:** — This committee has considered estimates. We will start with the voting of estimates, the main estimates. Vote no. 30, Government Relations, page 77, central management and services, subvote (GR01) in the amount of \$10,543,000, is

that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. First Nations and Métis engagement, subvote (GR12) in the amount of 79,383,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. The municipal and northern engagement, subvote (GR07) in the amount of \$375,514,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. The Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (GR07) in the amount of \$1,746,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Public safety, subvote (GR11) in the amount of \$9,807,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Provincial public safety telecommunications network, subvote (GR13) in the amount of zero dollars. This is for informational purposes only and there is no vote required.

Amortization of public assets in the amount of \$2,429,000. This is also for information purposes only and no vote is required.

Government Relations, vote 30, in the amount of \$476,993,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

[17:30]

**The Chair:** — I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2014, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of \$476,993,000.

Mr. Huyghebaert. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Justice  
Vote 3**

**The Chair:** — We'll move on to vote no. 3, Justice, page 99, central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of \$46,566,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of \$41,224,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Legal and policy services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of \$32,329,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. Community safety outcomes, subvote (JU13) in the amount of \$13,280,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Community justice, subvote (JU05) in the amount of \$20,915,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Boards and commissions, subvote (JU08) in the amount of \$27,348,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Custody, supervision, and rehabilitation services, subvote (JU06) in the amount of \$157,023,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Policing, subvote (JU09) in the amount of \$187,115,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Saskatchewan Police Commission, subvote (JU12) in the amount of \$1,459,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Major capital projects, subvote (JU11) in the amount of \$45,425,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Amortization of capital assets in the amount of \$1,304,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — I'm sorry. There's information only. We don't have to vote on that one.

Vote 3 in the amount of \$572,684,000, I would now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2014, the following sums for Justice in the amount of \$572,684,000.

Mr. Norris.

**General Revenue Fund  
Parks, Culture and Sport  
Vote 27**

**The Chair:** — We'll now consider main estimates, vote no. 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, page 109, central management and services, subvote (PC01) in the amount of \$11,223,000. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Community Initiatives Fund, subvote (PC06) in the amount of \$9,589,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Building communities, subvote (PC11) in the amount of \$3,166,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Parks, subvote (PC12) in the amount of \$30,251,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Culture, subvote (PC03) in the amount of \$34,604,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Heritage, subvote (PC07) in the amount of \$9,360,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Sport, recreation, and stewardship, subvote (PC15) in the amount of \$4,243,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Capital Commission operations, subvote (PC17) in the amount of \$9,080,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Amortization of capital assets in the amount of \$3,402,000, this is for information purposes. No vote is required.

Parks, Culture and Sport, vote no. 27 in the amount of \$111,516,000, I would ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2014, the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of \$111,516,000.

Mr. Tochor. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — March  
Justice  
Vote 3**

**The Chair:** — Supplementary estimates, vote no. 3, Justice, on page 5, central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of \$2,123,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of \$1,453,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Legal and policy and services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of \$664,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Adult corrections, subvote (JU06) in the amount of \$2,968,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Courts capital, subvote (JU11) in the amount of \$730,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Justice, vote 3 in the amount of \$7,073,000, I would ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2013, the following sums for Justice in the amount of \$7,073,000.

Mr. Norris. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried.

Okay, under vote 3, under courts and civil justice, there's salaries — provincial court judges, statutory in the amount of \$865,000 for information purposes.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — March  
Government Relations  
Vote 30**

**The Chair:** — Supplementary estimates, vote 30, Government Relations on page 4, public safety subvote (GR11) in the amount of \$35,470,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried. Government Relations, vote 30

in the amount of \$35,470,000, I would now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2013, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of \$35,470,000.

Mr. Phillips. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried. Committee members, you have before you a draft of the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We require a member to move the following motion:

That the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

Mr. Phillips so moves.

**Mr. Phillips:** — I move:

That the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Phillips has so moved. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That is carried.

Committee members, that concludes the business portion of our committee this afternoon. Thank you very much for your diligence. I would ask a motion that we adjourn this committee until tomorrow. Mr. Norris so moves. Carried. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 17:42.]