Acting in the National Interest: The Saskatchewan Tradition

Saskatchewan has a history of assessing, and acting in, the national interest,” Premier Romanow told SIPP’s Leadership forum. Reminding the audience that Canadian historian Frank Underhill described a nation as “a body of people who has done great things with respect to social policy, federal programs, national unity and trade,” Romanow said that Saskatchewan culture reflects Canadians’ core values — co-operation, compassion, community. Prosperity, if not mere survival, on the harsh prairie compelled a collective spirit for the “well-being of all its members,” he theorized. Our “cultural factors are amplified by pragmatic, structural concerns, which encourage us to promote, protect, and even champion the idea of national policies.”

“We know the Canadian experience from many sides,” said the Premier. Saskatchewan’s position as a “have” and “have not” province “has taught us to recognise the limits of the federal government’s legitimacy in maintaining regional equity,” he said. Furthermore, our attitudes reflect both our neighbouring provinces. For instance, Alberta’s “province-building” initiatives through expansion and diversification of the economy, and Manitoba’s interest in federal-provincial agricultural issues. And lastly, we know all too well the fiscal reality: “We are a small province, and we understand (that) we need the larger national community to help us provide important programs. We know we need this country to work effectively in the interests of all its citizens if we, as a province, are to prosper.”

Premier Romanow spoke of the introduction of Medicare, “our gift to Canada,” as an example of “federalism at its best” and of Saskatchewan’s commitment to acting in the national interest. Medicare was first established in Saskatchewan in 1962. The experiment was a proven success and served as impetus for the national adoption of the program. Canadians recognised “that our idea of accessible, publicly-funded health care for everyone really did reflect a ‘national interest’.”

Saskatchewan supports federal involvement, as its conditions ensure that quality care is available to all Canadians. Romanow stated, “We support the federal spending power when it can promote the national interest.” He was quick to add however that any federal self-interested moves would be opposed, “we have tried for years to advocate for (Continued on page 7)
S everal months ago in this section of SIPP’s newsletter, I talked briefly about the need for public policy institutes such as ours to be relevant in all they do. As institutes like the Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy here in Regina strive for relevance, we must also reach out to include the bright young women and men scholars in all our endeavours. This is, of course, not a call to ignore anyone over 30 but rather a reminder for us in the public policy community to include in a meaningful way the bright new scholars across the country in the public policy debate.

David Lodge offers in Small World a parody of the academic conference circuit where a group of academics who all know each other meet on a regular basis at all of the major conferences to discuss aspects of literary criticism. When one looks at the many conferences and other gatherings that loosely involve the public policy community in Canada, one can find striking similarities to Lodge’s fictional world.

Some of that is expected, of course, but given the renewal within the Canadian academy, we have to be fully aware of the need to include the new scholars and practitioners within that group of seasoned veterans.

This is not to suggest that the existing community of public policy scholars, nestled, for the most part, in Canada’s universities are not a bright and creative group. They are, and they continue to offer new insights into contemporary issues. However, that circle must be widened.

We cannot forget that for much of the last two decades the traditional disciplines in the arts and social sciences that have provided the brain trust for much of the public policy debate outside of government have not been renewed as vigorously as they might have been. Now that the nation’s universities are once again hiring, those new scholars must be incorporated into the public policy process.

Moreover, the new scholars bring with them new perspectives and new insights. They have come of age only recently and their views of Canada and the issues that it faces are quite different from that of those trained a generation earlier. They will bring fresh perspectives and they will make a contribution. Above all else, the public policy community must be forward looking.

The need to include new researchers into the public policy community is further hastened by the fact that virtually every university in Canada today is encouraging its faculty – especially its recent hires – to become active researchers and to apply for research funding. The central funding agencies such as the Social Science and Humanities Research Council as well as others are directing their research dollars to socially and economically relevant research. This means that those agencies are in fact consciously encouraging many of the new researchers to investigate many of the issues that face us as a society. Over the past few months at the Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy we have prepared research proposals on health, productivity, and early childhood development. All of these subjects have major public policy implications. And, at SIPP all of our proposals have included a number of young scholars in the proposed research teams.

“Above all else, the public policy community must be forward looking.”

Some organizations are very serious about including younger scholars in a meaningful way. One of the best examples is the Association of Canadian Studies/Association d’études canadiennes which held a two-day workshop in December. I must admit that I was involved in the conference as a member of the ACS/AEC but the Association adopted for its workshop a model that other organizations concerned about the inclusion of new scholars and renewal might consider. Each Program Administrator invited to the conference was invited to bring a junior faculty member to participate in the workshop. This allowed younger scholars to become involved in the discussions concerning the future directions of Canadian Studies. That will be an important first step in encouraging the participation of new scholars.

The public policy community must also work seriously to include new and younger scholars in the public policy process. To do otherwise would reflect badly on the public policy community in this country and certainly would not be good public policy.
As part of a presentation series of provincial leaders to speak on citizen engagement, Elwin Hermanson spoke to an audience of academics, civil servants, students and the general public. The title of his talk, which took place at the University of Regina on November 2nd, was “Citizen Re-engagement—Building Communities and Slaying Government.”

Mr. Hermanson acknowledged that citizen engagement can mean different things, but generally defined it as, “ordinary people taking action to influence their environment.” Mr. Hermanson explained, “the title I’ve chosen for my presentation, Citizen Re-engagement, refers to the challenge faced by politicians and senior civil servants to re-think the relationship between citizens and the government in the development of public policy.” Mr. Hermanson admitted, “many people express a cynical view about politicians and the public process.” He added, “they often complain about a political system they perceive has little room and even less interest in their input. This is not to say people are not interested in participating in the process.” Optimistically, Mr. Hermanson quoted a poll conducted by EKOS Research that suggests a significant percentage of Canadians “are willing to engage in a process that gives them a legitimate opportunity for influencing policy development in areas that affect their lives.”

Mr. Hermanson explained that his sub-title, Building Communities and Slaying Governments, “refers to the outcome of many effective cases of citizen engagement.” He did not suggest that effective citizen engagement should be measured by its negative impact on politicians at election time. Rather he asserted that “failure to effectively engage citizens in public policy development has the potential to slay governments.” He used the method in which 53 hospitals in Saskatchewan were closed in the early 1990s as case in point of an ineffective exercise in public consultation. In another sense however, Mr. Hermanson described the public reaction to the government initiative as “an excellent example of citizen engagement.”

Mr. Hermanson was critical of the lack of debate in caucus, cabinet and the legislature over the decision to close the hospitals. He charged that “the government had already determined the outcome. The only thing left was to implement the decision and attempt to manipulate public support.” In his opinion, the community meetings that were held by the provincial government were motivated by the desire “to win acceptance, if not support, for the hospital closures by linking the closures to the province’s desperate financial situation.” To make matters worse, Hermanson suggested that cabinet ministers left the task of explaining the decision to close the hospitals to the senior health department officials. Only after the Premier stepped in and ordered at least one cabinet member to be present at the meetings, did the public uproar become “reduced from a rapid boil to a slow burn.”

The public saw through this attempt to avoid inevitable confrontation to the closures. Mr. Hermanson stated that the failure to engage the public ultimately “sowed the seeds of electoral defeat for almost all rural NDP MLAs in 1999.” Bitterness lingered over the process to close the hospitals. Furthermore, rural citizens began to feel that the state of health care had continued to deteriorate after health care reform was introduced. Still to this day, resentment in rural communities remains a festering sore for the current government even though “most people will acknowledge some hospital closures were necessary,” he said.

Mr. Hermanson raised the process of recall, a system which provides citizens, with the “opportunity to remove the MLA in event he or she is not representing the majority of constituents.” The Saskatchewan Party considers this system as a way for citizens to hold government accountable between election.

A successful process of citizen engagement was “The Charlottetown Accord of 1992 and the National Referendum that followed an arena for one of the most important public debates in our country’s history.” While the process of engaging citizens did not result in change, citizens carefully considered the proposed amendments to the Constitution, as well as closely followed and involved themselves in fierce debates across the nation. Canadians were involved from the outset, and were able to control the final outcome.

And so, democratic process continues to evolve as voters demand a direct role in policy development, and elected officials grapple with identifying the “right mix of leadership and public input.” Currently in Saskatchewan, the Fyke Commission is engaging citizens in what Mr. Hermanson referred to as, “one of the most important restoration projects of our time – the restoration of public health care in the 21st century.” Mr. Hermanson concluded, “Citizens are demanding to be engaged directly in the challenge of building their communities and their country.” And warned, “that governments who fail to effectively engage the public will pay a price.”

To obtain a copy of Mr. Hermanson’s presentation, please visit SIPP’s web site at: www.uregina.ca/sipp.
Mobility, Migration and Myths

In January 2000, Victoria de la Ronde, Dan Beavon and Mary Jane Norris of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development presented their research findings from a study titled: “Registered Indian Mobility and Migration: An Analysis of 1996 Census Data”. The paper was originally presented by Norris and Beavon at the Canadian Population Society Meetings in 1999, at the Congress of Social Sciences. Using 1996 Census migration data, this study analyzes and compares patterns by age and gender within Aboriginal groups as well as within the general Canadian population.

The authors contest the belief, one that tends to be expressed in the media, that there is a one-way high migration rate of Aboriginal people leaving reserves for urban centres, causing large increases in Aboriginal population in urban areas. They identify two important facts that debunk this myth:
1. There has been no mass exodus to major urban centres.
2. Migration is not a major contributor to current (1991-1996) growth of the Aboriginal population in urban centres.

It has been generally thought that the growth of the Canadian urban Aboriginal population is due to large net outflows of registered Indians from reserves to cities. But as this study demonstrates, reserves have not in fact experienced large net losses of registered Indian migrants but rather have consistently posted small net gains, a pattern that has existed from the late 60s, while net migration to rural communities has been consistently negative from 1966 to 1996. Over the 1966-1996 study period of 5-year migration intervals, large urban centres posted net inflows of registered Indians during the 1966-71, 1981-86 and 1986-91 periods, but not during the 1991-96 interval. Currently, the majority of migration is occurring between urban centres.

The intercensal growth of Aboriginal populations in urban centres is currently not attributable to migration, but rather to other components of growth, including the relatively high fertility rates among the urban Aboriginal population as compared to the general population. Other factors include: specifically in the case of registered Indians, the large number of reinstatements after the implementation of Bill C-31 and for the Aboriginal population in general, the impact of “ethnic mobility” that is the change in self-reporting from non-Aboriginal in one census to Aboriginal in the next census. Bill C-31 was introduced in 1985 in order to correct the discriminatory provision of the Indian Act concerning intermarriage of registered Indian women who lost their status if they married a person who was not registered Indian, as did their children in such a marriage. The large number of reinstatements since 1985 (especially pronounced between 1986 to 1989) and still ongoing, occurred primarily among the off-reserve population, contributing to the observed intercensal increases of registered Indian populations in urban centres.

The findings show that for the top ten cities across Canada with the largest number of Registered Indians, the number of registered Indian out-migrants exceeded the number of immigrants over the period of 1991 to 1996 (with the exception of Saskatoon). Moreover, those leaving the reserve for the urban centres were more likely to leave for reasons related to family, housing and education (accounting for nearly 90% of moves from reserves) than for employment. Those leaving the cities for the reserves did so largely as a result of family and housing considerations, accounting for practically 70% of moves to reserves. Employment considerations were a major reason, after family and housing for movers between communities off-reserve.

Although the rate of migration for First Nation communities (reserves) is relatively stable at the present time, it is probable that pressures to migrate to urban centres will mount. The current housing demands and shortage of job opportunities in First Nation communities, combined with the growth of the working age population could fuel increasing pressures to migrate off-reserve.

While Registered Indians, like other populations tend to be most mobile during their young adult years (associated with transition into labour force participation and family formation), off-reserve, they are notably much more mobile than the general population. The findings conclude that the Aboriginal population off reserve is in a high state of flux or “churn”. That is also characterized by a high proportion of Aboriginal families who are headed by a female lone parent, with a high proportion of migrant female single parents below the poverty line. The increased mobility has implications related to the upheaval of families, impacts on delivery of services, schooling and housing. A highly transient population off-reserve suggests that Aboriginal people are not being integrated into the labour force.

The presentation closed with reference to “Gathering Strength”, an integrated, government wide plan, through which initiatives are underway to address the key issues facing Aboriginal people. It aims to address the need for structural reform of the federal government’s Aboriginal programming to promote self-sufficiency and economic development, as well as the need to enhance and strengthen the capacity of Aboriginal governments and organizations to run accountable, responsive government systems.

A final version of this paper incorporates an additional discussion of the literature in relation to the approach and findings of the study and will be available early next year.

The Research and Analysis Directorate is planning to release other studies concerning Aboriginal migration, First Nation settlement patterns and rural-urban characteristics over the next year.

For a complete listing and details of completed and ongoing studies please contact Edith Beaudoin: phone (819) 953-0779, e-mail beaudoine@inac.gc.ca.
Treaties as a Bridge to the Future

Treaties as a Bridge to the Future

Judge David M. Arnott, Treaty Commissioner for Saskatchewan led the first SIPP Armchair Discussion of the academic year. The following is an abbreviated excerpt from his talk, “Treaties as a Bridge to the Future.”

Saskatchewan has, historically, been a leader in developing innovative public policy instruments for the provision of human services such as Medicare. In the emerging realm of improving relations with First Nations, Saskatchewan is once again moving into a leadership position by providing a beacon of hope for all of Canada.

At arms length from government, the Office of the Treaty Commissioner (OTC) represents a new concept in advancing public policy. The OTC model is distinct in that its mandate is to explore what the century-old treaties mean and to look at ways of living up to the promises that were made. Fostering a better understanding of the treaties and their provisions is one important way to help increase self-sufficiency within First Nations communities. In turn, self-sufficiency will narrow the gap between the quality of life experienced by First Nations communities and the quality of life experienced by other communities.

The unique feature of the OTC is that the two treaty parties, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN) and the Government of Canada, along with the Government of Saskatchewan as an observer, came together jointly and voluntarily to create the OTC and the Exploratory Treaty Table. The Exploratory Treaty Table is an impartial forum where the treaties can be honestly explored and the necessary discussions, although sometimes difficult, can be held. The key to this discussion is that the parties are coming together in good faith, willing to talk things through.

While the Exploratory Treaty Table is a powerfully effective communications forum, with its sincere desire to discuss rather than confront, it is not the OTC’s only public policy lever. The Treaty Table players have entrusted the OTC with a mandate to provide public education about treaties. Recent polling conducted by Angus Reid Group for the OTC told us that there is little understanding of First Nations and treaty issues in the general public. Specifically, the Angus Reid survey found that 78% of Saskatchewan people are not knowledgeable about treaties and they want to know more. Approximately, 68% of this province’s population believes that an improved understanding of treaties will build better relations between First Nations and other communities. Thus, improving public understanding of First Nations and treaties is critical to building a better relationship between all Canadian communities. Fortunately, there exists a huge public appetite to learn about First Nations and treaty issues. Based on these findings, public education about treaties becomes a necessary and potent tool if we are to build new understandings, new partnerships and new bridges to the future. The opportunity facing us is clear: public education has the potential to trump ignorance.

That belief in the power of public education led the OTC to commence a treaty-focused public education program to inform people about the treaties. We have been building and delivering new public education programs one step at a time. As a first step, we started a Treaty Awareness Speakers Bureau. The OTC has mobilized 100 volunteers who go into any community in Saskatchewan and talk about treaties. They talk to anyone who’s interested in the treaties, the First Nations, and in building a better future.

The OTC public education program includes many additional initiatives as well: we have an OTC web site; we’ve launched a Treaty Awareness Display which has been showcased at Wanuskewin, Government House, and, currently, is touring the province; I write a column about treaties and the treaty relationship that appears in many of the province’s weekly newspapers; and, this fall, the OTC is publishing two new books about treaties.

Taken together, these programs deliver practical and tangible educational information to the public. Undoubtedly this is an important step toward building more informed public attitudes about a crucial issue facing both Canada and Saskatchewan. However, it is also just a start. The OTC is expanding its public education programs to more effectively communicate factual information such as the changing demographic realities in our province. People need to know that Saskatchewan’s population will be one-fifth First Nation by 2013 and one-third First Nation by 2045. If people are to learn more about these issues, if more modern attitudes toward building a better future are to be cultivated, the OTC’s current public education initiatives are, truly, only a beginning.

The OTC model does offer a productive means of resolving issues and an effective means of educating the public. These two components provide a solid foundation on which to build a better future for the First Nations and for all of Canada. The parties in this “made in Saskatchewan” process are to be commended for their commitment to positive dialogue founded on mutual respect. The process is an interest-based discussion that demonstrates that cooperation is superior to either confrontation or litigation. Public policy in this country would be well served by expanding this model beyond its Saskatchewan birthplace.
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN POLICY DEVELOPMENT

From the 1999 provincial election that resulted in a coalition government, to the overwhelming spectacle of the American election, and now to the federal election currently,” Dr. Melenchuk pointed out that Saskatchewan has been immersed in politics in the last year and used these events to illustrate the interesting trends that have emerged.

“Believe it or not,” said Jim Melenchuk, policy development does “depend on public participation.” This participation starts at a grassroots level, in the coffee shops where patrons discuss the issues they face. Those who can formulate their ideas and effectively express their merit stand up to the test of peer criticism. And Jim Melenchuk is receptive to those ideas since, “a good political party will have its finger on the pulse of public opinion,” he stated.

He admitted however that, “People have complained that policy development is more often guided by polling,” and acknowledged the limitation of polling. “While polling identifies issues, it does not as a rule set out policy alternatives to address issues.” It is the political party that is connected to its constituency that provides the grassroots alternatives that can bring other solutions to the public debate.

“While polling has an important role in issue of identification,” the Minister said, the public also needs to be involved in the “fine tuning” of policy development. Mr. Melenchuk discussed two methods that achieve public involvement — focus groups, and a more recent phenomenon, the Internet.

For almost a year, Jim Melenchuk has hosted a virtual forum on his interactive web site, SaskChat.com. It “provides ordinary people with the opportunity to talk directly with me about the issues of the day.” Not only is this site unique to Canada, but also to North America. Dr. Melenchuk pointed out that “no where else in North America do people have the chance to talk directly with a political leader on policy concerns that affect them.”

“There is a growing perception of a growing divide between politicians and the public,” said Dr. Melenchuk. And the onus is on the politicians to seek public participation “through forums such as SaskChat or public consultation meetings.” In fact, public consultation meetings have increased in number over the past few years. As well, government departments hold their own focus groups. Government must obtain approval from its stakeholders prior to implementation. Unfortunately, many feel that “these meetings are ‘fait accompli’”, and that a final decision has already been made. “That is why,” he said, “that when and if these types of meetings are held, the process should be as transparent as possible.”

Furthermore, the public should be encouraged to attend public consultation meetings. He maintained that government should seek to familiarise the public with the process. This should logically begin in the schools. “The public must be educated about the political process, and its rights and roles within that process.”

One important issue Melenchuk asked the audience to bear in mind is cost. “Whether it is by the Internet, polling, public meetings, or direct mail, there is a financial cost to elicit participation.” Increasingly we are seeing a new system where “efficiency rules, because time is money,” he explained. “Without public participation or interest in formulating policy, the public is leaving the process by default to special interest groups and paid political professionals, which increases public cynicism about a system where only those who can afford to get involved, do get involved.” It is vital to involve the average citizen instead of only taking the opportunity to listen to organised protest. “I am not comfortable in a world where protest is seen as the only avenue where the public can make their concerns heard regarding policy,” he said.

Education is imperative to encouraging people to include themselves in the process. “A greater understanding of how our system works will result in a greater efficiency of the public getting their thoughts heard.” Politicians must also take advantage of all avenues of communication “to broaden policy development beyond the bureaucratic stage to include the public”. Simply put, “a greater understanding of public concerns will help politicians make the right policy choices to better address those concerns.” Those who ignore public opinion will risk losing their seat at the next election.

Jim Melenchuk urged open lines of communication. He concluded that, “if we stop listening to each other, we close ourselves off from the answers we may need to make this province work for all.”

Dr. Melenchuk’s complete speech is available for download on SIPP’s web site: www.uregina.ca/sipp.
each session of the conference.

Although all related to the central theme of equalization, the papers presented were both diverse and wide-ranging. After welcoming and introductory remarks by Paul Boothe, François Vaillancourt (Université de Montréal) spoke on “The Role of Intergovernmental Fiscal Arrangements in Maintaining an Effective State in Canada”, a topic he had addressed in a paper co-authored with Richard Bird (University of Toronto). This was followed by Joe Ruggeri (University of New Brunswick) speaking to a paper he and Bob Howard had prepared on the concepts and dimensions of vertical fiscal imbalance. Ken McKenzie then discussed the tax changes recommended by the Alberta Business Tax Review. His discussant—Kirk McGregor, Saskatchewan Finance—paid particular attention to the equalization implications of Alberta’s decision to eliminate the corporate capital tax and, for Alberta Income Tax purposes, to disallow any deduction for capital taxes of other jurisdictions. The concluding session of the first day considered the recent Swiss restructuring of inter-governmental finance; this was presented by Anne-Béatrice Bullinger (a Swiss PhD candidate at Université de Montréal).

Arndt Vermaeten (Finance Canada) opened the second day of the conference with a detailed consideration of the changes to the equalization program that have been introduced for the 1999–2000 to 2003–2004 fiscal arrangements period. Annette Ryan (PEI Treasury) responded as discussant, indicating what, from a provincial perspective, might be considered as good or bad in these changes. Sean Keenan (Saskatchewan Finance) then spoke to a paper he and Blake Winslow (University of Regina) had prepared on how the equalization-payment system might be changed to lessen the variability and improve the predictability of payments to the provinces, thereby lessening the severity of what is, at times, a serious problem for provincial budgeting.

The fourth session of Day 2 considered a paper by Ron Kneebone (University of Calgary) and John Leach (McMaster University) that explored the extent to which the choices of members of the Canadian economic union have impacted one another. Kneebone pointed out that the causes of debt accumulation are distinctly different at the federal and provincial levels, and that the policy choices of the federal government have had a negative impact on the efforts of the provinces to control their accumulation of debt.

The “Future of Federal Transfers” was the subject of a luncheon panel discussion consisting of John Wright (President, SaskPower and former Deputy Minister, Saskatchewan Finance), Michael Butler (B.C. Finance), and Paul Boothe. While the discussion ranged widely, there appeared to be something of a consensus that the probability of a fundamentally changed direction and structure for federal transfers was relatively low. It was noted, however, that the significant regional redistribution embodied in federal programs that are not ostensibly directed to such redistribution imposes strains on the federation that are best avoided. The presenter for the closing session was Finn Poschmann (C.D. Howe Institute), who discussed “Equalization in the 21st Century”, a paper prepared by Michael Smart (University of Toronto) and he. The major thrust of the paper was a consideration of the relative merits of the fiscal arrangements period.

The Saskatchewan Tradition
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clarifications to ensure that it (federal spending power) could only be used to truly serve the national interest.” The Premier recalled that both the patriation of the constitution and the Charlottetown Accord included important clarification of the legitimate use of the federal spending power. Most recently, the Charlottetown round obliged “Ottawa to negotiate with provinces and territories – both on establishing new cost-shared programs and on changing the rules for funding existing programs.” Saskatchewan supported the reforms because citizens recognised that “unilateral federal action can seriously undermine the national consensus about the legitimacy of the spending power.”

Cut backs to the provinces for social programs through the CHST re-ignited the provincial-federal debates. “To this end,” the Premier stated, “we were instrumental in creating a new intergovernmental forum—the Ministerial Council on Social Policy Renewal. Our hope is that the forum will help define the national interest in social policy, and once again build a consensus about the legitimate role of the federal government in designing, funding and delivering social policy.”

As “Saskatchewan has played a leading role throughout the last forty years” in promoting the national interest, so too does it now lead in ensuring that Medicare remain a strong, universal system at a reasonable cost. Premier Romanow declared that “there is no more important issue for any government in this country right now than the renewal of Medicare”. We must remain committed to acting in the national interest in order to ensure that the system remains protected. Premier Romanow asserted, “The challenge is upon us now.”

Premier Romanow’s complete speech is available for download on SIPP’s web site: www.uregina.ca/sipp
The Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy is a research institute of University of Regina.

Fiscal Federalism Conference
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of macro determinants of equalization amounts and the present detailed micro model with its reliance on a multiplicity of variables. A considerable diversity of opinion was evident in the discussion that followed the paper.

In addition to those presenting papers at the conference, valuable contributions were also made by the discussants. Included in this group were the following: Howard Leeson (University of Regina Public Policy Scholar, SIPP); Mel McMillan (University of Alberta); Kirk McGregor (Saskatchewan Finance); Annette Ryan (P.E.I. Treasury); Derek Hermanutz (Finance Canada); Brad Reed (University of Alberta); and Ron Neumann (Manitoba Finance).

In his closing remarks, Paul Boothe expressed his satisfaction with the conference. The combination of the “invisible college” and academics interested in the issues of fiscal federalism was both stimulating and symbiotic, and provided every assurance that future conferences with the same focus had the potential to contribute greatly to the process of renewing the equalization payments system.

The Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy will be publishing the papers either in a conference volume or in its series Public Policy Papers. Further information concerning the publications will be provided on our web site.

Visit our website for information on SIPP events.
http://www.uregina.ca/sipp
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