



STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 20 – May 9, 2017



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES

Ms. Colleen Young, Chair
Lloydminster

Mr. Ryan Meili, Deputy Chair
Saskatoon Meewasin

Mr. Fred Bradshaw
Carrot River Valley

Mr. Terry Dennis
Canora-Pelly

Mr. Glen Hart
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Mr. Warren Kaeding
Melville-Saltcoats

Mr. Kevin Phillips
Melfort

[The committee met at 15:05.]

The Chair: — All right. Welcome, committee members, this afternoon. Those present: myself, Colleen Young, as Chair; committee members Fred Bradshaw, Terry Dennis, Warren Kaeding, Kevin Phillips, and Mr. Glen Hart will be joining us a little bit later. And sitting in for Deputy Chair Ryan Meili is Mr. McCall.

This afternoon we will be considering the estimates for the Public Service Commission and then followed by consideration of Bill No. 50, *The Provincial Capital Commission Act*.

**General Revenue Fund
Public Service Commission
Vote 33**

Subvote (PS01)

The Chair: — We will now begin our consideration of the estimates for the Public Service Commission, vote 33, central management and services, subvote (PS01). Mr. Minister, if you would like to introduce your officials and begin with any opening remarks.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Well thank you very much, Madam Chair. Good afternoon to you and to committee members. I am pleased to be here to provide information on the estimates for the Public Service Commission. I have some brief opening comments, but before I start I'd like to introduce my officials. To my left is the Chair of the Public Service Commission, Karen Aulie; Ray Deck, assistant Chair; Giselle Marcotte, assistant Chair; Scott Kistner, executive director of the human resource service centre; Glenda Francis, executive director of corporate services; and Lorraine Von Hagen, director, business services branch.

As you know, the Public Service Commission, or PSC, ensures the Government of Saskatchewan has the workforce required to successfully deliver on its priorities to meet the needs of citizens. Saskatchewan's public servants are the boots on the ground, delivering a broad range of programs and services to Saskatchewan people. As a central agency of government, the PSC works closely with ministries to provide strategic support for labour relations and organizational development. It also supports foundational services including payroll, staffing, and classifications.

The PSC has implemented a business partner model. This is an organizational structure where HR [human resources] professionals work closely with their client ministry senior leaders in order to develop an HR agenda that supports the overall goals and aims of their organization. In the model, human resource professionals add value by participating in strategic planning to help the organization meet present and future goals rather than concentrating solely on transactional or traditional HR duties.

The PSC's goal is to be a true business partner with their clients, and their efforts are paying off. I'm proud of the expertise, guidance, and support the PSC continues to provide to the ministry's transformational change initiatives to ensure

the sustainability of high-quality public services.

The PSC's strategic plan serves as the long-term road map or strategic human resource plan for the Government of Saskatchewan. The plan focuses on five strategic goals: number one, effective leadership. Projected retirements and a shortage of skilled labour are driving our need for effective leadership. We must ensure the Government of Saskatchewan has the leadership required into the future to deliver on its commitments. This includes acquiring leadership capacity through proactive and targeted leadership and recruitment service. It also includes building leadership capability by enhancing development programs for leaders, enhancing government's performance management system, and strengthening leadership succession across government.

The second area is high-performing employees and organization. To ensure we can deliver on the growth plan, we need to ensure we provide a strong work environment and attract, develop, and retain high performers. We must ensure employees have the skills they need, that the government has the reward system that keeps it competitive as an employer, and that the public service continues to be supported in its cultural journey and employee engagement. It will also ensure that we achieve a labour relations environment that supports the government's business objectives.

Item three is an inclusive workforce. It's good business to ensure that the Government of Saskatchewan has a workforce reflective of the province's population and ensure well-rounded decision making to best serve our citizens. The PSC continues to work on an inclusion strategy aimed at achieving a diverse workforce and inclusive workplace.

The fourth area is health, wellness, and safety. The health, wellness, and safety of our employees is paramount; therefore supports are required to build the culture. Mental health is emerging as a major reason for workplace absence in all sectors. The PSC has a number of initiatives to create a culture of health, wellness, and safety in the public service.

The fifth goal is internal to the PSC: an engaged and high-performing PSC. The PSC is working to ensure it enhances its clients' experience, to optimize its HR information systems and technology, to improve its systems and processes through continuous improvement, to progress on its own cultural journey, and to improve engagement and ensure that the PSC has the workforce it needs to successfully execute on this strategic plan. This is an aggressive agenda, Madam Chair, for the PSC, and it's a long-term strategic plan. The PSC has consulted with its client ministries to determine their priorities. They are on the right track, aligned with government direction, and well-positioned to help us meet our strategic goals.

The focus of the PSC for 2017-18 is to further advance its strategic plan. Specifically, operational highlights of 2017-18 include: to build proactive and targeted leadership recruitment services, enhance leadership development and strengthen leadership succession, and assess alternative compensation approaches where necessary; to strengthen employee recruitment services and learning and development, and improve employee engagement, implement an inclusion

strategy, and continue Aboriginal cultural awareness training; to continue to provide HR support to transformational change initiatives across government; and to improve health and safety through the psychological health and safety in the workplace standards, continued support of the corporate health and safety plan, and the Be At Work program.

Continuous improvement. The Public Service Commission underwent a number of continuous improvement projects in 2016-17. The PSC Client. Perhaps the most notable is PSC Client, an employee portal system that has been instrumental in enhancing client service and improving business processes related to payroll and benefits for government employees and managers. This is an easy-to-use, web-based application accessible from any Internet-connected device that allows employees to self-manage their own employee information.

The PSC launched the PSC Client in early 2015 and has since added a number of features including the ability for employees to change their home address, work email address, phone number, and emergency contact information; to obtain their T4s electronically; to review their vacation and sick leave balances and utilization; and to view their current employment information and pay stubs. A manager portal allows managers to view necessary personal and employment information on their direct reports including vacation and sick leave balances. The PSC Client is being embraced by government employees. The majority of employees have now signed on to the PSC Client platform.

Electronic time cards. A new electric time card system was implemented April 1st, 2017 that allows employees or delegates to submit time worked and taken. This then goes through an automated approval and data process update, removing the need for manual data entry by more than 800 timekeepers in ministries across government. Future enhancements are indeed planned. PSC Client and electronic time cards are ways that the PSC is using technology and innovation to create efficiencies and deliver improved service to their clients. The estimated cost savings to date is \$627,000.

In conclusion, as part of the 2017-18 budget address, the Finance minister introduced the concept of meeting the challenge. Reducing public sector compensation is one of the requirements needed to address the province's fiscal challenge as outlined in the budget. There is an expectation that a 3.5 total compensation reduction target will be achieved across the public sector. This equates to \$250 million. Employers and unions have been asked to work together to find solutions to achieve total compensation cost savings.

Compensation for out-of-scope employees will also be impacted. The collective bargaining process will determine how this goal will be achieved. The Public Service Commission is the employer's representative for executive government at the bargaining table and is the lead in this process. We appreciate this is not pleasant news for public service employees, and we will continue to keep our employees updated with information as available and as appropriate within the context of the collective bargaining process. We understand that once final decisions are concluded, ministry budgets will be adjusted accordingly. In the meantime, to respect the bargaining process, I will not speculate on the outcome.

[15:15]

As the Government of Saskatchewan embarks on meeting the challenge, the strategic advice and guidance of the Public Service Commission will be more important than ever to ensure we have the right people with the right skills delivering the right programs and services to the citizens of Saskatchewan.

The PSC has a challenging set of priorities outlined in 2017-18, as does the rest of government. I am proud of the PSC's accomplishments and confident in the work that is planned for the coming year. With that, I conclude my remarks, Madam Chair, and am happy to answer any questions you or any member of the committee may have.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. I just ask that if you have your officials responding to a question for the first time that they state their name for the purposes of *Hansard*. And I'll now open the floor to questions. I recognize Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We do indeed have a question or two from the official opposition in terms of the estimates for the Public Service Commission and the work this important body performs.

I guess, so first off, Mr. Minister, Madam Chair, your officials, through yourselves to the men and women of the public service, we extend our thanks and our appreciation for the work that is done day in, day out. And I guess we'll pick up where the minister left off, in terms of meeting the challenge and the assignment of finding 3.5 per cent reduction in overall compensation, amounting to 250 million. Can the minister or officials describe to the committee why that figure was selected?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much to the member for the question, and certainly it's an important one. It's part of the budgetary process that takes place every year in government and has so for all time. In being part of a budgetary process, certain financial targets are put in place, and this year the target was a reduction in salary of 3.5 per cent and with accumulated total value of \$250 million.

As explained by the Finance minister on budget day and since that time, that's the amount of money necessary to ensure that the government meets its three-year strategic plan financially and puts the Government of Saskatchewan on a solid footing going forward.

Mr. McCall: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. We certainly have some understanding of the process, but if you could tell us a bit more about how the figure, the amount of 250 million, 3.5 per cent reduction in overall compensation for the public service, how was that arrived at? What's the rationale?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. As the member will know, the overall theme in this budget is fairness, fairness for all in how we meet the challenges that are before government. And in a fair and systematic way the Finance minister was able to present some tax decreases, some tax increases, some changes in the way calculations are made. And certainly part of that process, as he indicated right from the very beginning, would be a

compensation factor for public service employees, all employees all across government. It was very important as we began the session that cabinet ministers and MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly] showed leadership by taking that initiative and saying that we will do our part. Since that time, very senior leaders in government have done the same.

It was all part of meeting the goal of \$250 million which Finance and the Finance minister has determined would be the fair and equitable amount that employees could undertake, to work towards the fairness and the overall budget totals that were needed. So that's, in a nutshell, how that amount has been determined. And certainly in conversations that I've had with different public servants and others, it is seen to be a fair and equitable amount.

Mr. McCall: — Mr. Speaker . . . or Mr. Minister; not to change your assignment there, Mr. Minister, in terms of what is fair and equitable for the public service, the public service has been through in recent history an exercise that saw the overall size of the public service reduced by, I believe it was 15 per cent, if not 16 per cent. There's some variation in what was planned. But certainly the workforce adjustment exercise that the public service was subjected to, there were a lot of wrenching decisions involved in that particular exercise, Mr. Minister. And that was certainly before we got into transformational change or meeting the challenge or however this latest round of requests that is being made of the public service came around.

And again the minister references the MLAs and cabinet. While the public service was being reduced in overall size by 16 per cent, the number of MLAs in this Assembly was being increased. So again we've had differences of opinion on who should be at the front of that line in terms of meeting the challenge and in terms of the measures that should be taken. But if it is indeed about being fair and equitable, surely to goodness there should be some recognition made of the wrenching reductions that the public service has already been through. Would the minister agree with that or not?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Well thanks very much for the question. And certainly, you know, our commitment as a government has always been to use taxpayers' dollars in the most efficient way possible. And the size of the Saskatchewan public service, relative to our population when we became government, was quite high, and government at that time felt it necessary to ensure that that efficient use of taxpayers' resources was looked at in every which way, within every ministry, and certainly within the Public Service Commission.

From the Public Service Commission's responsibility, it meant meeting certain targets that reduced the size of the public service. This was done over a four-year period. The targets, I believe, were fair and were done in such a way over time that, you know, attrition could be used. And those targets were met and, you know, the overall theme to ensure was that public service to the people of Saskatchewan hasn't been affected by doing that.

So it was done in such a way to ensure that the good service that Saskatchewan residents receive from their public service continues, albeit with less individuals. And we thank the members of the public service for meeting that challenge, to

taking on that challenge led by senior administrators across the government, and I think we're better for it.

And certainly that was in a time when we had balanced budgets and surpluses but, at the same time, we felt it necessary to ensure the efficient use of those resources. That continues today as we want to see the most efficient use and a fair and equitable budget. So I think the two go hand in hand and, you know, once again we're asking not only public service providers but people across Saskatchewan to work with us.

We're had 10 years of growth and development. Now we're faced with a fiscal challenge of resource revenue being down \$1.3 billion, and we all have to share in that, whether you're a private sector company that's going to be paying some additional PST [provincial sales tax] or whether you're a government worker that's going to see some reduction in your wage. We're all doing that.

But at the end of day, I believe, we'll be better off. We'll be in a position that will be the envy of some of our neighbouring provinces when we're able to balance that budget and have a firm, solid footing going forward.

Mr. McCall: — Again, Mr. Minister, I think that in the public service, you'd referenced the valuable work that they do, right off the top, and we certainly agree with that.

But in terms of, you know, the rank-and-file public service feeling set upon by this government in terms of having been through a reduction in numbers in positions in the good times, and now that the bad times are here being sized up for a 3.5 per cent reduction on top of marginal wage gains throughout that period that the minister references as well, I guess it leads to a question around, what sort of work do you do to examine the question of morale in the public service? I know in the annual report there are targets assigned around retention within the public service. But what's the sense on the part of the minister of morale amongst public servants in the province of Saskatchewan today?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. The member is touching on an important area of the public service. It's one that is continuously gauged and monitored. Certainly engagement surveys are done in this government and governments in all provinces, and we compare ourselves to other provinces. And what we find with those engagement surveys is that we are slightly ahead of other provinces, as far as a positive feedback on engagement strategies.

And what the government works towards is cultural engagement, recognition, all kinds of different activities. And certainly I have lists here that I can go into more detail on, to increased employee communication, investments in learning and development, and many, many other areas. So we see it as a priority. We see as our job to ensure that that morale continues to be positive.

We find the attrition rate in the province of Saskatchewan is above what it is in other provinces and so, you know, we're in a very good position. We continue to monitor it very closely because, you know, granted, times are a little bit tougher now

than they were over the last few years, but we continue to listen very closely and have those communications with employees to understand what their needs are and to do as much as we can in light of the less dollars that are available.

[15:30]

Mr. McCall: — Is there any survey work that's done with the employees that asks the question, do you feel valued by your employer, the provincial government? Is there anything done in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. I'm told that in asking questions of employees in the engagement, that very question about do you feel valued is not specifically one of the questions. But certainly there are questions about just general satisfaction with their jobs and opportunities, questions if they are contemplating leaving government for other employers. That's something that you'll want to monitor for sure to make sure that there isn't a spike in that regard.

An important question is, do you feel engaged with the goals of the Government of Saskatchewan? Do you feel that the work that you are doing is contributing to the overall goals? And we're very satisfied with the numbers that we receive, and certainly we'll be monitoring them very closely going forward.

Mr. McCall: — Can the minister share that survey with the committee?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. I'm told we don't have the entire information here with us. But the way it's compiled is each ministry is asked to provide that information, and then it's put together. But I would undertake to get that information for the members as soon as possible.

Mr. McCall: — Thanks very much, Mr. Minister. We appreciate the undertaking. When was the figure of \$250 million arrived at as what was looked to be achieved through cuts to wages and benefits? Is that part of the transformational change exercise, and is the minister on that committee of cabinet? Or was this a treasury board directive? Or is this a decision of the public sector compensation committee of cabinet? Or did the Legislative Secretary for — I'm forgetting the proper title — for the public sector . . . Like how was this figure arrived at?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Well thanks for the question. There was certainly no magic to it. It was arrived at by, you know, cabinet. And I'm not going to get into cabinet discussions here, but just to give you an overall flavour that, you know, the Finance minister was able to provide the dollars that encompass part of the budget, the very, very large part of the budget that is salaries. And Finance officials and others that advise the Finance minister felt that \$250 million would be an adequate complement of salary dollars to ensure the fairness again of the entire budgetary process.

And so it was part of the budgetary process. You know, figures they tend to go up and down a bit when you're working through the budgetary process, but \$250 million again is three and a half

per cent. And it was felt that that would be a fair number for employees of the Government of Saskatchewan to contribute.

Mr. McCall: — As year one of a three-year plan, are there additional amounts assigned for years two and three of the plan to be achieved in savings from total compensation and benefits . . . wages and benefits, pardon me.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. And of course, you know, the 3.5 per cent reduction will continue into the future. So the one-time 3.5 per cent of course will continue to contribute those dollars going forward in ensuring that the Finance minister can meet his goals.

As was laid out in the budget documents, there is targets going forward, and those are the targets that the Public Service Commission will work towards achieving.

Mr. McCall: — But there's nothing for the record of yet?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Pardon me?

Mr. McCall: — Am I understanding correctly that there are no amounts that have been assigned in a similar fashion to years two and three in terms of what the public service will be looked to in terms of additional savings for year two and three or additional cuts?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. There's nothing else that's been asked for at this time. Certainly the 3.5 per cent, there's a lot of work to achieve that in front of us, and that's the target. That's the goal, and that's what will be worked on. And the rest of it will be just holding the line.

Mr. McCall: — Can the minister describe for the committee . . . And I don't say this to be unkind or anything like that. But we're joined as well by what I understand is the Legislative Secretary for public sector bargaining, the member from Kelvington-Wadena. So I know he's a fine poet, but can the minister describe for the committee how that member interfaces with the work of the Public Service Commission or with the public sector bargaining committee or how that works? And again, I ask this question here because this is the only chance we have to find out what legislative secretaries are doing.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much. It's a bit of an interesting question, you know: what do you really think of your colleague? So absolutely I see him here smiling, and I know he will continue to smile after my answer because, you know, the member from Kelvington-Wadena is one of several members that was just elected in the last election who has brought a great talent and skill to our caucus. Many individuals that were successful in the last election came from varied backgrounds and were able to help us as we rounded out our caucus and replaced members that have been in this legislature for a long time. So they had big shoes to fill.

The member from Kelvington-Wadena was part of the cabinet committee on public sector bargaining, a committee that I sit on as well, so I get the opportunity to watch him in action quite often. And you know, what I find is that he is a very detailed individual, someone who reads his material thoroughly, asks

very pointed and tough questions, whether it's a minister in an internal committee or whether it's, you know, committees that are operating within meetings and the like.

So you know, joining him is the member from Canora as well, who sits on the cabinet committee. You know, something that the Premier felt very strongly about is the involvement of private members in different committees, cabinet committees and others, so all members, caucus members, have an opportunity to see the working of those committees and to really contribute. And in this case, the member for Kelvington-Wadena has made a great contribution and is certainly a person that thoroughly understands and brings a background from his private sector life to this committee. So I see that as a great, great help to our committee.

We have some very big challenges ahead of us. We've reached out to our union friends and said they will indeed need to help us meet those goals. And this committee is tasked with a lot of that and certainly the member for Kelvington-Wadena does his part and is a very, very positive part of the committee.

Mr. McCall: — Well mark that down, Mr. Minister. Thanks for that explanation. In terms of the work of a body like the public sector bargaining committee of cabinet, in terms of even the goal of 3.5 per cent reduction in wages and benefits or in total compensation out to ministries, out to different Crown corporations, government agencies, how was that communicated out to your different ministries, again as the central agency, the Public Service Commission having this coordinating role to perform? In terms of estimates that we've been party to, you know . . . And certainly I appreciated one thing about the Parks, Culture and Sport estimates, is that the minister had the amount that was being assigned to the out-of-scope employees and the amount that was being assigned to the in-scope employees and then, you know, what the overall objective was for Parks, Culture and Sport overall.

That's not been the case across these estimates. There seems to be some confusion as to what's going to happen. Has the word gone forth to each ministry? And I guess if the minister could supply a bit of a status report in terms of, is everybody in executive government on the same page as regards this goal of government?

[15:45]

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. In my earlier answer, I didn't mention that the Finance minister chairs the cabinet committee on the public sector. And the way it works, like ministers or ministries don't do the bargaining. The Public Service Commission as a whole has that responsibility. We have the responsibility of oversight. And the Government of Saskatchewan, as the funder, provides direction to us, and that's communicated under signature of the Finance minister to the different ministries once a direction is given from the committee.

Mr. McCall: — Just for clarification, when was that direction given?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Again, thanks very much for the question. You know, the cabinet committee on public sector

bargaining is in charge of the negotiations that will need to take place. The parameters are given by cabinet, but the overall direction that the minister asks for, is that indeed was given by the budget itself. So the budget gives the direction. The parameters are given by cabinet, and the cabinet committee is responsible for the negotiations that are just getting under way.

Mr. McCall: — So we'd heard different things about, you know, would it be out-of-scope employees settled first or in-scope employees settled first over the course of the estimates for the budget? In one case, we dealt with a government agency that has zero for an in-scope complement, that said it was waiting for the collective agreements to be settled across executive government before it proceeded. We've heard different things in terms of what the approach is in that regard.

But we do know for certain that this goal of \$250 million has been established. Can the minister provide for the committee . . . And I guess we're aware of the \$280,000 of savings that was identified with the 3.5 per cent being applied to CEOs [chief executive officer] and deputy ministers, and presumably the Chair of the Public Service Commission last week. I think 280,000 was the figure attached to that. I stand to be corrected, but there's roughly \$200,000 attached to the 3.5 per cent reduction being applied to cabinet and MLAs. So that would put us in and around \$500,000 accomplished of a \$250 million goal.

Are there other savings on the board, or reductions or cuts on the board that we're not aware of? Can the minister provide us a status update in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much for the question. The member indicated amounts of \$280,000 and \$200,000 for chief executives and MLAs respectively. And I'm told that those are close, without having the exact amounts here right now, that those are certainly close. The target for the Public Service Commission out of the \$250 million will be \$35 million. That would be the portion that has to be achieved by the Public Service Commission.

And you know, the member says that he's been hearing different things. I'm not sure where that is coming from but, you know, I can certainly let him know that employers and unions have been asked to work together to find solutions to achieve total compensation cost savings. Compensation for out-of-scope employees will also be impacted. The collective bargaining process will determine how this goal will be achieved. And I think you'll hear the same thing from each and every minister involved.

Mr. McCall: — Okay. In terms of, again there's sort of . . . There's going to be respect for the public sector bargaining framework or collective bargaining process and labour rights but — that is certainly talked about — certainly one of your colleagues I'd asked, you know, was this going to be made up one way or the other? And he said that, you know, he didn't think he'd be going back to his colleagues to tell them that they couldn't find the 3.5 per cent. So effectively answering, yes, that the 3.5 per cent is a hard target. It's got to be found one way or the other.

Now I don't have an exhaustive familiarity with all the different

tables at play, but I do know that the request has gone forth, and in some cases has been, the answer has been no. So in terms of, be it the public sector bargaining committee of cabinet or cabinet itself, what's plan B if you can't achieve these things through the bargaining table? Are you going to go to the contingency fund to make up the \$250 million?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Well certainly I'm not going to get into that line of questioning in hypotheticals. What we have before us is a very hard target. It is one that's been set out from the Finance minister. It's been set out in the budget. It's 3.5 per cent. It's \$250 million, and it will be met.

Mr. McCall: — So the minister said, not going to get into whether or not this will be taken out of the contingency fund. Fair enough. Has the public sector bargaining committee or the minister begun consideration of what a legislated, imposed 3.5 per cent reduction would look like, how that would be arrived at? Has there been any legislative instruments under consideration by the minister or the public sector bargaining committee of cabinet or by cabinet itself? And you don't have to tell me about the content of those instruments, but has that measure been under consideration by the government?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Almost the entire focus of the committee has been on working with officials and to ensure that negotiations begin in earnest and that they take place following the collective bargaining process. So I can honestly say that that's been almost the entire content of those discussions and those meetings and what I've been working on as well as minister. So you know, beyond that I can't get into any further levels of discussion but I can say that, in all earnest, work is being done to ensure that the collective bargaining process is followed and those negotiations are going to be under way very shortly.

Mr. McCall: — Does the minister anticipate that the Assembly will be called back in the middle of summer to impose a legislated solution on bargaining?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Again I'm not going to speculate in that manner. Legislatures are called back in emergency situations. And certainly I think what we have here is a target and a plan to reach that target. So I think that work needs to begin, and it will do so in the next little while. And I am anticipating that those professionals that are bargaining on behalf of the government will do their job and that it'll be done within the rules and the laws of the province of Saskatchewan. And I anticipate those goals will be met.

Mr. McCall: — So for those who have closed collective agreements, they are off the table. Am I understanding the implications of what the minister's saying in that regard?

[16:00]

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. Conversations will indeed take place with unions that have closed contracts, and those conversations will entail seeing if we can achieve the savings that are necessary. So those discussions will be attempted in earnest.

Mr. McCall: — Again though, the minister's describing a

number of competing dynamics here in terms of if the \$250 million is a hard target, and the savings that have been achieved to date leave about \$249.5 million to go, and collective bargaining is to be respected, and the request is going forward to the different, you know, public servants, whether they're covered by a closed collective agreement or they're in the bargaining phase — how does this all add up? How does the hard target get met when again you've got any number of public servants who've already been through a 16 per cent reduction in the very recent history of their overall complement, and arguably were way ahead when it came to making a contribution to sorting out the fiscal situation of this government. So how does this all hang together, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question, and certainly I'm not going to speculate on what's going to happen at those bargaining tables. I can tell you that, you know, the government as funder has asked employers and unions to explore options to meet the target. And certainly the hope behind that direction is that the unions will co-operate to a certain extent, certainly bargain and negotiate as they do well, but at the end of the day realize that this is a target that is needed to be met to ensure the long-term financial stability of the province so we can continue to see the growth and the well-being that we have had over the last decade.

So you know, those discussions are needing to take place. We want those officials on both sides to explore each and every option and report back to us with a plan to meet the target.

Mr. McCall: — Thanks for that, Mr. Minister. In terms of lean, is lean still a responsibility that attaches in some way, shape, or form to the Public Service Commission, or has lean sort of faded into the sunset?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. Lean is actually implemented by the Ministry of Finance, and that's under their jurisdiction. You know, my understanding, it's one of the many tools that are used to explore the continuous improvement of government. We've seen different items of lean come forward with different degrees of success, but certainly it's a feature that is used by governments around the world to varying degrees. It's been used here in the past, and again, it's the purview of the Ministry of Finance to use it as a tool going forward.

Mr. McCall: — One last question and then we'll wrap, Mr. Minister. Just the goals that are set around for engagement of First Nations and Métis people with the public service, the Human Rights Commission goal of 14 per cent is accepted.

There's some reference to the work that's being done around Aboriginal cultural awareness throughout executive government. What does that work consist of? Is it similar to the old Aboriginal employment development program work that was conducted a few years back now or how does that ... What's the status of that work?

Does the minister have confidence that we'll hit the goal of 14 per cent First Nations, Métis employment in the public service and how is the ... Are things like the Aboriginal Government Employees' Network looking forward to continuing? How is that all impacted?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. And yes, it is an important one, and it's certainly one that we review and talk about a great deal. And its targets that the member mentioned are 14 per cent. Over the last three years, it's been in the 10 to 11 per cent range, so there is some work to do still, but that work is being done.

Aboriginal cultural awareness training is expected of each employee. The Aboriginal Government Employees' Network still operates and is engaged. But what direction we've been going in the last little while is more facing inward, ensuring that the operation of the government is a welcoming place for First Nations individuals to learn about the culture, learn about how that transition takes place, and making an environment where Aboriginal people want to stay in the government and continue their career.

Government has been a great place for many Aboriginal people to come and to learn and to move on to the private sector and to their own businesses as well. But we feel the way to get this number up is to ensure that they feel comfortable in the work and that they can see a long-term career strategy within the ministry. So I'm confident that good work is being done. Would I'd like to see these numbers higher? Absolutely. And that's why we set targets, and they're there to guide us into the future. And our guide will be working towards 14 per cent.

Madam Chair, I have one thing I'd like to clarify. In an earlier question, I said that the attrition rate is slightly lower than other jurisdictions. The attrition rate is slightly lower than other jurisdictions. I indicated that it was slightly higher, and that was my misinterpretation there. So the attrition rate is slightly lower than other jurisdictions in Saskatchewan.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. McCall, for your questions, and thank you, Minister, for your responses. We will now vote on 33, Public Service Commission, central management and services, subvote (PS01) in the amount of 5,008,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Human resource service centre, subvote (PS06) in the amount of 10,942,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Employee relations and strategic human resource services, subvote (PS04) in the amount of 9,856,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Human resource consulting services, subvote (PS03) in the amount of 8,139,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 350,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Public Service Commission, vote 33, in the amount of 33,945,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2018, the following sums for Public Service Commission in the amount of 33,945,000.

Mr. Kaeding so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. That concludes our business with the Public Service Commission. Mr. Minister, do you have any closing comments you'd like to make?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Just a thank you to the opposition critic for his questioning. Questions were very thoughtful and to the point, and I think taxpayers were well served by this session. So I thank him for that. I thank all committee members and I appreciate your indulgence, Madam Chair. And thank you to all my officials as well.

The Chair: — Mr. McCall, if you would like to make any closing comments.

Mr. McCall: — Just thanks to you, Madam Chair, Clerk-at-the-Table, committee members, and certainly minister and officials, and certainly through you, to the men and women of the Saskatchewan public service. You do so many important things for all of us. Thanks.

The Chair: — All right. Thank you. We will take a brief recess right now just to change officials. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[16:15]

Bill No. 50 — *The Provincial Capital Commission Act*

Clause 1-1

The Chair: — All right, committee members, we will now begin our consideration of Bill No. 50, *The Provincial Capital Commission Act*. Minister Tell, if you would like to begin by introducing your officials and making any opening comments you wish.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yes. To my left is Nancy Cherney, assistant deputy minister. To my right is Richard Murray, deputy minister, Central Services. And sitting in behind is Kirsten Felber, chief of staff.

Good afternoon. Thank you for having us here today and for the opportunity to say a few opening remarks. Wascana Centre has been the very heart of our capital city for many, many years. Whether you're from Regina or a tourist visiting the capital city, it's hard to imagine an attraction that offers more to the thousands of people that flock to the centre every year.

I know that the citizens of Saskatchewan count themselves

lucky to have an urban oasis as spectacular as this park, one that also serves as home to the symbolic centre of our province's democracy: our legislative buildings. For those and many other reasons, our citizens are very protective of the park and all it represents. To them, it is a place for family, a place for sports enthusiasts, a place for nature lovers, a place for gathering, and a source of personal pride for their capital city and their province.

My colleagues and I share these very sentiments. We want what's best for Wascana Park, and that was the reason why we brought Bill 50 forward. Our interests are to serve Wascana Centre and ensure it is well maintained for future generations.

As demonstrated in the comprehensive review, the park's condition has been deteriorating to a point of significant concern. Many of the landscapes, infrastructure, and buildings are characterized in the review as being in poor or fair condition. Simply put, many of them are past their intended life cycle.

The review also validated that in the next 20 years the centre will need \$54 million in infrastructure upgrades and \$27 million in building replacement costs. An important decision needed to be made on the best way to preserve the legacy of this beautiful park in the heart of our capital city.

We considered the comprehensive review and its recommendations very thoroughly before proceeding with the development of legislation. The highlights of the new legislation are, a new advisory board structure involving the city and the university, with the government assuming overall responsibility for the centre; the assets and the staff at Wascana Centre Authority will be joining the Provincial Capital Commission; a defined financial obligation from the partners for common areas; the partners financially committing to upkeep of their own lands; and continued updating of the master plan.

I do want to point out that the review and the recommendations have already been informing decision making in Wascana Centre for the past several years. It is a credible and highly informative review and the partners in management of the WCA, Wascana Centre Authority, refer to the findings regularly to prioritize work and investments in the park as best they can.

The board accepted the report and provided it to government for consideration. Government received the recommendations and developed a model that it believes will accomplish the goals and vision that were described through the comprehensive review process. As you know, this direction came under budget consideration, meaning it was confidential until it was released on budget day. Since it was announced on budget day, we have worked with our partners to incorporate their feedback and further refine the Act.

The changes we've made to reflect their feedback were, to clarify the process for appointing representatives to the board; allow for the appointment of alternate members who will have the full authority to act if the member is not present at one of the advisory board meetings; exempt the university from bylaws restricting sporting and recreational activities within

Wascana Centre, an exemption they actually held under the previous Act; specify that it is the advisory board that is responsible for overseeing the process for setting annual budgets for shared costs within the centre; include the requirement for a reasonable notice period to be provided to all members and alternates for upcoming meetings.

In the spirit of approaching the next phase of our relationship in a positive and effective way, I'm pleased these changes are now reflected in the bill. There are other virtues of the new bill I want to share with the committee. There are more freedoms for the partners, who are also the landowners in *The Provincial Capital Commission Act* as opposed to under the Wascana Centre Authority Act.

The new legislation allows the partners to make upgrades and enhancements to their own lands and properties without having to go through several decision-making layers. That alone means the park will be better maintained because investments can happen more quickly and will be at the landowners' discretion.

I've taken some time to acknowledge the virtues of the bill, and I've talked about the excellent collaboration we've had with the city and the university to ensure that the bill reflects their suggestion. We acknowledge that some may have concerns about the future of the park and what this new legislation might mean. I think that's to be expected with a large-scale change such as this.

I assure the committee today that we've made the decision to assume responsibility of Wascana Centre and to ensure that it is well cared for. We do not plan to undo that by allowing development that doesn't fit with the park and doesn't benefit its citizens. We are committed to the master plan process, a process which has always guided the development of structures, infrastructure, and landscapes in the park, and we will continue to do so.

Wascana Centre is a jewel on our prairie landscape and has come to be beloved by Saskatchewan people and visitors alike. The intent of this legislation is to safeguard and enhance this legacy for generations yet to come. Thank you. I'd be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. I'll now open the floor to any questions and recognize Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: — Thanks very much, Madam Chair. Madam Minister, earlier in your remarks you'd stated that or you'd referenced the governance report that came up with the recommendation that is the crux of the matter here today.

The concept of a Provincial Capital Commission is one that's been around for many years, and you know, it has a lot to recommend it. But that that should be utilized to take a partnership that worked for 55 years in the Wascana Centre Authority and the way that that board was balanced between three appointees from the university, three appointees from the city, and five appointees from the provincial government; and replaced with one appointee for the city, one appointee for the university, and three appointees for the province, whereby the power sharing that existed in that board is effectively taken over by the province is not acceptable, is not something that is called

for by the city or by the university. Or indeed, the minister had used the word “accepted.”

So just to make sure that we’ve got all the facts correct here, the governance committee goes out, authors a report, comes back with the model that contains this recommendation to change the power balance on committee. The minister said that that report had been accepted by the Wascana Centre Authority. What does the minister mean by accepted?

[16:30]

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Before we get to your specific question at the end of your preamble, I’m going to address the comments in your preamble. Currently the parks infrastructure, which includes buildings, roadways, sidewalks, etc., needs extensive maintenance, renovation, or even replacement. Necessary maintenance dollars and capital have not kept pace with current and future needs.

The study highlighted . . . And this is coming directly from the study: 35 per cent of building assets met or surpassed their life cycle. Thirteen per cent of buildings have less than 10 years of remaining life. Fifteen per cent of buildings have less than 20 years of remaining life. Four buildings were in good condition. Four were in adequate condition, and 14 in poor condition. The capital required to repair or update the building portfolio would cost 4.64 million immediately and \$27 million over the next 20 years to replace or update the buildings.

There’s also a lack of clarity amongst the funding partners about who is actually responsible for maintenance and capital investments in the centre, resulting again in the centre’s upkeep being underfunded.

The fiscal challenges faced by the Wascana Centre Authority have resulted in investments being scaled back and limited to routine operations such as grass cutting and snow clearing, etc., managing and regulating activities in the park, and making capital investments only when infrastructure failure occurs or public safety is at risk. This has created a problem of needed maintenance in the centre being delayed. This is clearly not sustainable and is symptomatic of a broken funding and governance model. The switch to a more streamlined governance model is not a matter of control, but rather a matter of ensuring that limited dollars are spent wisely in the park for the benefit of their citizens.

With respect to the report being sent from the board, from the Wascana Centre Authority to government:

The draft report was received by the Authority’s board, however not approved, pending receipt of the Government of Saskatchewan’s perspective.

There is a number of paragraphs in here that speak to governance and communication:

The current consensus [as written by the board], is that the four principles articulated in the report remain valid. Landowners must be accountable for the operation . . . Wascana Centre’s vision must encapsulate what the province, city, and university strive to achieve together.

There is a need to be open and transparent to the public. A precinct approach . . . can help inform uses for different sections of land area within Wascana Centre.

This is all from the review that was done:

The above points [that I just read] remain fully endorsed [and this is written by the board to the minister of the day] as is the mandate articulated in *The Wascana Centre Act*.

Wascana Centre Authority’s Board of Directors presents the recommendations from the draft report as an option to be considered. However in light of the progress made in the intervening years . . . [which of course I alluded or I spoke to directly, that the board has continued to use this report to facilitate their decision making] the board would also support other alternatives such as continuing with the existing unique partnership model that was formalized in 1962.

The board accepted the report and provided it to government for consideration. Government received the recommendations and developed a model that it believes will accomplish the goals and vision that were described through the comprehensive review and its consultative process. As you know, this direction became budget consideration.

So suffice it to say that the Wascana Centre Authority took their time that they needed to go over the report, this extensive report, and then presented it to the minister of the day asking us to, you know, consider the report and come forward with our recommendations.

Mr. McCall: — Two things: could the minister, under rule 52, table that correspondence with the committee?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Of course we’ll make that available.

Mr. McCall: — When?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — I guess, when do you want it?

Mr. McCall: — No time like the present, Madam Minister.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Well we’ll certainly hand it over.

Mr. McCall: — So again in terms of what the minister is characterizing as acceptance, this committee accepts correspondence. It accepts documents to be tabled. And that’s a very different thing from a vote of endorsement or a vote of policy.

Can the minister provide to the committee any such documentation on the part of the Wascana Centre Authority where they have endorsed the recommendation that the power-sharing arrangement on Wascana Centre Authority be changed to what the minister is talking about here today — moving from, again, three appointees on the part of the city, three from the university, five from provincial government, to one from the city, one from the university, and three from the provincial government? Can the minister provide documentation in that regard or substantiate what she’s saying around acceptance?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The review and its recommendations have, even without formal endorsement from the partners, informed decision making in Wascana Centre, meaning that this is a credible and highly informative review and the partners and management of WCA, Wascana Centre Authority, refer to the findings regularly to make decisions about the park. The logical next step was to address the governance aspect.

As I said earlier, the board accepted the report and provided it to government for consideration. Government received the recommendations as contained in the report and developed a model that it believes will accomplish the goals and vision that were described throughout the comprehensive review and its consultative process. And of course this was a budget bill, and as it was being developed was under budget secrecy.

I just find it interesting that . . . Yes. I mean the University of Regina agrees with the decision made by the province. Dave Button, VP [vice-president] of administration, he says, “In many ways the changes are actually strengthening the recognition of how important this park and this jewel in the crown of Regina is to the people of Saskatchewan.”

So we utilized the report that was provided to us by the board and utilized it to develop the legislation that is before us today.

Mr. McCall: — So asking the question another way: in terms of, you know, again the use or misuse of broad quotes from someone like David Button . . . Can the minister provide to the committee any documentation of the university or the city of Regina explicitly endorsing the power-sharing model on the board that’s being proposed in this legislation? Can the minister provide that to the committee?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — As I said earlier, is that the Wascana Centre Authority had ample opportunity and took ample opportunity to review the comprehensive review that was done by an independent group of qualified individuals. The report is highly credible and highly informative. The report was presented to government, and government made the decision to accept and adopt the recommendations in the report. And as a result, there was the legislation that we’re talking about here today.

Mr. McCall: — Again, I get that the province has made decisions around how they want to proceed here. But in terms of what is the very structure of a partnership that has worked for 55 years, you would think if this was such a great idea that the minister would be able to substantiate the acceptance on the part of the university and the city or Wascana Centre Authority itself, through a formal motion of that board, the acceptance of the governance model that’s proposed here. And the minister has not been able to do that, and the minister doesn’t have a mandate to do that.

[16:45]

Budget secrecy notwithstanding, the minister can’t point to a Wascana Centre Authority motion of endorsement of the governance model. She can’t provide the committee with the permission of the partners, in the case of the city of Regina and the University of Regina, for the governance model.

And to proceed in a manner where you put, you essentially take

over what has been a successful 55-year partnership and has, for better or worse, seen the Wascana Centre Authority be so well beloved by the people of this province, that they would do that without the permission from the partners, again speaks to an impulse on the part of this government to control, to want to run everything that’s, you know, is not substantiated by what the minister’s produced here in committee today or in estimates.

So one last, one last try, Madam Chair. Can the minister provide substantiation of her sort of implication that the takeover of the Wascana Centre Authority board under the Provincial Capital Commission legislation is anything but the province doing exactly what it wants against the expressed wishes of their partners in the university and the city?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — I think it’s important to note that in the comprehensive review, a number of times the report references and speaks very directly to the recommendation of the province assuming responsibility for Wascana Park. And I also must correct something here in one of your comments that you made, is that the Wascana Centre Authority is beloved, and that is not accurate at all. I believe that most people that live in the city and visit this park would say that the park is the beloved part of Regina, not necessarily Wascana Centre Authority.

The change will introduce a new governance model. The province will take on the management and operation as per the comprehensive review and operation of Wascana Centre. The current Wascana Centre partners — the city, university, and the province — will continue to have input through a board structure overseeing the work of the Provincial Capital Commission.

The results of this review further showed simplification of the governance and operation of Wascana Centre would provide opportunities to advance the vision. Securing statutory protection of the lands and the land use should be pursued. Being open to the pursuit of revenue opportunities should be encouraged. And of course, the citizen experience matters.

So with assuming the responsibility for the park, we still have our partners as part of an advisory board. Our goal is always that this park will have the stated input of both the city, the province, and the Government of Saskatchewan, overarched by a memorandum of understanding to ensure that all partners, including the government, understand the nature of the advisory board.

This is not the Wascana Centre Authority. It will no longer exist. The streamlining approach of decision making, the multi-layers of decision-making process were also mentioned in the report. And as such, this board, advisory board will consist of three government members, one city, and one with the university, and with an overarching memorandum of understanding.

Mr. McCall: — I guess, Madam Minister, how is it that if you can be as, you know, sort of precise as to take exception to Wascana Centre and Wascana Centre Authority being used interchangeably, how is it if that’s a big problem that you can’t substantiate the permission on the part of the partners for the governance model that you’re proposing here today that is central to this legislation? If you’re that precise and that detail

oriented, you'd think that that should be quite easily accomplished if that was what was here today. But that's not the case.

This government is proceeding, not with the endorsement of the partners, not with the support of the partners, but over their objection. They're taking over a 55-year partnership that, for better or worse, has served the people of Saskatchewan well. And they won't even own up to that. So you'll forgive me if I don't take a lot of solace from the notion that there's going to be some kind of memorandum of understanding that's going to secure the input on the part of the partners who've had that input secured in legislation in the Wascana Centre Authority Act for 55 years.

So I guess my question is to the minister, like at least own up to the fact that you're doing this against the wishes of your partners in the Wascana Centre Authority. At least admit that.

Mr. Murray: — Richard Murray. I'll say as a former board member, the reviews were conducted at the time. The recommendations were supported. They were not formally endorsed by the board but they were certainly supported by the board. They certainly were used to inform decision making on the part of the board and the Wascana Centre Authority in terms of activities over the next several years.

The review and recommendations were then provided to government for further direction and consideration. Our direction from government has been to proceed with all of the recommendations contained within the governance report, which would include streamlining of the board and more efficient, effective decision making in all regards.

[17:00]

I'll just make a note, you know, there's a \$54 million shortfall on infrastructure, \$16.7 million shortfall on buildings that are quite pressing. We've got sewer lines collapsing underground. We've got electrical lines failing, irrigation systems that are going to require replacements. Just today I provided approval on a paving and sewer line emergency replacement right out here in front of this very building.

And so my ministry maintains and operates 750 buildings in 137 communities. It's what we do for a living. We've got a large staff. We've got maintenance people. We've got building operators. We've got plumbers and electricians and painters. And so I have to believe it's more efficient for the province to provide that maintenance operations within the park on our own lands, provincially owned lands, as it is for the city on city-owned lands, university on university-owned lands, rather than providing that pool of funding to a third party agency who will then prioritize on our behalf.

We've expended \$14.38 million over the last 10 years over and above the dollars that are provided to Wascana Centre Authority; the 3.6 million that was provided in the most recent year, for example — everything from emergency repaving of roads and replacement of underground infrastructures and lighting in the park — over and above the allocation that's provided to Wascana Centre. And so I believe there is a lot of merit in the report, in terms of governance recommendations, in

terms of a new governance model, and a plan for advisory commitment by the original Wascana Centre Authority partners and stakeholders, with partners remaining responsible for the stewardship of land and structures that they own within the centre.

And we will come to an agreement in terms of shared or common lands within the park. A working group has already been formed. I believe we've got our first working group committee going here within the next week or so, and we'll sort out the details in terms of memorandum of understanding and terms of reference for the advisory board. I hope that's helpful to you.

Mr. McCall: — And you know, at the centre of this is the question of governance and the move on the part of this government to take over the Wascana Centre. And one of the great, one of the critical things to good governance is that the governors should govern with the consent of the governed. And you're taking a 55-year partnership with a power-sharing agreement that has worked, that has served the interests on which the province had a plurality, but that wasn't enough. You have to move to an outright majority.

And again, I've asked again and again to have the sort of misdirection around whether or not the Wascana Centre Authority has endorsed this model . . . They have not. And certainly the letter that was provided as somehow in aid of that argument does not endorse the governance model. The partners themselves have not endorsed the governance model.

So again, this legislation, the government's bound and determined that it should proceed. But it does so against the . . . by turning the concept of partnership, by turning 55 years of successful partnership right on its head. And it won't be forgotten anytime soon. I've asked the minister to substantiate the different things she's said here in the committee, and she's not been able to do it.

So I don't know how much better we're served to carry on here, Madam Chair. But we've asked for evidence. We've asked for proof. We've asked for substantiation of the consent on the part of the other partners, and they can't provide it because that consent isn't there. This is this government bulling ahead, doing its own thing, taking control of a much-beloved park. And this won't be forgotten. With that, Madam Chair, I'd invite you to proceed as you need to do.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. McCall. I will just note for the record here that the document that was tabled today is CCA 40-28.

There being no further questions, it's my understanding that there are a number of proposed amendments on this bill. And so therefore I will be calling each clause separately and taking my time on them.

So part 1, Preliminary Matters, clause 1-1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clause 1-1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 1-2 to 2-2 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 2-3

The Chair: — Clause 2-3. I recognize Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: — Madam Chair, I'd like to move the following to clause 2-3 of the printed bill, that:

Subsections 2-3(1) to (4) of the Printed Bill are struck out and the following is substituted:

2-3 (1) The commission shall consist of eleven members:

(a) 5 of the members shall be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council;

(b) 3 of the members shall be appointed by resolution of the council of the city;

(c) 3 of the members shall be appointed by The Board of Governors of the university;

(2) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), a person appointed pursuant to this section:

(a) holds office at the pleasure of the respective participating party for a period not exceeding 3 years and, notwithstanding the expiry of his or her term, continues to hold office until his or her successor is appointed; and

(b) is eligible for reappointment.

(3) If a member dies or resigns, that person ceases to be a member on the date of death or on the date on which the resignation is received by the board, as the case may be.

(4) If a vacancy in a participating party's representation on the commission occurs the participating party may, having regard to the requirements of this section:

(a) appoint a person for the remainder of the term of the person who vacated the office; or

(b) appoint a person for the term mentioned in subsection (2).

Madam Chair, I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. McCall, in the lengthy amendment that you just provided, it appears that you are suggesting that there'll be an addition of new members to this board and that they be appointed, which would, I believe, incur some additional financial implications to this bill. So I rule that your amendment is out of order.

So going back to clause 2-3. Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Phillips: — Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would move the following amendment:

Amend Clause 2-3.

(a) in subsection (1) by striking out clauses (a) and (b) and substituting the following:

“(a) 1 person nominated by the city;

“(b) 1 person nominated by the university”;

(b) by adding the following subsection after subsection (1):

“(1.1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint for the member mentioned in:

(a) clause (1)(a) an alternate member nominated by the city; and

(b) clause (1)(b) an alternate member nominated by the university.

“(1.2) An alternate member mentioned in subsection (1.1):

(a) may act as a member when the member for whom the alternate member is appointed is unavailable or unable to act; and

(b) has all the powers of a member when acting as a member”;

(c) by striking out subsection (3) and substituting the following:

“(3) If a member or alternate dies or resigns, that the person ceases to be a member or alternate member on the date of death or on the date on which the resignation is received by the board, as the case may be”;

(d) in subsection (6) by striking out “is appointed as a member” and substituting “is appointed as a member or alternate member”; and

(e) in subsection (7) by striking out “is appointed as a member” and substituting “is appointed as a member or alternate member”.

The Chair: — Mr. Phillips has moved a number of amendments to clause 2-3. Do committee members agree with the amendments as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — Carried.

Mr. McCall: — On division.

The Chair: — On division. Just for the record, is clause 2-3 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — Carried on division.

[Clause 2-3 as amended agreed to on division.]

[Clauses 2-4 to 3-1 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 4-1

The Chair: — Under part 4, Powers re Wascana Centre, clause 4-1. I recognize Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Phillips: — Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would move the following amendment:

Clause 4-1 of the printed bill:

Amend Clause 4-1 in clause (1)(i) by adding “, except if they are part of university activities” after “other recreational activities”.

The Chair: — Mr. Phillips has moved:

Clause 4-1 of the printed bill:

Amend Clause 4-1 in clause (1)(i) by adding “, except if they are part of university activities” after “other recreational activities”.

[17:15]

The Chair: — Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 4-1 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 4-1 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 4-2 to 7-28 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 8-1

The Chair: — Part 8, Financial Provisions, division 1, Financial Matters concerning Wascana Centre. I recognize Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Phillips: — Madam Chair, I'd like to make the following amendment:

Amend Clause 8-1 by striking out “established by the commission” and substituting “established by the board”.

The Chair: — Mr. Phillips has moved clause 8-1 of the printed bill:

Amend Clause 8-1 by striking out “established by the commission” and substituting “established by the board”.

Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Is clause 8-1 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 8-1 as amended agreed to.]

Clause 8-2

The Chair: — Clause 8-2. I recognize Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Phillips: — Madam Chair. I'd like to move the following amendment:

Amend Clause 8-2:

(a) in subsection (1) by striking out “the commission shall” and substituting “the board shall”; and

(b) in subsection (2) by striking out “established by the commission” and substituting “established by the board”.

The Chair: — Mr. Phillips has moved clause 8-2 of the printed bill:

Amend Clause 8-2:

(a) in subsection (1) by striking out “the commission shall” and substituting “the board shall”; and

(b) in subsection (2) by striking out “established by the commission” and substituting “established by the board”.

Mr. Phillips has moved. Do the committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 8-2 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 8-2 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 8-3 to 11-1 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 11-2

The Chair: — Clause 11-2, is that agreed?

Mr. McCall: — Madam Chair.

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: — If I might. Again, this is based on the principle that if this is a measure that is valuable for the people of Regina and Saskatchewan, and they want to sign off on this takeover of the Wascana Centre Authority by the provincial government, that they should take it to an election. And they should have that as part of a campaign and get that permission from the people involved.

And as such, I'd move an amendment to the effect, wherein the current board of Wascana Centre Authority would stay in place until January 1st, 2021 and as such, Madam Chair, I move the following:

Clause 11-2 of the printed Bill

Subsection (2) of Clause 11-2 is amended by striking out “cease to hold office” and substituting “continue to hold office until January 1, 2021.”

I so move, Madam Chair.

The Chair: — Mr. McCall has moved an amendment:

Clause 11-2 of the printed Bill

Subsection (2) of Clause 11-2 is amended by striking out “cease to hold office” and substituting “continue to hold office until January 1, 2021.”

Does the committee agree with the amendment as presented?

Some Hon. Members: — Yes.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — The amendment is defeated by division. All those in . . . There will be a recorded vote, so all those in favour of the amendment raise your hand. All those opposed.

The motion is defeated. The motion is defeated on 5 to 1 . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Sorry, one left. Sorry, 4 to 1.

We will go back and vote on the original clause 11-2. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 11-2 agreed to.]

[Clause 11-3 agreed to.]

Clause 9-10

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Phillips: — Madam Chair, I wish to add:

New Clause 9-10 of the printed Bill

Add the following Clause after Clause 9-9 of the printed Bill:

“Notice of meetings

9-10 The chairperson shall cause reasonable notice of all meetings to be given to all members and alternate members of the commission”.

The Chair: — Mr. Phillips has moved:

New Clause 9-10 of the printed Bill

Add the following Clause after Clause 9-9 of the printed Bill:

“Notice of meetings

9-10 The chairperson shall cause reasonable notice of all meetings to be given to all members and alternate members of the commission”.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Is new clause 9-10 agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clause 9-10 agreed to.]

[Schedules A and B agreed to.]

The Chair: — Carried. Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Provincial Capital Commission Act*.

[17:30]

I would now ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 50, *The Provincial Capital Commission Act* with amendment. Mr. Dennis moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Minister, if you would like to add any closing remarks.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yes, I just want to say thank you. Thank you for your time, members, and have a good night.

The Chair: — Mr. McCall, if you have any closing remarks you'd like to add.

Mr. McCall: — Just thanks to members of the committee, Madam Chair, Clerks-at-the-Table, and to the minister and officials. And to say it again, we have some profound disagreements over this legislation.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. McCall. We will excuse our officials now and just take a brief recess before continuing on with voting off bills.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**General Revenue Fund
Central Services
Vote 13**

The Chair: — All right. Welcome back, committee members. We will be voting off 13, Central Services. Central management and services, subvote (CS01) in the amount of \$49,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory.

Property management, subvote (CS02) in the amount of 4,707,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Transportation and other services, subvote (CS05) in the amount of 3,955,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Project management, subvote (CS03) in the amount of zero dollars. This is for informational purposes only. There is no vote needed.

Information technology, subvote (CS11) in the amount of 15,026,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Major capital commission, subvote (CS07) in the amount of 169,567,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial Capital Commission, subvote (CS13) in the amount of 10,299,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 790,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Central Services, vote 13, 203,554,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2018, the following sums for Central Services in the amount 203,554,000.

I recognize Mr. Dennis as moving the motion. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Finance
Vote 18**

The Chair: — Moving to vote 18, Finance. Central management and services, subvote (FI01) in the amount of 7,098,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Treasury management, subvote (FI04) in the amount of 1,575,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial Comptroller, subvote (FI03) in the amount of 10,800,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Budget analysis, subvote (FI06) in the amount of 6,318,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Revenue, subvote (FI05) in the amount of 31,115,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Personnel policy secretariat, subvote (FI10) in the amount of 510,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Research and development tax credit, subvote (FI12) in the amount of 5,000,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Miscellaneous payments, subvote (FI08) in the amount of 22,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Pensions and benefits, subvote (FI09) in the amount of 161,653,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 1,060,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

[17:45]

Finance, vote 18, 224,091,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2018, the following sums for Finance in the amount of 224,091,000.

Mr. Kaeding so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Finance — Debt Servicing
Vote 12**

The Chair: — Vote 12, Debt servicing, statutory. Debt servicing, subvote (FD01) in the amount of 347,100,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory.

Crown corporation debt servicing, subvote (FD02) in the amount of 19,300,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory. Finance, debt servicing, vote 12, 366,400,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation
Vote 154**

The Chair: — Vote 154, Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation, statutory loan, subvote (SO01) in the amount of 16,000,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
Saskatchewan Power Corporation
Vote 152**

The Chair: — Vote 152, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, statutory loans, subvote (PW01) in the amount of \$728,600,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation
Vote 153**

The Chair: — Vote 153, Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation, statutory loan, subvote (ST01) in the amount of 100,000,000. There is no vote on this as it is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
Saskatchewan Water Corporation
Vote 140**

The Chair: — Vote 140, Saskatchewan Water Corporation, statutory loans, subvote (SW01) in the amount of 30,500,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
SaskEnergy Incorporated
Vote 150**

The Chair: — Vote 150, SaskEnergy Incorporated, statutory loans, subvote (SE01) in the amount of 186,900,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Advances to Revolving Funds
Vote 195**

The Chair: — Vote 195, advances to revolving funds,

statutory. Advances to revolving funds, votes 195, in the amount of 518,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments
Debt Redemption
Vote 175**

The Chair: — Vote 175, debt redemption, statutory. Debt redemption, vote 175, in the amount of 376,491,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments
Sinking Fund Payments — Government Share
Vote 176**

The Chair: — Vote 176, sinking fund payments, government share, statutory. Sinking fund payments, government share, vote 176, in the amount of 75,342,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments
Interest on Gross Debt — Crown Enterprise Share
Vote 177**

The Chair: — Vote 177, interest on gross debt, Crown enterprise share, statutory. Interest on gross debt, Crown Enterprise share, vote 177, in the amount of zero dollars. This is for informational purposes. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Non-Budgetary Appropriation
Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority**

The Chair: — I would also like to advise the committee that we consider the General Revenue Fund non-budgetary appropriation for Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, and at this time we will conclude our consideration of the General Revenue Fund non-budgetary appropriation for Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — March
Finance
Vote 18**

The Chair: — Supplementary estimates, vote 18, Finance, pension and benefits, subvote (FI09) in the amount of 3,700,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Finance, vote 18, 3,700,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2017, the following sums for Finance, in the amount of 3,700,000.

Mr. Bradshaw so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Committee members, you have before you a draft of the third report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies. And I require a member to move the following motion:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

Mr. Phillips so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Mr. Phillips has moved:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I will now ask a member to move a motion of adjournment. Mr. Bradshaw has moved a motion to adjourn. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. This committee now stands adjourned until Thursday, May 11th, 2017, at 1:30 p.m.

[The committee adjourned at 17:54.]