

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

**Mr. Goodale:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have just one or two items I'd like to pursue with the minister this evening and I hope he can provide me with some information on a couple of subjects.

First of all, Mr. Minister, I have a technical question about a publication produced by your department called *Saskatchewan Hunting and Trapping Guide for 1987*. I'm sure your officials have a copy of that.

And I have received a number of inquiries from people in different locations in southern Saskatchewan having to do with the new licence fees that have been imposed for 1987. And I would draw your attention particularly to page 26 of this publication where the licence fee schedule is laid out, and I just would, first of all, Mr. Minister, ask for your confirmation that I'm reading this chart accurately.

And I want to take for example the average case in southern Saskatchewan of a farm family where, say, a son in the family wants to get a licence for hunting gophers or rabbits or whatever, and . . . or weasels, or so on. And this chart would seem to indicate that first he would have to acquire a Saskatchewan wildlife habitat certificate for \$10, and a further, southern Saskatchewan fur licence fee of \$30, and that would result in the total cost to this young person, for example, of \$40. I think, Mr. Minister, if I'm correct, that that's a three or fourfold increase from the fee that used to be in place.

In wonder, first of all, can you tell me if I'm reading that chart correctly. And secondly, is it an increase of that magnitude? And could you explain why your department felt it necessary to increase that particular fee for a very normal, common practice which young farm people have pursued for years at relatively little cost; why that kind of a fee increase was considered to be necessary for this year.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd be really happy to respond to that. First of all, the hon. member used the example of gophers and rabbits. I think you're just throwing one out. There is no fee for that; there is no licence fee whatsoever. However, there is a \$10 habitat certificate, first of all. Then any other hunting that the individual would want to do, you'd purchase your licence in the normal fashion.

There is no requirement to purchase a fur trapping licence unless the individual is going to be engaged in that. And yes, that went up, but it reflects the increase in the cost of fur. For example, if you trap a mink this year, it's worth about \$80. And people who are looking for mink would be looking for more than one at a time, or some of

the other fur. So the fur licence did go up.

Now specifically, I think you referred to the habitat certificate and you want to know about that one. Mr. Chairman, the major problem facing our wildlife today is habitat, or more precisely the lack thereof. We are losing habitat at a tremendously alarming rate in Saskatchewan. We're losing habitat for white-tailed deer, moose, elk, as bush is being cleared. And we can't blame the farmers for wanting to clear bush because given the economic times, they have to make every dollar they possibly can out of every acre they have so they're clearing bush. Well right away, we're destroying habitat for the large ungulates.

We're also losing habitat for our water-fowl populations at a tremendous rate. In southern Saskatchewan, sloughs are being drained off and pot-holes are being drained off so we don't have the breeding ground for the ducks. In fact, our duck population is down 25 per cent over what it was just a very few years ago. So we have gone very strongly into habitat protection programs.

We have the habitat protection Act, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act, which we introduced a couple of years ago. We're adding more acres again this year. It did go, I may say, as a non-controversial Bill last year when I added 1.2 million acres to that Act. I would hope it would go non-controversial again this year because it did seem to have the support of all members in the House at that particular time. We have to be concerned about a habitat.

We have the figures of the loss per constituency. In some areas it's 3 to 4 per cent per year, Mr. Chairman, where we're losing habitat for wildlife. Habitat is the single most important problem facing our wildlife populations not only in Saskatchewan but right across the continent, and in Saskatchewan we are taking measures to address it.

On the fishing licence we have an impost there where one-third goes straight into fish development programs, breeding ponds, stocking of lakes. We're doing the same thing on the hunting licences and we're doing the same thing with the habitat certificate, and that in a nutshell is the reason behind it.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Minister, as a rather ironic aside I might note that some of what you have just said could well fit into the many briefs that were presented this afternoon at the Rafferty Hearings where the issue of habitat was very, very prominent. I'm sure those who presented briefs in opposition to that proposal on the basis of the habitat considerations might take some encouragement from what you've said in indicating your concern about habitat as well.

Just to clarify the point about the licences, Mr. Minister, in relation to the \$30 southern Saskatchewan fur licence, could you indicate to me what sort of game and animals and fur-bearing animals would be covered by that \$30 fee? You've indicated some who are not, which I fully understand. I wonder if you could indicate to me what is covered by that \$30 fee, and how does it compare to the fee for last year.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, the royalties

structure can be found on page 36. It's based on a three-year average. The fee had been \$10; it's increased to 30. It also reflects the increase in the price of fur which can be expected to be returned to the trapper, and all of the different animals are listed there with the royalties structure on page 36.

I think you'll find, and all members would find, Mr. Chairman, that this really is a very comprehensive brochure. We've had a few compliments on it about the content and just how much information is available in it.

**Mr. Goodale:** — I appreciate that information, Mr. Minister. Your explanation with respect to the increase seems to be directly relevant to those who are in commercial kinds of operation. And I wonder if you have given any consideration to the type of hunting that occurs in many farm areas that really is not of a commercial nature. And is there any room in your structure for an exemption, perhaps, for a young person on a farm with a very casual limited amount of hunting involved. Is there a possibility that that could be given some special consideration because the level of fee taken together in total, \$40, might well turn out to be prohibitive for the kind of practice that young farm people have carried on in southern Saskatchewan for many years at relatively little cost?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, it's rather difficult to make a distinction between the, may I say, casual trapper, to the hon. member, as compared to someone who belongs to a trappers' association in northern Saskatchewan and is making a living, because they realize the same profit from the pelt. For example, the northern trapper could expect to realize between \$450 and \$500 for a wolf pelt. A coyote right now would be worth about \$150. So really, when you take the cost of the trapper's licence which everyone must have - they must have the fur licence - one coyote pays ten, twelvefold the cost of that licence.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Well, I thank the minister for that information. I hope he will at least take my concern under consideration. I've had a number of people contact me on this point in the last little while, I gather, as this booklet has gained some broad distribution in Saskatchewan. And in some parts of the province it does seem to be raising concern, and I would hope the minister might look at it and determine whether, in all the circumstances, that is a reasonable fee in especially the southern parts of the province. I'll just leave that point with the minister for his consideration.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to move to an entirely different area. Probably as different as you can get . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the minister would like to respond, yes, please if you would.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I thank the hon. member for the opportunity to respond. I think one of the things that we've been trying to do as a department is to tie the fees to the value of the resource, and that is reflected in this year's increase. Now I know that the increase looked fairly . . . it didn't look fairly significant, it is an significant increase, but the profit realized to the trapper is also extremely significant right now, and so we've tied it to the

value of the resource.

And I may also say that what we have offered in the last two years, and especially in southern communities where perhaps trapping is not quite as prevalent, we are offering training schools to anybody who's interested. All they have to do is contact the department. We'll put on the training school and assist them to increase their skills, improve their skills, and I'm sure for the cost of the licence, which we're asking them to pay, they are really going to realize a profit on that. So I offer that for your information.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Well I thank the minister for that answer.

I would like to turn to another area, Mr. Chairman. It's about as different as you can get from the one we've just been discussing, and that has to do with the very hotly debated topic in Regina with respect to the building and, in particular, the location of a new art gallery in Regina.

To most people in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, the great fight that seems to be going on in Regina about the art gallery is a little bewildering, and I would like to get this evening some specific clarification from the minister about the status of the project and, in particular, the government's involvement in it.

I wonder if the minister could first of all, just to set the stage, if the minister could indicate what actually is being proposed, where precisely it is to be located as the plans presently stand, and who in detail is going to be paying for the total project?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may I'll just quote from a little briefing note that I have here to give you some chronology of the events leading up to the current status. If you prefer and if other members prefer, I can have a chronology of the outline of events prepared for you and have it sent to you in the next couple of days so you know exactly how we got to the current, situation, if that would be of any use to you in answering constituency inquiries.

Very briefly, in October 1984, a study was commissioned by the gallery and it identified eight sites, and the preferred site being in the Wascana Centre adjacent to the museum. That was one of the sites studied. A 1984 study was also commissioned by the city of Regina, and they identified four locations with the museum site, the natural history museum site being the preferred site by that city's parks and recreation department.

In February of 1985, Mr. Chairman, the Mackenzie Art Gallery placed advertisements in the Leader-Post requesting interested parties to submit proposals regarding site preference for a new gallery. I may say to all hon. members, not one reply was received to that ad that was placed in the newspaper.

In September 1985, Regina market Square agreed to the Wascana Centre site also; September 30, 1985, the city council adopted a recommendation endorsing locating the gallery on the Wascana Centre site located at Albert Street via the Museum of Natural History.

(1915)

And on April 1, 1986, following all of these consultations, following all of these proposals, following all of the recommendations, including a motion passed by the city council, the Premier announced a co-operative funding agreement to construct a gallery adjacent to the museum. That co-operative agreement called for \$3 million contributed by the provincial government, \$3 million contributed by the federal government, \$1 million — approximately, slightly over 1 million — by the city of Regina, who also wanted to include a performing arts theatre in that location attached to the Museum of Natural History, with local fund raising in the order of \$2 million. So there we have an approximate \$9 million structure, a new art gallery attached to the upgraded, renovated, refurbished museum, together with a theatre for performing arts.

On four different occasions city council passed a motion saying that was the site, that was their preferred site. There had been no arguments until after the final step was taken which was to have an architectural competition, and the selected jury members picked what they thought was the best plan, and certainly was a beautiful plan, and everything was supposed to move ahead. It was about that time I became minister of the department, and shortly after that there was some controversy saying, perhaps some citizens of Regina did not like this site, notwithstanding the fact that city council had approved that site on four separate occasions by motion of city council.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Chairman, to the minister, he has indicated that the Government of Saskatchewan has made a commitment of some \$3 million to this project. Could I ask, just as a technical matter, to whom was that commitment made and precisely under what authority, and could the minister indicate where that item appears in the Estimates, just so I can be clear of where to find it.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — A precise dollar figure would be found under the property management corporation because they will be spearheading any construction. They have to this point in time, I may say, Mr. Chairman, taken on the lead role in terms of supervising what work has been done so far. There's been, oh, close to \$300,000 worth of work been done — architecture, project design, that type of thing . . . management. It has come to that much, which would be from the provincial government's commitment.

It was a commitment signed and agreed to. Notwithstanding the current arguments about site and moving, I think it may be very difficult, given that there was a written agreement between the three levels of government — the municipal level, the provincial level, the federal level — together with the board members of the Mackenzie Art Gallery, and it was with that corporate body that the agreement was struck and reached.

It may well be a binding agreement. I don't know that. We have said, as a provincial government, that the \$3 million that we're contributing is not site specific. We haven't said, you have to build on that site or you may have to build on another site.

All along what I have said is, I would like to see the project go ahead. I would like to see it built. It is a good project for the city of Regina. It is a good project for the people of Saskatchewan. I think it's good for the University of Regina, who will be able to get out from under a financial burden which they currently have by looking after the Mackenzie Art Gallery out of their own funding.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Chairman, do I take it then, from what the minister says, that the Government of Saskatchewan does not have any direct control over the project? If that is true, and it's a part of a four-way agreement, where would the control lie, Mr. Minister, in terms of final decision making, and if a decision is to be made at this stage to make some changes, who would actually be in a position to make those decisions?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I believe, Mr. Chairman, that any determination on a change of site or confirmation of site would take place between the city council of Regina on behalf of the residents of Regina and the board of the Mackenzie Art Gallery.

I hasten to point out that the provincial government is just one funding vehicle to make this project work. The project had been talked about for a number of years. There was no real dispute as to the need for a new gallery or as to the desirability of a new gallery. It was a question of when and where. And our Premier, in conjunction with the other bodies mentioned, agreed that we would be part of the funding vehicle to bring about this museum to reality. It's only subsequent to the agreement being struck, having already advertised and said: here's a site; are we going to go ahead; do you have any alternative proposals? None was received. So everybody went ahead in good faith, including the board of the art gallery, the provincial government, the federal government representatives, and to the best of my knowledge, city council — who are now somewhat vacillating in their position and the level of their commitment to the project because, as I understand it, they have received some heat from a number of residents of the city of Regina.

I don't think the provincial government should be placed in a position of being a referee in some kind of argument between city council and the people whom they purport to represent, the citizens of Regina. I'd rather see that settled between them at that level, in conjunction with discussions with the board of the Mackenzie Art Gallery, and then come back to us.

The provincial government obviously has no particular axe to grind in this issue. We are flexible. We're certainly not intransigent on the subject of a site, but we have gone ahead, absolutely in good faith, assuming that was a preferred site, that was a chosen site, and that was the logical site.

I personally from day one have supported this project, and I can say without fear of being contradicted, I do support that particular site. I realize some residents would not be happy to hear that, but I think what we would have in there, especially with the design the way it is, which is an absolutely beautiful piece of work, we would have a tremendous cultural cloister on that particular corner that

could become a very major tourist attraction for the city of Regina.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister has indicated over a period of two or three years that from time to time public input was sought with respect to the project and, in particular, the location of the project. Could I ask the minister if he feels the advertising of that call for public input was adequate. Does he feel that there has been ample opportunity for people, perhaps with reservations or other points of view, to express their opinion?

I ask the minister the question because there does seem to be some body of opinion in Regina that there has not been an adequate opportunity to this point for the public to be informed and to have their say. And I wonder if the minister could indicate his view on that.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I thank the member for raising that particular question because I think that's crux to the whole matter that we're discussing right now, and he makes a very valid comment in saying that perhaps we should reflect back in retrospect on the steps that were taken and was it adequate consultation.

Obviously I was not the minister at the time when this had gone on. I hadn't paid an awful lot of attention, I confess, to the issue. It wasn't relevant, either to my portfolio or to my constituency, which are my two all-consuming interests. It is now part of my portfolio, and obviously I've got myself involved in it and tried to become as familiar as possible with the situation.

As I understand the events leading up to the final decision which culminated in the decision to build on that particular site, I am assured certainly by the people on the Mackenzie gallery board that there was ample opportunity for consultation, for input. In fact, the very day last December when we announced the result of the jurying and who would, in fact, be the winning architect and go ahead with the particular design that was chosen, was the first time I heard a negative. And I heard it from one reporter who came up to me and said, this is not going to be an easy interview; do you realize that an awful lot of people don't like the site for the art gallery? And I had to confess it was the first I'd ever heard of it being in any way a controversial subject.

**Mr. Goodale:** — The minister will know that some steps have been taken in Regina to trigger a public referendum on at least some aspects of this issue, and I wonder if the minister could tell me, in terms of the agreement that he has referred to involving four parties and so forth, what would be the legal or the practical impact of that referendum, which I understand is to be taken in Regina next week, I believe. What are the consequences that flow from that referendum as far as the Saskatchewan government is concerned?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The understanding and the perception I have of the situation, Mr. Chairman, is that should the plebiscite come out in a negative fashion, then the city would not be obliged to put up their \$1.05 million which they had previously committed.

I've discussed this with several of the councillors informally, not at a council meeting and certainly not at the delegation when city council met with the cabinet delegation of approximately one week ago — it wasn't discussed then — but I have discussed it with several councillors who told me that what they wanted to do was take the 1.05 million, put it in trust, and hold it for the gallery people because they did want to go ahead and they were interested in seeing the project come about.

Should the plebiscite, as I understand it, should the plebiscite come out, nay — come out negative — all it means is the city would not be contributing \$1.05 million. I have to be perfectly frank with the hon. member and all members in the House. I really feel that two questions should have been asked on the plebiscite. The plebiscite question, if I may paraphrase, says: do you support spending \$1.05 million of city money, municipal money, on a Mackenzie Art Gallery to be build adjacent to the Museum of Natural History.

I really feel, Mr. Chairman, it should have been two questions asked if they were going to ask any at all: 1) Do you favour spending over \$1 million of city money on an art gallery, and; 2) Do you favour the site being the Museum of Natural History. Then I think we would have had a much more clear indication of precisely what the citizens of Regina want.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Chairman, further to the minister, just to clarify one previous answer he gave to me with respect to the provincial share of some \$3 million, could the minister say whether there are any strings whatsoever attached to that commitment on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan? Are there any conditions or limitations on the Saskatchewan government grant that affect the issue of where the gallery ought to be finally located?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is one very significant string attached to this. You know, I can't help thinking, when the hon. member started out discussing trapping and hunting, it's almost like we're into another blood sport here, looking at this issue of the Mackenzie Art Gallery. The one string, if one could call it a string, was a condition that should the art gallery be built on the site, attached to the Museum of Natural History, then because it's attached to an existing government building where we pay the maintenance, we pay the power bills, we pay the security, we pay for landscaping, and we pay for snow removal and parking, that we would continue to absorb that cost on behalf of the gallery, which has been estimated to be approximately \$400,000 per year.

Now if the board of the gallery should decide that they will in fact build elsewhere or become part of an existing building - most of which have been ruled out, namely the Centre of the Arts, the T.C. Douglas Building, where space could have been made available in either one of those, have been ruled out by the board; should they in fact decide to relocate to one of those places, then it's a government building. We would pick up the maintenance cost. Should they go with a free-standing structure of their own on their own property, that belongs to them and we wouldn't be involved in any ongoing

maintenance. So I guess the main incentive from that point of view would be that we would be picking up about \$400,000 per year of maintenance and operating costs that we would not pick up if it's free-standing and independent.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Mr. Minister, could we just review again, for the interests of clarity, the exact financial commitments that have been made. I think I heard you say earlier: \$3 million from the Government of Canada; about \$1 million from the city of Regina; \$3 million from the Government of Saskatchewan, of which some 300,000 has been spent, roughly in those terms; and another 2 million raised from local fund raising sources. Is that the total package? And of the expenditures that have been made to date, is it only the \$300,000 out of the provincial 3 million that has been spent? Has any other money to your knowledge been spent to this point? Are all of those commitments firm, I gather with the one exception being of what may happen in respect to the plebiscite in the city of Regina? When and how are the moneys to be released out of this package? And do you feel, apart from the city of Regina, are any of the commitments in any jeopardy of lapsing or perhaps diminishing over time?

(1930)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There are two or three parts, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member's question. The 300,000 approximately — I believe is a little less than has been expended today — was expended by the provincial government through the property management corporation. To the best of my knowledge that's the only money that has been spent on the project. It was for design, architectural fees, project management, that type of thing. And that came from the provincial share; no other funds have been expended as far as I'm aware.

How would the disbursement be made? It would be made when construction started; it would be paid as it went along.

Is any of the funding in jeopardy? I believe that was the third part of the question. Funding would be in jeopardy because the federal and the provincial is a matching arrangement. If one or other should withdraw, the other is automatically out. So if 3 million goes from one source, it's actually 6 million that would be gone altogether.

We don't want to withdraw ours. I've had representation from groups, I've had calls, I've had letters from people saying to me, if they're going ahead with that site, don't give them your \$3 million. That's a very difficult situation for me, and really one that I don't find at all tenuous or viable because if we said we were not going with our 3 million, the federal government would not be there with their 3 million, and we'd be looking at . . . Well, it would be the death of the project. I don't want to see the project die. I firmly believe it's a good project. For Regina, for Saskatchewan, I'd like to see it go.

**Mr. Goodale:** — I gather what you've said, Mr. Minister, with respect to the two contributions from the senior levels of government: 3 million from the Government of Canada and 3 million from the Government of Saskatchewan, that that money is essentially paid out

simultaneously. Is that a correct understanding, or is it the situation where the province will put in its 3 million first and then the federal 3 million will come along?

I'm just wondering whether this all goes into one global pot all at once and the money is disbursed from that pot as expenses are incurred, or does somebody pay first and somebody else comes along after the first commitment has been completely satisfied and so forth. I wonder if there's an order of spending here or whether it's all lumped together.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would be global in the sense that it's managed, if it's on the site of the Museum of Natural History, by the property management corporation, and that would be global in the sense once it's started we're already in, and everybody else would kick in their funding, including the approximate figure of \$2 million which has to be raised by the Mackenzie Art Gallery board — and I may say they are very close to that figure right now; they're in excess of 1.5 million, so they've done remarkably well. I think they have demonstrated that there is a commitment and there is a desire to see that art gallery built here in Regina.

**Mr. Goodale:** — One final question, Mr. Chairman, for the minister on this subject. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if I could refer back to your very first answer on this subject where you indicated some briefing information was generally available. I'm wondering if you could indicate what information about this project is public now, or has been made public and is generally available for examination, and I wonder if the minister could provide a listing of all the public documents and information relating to the gallery. And I wonder if he would be good enough to table that information in the House so that it can be generally available to all who may be interested.

And secondly, in that documentation, I would be grateful if the minister could indicate if any of it relates to the issue of public input into this decision making process; number two, any conditions upon the Saskatchewan government grant with respect to the gallery; number three, what there might be in the documentation that would relate to the issue of location and siting; and number four, the details and the firmness of all of the financial commitments that have been made to date by all of the participating parties.

There seems to be so much fault surrounding this issue, Mr. Minister, and so many questions that have been asked, that I think it would be useful if that sort of information could be put on the public record and then people could make their own judgements about it. That information need not be submitted instantly at this moment, but if it could be done within the next day or two, I think that would be helpful.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that I appreciate the line of questioning the hon. member has put forward. I've already made myself available to the media, including yesterday when I was phoned in my constituency, about this particular issue. They don't always carry a full half-hour interview, obviously, when they put into a synopsis of something like 20 seconds, but all of the information relating to this project has been

readily available to the public, to the media, to anybody who has requested it.

I'll table right now a particular document that outlines almost all of the things that you have asked for. Some of the other things you've asked for, I can find for you. I think it would be somewhat instructive to get some of the details on the competition, the architectural competition, and costs related to that, put that on the table so that you can see how it was done; also the chronology of the events whereby the main players in the game, one by one, endorse not only the project but the chosen site. It seems vacillation is coming about now because some residents have become very vocal about the particular site and are complaining about destroyed the site, saving the park. A couple of people that are the most vocal are people from the CBC who weren't particularly vocal when the CBC built a great, huge, conglomerate new building in that particular park, and didn't seem to be very concerned about it at that time. Now those people are very excited that any corner of the park could be altered in any way. I find that an extremely difficult situation to accept.

So anything that I can lay on the Table, I'd be pleased to do it for you.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, can I infer from your remarks then that you're satisfied that the whole process that the Mackenzie board has gone through is above-board or has been above-board? And with particular reference to this site selection, are you satisfied, Mr. Minister, that the whole question of site selection has been dealt with fairly, honestly, scrupulously attentive to all of the options available to the Mackenzie board?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no hesitation, standing here staking my reputation, putting my seat on the line by saying that everything — everything — was done completely above-board. I know the hon. member is not inferring that there was any hanky-panky by the board members, by the board chairperson, Peggy Wakeling, or any other who've been concerned with that. I think he's referring to the site selection. That was before I became the minister.

I can safely stand by anything I have said and done since I became responsible for this particular department and the project fell under my purview and under my administration. I have absolute faith and confidence in the honesty and integrity of all of the people on the board, of Andrew Oko, who's the curator at the gallery, and anybody who's been in any way involved with the project. It has been above-board; it has been public; they have held news conferences; they have never, at any time, as a board withheld any information whatsoever that has been requested from them either by me or anybody else I know of. So I'm perfectly satisfied that all dealings are absolutely above-board.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Can I deduce from the minister's defensive posturing that the site selection process in particular, that with respect to that process, that you are satisfied that it was completely fair?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The site selection, Mr. Chairman,

took place before I became minister of the department, and as a matter of fact, as I've admitted earlier, I didn't really care about the site selection. Number one, it's not in my constituency; number two, it wasn't within my area of jurisdiction or administration when I was minister of parks and renewable resources, and I've paid very little attention to it. As far as I was concerned, it was strictly a Regina city issue and nothing else.

Now I live in Regina city by virtue of my cabinet position. I still count Spiritwood, Saskatchewan, my home. I still think of that area, the area in which I vote, as the area where I live and the area of the most paramount importance to me. So I'd never considered this as anything other than a Regina city issue.

The information I had prior to taking on this portfolio was that the site selection was done in a very fair manner, and nothing has been presented to me to indicate otherwise, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, if I might, a further question to the minister. The minister finally conceded that, in his opinion, the site selection had been conducted in a very fair manner. Can I ask the minister then . . . or perhaps I should point out that the site selection, and some of your officials will be familiar with this, the site selection purported to evaluate a number of sites in the city of Regina according to certain criteria and then gave a certain rating to each of the sites depending on to what extent they met the criteria, and there was waiting for some of these criteria.

The minister will know from his official that one of those criteria was that the gallery be located in a park-like setting. Now that is one criterion that weighed very heavily against any potential site in downtown Regina, and you might say, well that's natural, but my question to you, sir, is: do you feel that that's an appropriate criterion, given the museums or galleries in this respect are primarily or mostly a series of windowless rooms? And I ask you why it's important then for a gallery to be located in a park-like setting, and I ask you also, in view of the fact that most provincial galleries or major galleries in other provinces are located by and large in the downtown centres of cities, why you would feel that this has been a very fair process?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the downtown-type of location has presented problems for other cities and other regions, parking being one of the prime problems.

If I may relate back again to the hon. member to the chronology of events, and I'm sorry if I seem to be taking a defensive posture. I don't feel particularly defensive about the project. I think it can stand on its own merits. But first of all we had the gallery study, having a commission studying this particular issue, coming up with a recommendation for that site; then we have a study commissioned by the city of Regina recommending that site; then we have advertising in the newspaper say, do you have any other sites — no replies were received — then we have the Wascana Centre Authority agreeing to that site.

I became the minister some time after all of this happened. Am I to say, Regina city council, you're wrong; Mackenzie gallery board, you're wrong; Regina Market Square, you're wrong? Certainly not. I don't have that kind of arrogance and certainly wouldn't even get involved in that kind of argument. I have to accept that these are the choices made by all of those independent bodies. Who am I to overturn them?

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not suggesting that you dictate to the people of Regina where the gallery should be built, but I would think that given the heavy involvement of provincial dollars that you might have some questions about the process, that you might ask a simple question such as: in view of the fact that an art gallery is a series of windowless rooms for the viewing of art, why is it that one of the most important criteria that you have for selecting the gallery is that it be located in a park-like setting. Have you asked that question, Mr. Minister, and if you've asked it, what answer do you have?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, it was never my place to ask why it was advertised as being in a park-like setting. If that's what Regina city council wants, if that's what market square wants, if that's what the Wascana Centre Authority wants, if that's what the board of the Mackenzie Art Gallery wants, who's Colin Maxwell to stand up and say, I question your judgement on this, in a particular Regina issue?

In any event, when it was advertised to go to competition for the architects, it was clearly advertised where it was going to be. There was no subterfuge about this whatsoever, no clandestine operation. It was always right up front, and there's no question about that. And anybody who didn't know that it was that particular site obviously doesn't read the newspapers and had no contact with any media whatsoever.

(1945)

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'm wondering if the province of Saskatchewan, under your department, has a policy concerning private wood lot operators, and if so, could you tell us just briefly what that policy is.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't have, as such, a policy but it's one of the things that our resource caucus committee has been examining, as you'd well know because you sit on that caucus yourself, and there have been proposals as to how to promote the private wood lot operation. And it is something under the FRDA (Forest Renewal Development Agreement) that the federal government has been looking at and has been promoting.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So there's no licensing procedure right now for wood lot operators in the province? If someone wanted to start a half-section or a two-section wood lot, there'd be no licensing requirement by the provincial government?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, they would be doing this presumably on their own land, and what they did with their own land would be their business. They wouldn't have to have a permit to do it.

I had the honour, two years ago, of meeting a gentleman who donated a Christmas tree to the legislature, out front, who has been running a small private wood lot for a number of years, intensive tree farming, and making an excellent living at that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — You mention that the FRDA has policies, towards this end, of getting small operators into private wood lots. I'm wondering if your department has had any consultations with ERDA (Economic and Regional Development Agreement) or one of the federal government programs to determine what type of funding is available for Saskatchewan residents who wish to enter such a venture.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm advised that the Canadian Forestry Service has a staff member who has been doing liaison work with people interested in pilot projects as wood lot operators, but it has been expertise, advice, assistance, guidance, and it hasn't been in the form of direct funding. In any event, the FRDA, the agreement would be cost shared between the province and the federal government.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well if, Mr. Minister, with all due respect, if you have no policy and someone came to you with a proposal, how would you make a decision to cost share that if you have no policy or promotion? Granted it is fine to have consultation with FRDA, but if the province has no mechanism, would it be on a piecemeal basis as to whether myself, or my neighbour, or someone else came to you with a proposal? Would it be on an individual by individual basis as to whether or not the decision be made to fund, and then you would cost-share that with the federal government?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The pilot projects to which I referred earlier, Mr. Chairman, were federal direct delivered through one of their staff people from Canadian Forestry Service. The FRDA programs which we're talking about which would be cost shared would not in any event, as I understand it, be grant oriented; grant money to someone to do something with a private wood lot. In any event, anybody with a private wood lot, and there are some operators like that around the province — there are one or two in my own constituency — they are at liberty to do whatever they want with their private land and sell the wood to whomever they please, be it industry, or a local saw mill, or anybody else.

And I'm sorry if I'm not understanding the thrust of your questioning. I'm not sure that's where you wanted to go with this one.

**Mr. Anguish:** — If someone wanted to start a wood lot operation . . . I understand you can't operate something, in fact it's not a good idea to operate on a business that's fully funded by someone else because the incentive isn't there to work very hard at the business in most cases. What I'm asking is that: where is there money available? You're telling me, if I understand, Mr. Minister, that

there's no funding available within the provincial system. It's my understanding that there is money available in the federal system. Can you confirm that? And if so, who would someone contact in the federal government to determine what funding they're eligible for, or whether or not they could put in a proposal to that specific agency or department?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We're not aware . . . My officials aren't aware, hon. member, of any funding that is available. What they could do, if they wanted to pursue it further, would be to contact the Canadian Forestry Service in Prince Albert. We do make some stock available to CFS Prince Albert, who in turn make it available to a private wood lot operator.

**Mr. Anguish:** — If a wood lot operator got into the business, Mr. Minister, are there any restrictions on whether or not that individual wood lot operator can sell, either to Weyerhaeuser or Sask Forest Products or to you as a Christmas tree? What licensing is necessary to then sell the product?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There is no licensing necessary through our department, Mr. Chairman, and just like any private operator, private farmer, growing whatever particular crop — in this case it's trees — they're at liberty to sell it anywhere they wish. So they could do it as a Christmas tree operation or sell to Weyerhaeuser or MacMillan Bloedel or Simpson Timber or L&M Wood Products in Glaslyn.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Minister, some time ago a group of entrepreneurs, I believe in your particular riding, were promoting a wood-fired electrical generator with by-product, using cellulose for cattle feed and possibly some use for the burn material that came out of the operation. And I'm wondering whether or not the provincial government has done any studies on wood-fired electrical generators, and if so, could you make those studies available to the members of this legislature.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — For the information of the hon. member, the Deputy Premier is in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and if you care to raise that with him, he's done a lot of work on this particular area. I know the people, the group who are involved in my constituency, the department really walked a mile with them. It just wasn't financial viable at that particular time.

There were studies available. You'll probably want to discuss this with the Deputy Premier during Sask Power, during Crown corporations, but the studies that were available, as I understand it, were not generated by Sask Power but by private companies. I still have copies of those particular reports and studies that were done in my office if you're interested in them. I have no problem shares those with you.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I would think that something like a wood-fired electrical generator would be important to the resource management of forests within the area where the particular generator would be set up or the burning system would be set up. And I would hope that the

department would undertake, at least if they haven't done so, to conduct their own study.

I don't know how you can say it's not economically viable to do that. There are many other places in the north-eastern United States, there's a wood-fire electrical generator going up at Lac la Biche. And Mr. Minister, I appreciate you saying that I should maybe talk to the Deputy Premier, and I hope that we have an opportunity to do that in Crown corporations when the minister appears before there.

But I understand one of the major problems is that Sask Power doesn't wish to buy the electrical output — and I'm not saying this in any political sense — but of course it would be not economically feasible as long as the provincial Crown corporation refuses to buy electrical generated power from wood-fired generators as opposed to building more and more megaprojects in the southern part of the province.

So anyone who would want to go ahead, Mr. Minister, of course, wouldn't be able to do that. I would have a hard time believing that entrepreneurs would want to invest in such a large project if they didn't think and had grounds to believe that it was economically viable to do so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, the Deputy Premier seems to be giving you lots of information. I don't know whether he's comparing Shand and Rafferty to a little 20 megawatt plant up in your constituency or in the member from Athabasca or the member from Cumberland, but I want to know if the department has done any studies, at least in terms of resource management, that would surround a wood-fired electrical generator. And if you haven't done any such studies, would you be undertaking to do so some time in the near future?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now first of all, Mr. Chairman, the advice I received — and I remember having numerous meetings with the group from Big River and other officials — was that in actual fact, using this particular system in Vermont, they're paying 13 times the cost for power that we're paying here in Saskatchewan, which right off the top makes it something less than a viable project.

We had offered at that time — and I do recall the meetings and the conversations with power officials and some elected people too — that we would buy whatever power they produced at avoided cost and they just couldn't come close to it. It would be a very expensive project to do that.

If you want to get into the technical details and the avoided costs, it's not my area of expertise because I don't deal with Sask Power, but I understand it to be related to what we would have to pay in terms of construction and how we generate our own power. They would be doing it in at what we would call our avoided costs. They would pick it up, and they'd be looking at something in the order of a billion dollars to do it, which it just isn't feasible. But we can find those numbers for you when you discuss it with Sask Power.

In any event, if we're going to be using wood and setting



off a whole series of this particular type of generating plant, I don't know that would be the best management of the resource side, given the conversation I had earlier with the members from Prince Albert . . . P.A.-Duck Lake.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, I wouldn't want the minister to close his mind to this and make that kind of value judgement: that wouldn't be the best use of forestry management. I know that Weyerhaeuser currently has an application in to spray for defoliation of trees in northern Saskatchewan. And it would seem to me that if you used the aspen stands that are within the province, at least if you're putting someone to work to cut them down and use a cellulose for cattle feed and burn to make electricity and use the charcoal for a charcoal process, it would be better management of that resource than sending people around to spray to do away with the broad-leaf trees in our forests. So I wouldn't want you to make that kind of a value judgement, Mr. Minister, until you're convinced in your own mind that there's adequate information there to base it on.

My question that I'd like you to answer, Mr. Minister, is: I'm wondering if anyone from your department has been over to the operation at Lac la Biche, or been in consultation with the company who is building the plant, and if so, is there a person in charge of gathering information on that type of resource management.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, Mr. Chairman, we haven't been involved and we hadn't looked at, but I can take the advice of the hon. member and certainly have somebody look at. My mind's not closed, but I do recall the extensive meetings that we had in the past and the long hours looking at the studies, and the Sask Power officials had assured me — and it was my constituency involved; it wasn't my portfolio at that particular time — that this just wasn't viable. We walked the extra mile with the folks up there. We did our best to accommodate them. We came in with all kinds of alternative plans, and it just didn't work out.

And I should point out, by the way, that Weyerhaeuser has not applied to do any spraying of trees in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you should be talking to the hon. member from Rosetown-Elrose, the Minister of Environment, during questioning when his department was in this Chamber before estimates. There had been an application come in from Weyerhaeuser to do some spraying around Christopher Lake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Candle Lake, around Candle Lake, and he said that it was in your hands. So are you telling us now there is no application or has not been an application by Weyerhaeuser to do spraying?

(2000)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, Mr. Chairman, there is no application from Weyerhaeuser. The test spraying that they had proposed was withdrawn: it never went ahead. The applications are currently on the books: one from a chemical company for a test site — a very, very small site — and the other one from the Canadian Forestry Service; and those are the only two. There's nothing from a private

forest company.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I thank the minister for that information. The last time we had questioning in this House on that topic there was in fact an application. I'm glad to hear it has been withdrawn because I think there are better ways of managing our forest resources rather than spraying them to kill off the broad-leaf species. However, the member from Athabasca does acknowledge there are two other applications, even though they aren't from private sector firms. They are in fact applying to do some spraying in test plots in our forestry belt in Saskatchewan.

I'm wondering if the minister could give me a commitment on two things today. One is, will you have someone look at the operation of Lac la Biche with the view of doing a viability study on that particular project? And secondly, I understand that you have assured me that Sask Power was willing to buy any electricity produced from smaller plants in the province of Saskatchewan, whether they be vertical-access water turbines or whether they be wood-fired electrical generators, that Sask Power will in fact buy that surplus electricity they could produce.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, with reference to Lac la Biche, given the structure of government, that more property falls under the portfolio of Economic Development and Trade, given their mandate. I can certainly have one of my senior officials take a look at this project and talk to the people there. But I think what I would also do is talk to the Department of Economic Development and Trade and try and interest somebody from there in taking a look at the project. Don't get me wrong. We're not close minded about the thing at all. Like I say, we've walked a mile on this one before and it didn't work out. So if there's something happening there that's worthwhile and it's feasible and it's viable, we'd be foolish not to take a look at it. So obviously, you know, if you're recommending that it's something to look at, we'll take a look at it.

On the business of Sask Power buying power from other sources, yes, they're willing to buy it, but at their avoided cost and I can't remember all the details that constitute avoided cost. I'm sorry, it's not in my area of expertise. You'd have to ask the Deputy Premier on that one.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, Mr. Minister, if you walked a mile before, it must have all been going to meetings because I think that if you had walked a mile, you should have at least had someone within the provincial government do a very extensive survey and feasibility study on it instead of taking bits of information from Vermont and bits of information from Sask Power and bits of information from the entrepreneurs who wanted to develop the project. I would think someone within the provincial government should have taken the project on and looked at it with a view of, how do we make this viable; not just to say that, this is not viable.

I think you should take a look at it in terms of, how do we make a project like this viable in places like Buffalo Narrows, Green Lake, and Big River in your own constituency? Those people are all starving for employment. They'd like more employment than what's

there at the current time. And I think it's a very labour-intensive type of operation. If you could fuel, say, a 10-megawatt or 20-megawatt electrical generator from burning aspen wood and you could do that with a radius of 20 miles of aspen, I think that you should be looking at it not with a view of saying, these entrepreneurs couldn't make it viable. I think you have resources within government to take a project like that and say: how is it we could make this viable — if you look at the employment, what Sask Power will buy the energy for that they're creating, whether or not you can produce enough cattle feed out of there to have a cattle lot operation. So I don't think the mile was walked necessarily in the way that you described it, Mr. Minister, with all due respect.

I would hope that when you have someone go to talk to the people that are putting the plant together at Lac la Biche, that they look at it with the view of what you're responsible for in terms of your forestry management. And I hope that you will talk to the department of industry and trade, or whatever the department was that you mentioned, Mr. Minister, so that at least somebody can take on the project and determine whether it's viable — not the political viability of it, necessarily, or whether it gets into the politics of you versus us, but I think it's very valuable to look at that type of a project. So I do look forward to the minister delving into this a little deeper than what has been done in the past.

I would like to, just before I close off — and I don't want to keep you unduly long — I'd like to ask the minister whether or not the department, your department, has any funding put into roads to be developed for Weyerhaeuser to access the 7 million acres of forest that were given to them by lease agreement earlier this year.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't put any money into roads for Weyerhaeuser. As I understand it, in fact, we don't put any money into roads for any companies in terms of forestry.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well then I would have to assume that the Department of Highways is doing that and we'll deal with that during estimates, but I'm glad the minister is very clear that you have nothing to do with any of the roads that are being built for Weyerhaeuser corporation. And that's the last time I'll ask the minister and if you're certain of that, then that's fine with me.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I can assure the hon. member that we're not involved in road building with Weyerhaeuser.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, we're going to take another leap in these estimates again and ask you to put on yet another hat. And I want to talk now about what I think is something very exciting that's happened in our province over the last number of years and that's the development of multiculturalism groups — local, regional, and provincial. It's my understanding that some 900 groups now exist in our province. And I can give you and this House an example of the work that multiculturalism groups are doing in this province from as recent as Saturday evening in the city of Moose Jaw, where the Moose Jaw multicultural group put on its

annual program called Motif. And those of us, those 600 of us who were there, enjoyed literally a banquet of ethnic delights and a program and a dance that brought every ethnic community in Moose Jaw together.

When I was at that event, Mr. Minister, people were saying to me that the cuts in your budget this year threaten the good work that's happening in the city of Moose Jaw and threaten that good work that's happening in communities across this province, and that's primarily smaller communities across this province. The Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan have calculated that more than \$105,000 has been cut from their budget from multicultural programs this year — from a budgeted amount of \$293,000 last year, cut to \$105,000 this year. So, Mr. Minister, I ask you, how do you explain, how do you justify this kind of massive cut in funding to multiculturalism?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to the last questioning. I should point out, first of all, that this morning I met with the Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. I met with the president, Hamid Javed, and the vice-president, Marge Nainaar. It was an excellent meeting. We discussed funding. We discussed some of the things that were cut from the budget, and there was not a great deal of argument that some of the things that were cut out — the grants that were cut out — don't have a great deal of detrimental effect upon that organization because we've maintained the funding levels and what they see as the most significant aspect of the work they do, namely heritage language retention.

We continue to provide consulting services, development of resource materials, and financial assistance, and a variety of other areas. Some were cut; some were not. The council themselves realized that we're facing some difficult economic times, that everybody's been asked to tighten their belts somewhat. They have co-operated. They still go ahead with the zone festivals, at their own expense, instead of depending on some government assistance, and that is not carved in stone.

I would like to tell the hon. member that we are, in fact, looking at some of the festivals coming up and some of the things that we want to do; that we may have to make some money available and do some juggling there.

We've increased our capabilities to provide consulting services in several areas to the multicultural groups in Saskatchewan. By and large, they find it very positive. We've also formed a ministers' committee on multiculturalism as another sign of our commitment. I believe the multicultural groups are finding that they're getting a sympathetic ear when they call on this government and certainly an open door policy.

So I don't think by any means it's all doom and gloom or negative, the things that are happening in the area of multiculturalism.

Some of the discussions we've had is that we have to look at multiculturalism as more than holding a festival and saying we're going to have, for example, Scottish

highland dancing and eating haggis, you know; there's more to multiculturalism than that. We have to look at the whole of Saskatchewan and what do we encompass all of the many facets of multiculturalism. Almost everybody in this province, and obviously I am an example, come from some place else and we have maintained, for instance, our immigrant settlement programs, and that also sits well with the council.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I very much appreciate the statement that you just made. I would like to see that statement and that avowed commitment to multiculturalism backed up with some funding in your budget.

Will you confirm for me that, in fact, the budgeted amounts for multicultural programs in Saskatchewan, tax-based funding, has gone from \$293,000 last year to \$105,000 this year? Are those figures accurate?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The only direct cut, Mr. Chairman, that was made that could be clearly identified as multiculturalism, was a program called ethnic studies, which was \$35,000. They're within the arts and multicultural grants, the whole facade, the whole array of programs. There have been some other changes but I would point out, immigrant settlement is at \$86,000, and heritage language is at \$390,000.

**Mr. Calvert:** — So, Mr. Minister, then in your budget is there money budgeted for, let's say for instance, the festival grants? Have you set aside a figure for the festival grants? You said a few moments ago that you may have to adjust that. Have you set a figure, and what is it?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There is money, Mr. Chairman, within the budget for festivals and grants to those, but they will encompass more than multiculturalism.

(2015)

In any event, and this will come as a surprise to the officials sitting around here tonight, I don't happen to like that particular program, and I've met with various groups like OSAC (Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils) and SCCO (Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations) and they pretty well have me convinced that we're on the wrong track, putting on these zone festivals is somehow duplicating as if this was a sporting event and taking it to a contest in culture, and I don't like it.

And I know the officials are finding this as a surprise because I didn't discuss it with them earlier today, but I can tell you we're going to be changing that particular policy and we are going to be reacting more to what OSAC and SCCO want us to see do with the money that's in that budget. And that also came about as a result of the meeting I had this morning with the Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, you're going to shorten these estimates right up because that was the very next line of questioning I had. I am glad to hear that you are reconsidering these zone arts festivals. I certainly have heard some of the same reaction that you've heard. I

didn't hear it being suggested in the community that we needed these, and so therefore I would hope that some of that money, and I think it was 200,000 budgeted, will then find its way to the work of multiculturalism.

May I ask, Mr. Minister . . . You raised the matter of your committee, the ministers' committee or the cabinet committee on multiculturalism. Can I ask you tonight when the committee was established, who is involved in that committee from cabinet, and how often that committee has met since its establishment?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was formed in July of 1986. It consists not specifically of ministers by name but rather than by the portfolio they hold. So it's comprised of the Minister of Education, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, Minister of Justice. I chair the committee. There was one meeting since the election. There have been two or three officials' working meetings, and there is a meeting scheduled this fall with the multicultural community of Saskatchewan with that committee.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, can you identify for this House tonight and for the province some tangible results that you've seen because of this committee and some directions that you've seen because of this committee and some directions that we might look forward to in the future?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, when we talk about multiculturalism, we're talking about a topic that's rather near and dear to my heart, given my own ethnic origins and the fact that I, too, am an immigrant, as one or two others are around here as I believe.

What we're doing with the committee is getting an awareness of issues as they transcend different departments. Now obviously when we look at the Department of Labour and Employment, and we look at immigration, and we look at English as a second language, and we're looking at the settlement of Vietnamese people coming into Saskatchewan, this is bigger than one department. It involves the Department of Education. It also involves Tourism and Small Business. It involves Economic Development and Trade; it involves a whole host of people, and what we're trying to do is make sure that all the players in this game are aware of all facets of the problems connected to multiculturalism.

I also think we have to look at the field from more than one point of view, and look at the total picture of what multiculturalism is, and what it means to this province, and what it also means in terms of economic development to this province and the part it can play in economic diversification in the province.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Again, Mr. Minister, I share that position, and I appreciate the fact that a cabinet committee has been established. What we on this side of the House, and I know the community, is interested in, is seeing this committee be at work and produce some tangible result, and so we'll want to be watching that committee over the course of its life.

Another issue that does concern the multicultural groups in Saskatchewan, because they too receive funding from

the lottery structure . . . And you will be aware of a letter that was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Devine, Premier, from the Saskatoon Multicultural Council, with a copy to yourself. If I may just quote this letter from the Saskatoon Multicultural Council. They say:

We also are strongly opposed to the government capping of Sask trust and the possibility of using lottery funds for government programs. The lotteries, which represent a major fund-raising activity for non-profit groups, are only licensed by the government, and the profits rightfully belong to the sport, culture, and recreation sector, non-profit groups.

And so multicultural groups and other, many other volunteer groups in this province, are raising the questions having to do with the lottery, and so I'd like us maybe to move there. I'm asking you in the House tonight: have you capped Sask trust?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that we decided that the net profit over \$100 million should accrue to the government — net profit over \$100 million. Now it may well be we don't sell that much this year in tickets. We've seen a phenomenal growth in lotteries over the last few years. In one year we went from \$65 million of sales to \$95 million of sales, and the projection this year is probably about 98 million. If it does go over the \$100 million mark, we're saying we'd like to see the net profit — not the gross; expenses have to come off there, obviously — net profit would accrue back to the treasury of Saskatchewan.

The fact of the matter is, the province of Saskatchewan is a member of the Western Canada Lottery Corporation. Funds generated through that are the property of the government. What has happened in the past is government has decided that funding arising from that source should be spent in the areas of arts, culture, sports, recreation, and I happen to subscribe to that; I think that's a very worthwhile way to spend the money.

There are others who say, well why don't you take lotteries and roll it into education, or roll it into health care. That wasn't the function, that was not the way lotteries were envisaged, that was not the way it was set up. I like the way it was set up. I agree with it. The cap is for this year; it may never well kick in because the sales may not hit \$100 million, but I'm certainly, certainly willing to sit down with the groups over this coming winter and decide the future of the lotteries, and the whole issue of capping would have to be on the table as well. I'm not sure it's the best move that was made; it was kind of a compromise move, but I'm certainly willing to discuss that with them. And they know this; we've had a couple of meetings already.

**Mr. Calvert:** — In essence then, Mr. Minister, we're agreed that, in fact, the cap has been put on the lottery even if it is over the \$100 million net.

I have in front of me the lottery allocations for this year as they've been set out, and I have some specific questions about some of those allocations. I note, Mr. Minister, that the non-profit group commissions which last year were

\$3,499,000 this year are down to \$3,200,000 - about \$300,000 less. Mr. Minister, I want to know why that decrease exists in the allocations.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, some of the groups have not spent all of their money. Some of them spend them in different ways. There were complaints, frankly, that some groups would receive an allocation, and at the end of year, if it was a sporting team, the money would be used for a party. Now I don't know if all of this is accurate. I had officials looking at it.

What we are going to do . . . well, with negotiations with Sask Sport Inc., we said that we'd reduce the amount that was going to all of those particular groups this year. I have some misgivings about that. I'm not sure that it was the best move, but it has been done. But we're willing to look at it over the coming year, see what effect, what kind of ramification it has on those groups, and if change is necessary, change will be made.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I want to be sure that we're talking about the same thing. I'm talking about the community groups, most of which are service clubs, who are provided these revenues in lieu of the sale of lottery tickets, which they used to conduct. That's the field we're talking about.

And so, by our answer tonight then, I'm taking some assurance that, in fact, this isn't the beginning of the end of this program. You anticipate this to be continuing for many years to come. This isn't the beginning of a phase out of this program.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, Mr. Chairman, this is not the beginning of a phase out; it was a beginning of a new way of doing business.

What happened was in return for these groups who had at one time been selling tickets and realizing a profit for giving up that particular privilege which they had, we'd agreed to give them a certain percentage every year. Some groups used it; some groups didn't use it. There was a bit of controversy. A decision was made, well they're going to be capped also with some kind of reduction.

Again, I say I'm not sure it was . . . the figure was the best figure that was brought in. I don't know it was the best figure. It was arrived at by officials of more than one department, I may say, not just my department, who are going to look at it over the coming year. I want to see what happens to those groups.

And I realize some of them are people like a fire-fighter group and so on. They're doing good work; the money's well spent. The sports groups who receive an allocation, and there's one in my home town of Spiritwood, don't exist solely on that allocation to get through this fund. They go out and raise funds in addition to that to buy uniforms and pay for the cost of travel of their hockey team. So they're not dependent entirely on that particular form of funding. They do have it augmented from other sources. And I'm very willing to take a good, hard look at the whole lottery picture this year.

We're also looking at the western Canada on the bigger

scale. We're looking at the Western Canada Lottery Corporation, we're looking at the way they do business. We're looking at the partnership we have with Manitoba and with Alberta. And we're looking for ways to do business in a better fashion than we're currently doing it.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Another much more significant cut, Mr. Minister, in the lottery allocations this year is the amount being paid to the exhibition associations. And the figures I have indicate that it's gone from \$2 million last year down to 300,000 this year, which is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 85 per cent cut. And I would like to hear the rationale for that cut.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, what happened there was there was a long-term agreement with exhibition associations and they'd wanted the money quicker up front, they needed it quickly. So in terms of . . . off the top of my head, if I took a figure, let's say of 1 million over three years, they might want to take three-quarters of it in the first year and the balance accruing to them thereafter. And that's what happened there. It was a long-term agreement for a specific amount of money; they drew down on the amount of money in the early years; subsequently the balance of course is much smaller and that's what's accruing to them now.

**Mr. Calvert:** — So, Mr. Minister, then you're assuring this House that the agreements in fact have been met that were made with the exhibition associations.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, on their specific request.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I see on this lottery allocation sheet a category entitled museum funding. Is that new to the lottery allocations, and is that category saying then to me that funding that used to be undertaken by the Government of Saskatchewan, in terms of museum funding, is now being moved into the lotteries?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now last year the funding that was being spent on museums, which is \$480,000 towards operating our museums, was actually contained in the line called the trust fund, which is probably something around \$14 million. So this year we put it as a separate item outside the trust fund and showed it as a true figure that was going to museum funding.

(2030)

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I think . . . I want to say to the House, and this is a personal statement, I am not particularly happy when we fund any valuable social program on the funds of gambling. I'm not particularly happy with some of the premises that lie behind even our lottery system — the premises that say that many must lose for one to win; the premiss that somehow we can buy our dreams. In some ways we may see the lottery as a tax on the poor. So I'm not entirely happy with the lottery and with the overall growth of gambling we've seen across our province.

**An Hon. Member:** — Have you ever bought a ticket?

**Mr. Calvert:** — The Minister of Finance asks if I've won at

bingo, and the short answer is, no.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, no. I said, have you ever bought a ticket?

**Mr. Calvert:** — And the second answer to the Minister of Finance's question, have I ever bought a ticket; the second answer is, no.

But, Mr. Minister, given the fact that we know that lotteries are here to stay; we know that many Saskatchewan people spend a dollar for entertainment value; and we know the significant benefits that the lotteries have brought to our province, particularly in the areas of sport, culture and recreation; I'm sure we would both want to ensure the very best possible lottery distribution system.

It seems to me that in this province we could be proud of the system of lottery fund distribution that we've had, and you well know, Mr. Minister, that it is unique across the country, and it seems to me it ought to please you that it is, in essence, a private enterprise system, a free enterprise system so that the lottery is now owned by the government, but is in fact owned and operated by the volunteer community in the province. It's licensed by the government, yes, and it's regulated, yes. And over the course of the years, arrangements have been made with governments to fund worthwhile projects when both parties have agreed, but in essence the lottery remains in the hands of the volunteer community.

Now earlier this year I think you publicly suggested that we may be moving to a different system where more and more, if not all, of the lottery funds would be coming into the provincial treasury. Many in the province are concerned about that, and I would refer you to an article, or an editorial that I'm sure you saw in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, dated July 2. And if I may just quote from this editorial from the *Star-Phoenix*, just the conclusion of it:

Provincial government programs should be funded by a tax system which as fairly as possible reflects ability to pay. Turning the lottery system into a tax collecting device would totally ignore that principle and might, in fact, run directly counter to it. The government's insatiable appetite for tax revenue, once tempted with a morsel of lottery profits, could encourage it to expand the scope of legalized gambling in the province when it should probably be moving to constrict it.

So, Mr. Minister, if we could move to some conclusion in this discussion, will you give the House your assurance that, in fact, you still believe in a free enterprise, private enterprise lottery system, owned and operated by the volunteer sector in Saskatchewan, that you will resist the temptation to expropriate moneys from that volunteer community to fund programs that ought to be tax-base funded?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, that was kind of a wide ranging discussion there that the hon. member initiated. I was interested in his comments about not really being terribly enamoured of a system whereby we

depend on gambling to generate revenue for programs that government may wish to sponsor. I just remind the hon. member that the Irish sweepstakes, which supported hospitals in Ireland for a long, long time, was an extremely popular move, not just in Ireland where it wasn't supposed to be done, but outside and all across North America.

As a matter of fact, just so the hon. member is aware if he isn't already, his own town of Moose Jaw, which he represents, is very anxious to get into the casino business to promote tourism in Moose Jaw. Frankly, I don't have any problem with that. The hon. member may not be really crazy about the idea. I don't really have any problem with it. I don't gamble myself, and I wouldn't buy a lottery ticket in any event, but that's beside the point.

Yes, we're proud of the distribution system. Yes, we're proud of the fact that it is run as a private enterprise venture, but I should point out to the hon. member it is not owned and operated by those groups. It is operated by those groups; it is owned by the Government of Saskatchewan as a partner in the Western Canada Lottery Corporation. And what we do is we decide who our provincial marketing organization will be, and that could be anybody. We could give it to the executive of the Kinsmen Club, the Lions Club, a rotary club. We could do it any way we wish. What has traditionally happened is Sask Sport Inc. is a PMO (provincial marketing organization) in charge of that. They don't own it; they operate it on behalf of the provincial government, and we have no problem with that system.

I don't envisage any change to the system, which was the last question the hon. member asked.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions, Mr. Minister. I want to clean up, and then we can get through with your department, providing that I can get the answers to some of the questions that I have.

First of all, Mr. Minister, you indicated you didn't put any money into highways in northern Saskatchewan and roads into the forest. Could you indicate, do you issue any licences for any roads that are built into the forested area? I guess the question I want to know, Mr. Minister, if the road has been built up the west side of Cowan Lake, does that road go through Parks planning before the road is built by the Department of Highways through Cowan Lake?

**An Hon. Member:** — That's Highway 55?

**Mr. Thompson:** — No, Highway 55, you've dropped that, and you were starting to build on the other side of the lake now.

**An Hon. Member:** — The Department of Highways is doing 55.

**Mr. Thompson:** — No, nobody's building Highway 55.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, if any company . . . In this case if it were to be Weyerhaeuser — and we're not sure — I'm advised that they would get a work permit

through our department to go ahead and do the clearing and make the right of way through there.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I didn't get the answer, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — If any company was building a road or doing a right of way, they would get a clearance through our department and they'd get a work permit to go in there and do that particular road. We wouldn't be building that road, though. That would be their responsibility.

**Mr. Thompson:** — My next question is then, Mr. Minister, did you give a permit and authorization for the construction of the road from Bodmin up the west side of Cowan Lake?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We gave permission in consultation with Environment, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Thompson:** — And that has been done, then? A written permission has been given to Department of Highways to build that road up the west side of Cowan Lake. That's right?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I believe, Mr. Chairman, it's Weyerhaeuser themselves who are building that road. I'm just looking over a briefing note to see how the process had come about. It doesn't say anything about Highways, so I have to assume and my officials are assuming that's a Weyerhaeuser constructed road through there.

**Mr. Thompson:** — So what you're saying then, Mr. Minister, is that Weyerhaeuser can build a road wherever he chooses within the forested areas that he has jurisdiction over without going through Parks planning. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, Mr. Chairman, they would have to consult with the department and we look at various things. For example, in this particular instance, we took action to minimize the road's negative impact on wildlife resource in the area. Certain conditions were imposed to control access and restrictions that would apply in there.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I'll just close that off with a comment, Mr. Minister. That road is opening up a completely new area through a forested area where wildlife did have access to and were isolated. This is going to be the first road up there. It's a major artery going from Bodmin right up to the south shore of Green Lake. And that is a Weyerhaeuser road, and I most certainly give notice that my colleague from The Battlefords will be following that up when we get into the Highways estimates.

But when we talk about protecting the habitat for our wildlife, what you have just done, Mr. Minister, or which Weyerhaeuser has just done, they have taken a large forested area and are putting a major artery right through the centre of it, and I think that that is a step backwards.

I want to . . . When we closed our estimates, Mr. Minister, about a month ago . . . And I guess this is why the estimates are going to go on so long this year is because in

your government's wisdom you decided to sit in the summer months and to not finish your departments, and as a result, more and more information keeps coming in so we can continue on with the estimates that we're in.

At that time, I guess what we could say, on behalf of all the members of the legislature and the legislative staff and the civil servants and their families, that this will go down in history as a summer that never was. And the Minister of Finance can take credit for that, for bringing in a budget in June when he should have brought it in on the end of February. That's why we're all sitting here, and that's why all the civil servants and their families were denied holidays this year because of the former liberal member who is the now Minister of Finance.

And let me tell you this, and let me tell you, Mr. Minister of Finance, yes, it will go down as a summer that never was for many, many families in this province.

When we closed off, Mr. Minister, we were discussing the transportation subsidy for the commercial fishermen in northern Saskatchewan, and I had requested that you reconsider that. You cut it down to 60 per cent, and for certain species, you took it totally off. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, have you made a decision to reinstate that fish transportation subsidy or does it still remain the same as it was?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — It remains the same, and as long as fish prices remain high and there's a good return for the fisherman, we'd be leaving it as is.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I see your logic there, Mr. Minister. It's sort of like what you're talking about . . . I see a little while ago you're talking about the \$400 timber wolf, and I just wonder how many trappers that you think that are getting \$400 for the timber wolves, or how many of them are averaging \$400.

I think if you would take a serious look at that, and if you knew anything about trapping, you'd find out that trappers who are selling timber wolves, their average would probably be around 60 to \$75 range, depending on what time of year they're caught. There's a lot of variables. I'll tell you when you start trapping and selling timber wolves, and as you refer to as a coyote . . . That's cowboy jargon but that's not what we call them in northern Saskatchewan. We don't call them coyotes.

But I see you decided, in your wisdom, because the price of fur goes up, that you want to increase the licence for the trappers to go out and catch the fur. I wonder if you're going to use the same logic on the farmers. Now all of a sudden cattle prices seem to be coming up a bit so I suppose that the farmer can now expect an increase in his lease fees. And knowing the government, the way you operate, you're probably going to do that. Because you continually take a look, you take a look at an individual who is making a good return and you say, well we've got to get that guy, because you've got to have more money for the Peter Pocklington and the Weyerhaeusers. That's what you have to do.

(2045)

Mr. Minister, I want to now thank you for the study that you sent over on fish; it's a large study. I have not had an opportunity to completely go through it, but let me tell you I'm surprised that you would get Deloitte Haskins & Sells, chartered accountants, to do a study on the feasibility of the commercial fishery or the commercial use of cisco, burbot, and mullets. Because when I read the study, I take a look at the study and it's a southern oriented study and they talk about a project in Calgary for burbot — and why would we want to go to Calgary to process burbot when it should be done in northern Saskatchewan? But I see, in your wisdom, you got Deloitte Haskins & Sells, a chartered accountant group — I don't know what their expertise are in burbot and cisco and mullets — but they've done the study and I will, as you indicate, comment on the study a little later on. I wonder if you could indicate how much that study cost, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments made there that beg response. First of all, there's no increase in a northern trapper's licence, and the hon. member should know that as one who's trapping. Secondly, if you know trappers that are getting \$65 for a wolf pelt, someone's taking advantage of them because the best advice I get — and we check the market — is it's 400 to \$500 a wolf pelt. And when I talk about coyotes, I'm talking about coyotes in southern Saskatchewan and I'm certainly not confusing them with wolves and I certainly don't need the help of the cowboy over here with the western boots from Regina Centre quipping away through the seat of his pants again. He had his opportunity to say something, he made a fool of himself like he did last year when he stood up here and he just rebelled on and on and on with things that were totally inaccurate and in the end he had to be sat down and embarrassed when we got into the discussion of Reggie Gross and his travels around the world. If you want to go through all that one again, I'd be pleased to do it for you.

Northern trapper's licence — no increase. Deloitte Haskins & Sells — they are a consulting company; they do more than provide chartered accountants. They are a consulting company. They have a very strong arm, a very strong arm in the resource sector — and the study was \$10,000.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to confirm that the timber-wolves that were sold in Saskatchewan in the last trapping season, if they averaged \$400.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'd be pleased to provide all the pertinent information to the hon. member as soon as we can look it up.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, that's not the question I ask you. And you just answered the question, so I'm asking you again: did the trappers in Saskatchewan receive an average of \$400 for all the timber-wolves that they pelted and sold on the markets?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Nobody said the average for everything that was sold was 400. Some are worth 400, some are worth 500, and some of them are worth even more than that.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well I'm not going to get an answer out of you because I don't really believe you want to answer that question and I'll tell you that there was no \$400 average. And as I indicated before, I'll think you'll find out that the average was probably below \$100.

I want to, Mr. Minister, turn to a letter that was received by your Premier from the chief of the Canoe Lake Band, Thomas Iron, who indicated his dislike for the signs that have been put up and the corridors that you have created on the northern highways.

I asked a couple of questions the other day in question period, and some of the answers I see that you gave back here were quite interesting. You indicate that a native conservation committee to discuss the precise policy, type of policy, was set up. Could you indicate how many individuals sit on that committee and the make-up of the committee, please.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I invited the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) to get back involved with the committee. We had the committee in place some time ago. Some of the members did not meet the . . . for whatever reason, didn't come to the meetings. There was one very active individual who wanted to promote the goals, the objectives of the committee. As I understand it, very recently, FSIN have again accepted my invitation, and they are interested in putting representatives on to that committee.

**Mr. Thompson:** — So you are indicating then that that committee is . . . You're making up the committee, but it hasn't actually sat. It actually hasn't sat then to discuss the issue of the corridors.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, Mr. Chairman, the committee sat and gradually it wound down. Some of the individuals on the committee were disagreeing among themselves, and the committee didn't sit. Latterly, now we're in the process of establishing a new one.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, then I guess the question I want to ask you: if you are going to set up a new committee, are you considering asking the chiefs of the bands that are involved — and I speak of the Canoe Lake Band, the Patuanak Band, the Dillon Band, and the Waterhen Band — to sit on that committee, because that is where the problems, as the chief of the Canoe Lake Band, Thomas Iron, has indicated to the Premier, and a copy to yourself, that they are not going to honour that. They feel, and I feel strongly too, that they have rights under treaties to hunt and trap and fish and camp on unoccupied Crown land, and you now have put corridors on hundreds of miles of unoccupied Crown land, and you have eliminated the treaty Indian from hunting in those areas.

Will you now take another look at that and ask the chiefs of the bands that are involved to sit on that committee and to discuss this particular issue?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We'll certainly entertain nominations from the FSIN, Mr. Chairman. Will we eliminate road corridors? Definitely not. And the 400

metres on either side of the road will exist. I heard an interview this morning, subsequent to our exchange in the House last week where we were both carried verbatim, with one native who said that not only would he not go 400 metres, he wouldn't go 4 inches.

Mr. Chairman, last year I spoke with one native who told me he shot 50 deer last year. I hardly think he was hunting only for food. And I think we have an obligation not only to the resource but to all of the people of Saskatchewan and to the people who pay habitat certificates and to the people who buy licences in this province to preserve the resource for future generations.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, when you talk about a racist statement, there we have an individual that's got up in here and said that a native shot 50 deer himself last year. What a racist statement to make. Was he ever charged? Was it ever proven? I think if you're going to bring up that kind of a statement in here, and use the racial overtones that you're using against native people, I think that it's time that the Deputy Premier got up and took you out of cabinet, and as far as I'm concerned, should ask for a by-election in the Turtleford constituency.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — Because that, Mr. Chairman, is . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order. Allow the member from Athabasca to make his comments.

**Mr. Thompson:** — On a point of personal privilege. I would ask the Attorney General to get up and explain what he's talking about when I'm asking for personal money.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — When the hon. member was asking about commercial fish subsidies, he forgot to mention he's a commercial fisherman, and what he's really doing is saying, would your government please put some more money in my pocket. That's one.

Secondly, I have never, ever in my life been accused of racism, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly don't intend to stand here and be accused by the likes of him or anybody else in here of being a racist, Mr. Chairman, because I stood here and told the truth of one native who told me he shot 50 deer one year. And it's not a question of whether or not he gets charged, or whether or not he broke the law. The point is he said he shot 50 deer. All I'm asking is: did he shoot them for his own personal use? Did he shoot them for food? I don't know; I hardly think so.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I just think that that, Mr. Chairman, is a racial statement. It's racial innuendo. And to suggest that because I am a commercial fisherman and I'm going to take advantage of a fish subsidy . . . What about all the farmers that are sitting over there, and what about their deficiency payment?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — I ask the Attorney General, where do you put all the farmers? They take their subsidies and



they're not all farmers. Some of them are lawyers and some of them are doctors. They're taking the subsidy. The amount of money that I take . . . (inaudible) . . .

But I say when you can have a minister of the Crown stand up in here, Mr. Chairman, and say that a native of this province, a native Indian, has shot 50 moose and for that reason you're not going to budge the corridors 1 inch because of that — and that's what you said — and that you're going to put these corridors up . . . You know that native Indians under their treaties have the right to hunt on unoccupied Crown land, and that is where your corridors have been put. You are taking the treaty rights gradually away from the native people. You're no different than what happened in 1969 when they brought the white paper out and were suggesting that the provincial government take over the responsibilities of native Indians. And that's exactly what you're starting to implement.

And are you saying that it's just native people who hunt and break the laws as far as hunting is concerned, and taking antlers and shipping animals, trophy animals across the border. Are you suggesting that it's only native people who are doing that? I suggest to you that you better take a look at the court docket — and there's some of them coming up — and you'll find out, Mr. Minister, that they're not all native people, and probably none of them are.

And I ask you again, Mr. Minister, will you set up a committee of the chiefs from these reserves to discuss the possibility of those corridors, and the rights that the treat Indians have within those corridors?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we'll receive nominations from the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations). As it relates to the road corridors, they're not new; they've been there for a number of years. I'm not, I am not going to remove the road corridors. We need them. We have to manage the moose; we have to manage the elk. What we're doing is we're protecting from opportunists hunting from vehicles down the side of the road. They can get out and they can walk through the bush, and then they can go hunting. Surely it's not too much to ask of anyone; I don't care if they're brown, white, or green with purple stripes, to go 400 metres across the bush to go hunting.

And I have never, ever — and you stand up and find literature that says otherwise to the contrary — I have never, ever said anybody, any specific group was poaching, was taking antlers, and was shipping them south, and nor did I imply it. And I'd invite the hare-brained lawyer from Regina Centre to show that in proof.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, just to close this off because we're not getting any place with this minister. I want you to answer this question: do you believe that the treaty Indians in this Province, under their treaties, have the right to hunt, trap, and fish, and camp on unoccupied Crown land?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Authorities, other than I, Mr. Chairman, have decided in their wisdom that treaty

Indians have the right to hunt and to trap and to fish on unoccupied Crown land, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, could you explain to me, between Green Lake and Beauval, in the 60-mile stretch, how you determine that that is occupied Crown land?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, any challenges that have come up in court have supported the concept of road corridors in the 400 metre barrier on either side.

**Mr. Thompson:** — You just got through saying that you support the treaties' right to hunt, fish, trap, and congregate on unoccupied Crown land. You just said that and *Hansard* will show that tomorrow, so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And yes, it's there; it's in writing.

Now all I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is, and you don't have to ask the FSIN, as . . . Get in touch with the chief; he's the one who wrote you the letter, the chief from Canoe Narrows. They're the ones that are having the problem. Will you agree to get in touch with them or have your officials get in touch with the chiefs and discuss this corridor in a sane way?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Let me reiterate once again, Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to remove the road corridors at all.

(2100)

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well we'll just leave that . . . we'll just . . . the minister just . . . When you have a minister that stands up and accuses a native person of killing 50 animals, a racist statement like that - gets up and says that the treaties do have rights and that they can hunt on unoccupied Crown land, then gets up and says, absolutely no way will he remove them, without even discussing it with the Crowns, I think, Mr. Chairman, that says what kind of a minister we have and what kind of a government we have in this province. And that's why they're not going to be around for very much longer, I can assure you that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, a week's a long time in politics, as Winston Churchill said. And we've got members on the other side saying, they're not going to be around very long. I'm sorry to disappoint you. We've got 4 years if we care to exercise it. And I hasten to point out to you and to your colleagues over there that in that four years an awful lot can turn around.

And you stand up and you make the kinds of comments you've made tonight outside of the House, and you make them to the natural history society; the Sierra Club, World Wildlife Fund, Habitat Trust Canada, Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, and let me see how long you're going to be around, buddy.

And one other thing I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman. Members of the fur block around Buffalo Narrows, around Buffalo Narrows, formally requested extension of the road corridor along Highway 155. Do you know why?

To protect the area moose and deer population from heavy hunting pressure. I rest my case.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. My question concerns Young Athletes Saskatchewan, which I'm sure and other members of the legislature know is a provincially registered non-profit organization that deals with sporting activities for young people, specifically basketball and soccer. I'm wondering what your department is doing to address the concern that Young Athletes Saskatchewan has with respect to the allocation of minor sport funds from Sask Sport funds and Saskatchewan culture and recreation. Presently they aren't receiving these funds. They feel entitled to them, given the kind of important work they do with a broad base of young children. And I want to know what your department is doing in this regard.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, the groups, or specifically one group, in any event, to which the hon. member referred is not a provincial sport governing body; therefore, they haven't been placed on the eligibility list. What we've told them is they are eligible to go, for example, to the Saskatchewan Basketball Association who are on the list, who do receive funding, and they could receive funding from them.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Minister, as you know that's precisely the problem. They cannot receive funding from the Saskatchewan Basketball Association, Saskatchewan Basketball Incorporated. Saskatchewan Basketball Incorporated is a very elitist organization; they control all the access to the funds. the YAS people have been able to get nowhere; therein is the problem, and I ask you what your department is doing to address that problem of the Saskatchewan Basketball Incorporated not sharing provincial funding with a broadly based participatory organization such as YAS?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well the SBA attitude has been that they are already running clinics, and they're running programs, and they don't want to see any duplication. Besides I'm not really in a position to speak on behalf of a sports body like the Saskatchewan Basketball Association. I respectfully suggest that you'd have to contact them and find out their specific thinking on the issue.

**Mr. Koenker:** — You aren't in a position to speak for the Saskatchewan Basketball Association, and I'm not asking you to do that. I'm asking you to speak for your department and tell us what you are doing to deal with this bottle-neck. Every member of this legislature has received a communication back in May from the people in YAS documenting this problem, documenting the fact that the Saskatchewan Basketball Incorporated claims to spend departmental funds received from the department on developmental programs, and does not spend it. That it's a very narrowly based program, sometimes with as few as 15 people participating. It's a very elitist program funded by the provincial government, by your department. Certainly you can speak to that situation.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well what's funded by my department, Mr. Chairman, is funded through lotteries. If they have some problem with the SBA, why don't they

run for office, get on the executive, and make the changes they want to suit themselves?

**Mr. Koenker:** — Well if that's the solution that you advocate, I'm sure they'll be very interested to hear that from you. I just ask you again: is there nothing at your department that you can do to facilitate the development of a participatory community-based sports program in opposition to what we have in Saskatchewan Basketball Incorporated, as a very elitist program. Are your hands totally tied? Are you incapacitated in this regard?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't control basketball in this province. There are all kinds of leagues in this province from wee little types — and my kid plays in one of them right here in Regina — to what they call senior men's that I played in, some of them sponsored by corporate bodies, most of them funded strictly by the people themselves who go out and play the game.

I see absolutely nothing wrong if 10 of us want to form a basketball team and join a church league in Regina. That's our responsibility; we throw 10 bucks in the pot and we go and play basketball.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I think one more question and we'll be prepared to agree to the items.

**An Hon. Member:** — Speak for yourself.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Some members say speak for myself.

Mr. Minister, I think these estimates have illustrated one thing very clearly, and it's been a long process we've been through here. You have said, yourself: I wear many hats. I've heard these estimates described as a hodgepodge. If one thing has been illustrated by these estimates . . . I mean, let's look at it, we go from symphonies to fishing licences; we go from education in the arts to water levels in Lake Diefenbaker; we go from fire-fighting to lotteries.

Mr. Minister, I suggest it's an inappropriate combination of departments that's happened here, an inappropriate combination of departments. My final question is this, Mr. Minister: will you be lobbying your cabinet colleagues, because someone's going to get short-changed in this combination; someone's got to get short-changed. And I fear that the culture and rec side of your portfolio is the area that's going to get short-changed. And so will you be lobbying your cabinet colleagues to see again establishment of a department that is specifically involved with culture and creation and that area of your department now?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member's correct about wearing many hats, and I've heard comment, too, about hodgepodge of activity. I will say when the two departments were firmly merged, I did comment it was not a marriage made in heaven; however, I have to say I enjoy immensely all of the activities of the department, whether they be on what we call the renewable resources division or on the division of sports, culture, and heritage. I think it's very possible that the department can work very well.

We have a new structure in place within the department. I think it's starting to relate to the problems of groups out there. As I say, I met with the multicultural council today, the Arts Board last week, and they seem to think that things are working out well. I'm really pleased with the way the department functions. I enjoy the activities of the department, and obviously, by the spirited debate here, I intend to enjoy it for some time to come.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

#### Item 21

**Ms. Smart:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, when I questioned you earlier about the money and the payments to the property management corporation regarding the rental for the Archives Board, you first of all told me that I would find out that answer in the Crown Corporations Committee, but in *Hansard* on page 1923 you finally said:

... I'm advised the rent would be paid by us.

Meaning your department.

The rent for the Archives Board comes out of this amount of money, the \$11-million-plus. My question still remains then: how much money is the Archives Board paying for the rental of their property?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't have a specific figure that the Archives Board is paying; all I have is a global figure that they have, and they're paying that rent. I would have to undertake to find out some other way or get it through the property management corporation.

**Ms. Smart:** — What do you mean by the global figure for the Archives Board? You've got 6,000-some money in here for the Archives Board, but that does not include the rent for their premises. You're asking us to vote here on \$11,492,500 payment to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. We will not have a chance until next year to question this in the Crown Corporations Committee. I believe that you should know — I believe that you should know how much money the Archives Board is paying for the rental of their property out of this \$11 million. Surely you have some way of breaking that down to know how much money in your department is going for that rent.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we paid to the property management Crown about \$409,000, and some of that would go to the rent, some to the operation. It's all taken care of by them.

I can advise the hon. member that in response to a written request from the member from Saskatoon Westmount, I provided him with all of that information he asked relative to property management Crown and space that's rented, and I think you can confirm he has all of that, and it's a very thick document.

Item 21 agreed to.

Items 22 and 23 agreed to.

#### Item 24

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, this item 24, "Grants in support of sport and recreation programs," there is a significant decrease in the budgeted figure from 1986-87, which was at \$1,810,000, down to \$1,260,000, and I would appreciate some explanation of that cut.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, one or two programs that we had been sponsoring, we no longer are. The "best ever" program, being one for \$100,000; youth leadership program for \$30,000; and we're not participating in the recreation director program any longer either.

Item 24 agreed to.

Items 25 to 30 inclusive agreed to.

(2115)

#### Item 31

**Mr. Calvert:** — This item 31, "Grants to the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts," here in Regina, Mr. Minister, I noticed you've held the grant constant to last year. I would just like to get some reflection from you on the situation that the Centre of the Arts now finds itself in. I have a quote I took from its 1984-85 annual report, the report from that year, quote:

... The ... viability of the Centre (of the Arts) depends (on) its ability to compete for convention and trade show business. (These activities account for two-thirds of the supporting revenue) ...

I think it's pretty obvious that the downtown convention centre now under construction, once completed, and the Queensbury Downs are competition, direct competition to the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, which is the responsibility of your department. And so I would like to hear some reflection from you on how you feel that the Centre of the Arts can address this new competition.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, simply put, the Centre of the Arts is operating a pretty healthy deficit, something like \$450,000 per year. There are several reasons for that.

We could go back and look at the history of the building of the thing; I don't think it would be very useful to dwell too long on that, but the fact of the matter is it cannot accommodate the big concerts and the big shows that come in. The seating capacity is not enough, for instance, for rock shows. They want to go out to exhibition stadium where they've got 7,000 seats as opposed to 1800 or 2000 seats. They just don't have enough seating capacity to cover the costs of those kind of concerts, so they're losing there.

What we've been finding out in recent years, and this isn't a new phenomenon, I think you'll find this with some of your colleagues who've been around the legislature for a

few years, that in fact conventions aren't very keen to locate out there because they have to drive back and forward. Albeit the parking's excellent out there, they still just can't be bothered driving. They want to be downtown; they want to be close to shopping; they want to be close to entertainment; and they want to stay in the hotels.

I think the future, unless some of the *modus operandi* changes, is rather bleak for the Centre of the Arts, quite frankly, and we are looking at some alternatives with the board and with the executive director that may make it a more viable operation.

I should tell the hon. member we've talked to the University of Regina about using space in there; we have talked about the art gallery in there; and we're looking at options like this that perhaps could make it a more viable operation.

Item 31 agreed to.

Items 32 to 34 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 39 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1988  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 39**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Any questions? Carried.

**Supplementary Estimates 1987  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Parks and Renewable Resources  
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 39**

Items 1 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 39 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1987  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Culture and Recreation  
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 7**

Items 1 to 2 agreed to.

Vote 7 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'd like to thank the minister's officials.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to join in thanking my officials for their assistance in preparing for these estimates. I'd also like to thank the members of the opposition for the spirited discussion which we've encountered since July 17 when we started on the estimates. I've enjoyed the exchanges, sometimes a little testy, most of the time rather entertaining and a lot of fun. I always enjoy the estimates.

In particular I thank my principal critics, the member from Moose Jaw South and the member from Athabasca. I think for the most part we conducted ourselves with a degree of civility, and we can always argue all we want in

here and treat each other like gentlemen whenever we leave the chamber. Thank you.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the minister and his officials for the good debate that we had. We didn't get all the answers that we wanted, but we'll keep working on him, and thank you very much.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Chairman, I, too, would want to add my thanks to the officials of the department who have endured these estimates. I'd also want to, through this House, thank the many who are employed in this department who serve the people of this province and, I think, serve our province very well.

And I want to add my thanks to the minister. Throughout these estimates you have made a number of commitments, and I appreciate those commitments. You, I think, approach these estimates in a co-operative way and were fairly frank with your answers, and we on this side of the House appreciate that. I think only once today did we feel that perhaps we were engaged with a bowl of jelly, or whatever the phrase was, and perhaps once tonight with a plate of haggis, I might say, but I want to thank you, Mr. Minister, for your efforts in these estimates.

The committee reported progress.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTIONS

#### Constitution Amendment, 1987

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Devine, and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Mitchell.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity to speak in this debate about the Meech Lake accord and the proposed amendments to the Canadian constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important debate on a vital subject, and I hope as the debate progress that all members, not just a few on either side, but all members will avail themselves of the chance to take part. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we owe our participation to our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents don't have the chance to take part in this discussion. They have been denied any formal opportunity to participate in the Meech Lake debate. The Premier says that we in this Chamber have to participate for them, and so we must do that. We have a duty, Mr. Speaker, to do nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, this should be an exciting occasion for Saskatchewan people and for all Canadians. It should be history in the making. I recall my time, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa a number of years ago, in the House of Commons, and also in the federal public service, when I had the chance then, a few years ago, to join personally in the

early process that led eventually to the constitutional agreements of 1981 and '82. It was, Mr. Speaker, an exhilarating experience, and I'm sure that the member for Elphinstone and the member for Riversdale felt the same sense of excitement in the parts that they played before 1982 on the provincial side on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan. And I'm also sure, Mr. Speaker, that the present Premier and the Minister of Justice have many of the same emotions now, as the process of constitutional change continues.

I recall, coming back from one of the constitutional conferences this spring, the Premier was saying that he felt like an expectant father — a latter day father of confederation. So it is exciting, Mr. Speaker. It is historic; it is constitution building; it is nation building, and this process is important.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my firm conviction that a process of public hearings, or some process, Mr. Speaker, of public involvement in Saskatchewan should be an absolute requirement before this Assembly is finally called upon to vote on the Meech Lake accord. This is not just an ordinary provincial law that we're considering. It's not good enough to have just an ordinary debate in this House and then an ordinary vote. What we're talking about is the fundamental law of Canada, the constitution, in which we all have a very large stake. And when I say we, Mr. Speaker, I don't just mean the Premier and a few members of the cabinet and their senior advisers. I don't just mean the few privileged Saskatchewan people who happen to sit in this House., When I say we, I mean every Canadian citizen living in Saskatchewan.

(2130)

It's vital to all of us, Mr. Speaker. It can, and it will, affect all of us sooner or later by one means or another. We will all be touched by the constitution. Changes to it are rare, the process is slow, the consequences are large and lasting. So when that process of change is under way, legislators have a special obligation to involve the public in as broad a way as humanly possible, especially as has been the case with Meech Lake. If most of the drafting has been done in secret behind closed doors in a pressure-cooker kind of atmosphere by a limited view, you need to let the sun shine in, Mr. Speaker. You need to let everybody get involved. You need to explain your draft with precision and clarity, and you need to give everyone the opportunity to understand it's impact and to grasp its ramifications.

People need the chance to ask questions and to get their answers, and they need the chance to express their views. And the draftsmen, Mr. Speaker, the people who originally put it together, they need to be prepared to listen and to respond and to make changes, if necessary, to satisfy the public will.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I believe in public hearings in this process and believe that very, very strongly. And unfortunately that process has been denied in this province. The Government of Canada and several other provincial governments agree with the position that I have just stated. They're holding public hearings in their

respective jurisdictions, elsewhere in this country, but not the Government of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that's wrong. Most Canadians outside of Saskatchewan have had, or will have, the opportunity to participate in public hearings on the Meech Lake accord, but not Saskatchewan people. And I think our citizenship, because we happen to be residents of this province, I think our citizenship is being diminished a bit because we won't have the chance to participate in this round of constitutional change while most other Canadians who happen to live in other provinces will have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to note that there is no particular rush in this process. Any legislature can take up to three years to ratify the Meech Lake accord, so there's lots of time available. We shouldn't need all of that time, Mr. Speaker, but we should take the amount of time that's necessary to do the job right, to hold our own Saskatchewan hearings, to digest the hearings that will be held in other parts of this country, and to make the accord as good as it possibly can be.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, and, I think, important that today the special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate which reported on the Meech Lake accord filed their report in the House of Commons today, and at best they could describe the accord as "workable." And that committee clearly concluded, Mr. Speaker, in the language that they used, that Meech Lake as it stands today is far from perfect. And all that being said, Mr. Speaker, I think in this House we should be cautious.

No one — I don't think on any side of this House, Mr. Speaker — no one wants to defeat the worthy and vital objective of bringing Quebec fully into Canada's constitutional family. No one wants to see the deal unravel. But, Mr. Speaker, I think what many of us want is to ensure that the deal is done right, and that we make it just as good as it can be. And that's all that any of us who express some concerns are saying.

The government basically says, well there it is, take it or leave it. But in taking it, Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to indicate for the record what my concerns are; and secondly, I want to set out what would be the Liberal agenda for future constitutional progress.

If it is the government's position, Mr. Speaker, that nothing more can or will be done at this stage in the process, then I want Saskatchewan people to know that my party will be building a bridge to the future so the present deficiencies in the Meech Lake accord can be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, the first among those deficiencies, as I see them, is the lack of progress toward meaningful reform of the Senate of Canada. In the 120 years since confederation there have, it seems to me, been two lasting irritants in our confederation, two major challenges in Canadian nation building. One has been, grappling with the legitimate concerns of the province of Quebec, and the other is that constant struggle that we have against regional alienation.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Meech Lake deals with the first of those challenges; that is, the concerns with respect to the province of Quebec, and it makes some considerable progress in dealing with those concerns. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is precious little progress on the other major concern over the past 120 years that I just mentioned, and that is the struggle against regional alienation.

The accord, it seems to me, on this latter point of dealing with regional alienation and the use of Senate reform as a vehicle to deal with regional alienation — it seems to me that the accord represents one step forward and two steps back.

The step forward, Mr. Speaker, is getting Senate reform on the official agenda for future constitutional discussions, and that's good. I'm glad to see that it's at least there as an agenda item for next year, or whenever the subject can come up. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have there is only an agreement to talk; it's nothing more than that. There's no flesh on the bones. There's simply agreement that it will come up on the agenda. I'm pleased to see that it's finally on the agenda, but an agreement to talk is by no means a guarantee that meaningful reform will necessarily follow.

The two steps back, Mr. Speaker, that I mention in respect of Senate reform, is first of all the imposition of the rule of unanimity in relation to future constitutional amendments relating to the Senate. Previously we had a formula in the constitution from 1982 that I thought was a pretty rigid formula when it came to changing federal institutions, and now, as a result of the Meech Lake proposals, that amending formula is going to get even tougher in relation to changing the Senate because it will require unanimity before it can ever be done.

And if we thought that Senate reform might be difficult to get under the older, more flexible amending formula, now, Mr. Speaker, it will be just that much tougher to achieve in the future. And that's the one provision that I regard as a step backward.

The Premier, of course, says that the veto provision, in relation to this particular section of the constitutional accord, is a veto that is placed equally across the country with every province in an equal position, and therefore our veto is just as good as Ontario's veto, or Quebec's veto, or any other province's veto, and that we ought to be glad to have equal status in terms of a veto.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suppose on the surface there may be some merit to that argument, but I would point out that when you are in the disadvantaged position, a veto really does you precious little good. The veto primarily works in favour of those who would like to sustain the status quo. If you don't want things to change, then the more people who have a veto and can stop the process of change, the better it is.

And so in respect to the constitution, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that we should be too sanguine about having a veto along with anybody else because that veto power, in every jurisdiction across the country, simply makes the process of change for the future much more difficult to achieve. If you don't want change, if you don't want to

make that future constitutional, that constitutional progress, then, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the more vetoes you can have, the better.

And maybe there are some parts in Canada where they would like the status quo to remain exactly where it is, and it would be wonderful if everything could be vetoed. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, from the western point of view, from the Saskatchewan point of view, a veto is precious little comfort to us because surely we are the ones who have a vested interest in change, and not a vested interest in keeping things the way they are. And therefore I'm not all that thrilled by the broadly based veto, because I think it works primarily in the interests of other regions of the country and not necessarily in the interests of our region of the country where we want things to change.

The second step backward, Mr. Speaker, that I would refer to in relation to this issue of the Senate and Senate reform, is the fact that the Meech Lake accord has, in relation to appointments to the Senate, simply in its transitional clauses substituted the tool of patronage at the provincial level for the tool of patronage at the federal level.

What the Meech Lake accord says is that, pending future formal constitutional amendment with respect to the Senate in a broad way, pending the accomplishment of that, that we will have in the meantime a provision whereby the federal government will no longer appoint the Senate directly, but will instead appoint people who are nominated by the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, some might think that is a great accomplishment. Quite frankly, I don't think that constitutes very much reform because, as I said a moment ago, what that section effectively does is substitute provincial patronage for what used to be federal patronage, and I'm not sure that moves us very much along the way toward legitimate reform of the upper Chamber in this country.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it could be a clear disincentive for reform in the future. It could stand in the way, because if every premier across the country has the ability to populate the Senate instead of the Prime Minister having that ability, if every premier has that ability in every province right across the country, the premiers will be sorely tempted to keep that ability, to maintain that tool of patronage in their hands, and wouldn't have very much interest in advancing the reform process where that whole system of appointment could be replaced by a system of elections which would provide legitimacy in the upper Chamber and really amount to genuine reform of that upper House. Instead, we have just one kind of patronage appointment substituting for another and, Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not very much reform at all.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that problem — in terms of the substitution of provincial patronage for what used to be federal patronage — that problem could be a greater road-block toward meaningful reform of the Senate in the future, could be a greater road-block standing in the way of that reform that the rule of unanimity which I mentioned as another concern in respect of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask why there are many of us in western Canada who dwell upon this issue of Senate reform and why we think it's so important. Some describe it in terms of the Triple E concept in relation to the Senate, making the Senate more legitimate by making it elected, making it equal in terms of regional and provincial balance across the country, and making it more effective in terms of giving it a clear mandate and sorting out the jurisdictional problems that presently beleaguer that institution and sap its credibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate of Senate reform along the lines of the Triple E concept, not as just an academic exercise in some political theory, but because I believe that Senate reform along these lines is one useful, practical vehicle, one method of genuine institutional change in our country to being unstacking the deck that's there today — and it's stacked very much against western Canada. It's a way to address that old painful malaise of western alienation.

(2145)

I don't argue for Senate reform just for the sake of having an argument about reforming an institution. I make the argument for a very practical purpose, because if it's done right, Mr. Speaker, along the lines of that Triple E concept, it is a way to enhance the legitimate clout of western Canada at the centre of national power in Ottawa. And that means with a properly reformed Senate, Mr. Speaker, that is very much linked to economic development for western Canada; growth for western Canada; jobs for western Canada; economic opportunities and diversification for western Canada; fulfilment in our region.

If we can begin unstacking that deck, if we can enhance our clout at the centre of national power, if we can legitimately reform some of those central institutions that we in our region think have been holding us back; if we can increase their sensitivity to what's important to us, then, Mr. Speaker, the proposal about Senate reform is much more than just a political science theory. Then, Mr. Speaker, it takes on real flesh and blood and bones in terms of economic development, growth, and jobs and progress for our region.

I believe it's a vital issue, Mr. Speaker. I believe it needs to be addressed in this whole process with the same passion and the same priority, with the same dedication and the same sense of urgency as we employ in addressing the important concerns of the province of Quebec. And sadly, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate to say that the Meech Lake accord does not do that. It mentions Senate reform as an agenda item for the future, but it doesn't move us very far along the process.

The second deficiency, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the whole accord, has to do with the imprecision in much of the language used in at least two important sections in the accord. One is the distinct society clause, and the other is the federal spending power clause, and I'd like to deal with both of those in turn.

First of all, in relation to the distinct society clause, that language used in that particular section, Mr. Speaker, is

new, it's rather vague, and to my understanding it has not been previously interpreted by our courts. And very much, Mr. Speaker, the ball in this case, because of the imprecise language, has been tossed to the courts for future interpretation, and the courts are going to have a very large role to play in defining what those words "distinct society" means.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's perhaps indicative of the first ministers' discomfort as they got together to draft that particular language. It's indicative of their discomfort with the lack of clarity of that phrase "distinct society" that they felt it necessary to add at least two non-derogation clauses to the Meech Lake accord. The first, which will be the new section 2(4), points out that this amendment does not alter the powers, rights, or privileges of parliament or provincial legislatures in respect of language.

The second non-derogation clause, Mr. Speaker, is found at the back of the constitutional amendment listed as item 16. And this notes that the interpretation of Quebec as a distinct society should not affect rights pertaining to multicultural heritage or aboriginal peoples. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, if the first ministers felt that they had done a good, precise job of drafting this particular amendment, they would not have felt it necessary to put in such non-derogation clauses as these as part of the overall amendment.

What it shows, Mr. Speaker, is that somewhere along the way in that pressure-cooker atmosphere of the bargaining room, there was at least one first minister at some point who realized that there might be a potential problem in using the language that they were using; a problem in respect of language rights, provincially or federally; a problem with respect to aboriginal rights; a problem with respect to multicultural rights; and so forth.

In order to prevent those problems from arising, the non-derogation clauses were inserted; I think, Mr. Speaker, a product of the fact that new and vague and imprecise language was being used. I wonder if a little more time was taken, if a little more study and effort was given, whether better language could not have been found.

And, Mr. Speaker, another question arises because of the drafting of the overall package in respect of this point. The question is: once the first ministers found it necessary to insert a non-derogation clause about multicultural rights, and then a non-derogation clause about aboriginal rights — once they felt it necessary to insert all of those, what happens to all of the other rights in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that aren't specifically enumerated in non-derogation clauses? I think it raises a question, Mr. Speaker, as witnesses before the federal committee have said, it raises a question about the status of those other rights.

I would feel far more comfortable, Mr. Speaker, if there was a clear provision in the Meech Lake accord — a clear provision indicating once and for all that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is in no way impaired or detracted from as a consequence of the Meech Lake amendments.

And I think that would resolve the concerns that many Canadians have expressed on that point.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the federal spending power, the provision in the Meech Lake accord provides the right to provinces to opt out of certain federal programs and receive monetary compensation for their opting out in respect to federal-provincial, cost-shared programming within a provincial sphere of jurisdiction. The caveat attached to that, Mr. Speaker, is that a province must proceed with a similar program that's compatible with national objectives.

And again in that particular section, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a problem of vagueness. I think there's a problem of imprecision in the language that is used. For example, who is to set the objectives? If you listen to different premiers commenting across the country, they have a much different view of who it is that's supposed to set the objectives; and in relation to that word "compatible" that's used in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, what precisely does that mean? Does compatible mean similar? Does it mean equivalent? Does it mean parallel? Does it mean consistent?

Mr. Speaker, there's a problem with that word in terms of vagueness, and I think it could be potentially troublesome in the future. And I think again, with a little more time and a little more openness on the part of some of the draftsmen, some of that problem of vagueness and imprecision could have been worked out, and we could have been heading off problems in the future while not defeating at all the ultimate objective of the Meech Lake accord.

The third deficiency that I would like to make reference to, Mr. Speaker, is in respect of the last portion the Meech Lake accord which describes the future agenda for constitutional change in this country, and it provides for the holding of annual first ministers' conferences on the constitution, and it enumerates a list of things that are to go onto the agenda for those future conferences. It's a very short list, Mr. Speaker; it mentions Senate reform, and I'm happy to see that; it mentions fisheries, and I'm sure those who live in coastal regions of Canada will be happy to see that, but that's where the list stops, Mr. Speaker.

It then simply says that any other matter may potentially be considered on his agenda for future constitutional change. And I'm sure that many people in legislatures across this country could draft up a long list of things that they would like to see on that agenda. And I don't make the argument at this point, Mr. Speaker, for a massive increase in that agenda. I'm glad that the Senate is there; I'm glad that the fisheries issue is there; but I think, Mr. Speaker, there is one profound and glaring error, and that is the fact that that agenda does not specifically include the rights and interests of aboriginal peoples in this country.

That is a glaring failure on the part of the draftsmen, that they did not specifically put that into the list of things to go onto the agenda early in this ongoing process of constitutional change. It creates, naturally, on the part of aboriginal peoples in this country, it creates doubt; it

creates suspicion; it creates resentment. And Mr. Speaker, it can be so easily resolved. I have not heard one member of a provincial legislature or of the Parliament of Canada, the House of Commons or the Senate, I haven't heard anyone say that they don't want aboriginal rights to go onto that agenda. They may have different views about the positions they would take to a table in order to begin the discussion of those rights, but I haven't heard anybody say that they don't want them on the agenda. Indeed, everybody said exactly the opposite, they ought to be on the agenda.

There seems to be, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can tell, unanimous consent, and we could do a lot to enhance the feelings and the attitudes of aboriginal peoples in this country with respect to the constitutional process by offering them the urgent respect that they deserve by putting their issues, enumerated specifically, into that agenda for future constitutional change, and not just leaving it among all the other things that will eventually get added to the program.

Mr. Speaker, I raise these concerns in this debate this evening not to stymie the worthy initiative which Meech Lake represents but I do so — raise these issues — to flag some potential pitfalls which I think are genuine and legitimate problems and, Mr. Speaker, to make the accord better and more satisfying for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, from their seats across the way, some of the members of the government have asked me about the position that has been taken by the national Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Turner. Now Mr. Turner has indicated very clearly the amendments that he will be fighting for in relation to the Meech Lake accord when it eventually comes before the Parliament of Canada. He has, for example, suggested that the issues of Senate reform and the entry of new provinces into confederation ought to be removed from those sections requiring the binding rule of unanimous consent before they can be accomplished.

He has also suggested that provision ought to be made immediately for an elected Senate pending full Senate reform, not just the transferring of the patronage lists from the federal level to the provincial level, but an election procedure pending the full reform of the Senate as at an early a date as possible.

Thirdly, he has suggested that there ought to be the opportunity for territorial nominations for appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada. That's one thing that is totally omitted from the present accord. Fourthly, he has proposed to include aboriginal peoples, multiculturalism, regional identities, and the Canadian economic union within the definition of the fundamental characteristics of Canada.

Fifth, he has proposed to guarantee the paramountcy of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Number six, he has called for greater protection for minority language rights in Canada.

Number seven, he has suggested a provision to ensure that provincial programs financed with federal money are not only compatible with national objectives but also



meet minimum national standards. And number eight, he has proposed specifically to add the issue of aboriginal rights to the list of items to be on the agenda for future constitutional talks.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will be able to see very clearly that those proposals from Mr. Turner are very much in line with what I have said this evening and what I have been saying for the last three or four months about the Meech Lake accord. These amendments touch upon the essence of what Canadians are concerned about. They don't detract from the Meech Lake accord, Mr. Speaker, they enhance it. They should be largely non-controversial and, Mr. Speaker, broadly accepted. And most important, they address some vital western regional concerns that Meech Lake otherwise omits.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this process by which Quebec will become an enthusiastic constitutional participant. The concerns that I have mentioned tonight, and the proposed amendments that I have endorsed, will simply give other Canadians, especially western and northern Canadians, some equal cause for celebration in our region too.

And I urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to be receptive to these ideas and to not shut the door with a "take it or leave it" attitude.

And, Mr. Speaker, if they won't be receptive to new ideas, if they persist in that take it or leave it attitude, at least Canadians, and Saskatchewan people in particular, will know that there is someone else beyond this government, or the government in Ottawa, with a continuing agenda to bridge to the future and at the earliest possible date to get the full job done, of getting it done right in terms of enhancing our constitution in which all Canadians can be satisfied and proud. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 22

Blakeney	Prebble
Brockelbank	Shillington
Romanow	Tchorzewski
Thompson	Mitchell
Simard	Solomon
Kowalsky	Atkinson
Anguish	Goulet
Hagel	Lyons
Calvert	Trew
Smart	Van Mulligen
Koenker	Goodale

#### Nays — 26

Muller	Duncan
Andrew	Berntson
Lane	Smith
Swan	Meiklejohn
Pickering	Martin
Toth	Johnson
McLaren	Hopfner

Muirhead	Hodgins
Gerich	Hepworth
Hardy	Klein
Martens	Baker
Gleim	Gardner
Kopelchuk	Britton

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:07 p.m.