



STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 14 – May 6, 2013



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Seventh Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. Don Toth, Chair
Moosomin

Ms. Danielle Chartier, Deputy Chair
Saskatoon Riversdale

Mr. Fred Bradshaw
Carrot River Valley

Ms. Jennifer Campeau
Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. Larry Doke
Cut Knife-Turtleford

Mr. Bill Hutchinson
Regina South

Ms. Victoria Jurgens
Prince Albert Northcote

[The committee met at 15:04.]

The Chair: — Well welcome, committee members, minister, and your officials. First of all, being a little warm in here, I'm just asking the committee for approval. If anyone feels that it's just a little warm and would like to remove their jackets, give members the approval to do that. Have we got an agreement on that?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — We're agreed. Thank you. So if you find it getting a little warm and you have to remove your jacket, that's okay.

This afternoon we're going to be dealing firstly with Bill No. 49, *The Forestry Professions Amendment Act*. We have with us Minister Cheveldayoff and his officials, and I will invite the minister to give his opening remarks, first of all introduce his officials, give his opening remarks. And just a reminder to officials, if you're responding directly to a question, to state your name for the sake of Hansard, at least the first time. You're probably all aware of that already, but just to remind you. Minister Cheveldayoff, the floor is yours.

**Bill No. 49 — *The Forestry Professions
Amendment Act, 2012***

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, committee members. I am pleased to be here to discuss amendments to *The Forestry Professions Act* that will establish in law the right to practise for professional foresters and forest technologists in Saskatchewan. This is the same right to practise as already legally established for many other professions in Saskatchewan, including agrologists, engineers, geoscientists, and land surveyors.

With me today are Kevin Murphy, assistant deputy minister, resource management and compliance division; and Earl Bourlon, forest policy coordinator, forest service branch.

The amended legislation elevates the forestry profession in Saskatchewan to the same level as in other provinces in Canada, including the other New West Partnership provinces.

The amended legislation also builds on several of our government's important commitments: to economic growth; to providing a competitive business environment not only for the forestry sector but for other trades and professions; and to the sustainable management and long-term health of our provincial forests.

The amendments will further enhance the public's confidence that Saskatchewan's publicly owned forest resources are being well managed by competent professionals who are recognized across Canada. Right now *The Forestry Professions Act* is right to title. Only registered members of the Association of Saskatchewan Forestry Professionals can call themselves registered professional foresters and registered professional forest technologists. However there is nothing in the legislation

to prevent anyone from engaging in the professional practice of forestry.

Forestry professionals, both foresters and technologists, may be required to perform or oversee many tasks where the environmental, economic, and public safety stakes can be high.

Companies rely on forestry professionals to make sure that they meet all their legal responsibilities, including their compliance with federal and provincial laws, certification standards, and information sharing with First Nations and Métis. The forest management decisions made by these professionals can have long-term implications for the companies employing them and for the forests on which the industry depends.

The Association of Saskatchewan Forestry Professionals supports the proposed amendments. Right to practise legislation as proposed does not affect the ability of the association to continue to regulate its members, thus assuring the qualifications and competence of those working as professional foresters and technologists in the province.

The association will continue as a self-disciplining professional body, ensuring that practising forestry professionals are registered, possess required education and experience, and subscribe to a code of ethics. Right to practise legislation in Saskatchewan will mean that practise rights are protected in all three New West Partnership provinces, and that the terms of both the agreement on international trade and the New West Partnership Trade Agreement are respected.

Since the amended Act was introduced, further amendments have been made that limits the Act's application to forested Crown lands. These changes were made at the request of the Association of Saskatchewan Forestry Professionals. They will ensure that the other professionals such as agrologists and arborists are not restricted from practising within the scope of the professions on private land and in urban forests.

The amended legislation represents a significant step forward for the forestry profession and for sustainable forest management in Saskatchewan. The changes demonstrate our government's confidence in our forestry professionals and their association, and are an acknowledgement of their key role in implementing a results-based approach to environmental regulation and the Saskatchewan Environmental Code.

With that, Mr. Chair, my officials and I would be pleased to answer any questions you or committee members may have. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. The floor is now open for questions. I recognize Mr. Nilson.

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. My first question is, can the minister explain what particular problem this legislation is intended to solve?

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes, good afternoon. It was at the association . . . Sorry, Earl Bourlon, forest service branch of the Ministry of Environment. The association was paying quite close attention to the debate that was going on in the House when the bill was

introduced, and they had heard some concerns about overlapping jurisdiction when it came to other professions and trades, and one of the key considerations was that it was they wanted a little more clarity around where the main focus of their profession is. And they were actually the ones that requested to limit it to forested Crown land as defined in *The Forest Resources Management Act*.

With that, there was a couple of other amendments that were proposed at the same time, and one of them was a signing of all final plans. The advice that they received as an association from their legal counsel was that it'd be better off prescribing those plans and documents in the bylaws, as opposed to saying all final plans and documents.

The third amendment speaks to plans that were listed in the scope of practice, and they're really plans that are described in *The Forest Resources Management Act*. And they chose to leave it a little broader so that it could encompass future developments and planning requirements that might be required in provincial forestland.

Mr. Nilson: — Thank you for that explanation, but I think it raises some further questions. So if one is a professional forester in Saskatchewan, their practice is only on forested Crown lands. And so therefore if they use their licence for somebody's private forest, then they're going contrary to *The Forestry Professions Act*. Is that correct?

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes. What some of the other jurisdictions that have right to practise is that they will hear the complaint of a private landowner who figures they've been wronged by a forester. And in some cases in Alberta, they've actually had hearings on those, disciplinary hearings on those because the person actually purported to be acting as a professional forester. And to the credit of their association, they wanted to make sure that that private individual had a resource to go to hear that complaint. But it doesn't preclude them from practising out there, but as long as they're upfront that if they're practising as a registered professional forester, they're accountable to the association.

Mr. Nilson: — I apologize, but I don't think that answers the question. So that if for example Weyerhaeuser, which is now more a forest-owning company than an actual harvesting or, you know, logging or paper company, if they were present in Saskatchewan and owned a big forest here, then what you're telling me is that this legislation would not apply to the forests that they had, even if it was a very substantial one, because it wasn't Crown owned. Is that what you're intending here?

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes, that's . . . The intent is that there be no obligation for a private landholder that was forested to be obligated to have the services of a professional forester or technologist. But there are other legislative instruments that all apply to those activities on those lands such as *The Environmental Management and Protection Act*, fisheries Act, municipal bylaws that might be in place. It's just that they wouldn't be obligated to acquire the services of a registered professional forester.

Mr. Nilson: — So this sounds a lot to me like a situation where a professional like I am, a lawyer, I'm told, well there's only

certain areas where your licence applies in the province of Saskatchewan. And otherwise you're kind of in the Wild West, whatever the rules are. And maybe the profession will look at it, maybe they won't.

This seems to me, from what I am just hearing here, is going in exactly the opposite direction than what the minister said, which was to increase the professionalization of the forest professionals in the province.

[15:15]

Mr. Murphy: — Kevin Murphy, ADM [assistant deputy minister] with Environment. So the amount of forested land held under private individuals within this province is relatively insignificant. And what we didn't want to do is restrict individuals from being able to manage their private woodlots. Significant forest resources within this province, managed under Forestry, are held by the Crown. And this Act therefore applies to those. We were looking for the significant majority of commercial forest that's held in the province, held by the Crown for this Act to apply to, not to hamper the activities of small-woodlot owners, the almost exclusive amount of which are south of the commercial forest throughout the province.

Mr. Nilson: — Okay. Well thank you. But I think I'm accurate in saying that this is going exactly the opposite direction from what I anticipated when you were bringing forward *The Forestry Professions Act* because basically I think all citizens of the province would prefer if the forest professionals dealt with all the land.

Now at this time you may be right that the majority or even, you know, super majority of the forested land is held by the province. But we know that there are initiatives to sell as much Crown land as possible as it relates to southern Saskatchewan and the land that's owned by Agriculture. And we're not certain what the long-term plan might be for the forests of Saskatchewan, and so to have your professional legislation based on that seems to be quite strange.

I mean what you would want is to have legislation that says our job as a professional is to work with forests, whether they're Crown land or whether they're private land or whatever, but basically our skills are transferrable, if I can put it that way. And I think as far as the public's concerned, they can't tell if a tree is a Crown land tree right next to a private land tree. And you know, so I need more explanation of what the purpose of the amendment is and why we're going this direction.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. First of all, the member mentioned government plans to sell off Crown forest or Crown land. I'm not aware of any of those plans. If he has information about those, I'd be happy to hear him share that with the committee.

The concern here is, if we went in the direction that the member is advocating, then it would apply to any woodlot at all. The definition would be narrow and wide. And you know, to use an extreme example, if you wanted to hire somebody to prune a tree in your backyard, that would be defined as a woodlot and you'd have to hire a professional forester to do that. And that's certainly not something that you want to do. So you want to

make sure that the legislation applies to Crown land forests where professional foresters will undertake to do their professional duties.

So it's designed that way to avoid confusion. I am not sure if it's doing that at the committee right now, but certainly this is something that has been asked for and by the stakeholders, and we're complying with.

Mr. Nilson: — Well it still doesn't answer my question about why a professional who's registered in Saskatchewan wouldn't want their skills to be able to be used anywhere in the province. And so I still think there's a lot of confusion on that point.

But when you've come forward with a definition now in the legislation that doesn't even . . . I don't have the other legislation here. I guess I can go and get it in the back there. But now you said forested land means forested land as defined in *The Forest Resources Management Act*. So I guess that's your attempt to say it only applies to Crown land. But I think that's a very imprecise or unclear way for the public to understand what that's about.

The legislation as it stands now talks about forests, forested land, and forest resources. And it's, you know, a broad definition I think people understand, was to catch everything that relates to the forests. And what you're proposing here is to basically eliminate the professional role of foresters from what the public would see as the whole forest. And if that's your intention, perhaps you can explain that. But I think, as I said before, it's going in exactly the wrong direction.

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes, in the existing legislation was a protection of title and it was all encompassing. Those terms are actually terms that are defined in FRMA [*The Forest Resources Management Act*], but there was no legal link to *The Forest Resources Management Act*. And it was the association's interest in clarifying that their interests as an association, the Association of Saskatchewan Forestry Professionals, lied with the definition of forest resources and forest products and forested land. In doing their consultation, they also found that Alberta's legislation is limited to Crown land as well, so they felt that they're on parity with that as well.

Mr. Nilson: — Can you explain what happens in British Columbia?

Mr. Bourlon: — I'm kind of at a loss. I can't remember what British Columbia is. I think it's all encompassing in British Columbia. Alberta is restricted to Crown lands.

Mr. Nilson: — Well I think I need a better explanation of why you would go this way, other than for the association to say, well we just don't want to be bothered with that other stuff or if it becomes a problem.

Because it seems to me that legislation that we brought forward, and this forestry professions Act is one I think I had some involvement with before, and the idea was to have that broader perspective on what a forester did and because it's about a protection for the public of the forest assets of the province. And so for a profession to say, well it's a little bit too hard to do this or do that, and let's cut this out and make it so we're quite

narrow, doesn't seem to me to be in the interests of the public. And so perhaps you can try explaining that one more time.

[15:30]

Mr. Murphy: — Kevin Murphy, Ministry of the Environment. I'd like to clarify first off that this does not prevent someone with a professional forestry background from practising on private land. It merely indicates that the government wishes to impose the need for those professionals to work on the planning and oversight of forestry on Crown lands, which is currently not a part of our legislation.

Secondarily the amendments to the Act clarify the situation so that there isn't overlap with agrologists who are beginning to expand their work on commercial agricultural forest practices, woodlot management on agricultural lands, and arborists on private lands so that there isn't a perceived overlap and/or exclusion of those professionals from practising on non-managed Crown resource forest lands.

So it's a combination of (1) ensuring that we have professional foresters working on our Crown forests while allowing them to continue to practise in other areas — not requiring them but allowing them to practise — while at the same time preventing that allowance from imposing upon the practices of other professionals who are already working on a number of both private and agricultural lands for the management of woodlot forest lands and other aspects of tree management.

Mr. Nilson: — Okay. Well there's three things that you've just said. Perhaps we can go through each one and you can explain how the legislation does what you say it does. So the first one was that the present forest professions Act doesn't require a professional forester to be working on Crown land. Can you show, you know, go through the Act and show me how that now changes?

Mr. Bourlon: — Earl Bourlon. In the definition of forested land in the existing provisions, it speaks to it means publicly owned or privately owned forested land. That definition has been amended to read forest land as defined in *The Forest Resources Management Act*. And following that, in the professional practice of forestry definition, it speaks to forested land which is then the defined term above.

Mr. Nilson: — So you just sort of created a little bit of a circle here. So what is the definition of forested land in that forestry management Act? I mean why wouldn't you just put the actual words in the Act here so we can know what you're talking about?

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes. Earl Bourlon. The current definition under *The Forest Resources Management Act* is being amended in *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2010*, and there are some changes to that definition. So in future there may also be other changes. So this was to accommodate a broader definition I guess or a definition that may be subject to change.

Mr. Nilson: — Well I just know as a legislator you like to have things fairly clear so that if somebody looks at an Act, they can actually tell what's happening, and right now we can't tell what

that is. So what is the definition presently and then how is it going to be amended?

Mr. Bourlon: — The current definition in *The Forest Resources Management Act* reads that it's:

... any Crown land where, in the opinion of the minister, a forest ecosystem is the predominant ecosystem and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, includes:

any Crown resource land designated as a provincial forest pursuant to the regulations; and

any Crown land described in a forest management agreement, a term supply licence or forest product permit;

but does not include any Crown mineral or Crown mineral lands within the meaning of *The Crown Minerals Act*.

The definition in *The Forest Resources Management Amendment Act, 2010* reads:

“forest land” means:

any Crown resource land that is designated as a provincial forest pursuant to the regulations;

any Crown land described in a forest management agreement, a term supply licence or forest product permit;

[and] any ... land administered by the Ministry of Agriculture or the Ministry of Environment that:

in the opinion of the minister, has a forest ecosystem as the predominant ecosystem; or

is prescribed as a forest fringe timber supply land; and

[is] an undeveloped road allowance that:

in the opinion of the minister has a forest ecosystem as the predominant ecosystem; and

shares a boundary with lands described in subclauses (i) to (iii);

[and again] ... does not include Crown mineral or Crown mineral lands as those terms are defined in *The Crown Minerals Act*.

Mr. Nilson: — So what you've said expands the definition to include things like road allowances and other situations, is that correct? Or does it reduce the description? I mean I'm not sure if anybody else is following this, but it seems to me that we don't even know now what professional foresters are supposed to do.

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes. Earl Bourlon. To answer the question, I think it was, what necessitated the change in *The Forest Resources Management Act* was some clarity by proponents

that were harvesting and adjacent property owners to know where some of the, I guess, description of the forest were. The common denominator or the common requirements are still there about provincial forest and any Crown land that's described in a licence that's issued under *The Forest Resources Management Act*.

The clarity came around the Ministry of Agriculture and the lands they administer. Currently there's some question as to who has jurisdiction for managing those lands. Agriculture is the land administrator, Ministry of Agriculture, and we do issue our licences under *The Forest Resources Management Act* on those lands because it is Crown timber. The decisions about the harvesting and the management rests with their land representatives in Agriculture.

The addition of the road allowances, there was some question when folks were licensed to harvest in the forest where that interest in the trees ended. And it also helped clarify, if somebody wanted to clear that road allowance, whether or not they were considered Crown trees or whether or not they were just something that could be removed and disposed of.

Mr. Nilson: — So is it possible that you could take this back and actually get some of that in the legislation in a way that's understandable? Because I think it is, you know, a fairly significant point. What you're saying is that professional foresters won't have anything to do with Crown land forests that are owned by the Department of Agriculture. Is that what I just heard you say?

Mr. Bourlon: — They will have ... Sorry. Earl Bourlon. They will have interest in those lands if there's a licence that's granted for the harvesting of those forest products on those Agriculture lands. One of the things that *The Forest Resources Management Act* requires is that you can't obtain any property in the Crown timber without getting granted a licence. So if somebody's going to utilize that timber or those forest products, then they would require a licence under forest resources management Act, which would trigger the requirement for a professional forester to be part of that.

Mr. Nilson: — So that's the rule now under the present Act? Is that correct?

Mr. Bourlon: — Yes that's correct. That's one of the two provisions that carried over from the current definition into the new amended one.

Mr. Nilson: — So then I don't understand what the amendments do other than diminish that protection.

Mr. Murphy: — Kevin Murphy, Ministry of Environment. So I'd like to clarify, sir ... Thank you for the question, and I agree that legislation can often be confounding. We have to specify here that we're talking about the original Act for forestry professionals and the amendments in this session. So I think perhaps Earl misled you in that the original forest resources management Act does not contain the expectation or right of practice for forestry professionals as described in the forestry professionals Act. And the amendment is what is clarifying that expectation.

So your question in relation to agricultural lands that are considered to have forest resources, Crown forest resources on them, the FRMA is defining what we're talking about today and the amendment would apply to. But the original FRMA had no expectation of a professional forester undertaking work on those lands. The new Act, the forestry professionals Act creates that expectation and the amendments then clarify their right to practise not so much on those lands but on non-Crown forest resources lands.

So to Earl's point, agricultural land that contained Crown resource forests, the expectation now would be that a professional forester would undertake the planning and oversight of activities for the harvest work on those lands. Whether or not those lands are to be harvested, the decision there would rest with Agriculture.

Mr. Nilson: — So if we didn't, you know, if we said this bill needs some more work and we didn't do anything, what would be the net effect?

[15:45]

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. And the net effect would be certainly that there'd be no guarantee of right of practice for professional foresters. There'd be no right of practice for our foresters to practise in British Columbia or Alberta. And there'd be no clarity of definitions as far as agrologists, arborists, and foresters go. So there would be some detrimental effects to not moving this forward.

Mr. Nilson: — Okay. So those things could be dealt with, without all this confusion on what forested lands are, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thanks very much for the question. And I understand that we can't do it without defining the land base. The two are inextricably linked. And the stakeholders have indicated that the Crown forest is what's of interest to them, and in keeping with the spirit of that, we'd have to define what indeed the land base is as well.

Mr. Nilson: — Well I guess the difficulty I have is that this was in, you know, had second reading on November 5th. And at 3 o'clock this afternoon we get the amendments that are here now trying to retool the wording around forested lands. And that appears to be a much bigger issue than the original bill, which there seemed to me to maybe take out some of the research foresters from the definition, and that was kind of it. So that was what I was expecting when I came this afternoon, to deal with that in quite a straightforward fashion. And then instead we get three amendments that go to either adding or releasing — I can't totally tell — protection for quite a bit of the forest that I think the public would expect the foresters have the professional obligation to be involved with.

So that's my frustration here about this is that these are amendments, but I'm not sure from what I've heard that they've been totally thought through in a way that gives us the three or four or five months thought and discussion. And as you know, we seek advice from others when we get legislation. And we did that last November and basically didn't have a whole lot of

trouble with this legislation until the amendments showed up today. So if in fact these amendments that you've introduced today are crucial for affecting what was supposed to be there November 5th there's . . . I mean I think maybe we should take a bit more time here and maybe retool the bill or give a better explanation about what you're doing.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much for the question. And certainly debate took place in the legislature in November. Points were raised by your opposition regarding overlap of agrologists and arborists and there was concern around that. The stakeholders were listening to the debate. They agreed with that concern and these amendments are an attempt to rectify this. So this is an area where we are listening to what stakeholders are asking us to do. It was a topic that was discussed here in the legislature and these attempt to do it. You know, we already have gone through the land base definitions and the relative size of what those land base definitions are, and I believe this needs to move forward at this time.

Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Chair, in the interest of time, I'd suggest that this bill be adjourned in committee and that perhaps the minister can come back next week after we've had a chance to review these amendments with the groups that are indicated because I don't know whether this meets the needs that were identified earlier or not. And since we got them at 3 o'clock, just less than an hour ago, I think the suggestion might be that we take a look at this next week. And I assume there's more time on the committee next week to deal with some bills.

The Chair: — I guess I'll seek some guidance from the committee and the minister. As the member has indicated, with the amendments just being . . . the members just having them this afternoon, it's created some difficulty. So if I could get a bit of guidance in that matter, that would be appreciated. Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And certainly it was a surprise to me that the opposition received notification at such a late time. You know, I agree that for the best legislation moving forward, the opposition needs a time to fully understand what is being amended and proposed and to have that discussion with the stakeholders as well. So I'd be quite willing to have . . . suggest to you that this can be adjourned and quite willing to come back next week and finish off this discussion.

The Chair: — I would be prepared then to consider a motion to adjourn the debate on Bill 49 and bring it back next week. If I could have a motion to that effect? Ms. Chartier. That the debate be . . .

An Hon. Member: — Brought back next week.

The Chair: — I'm not sure if it's adjourned or just postponed and brought back next week once the opposition has had an opportunity to review it. Is the committee in agreement with the motion of adjournment? That's agreed. We'll finalize this debate next week.

At this time then, we'll just take a short recess for the officials to change and the next minister to join us at the table. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

The Chair: — I call the committee meeting back to order, and welcome Minister Boyd and his officials for the discussion on Bill No. 83, *The Foreign Worker Recruitment and Immigration Services Act*. I recognize the minister and ask him to introduce his officials and make his opening comments.

Bill No. 83 — *The Foreign Worker Recruitment and Immigration Services Act*

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, committee members. Thank you very much. I would like to introduce my officials from the ministry. On my left is Rupen Pandya, assistant deputy minister of labour and market development division. On my right is Eric Johansen, director of program integrity and legislation.

The purpose of Bill 83 is to protect foreign workers and immigrants from exploitation by recruiters, immigration consultants, employers while being recruited to Saskatchewan or in the process of immigrating to our province. Our approach will provide comprehensive protection for newcomers. We have built on the best practices of other provinces to establish a new standard for ensuring fairness to newcomers.

In 2012 we saw 11,182 immigrants arrive in Saskatchewan, while over 9,300 foreign workers made their living here. In the next five years, Saskatchewan's economy will require 75 to 90,000 skilled workers. We will fill this need through developing the skills of our current population, especially our First Nations and Métis population, by attracting people from elsewhere in Canada, and through immigration.

Bill 83 will help Saskatchewan be a preferred destination for immigrants and foreign workers by ensuring they're treated fairly. Under this bill, foreign worker recruiters and immigration consultants will be licensed so that they can be informed of their responsibilities and held accountable for their actions. Foreign nationals and Saskatchewan employers will be able to access a public list of licensed representatives to assist them. Employers will be registered prior to hiring foreign workers, and clearly informed of their obligations.

The bill will ensure foreign workers, like Canadians, do not pay for their own recruitment by placing responsibility for paying recruiting costs on employers. It will make the recruiting and immigration consulting more open and transparent through contracts and disclosures. When this legislation is brought into force, we will take the time to educate our stakeholders on the implications of the Act for them. This will include employers, foreign worker recruiters, immigration consultants who we will reach through emails, website materials, and informational workshops. We will work with immigration service providers and ethnocultural agencies to inform foreign nationals of the protection the legislation affords them. If the legislation is not complied with, the sanctions that can be applied include loss of licence or registration, compensation orders, and court-ordered penalties.

[16:00]

In our consultations with stakeholders in 2011-12, we consistently heard the need for legislation to protect foreign workers and immigrants. Bill 83 will be good for our province, for the foreign nationals coming to live and work here, and for Saskatchewan employers who are looking to hire foreign workers and for recruiters and immigration consultants who provide fair services. With those brief opening comments, Mr. Chair, we're prepared to take questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. The floor is now open for questions on Bill No. 83, short title. I recognize Mr. Broten.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the minister for the overview. In developing this legislation, could the minister please highlight what consultation occurred with those in the immigration field in the province?

Mr. Pandya: — Good afternoon. Thank you for the question. Rupen Pandya, assistant deputy minister, labour market development division, Ministry of the Economy.

The consultations that were undertaken occurred over the course of the spring of 2011 and spring of 2012. Starting in the spring of 2011, the ministry undertook consultation through 25 stakeholder focus group sessions, which were attended by 135 participants in Saskatoon, Regina, Yorkton, Swift Current. Participants included immigrants, immigration consultants, lawyers, foreign worker recruiters, settlement service providers, ethnocultural organizations, and employers hiring foreign workers through the Saskatchewan immigrant nominee program.

An online survey was also conducted, of which 89 individuals responded. A press release invited stakeholders to participate in the online consultation, and as an advertisement. The Government of Saskatchewan also consulted in 2011 with Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, and reviewed legislation in Alberta, British Columbia through the New West Partnership, and as well as the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council.

In the spring of 2012, the Ministry of Economy undertook a second round of consultations. And these were undertaken primarily because during the first round of consultations, although we included immigration consultants at that time, the province was not considering regulating immigration settlement services. We were considering regulating immigration consultants who were providing recruitment services during the 2011 consultation, and through that consultation process it was brought to our attention that we should also consider regulation of immigration settlement services. And so we undertook a new round of consultation in 2012, with new provisions specifically around provisions relative to immigration consultants who are providing immigration settlement services.

Those consultations occurred through focus groups with recruiters and immigration consultants in Saskatoon and Regina. And the immigration consultants under the 2012 consultations were actually invited to the consultations by the Immigration Consultants of Canada Regulatory Council, the ICCRC, and recruiters were invited by the Ministry of the Economy. We also conducted additional focus group sessions

with the Saskatchewan Law Society, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Saskatchewan Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council, Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, and then follow-up conversations with ICCRC and the Canadian Bar Association.

Similar to the 2011 consultations, a press release was issued inviting members of the public to participate in an online survey. Through the second survey, we received 99 responses. We also informed stakeholders of the survey through contacting employers who had registered through the Saskatchewan immigrant nominee program for skilled workers. And so we contacted some 615 employers through that process, as well as contacting interested parties, ethnocultural organizations, settlement service providing agencies. Immigration lawyers were contacted with the Saskatchewan Law Society on our behalf, and business associations. A range of professional associations and regulatory bodies were also contacted, educational institutions.

And then we conducted a second round of government consultation with the ministries of Health, Education, Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, Justice, First Nations and Métis Relations, Intergovernmental Affairs, the Human Rights Commission. Again we circled back with HRSDC [Human Resources and Skills Development Canada] and CIC [Citizenship and Immigration Canada] so they could understand the new provisions, and of course reviewed again Alberta and British Columbia's legislation.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. The impetus for this legislation, is it in response to abuses that the minister is aware of, or is it more preventative? Or is it watching other jurisdictions, or is it a combination of those factors, please?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Thank you. It's a combination of things. There were complaints that were raised with the ministry. There certainly was then the view that, in consultation with a whole range of people, that there should be legislation presented to address the concerns and complaints that the ... modest numbers that we'd received.

Mr. Broten: — Is there a figure on the numbers of modest problems, as the minister described it?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well I would say that when you factor out the ones that legislation wouldn't address, we're probably in the range of a couple hundred.

Mr. Broten: — Okay, thank you. So the licensing requirements for those who would work as an immigration consultant, could you provide a bit more detail on what are the requirements that those individuals will have to meet in order to be one of the recognized consultants, please?

Mr. Johansen: — Eric Johansen, I'm the director of program integrity and legislation with the Ministry of the Economy. The specific requirements for the licensing are in the process of being developed in anticipation of implementation of the legislation later this year, if things go according to plan. We are anticipating that it'll include character reference kinds of checks which will include a criminal records check. Potentially also investigation of previous history of employment so that

references can be obtained from previous employers, checking to see if there has been experiences of investigations with professional associations that the applicant might have been involved in previously, or any other kind of an investigation with respect to a legislative authority in some jurisdiction in Saskatchewan or elsewhere.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. Does the ministry have a target for how many consultants they would foresee being licensed once this legislation is in place? And a follow-up question: how would that differ from the number currently practising?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — We haven't set a target, no. There would be, you know, there may be individuals or groups that would want to come forward and set a business up of this type, perhaps. Currently there are five recruiters and 33 other companies that are active in this area in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. It was mentioned in an earlier response that the licensing requirements are under development. Another component would be the penalties for breaking the rules for a consultant who is licensed. Is there more detail at this time on what the penalties will be if there is, if someone is doing something they shouldn't be?

Mr. Johansen: — Again, Eric Johansen. The penalties that are outlined in the legislation include that a licence can be suspended or revoked permanently. The compensation can be ordered by the licensee for a violation where some financial harm has occurred with their client. And through the courts, penalties can also occur which include fines of up to \$50,000 for an individual, or one year of imprisonment and up to \$100,000 for a corporation. More detail on how the penalties will be applied is being developed as part of the package of regulations that'll be going forward for approval within the legislation regulations review committee in cabinet.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. A common complaint when it comes to immigration, by everyone, is the length of time that it can take, whether it's sometimes a business or whether it's an individual wanting to come to the province or someone welcoming someone to the province. Is it the minister's view that this process will change processing times or the length that it takes to have someone come to the province? Or is this seen more as separate from that?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Thank you. That is an important question because we do hear it frequently that, you know, times are too long. And we attempt to look into those situations when they move into an excessive time frame. The typical time frame is 8 to 12 weeks currently. Sometimes they go much longer than that, and there's maybe unusual circumstances that would be a part of that.

Through this process we're hoping that it will help streamline significantly these applications. The employers will be able to, with a password, access information fairly quickly. And then as a result of that we anticipate that times could go down fairly dramatically, perhaps half or even less.

Mr. Broten: — And the explanation for those times going down, which is hoped and expected for, that's simply because there is ... Would that happen because there's clearer

parameters on how the program works?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — It's for the employers — right, okay, I want to make that clear — not for the person that's immigrating. Four to six months is a normal time frame.

Mr. Broten: — Yes, I think many of the individuals would have been very happy to have that wait time to be their reality. Is it the minister's view . . . This legislation, is it, within the immigration community — and of course that's divided up into different segments — but those working as consultants and businesses and families, is this, through the consultation that occurred that was outlined by the official, is it the minister's view that this is generally supported and appreciated by most people?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I would say yes, that we see on both sides of the equation, the immigrant community themselves and on the consultant side, that there is general agreement that legislation of this type would be beneficial. You will never get unanimous support for anything. There are always some people that feel that it isn't necessary or doesn't go far enough — one of the two. But I think our thoughts are is that this does satisfy the majority of people in these situations.

[16:15]

Mr. Broten: — In the earlier response about the shortening of wait times at least for the employers, in order to facilitate this process once the legislation is passed, will additional FTEs [full-time equivalent] within the ministry be required, or is it the reallocation of existing duties with the existing staff complement?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — We don't anticipate any changes in the FTE count.

Mr. Broten: — So if there are additional duties associated with this, that those duties would be met by people currently working within the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Yes.

Mr. Broten: — Is the minister concerned that that might take away from the expedient processing of applications in different areas, the additional work that the ministry officials already do?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — It's felt that this will reduce the time for employers, so it is, you know, as a result of that we feel that there will be adequate staff in place to deal with the increased workload in these areas.

Mr. Broten: — Okay, thank you. Is there a price tag associated with the implementation of this legislation, for what it would cost the ministry to develop the application process and the monitoring? Is there a dollar figure for that, please?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — The anticipated costs will be, I think, fairly modest. \$37,050 is what is budgeted at this point.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. Is there any . . . Has there been discussion or are there thoughts on how this, with respect to cost for the process for what individuals may pay businesses or

what consultants are paid, will this have an effect on that?

Mr. Johansen: — Eric Johansen. It's not anticipated that the costs . . . that the legislation is going to regulate costs in any form. And there isn't any jurisdiction in Canada that has legislation in place that regulates the cost of foreign worker recruiting or immigration consulting. It is possible that we may see some differences in what an immigrant pays to come to Saskatchewan in the event that there has been incidents where employers have not been paying the full cost of recruitment. And in that case we would anticipate that, as under the legislation, they're going to be required to pay the full cost of recruitment, that newcomers coming to Saskatchewan may see some reduction in their cost as a result of that.

Mr. Broten: — So it's the ministry's belief that this could in fact fix a problem with employers not fully paying the costs of employee recruitment? So this might assist workers in that, in certain situations?

Mr. Johansen: — Yes.

Mr. Broten: — Does the ministry have an estimate on the frequency of instances like that?

Mr. Pandya: — Thank you for the question. So our current estimate is that it would be about half of the . . . Of the 335 program integrity cases that have so far come forward, about 30 per cent of those are not covered by any existing federal-provincial legislative provision. Based on the nature of the complaints we've received, about half of those are related to employers redirecting fees back towards immigrants.

So the other thing I would note, member, is that in fact currently based on a complaint-driven process that we are only seeing those complaints that are coming forward. And we anticipate that once this legislative framework is in place that we should see an increase in the number of complaints coming forward because this will afford foreign workers protection in terms of bringing a complaint forward.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. I'm close to concluding on my questions, but one final question. I think it was mentioned briefly in the remarks, but a big part of ensuring that individuals aren't taken advantage of is to ensure that everyone knows what their rights are and what the facts are. And often when someone's coming to the country, there may be language barriers. They may be in an isolated location perhaps. There may be a strong reliance on the employer. It's important that individuals aren't taken advantage of and that they know their rights.

So with this type of framework in place, if the legislation goes through, what other efforts will be done by the ministry in order to ensure that workers know what they're entitled to, what their benefits and rights are, and then also what avenues they have — whether that be through the ministry or through the Ombudsman, whatever role or channel — in order to have a safe and trustworthy place where they can go to with a concern? Are there efforts planned around that? Because I think that is very important and should be factored into the work that is to be done.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I would say all of that. Yes. Certainly we want to make sure that people who are coming to Saskatchewan are aware of the protections that are in place. So we'll be looking to educate employers, foreign worker recruiters, immigration consultants through email, website materials, information workshops. We'll work with the immigration service providers and the cultural organizations as well to make them aware of it. So we'll be making, you know, I think solid efforts to make sure that people are aware of the legislation that's in place and the protections it affords.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. And there might even — I mean without getting into the detail of what needs to happen — but even, I mean with that type of work, even if there's language-specific information available to different ethnic communities, I think that could be very beneficial in terms of knowing what the process is, especially if someone is coming from a location without as democratic practices or democratic practices that aren't as strong as they are in Canada. It's important that they know what avenues are there. So I thank the minister and the officials for the information provided this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I thank you for your questions this afternoon. Certainly we would agree on that front in terms of languages. We translate into some 23 different languages currently, and if there's a need, we would look at expanding that.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, Mr. Broten. Any further questions of the minister and his officials? Seeing none, we will begin voting on the clauses. This has 56 clauses. I'm going to do clauses 1 and 2, and then I'm going to ask for leave to do it by part.

Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clause 2 agreed to.]

The Chair: — And then we have the . . . I'd ask leave of the committee that we be able to move through the rest of the bill by parts. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clauses 3 to 56 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Foreign Worker Recruitment and Immigration Services Act*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member now to move that we report Bill No. 83, *The Foreign Worker Recruitment and Immigration Services Act* without amendment. Mr. Doke. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Thank you. We will then move on to discussion on Bill 81. And the minister and his officials, I believe are . . .

I'd like to welcome the minister and his officials here for discussion on Bill No. 81. I invite the minister to introduce the officials and make his opening comments.

Bill No. 81 — *The Global Transportation Hub Authority Act*

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, committee members. Good afternoon. Joining me here is on my right, Chris Dekker, interim CEO [chief executive officer] of the Global Transportation Hub; on my left Blair Wagar, chief operating officer of the GTH [Global Transportation Hub].

We're here today to discuss Bill 81, *The Global Transportation Hub Authority Act*. As you recall, the intent of the bill is to establish the GTH as an independent authority similar in nature to other port authorities established across the country.

When the hub was established several years ago as a treasury board Crown in partnership with the city of Regina, the vision was to move to an independent authority model once the appropriate infrastructure was in place and several new tenants were established. I'm happy to report that that vision is now a reality. Since introduction of Bill 81 last fall, myself and the staff of the GTH have conducted extensive consultations with several stakeholders and have held several meetings with our partners at the city of Regina. The city has raised some issues that they felt needed to be clarified in the Act, and, as such, a member of the committee will be moving two amendments to the bill at the end of our proceedings here today.

[16:30]

First we will be replacing section 32 with a new section that more clearly defines the relationship between the city and the GTH by stating that the city shall be indemnified and held harmless in any third party liability claims and also more clearly stating the framework under which service agreements will be established. The amendments to section 36 will clearly state that the GTH will be responsible for administering the duties of the local authority under all Acts which prescribe those duties, and also expresses indemnification provisions mentioned in section 32.

I want to at this time thank the mayor, Mayor Fougere, and his officials from the city of Regina for their assistance in the establishment of this legislation. I also look forward to working closely with them as we create the associated regulatory body.

Mr. Chair, the GTH is an exciting development for both the city of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan. We are seeing

rapidly increasing interest in the hub as a world-class logistics and transportation centre that will solidify Saskatchewan as a top exporter of products, both domestically and internationally.

The significant construction activity going on at the site today is just the beginning of the major development we'll see over the next several years. This activity will drive economic development, create jobs, ensure Saskatchewan continues to be an international leader for years to come.

Mr. Chair, we're prepared to take questions.

The Chair: — I thank the minister. The floor is now open for questions. I recognize Mr. Wotherspoon.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the introduction. Thank you to your officials for being here today, Minister. Maybe if this bill passes we also refer to you as Your Worship as well, by the nature of the GTH, but . . .

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — That may be a little bit premature.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Premature yet. We do have some concerns. I'm pleased to hear the meetings that have occurred with the city of Regina, who had an important voice to be included in this process. I'll maybe be seeking some clarity as to the changes, the accommodations that have been made on that front.

But just first off, the Information and Privacy Commissioner had made a request that the legislation be amended to ensure that it's certain that freedom of information requests would be accessible or allowable. What certainty or what changes have occurred to make sure that that's possible?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — We would certainly want to comply to the greatest extent we possibly could with any freedom of information requests, of course respecting the confidential nature of transactions between individual companies and the GTH, which of course is a long held position of government when it comes to commercially sensitive materials.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So is the minister familiar with the letter that was sent to him by the Privacy Commissioner on March 5th, 2013, and has he made changes to satisfy that request?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Yes, we're certainly aware of the letter, and we are in the process of responding to the commissioner with respect to this, but it's not really under the GTH. It's under *The Privacy Act* so we would be complying under that. And we've agreed that we will comply with his request.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So that would be . . . To comply with that request, then it would answer the request here that, is it the government's intention to add the authority to the list of government institutions for the purpose of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*? And the minister's answer was . . .

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Yes.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Yes. Okay. That's important because it involves obviously a lot of public dollars.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Correct.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Maybe getting down to . . . I do have questions about what's necessitated these changes to this operation. It seems to me that a lot of what's being discussed about turning lanes and green space, that these sorts of matters could have been dealt with probably more expeditiously, more democratically by municipal bylaws to ensure that it facilitates some of the pressures that are highlighted. To create in essence a new municipality is, with a lot of control by government, seems to be questionable from my perspective.

But I guess to the minister, what's the purpose of this legislation and what's being achieved here that couldn't have been achieved through partnership with the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well I think that there's a few things. I don't want to downplay some of the things as you may have with respect to some of the concerns about roadways and those kinds of things because they do fall outside of the framework of normal developments in the city. And the city, I think reasonably so, is somewhat reluctant to make exceptions to these types of concerns. When you make exceptions, of course it does, you know, it has sort of the possibility of setting precedent in another area, and I think the city had some concerns about that as well, about moving outside of their normal framework of doing business.

In addition to that, in consultation with the city, the city was concerned about the possibility of this becoming a liability in some capacity to the city. We wanted to make it very clear that that was not the intention of the legislation at all or the GTH, frankly, that we would not want the GTH to be a burden to the city of Regina or the province of Saskatchewan, that indeed it would be such that this would be a commercial venture and then generate both jobs and revenue for the future.

So I guess I would say that both the . . . I think in both of those areas there was agreement with ourselves and the city that an independent authority was probably the way to go to address both the concerns of the city and the operational concerns of the GTH.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — What provisions and arrangements are in place for revenues to flow back to the city of Regina?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Those are ongoing discussions that are taking place right now between the GTH and the city of Regina around municipal property taxes and also fees for services. And I think we have reached a reasonable compromise or are close to reaching a reasonable compromise at this point in time.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So would the revenues be reflective of what they would be if it was a commercial development within the city of Regina?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — No, I don't think so. What we are looking at is a fee for service for the various types of services that you would receive — water, sewer, fire protection, policing, and so on. And in order to alleviate some of the concerns that the city had around it becoming a potential liability, we are negotiating on the property tax front.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So what's the range of possibilities on that front? Because at one point this land was within the city limits, and now it's by way of this legislation being pulled from that, and certainly any of the property taxes will float directly to the authority under the legislation. What's the range of possibilities to provide some assurances to a community that certainly needs to be making investments and making plans to service its infrastructure?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — It will depend upon what services are ultimately provided to the GTH from the city of Regina, and it will be done on a cost recovery basis for the city. At the end of the day, as I said, we want to ensure that the city both is not disadvantaged in any way by the GTH but also has the ability to recover their costs for the services that they provide. So the discussion is around that.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — But it wouldn't reflect the types of compensation or revenues that are derived from typical commercial development of a similar type.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — This isn't a typical commercial development of a similar type. There isn't one. The only ones that you could compare it to are other independent authorities like airport authorities and things of that nature. So this isn't quite the same as a normal commercial development, and I think that's why, you know, the city was pretty firm on being indemnified from concerns that they had.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Now the city and the concerns they brought forward to your ministry, either to yourself or to officials or to the authority, have all those concerns been satisfied with the amendments that are here, or are there some outstanding concerns that weren't addressed?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I think we can reasonably say yes. I'm optimistic that Mayor Fougere would agree with me on this. After long discussions that we've had about this, these amendments satisfy their concerns. We will also be though, in the regulation development stage, working alongside the city, and they have our commitment to work as co-operatively as we possibly can to address any concerns that they have. I think the relationship is such that everyone is of the view that that can be accomplished.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Now as it's structured, am I right to say though that the GTH won't exactly be an equal partner in that relationship? At the end of the day, the GTH is given an awful lot of authority by way of cabinet, by way of government, so it's good to hear that there's an expression of some goodwill to listen and do some partnering at this stage of the game. But if I read through this legislation, basically all the controls are in the hands of the GTH ultimately, and this government.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well I guess it's a bit of a matter of interpretation. There is a fair bit of, I would say, options available to the authority, yes. On the other hand, it carries all the risks. It carries all of the potential liabilities that are there as well. So I think it's there is a balance there.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I'd requested in a previous meeting maybe about a week and a half ago significant data about the investment of the public into this hub. I haven't yet received

that information.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — We're putting that information together. It's fairly detailed in nature. We wanted to be as comprehensive as we possibly could. You had asked for, like, virtually everything, so we're putting together the package of information. We also wanted to have some consultations with our partners there if they have any sensitivities around the information or not. I don't really anticipate that, but we want to make sure that our very significant partners that have, you know, put at risk very serious dollars, private sector dollars, that they are comfortable with that information being provided. And I, as I said, I don't anticipate any problems there, but we'll get that information to you.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The authority that's being created, of course there's these outstanding circumstances and lawsuits as it relates to the expropriation that your government engaged to create this hub. Those have sort of a cross-ministry responsibility potentially. But certainly they were for the express purpose of developing . . . The expropriation was for the hub. So those lie potentially as a liability for the Ministry of Highways right now. What's being done by the hub, this legislation to take on any of those responsibilities and liabilities by way of the lawsuits that are in play?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — The GTH itself is not involved in those activities. The Ministry of Highways is addressing those concerns, and they're working in consultation with Justice around those. So it's a little bit out of our area of responsibility at the GTH.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — It's just we certainly don't have much data before us. In essence you're creating a new municipality, Mr. Minister. You're giving it all of the powers of a municipality plus additional powers by way of its relationship to government. And we don't have the public investment that's gone into it. There's lawsuits that exist because of its creation. And it's difficult to fully engage in the debate with all that information before, and there's also reference to compensation and agreements to local municipalities. But really, at the end of the day, nothing but uncertainty on those fronts.

[16:45]

I'm very pleased that the city of Regina and that Mayor Fougere have been engaged on this file. They're a very important voice to be engaged on this. Their concerns are valid concerns, and that's important. But it's difficult for us to go about analyzing this legislation without having the full cost of creating this municipality that you're creating, Mr. Minister, with a lot of authority and heavy-handed authority from government.

I'm interested in the possibility of . . . Am I correct when I read this legislation that basically any land use possibility is potentially on the table? I know it describes certain types of development, but I believe that that makes a statement to say, or any type of land use.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I would say that there is, I think, a fair bit of oversight with respect to the land use options that are available. The board is very much of the opinion that the land uses are for transportation, logistics-related activities. And then

of course there's a final cabinet approval for sales of anything over \$5 million. So I think there's adequate controls in place for that.

I guess I would say that the whole concept of a separate authority comes from the experiences in other places across Canada, that this is the model that's been used in these types of centres because of the sort of specific needs that clients of these transportation logistics hubs have. And you know, I think this is seen as best practices in terms of creating these types of authorities.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — But as the legislation reads, if I look at the purpose of transportation logistics hub, it describes very specifically what that land could be used for. And if you go to (e) after, it talks about rail and transportation and road, water, air — all the different transportation. It goes through as well and talks about that public improvements are . . . could be also a possibility there. I'm not sure exactly what that . . . how that's defined. So maybe the minister can define that.

And then at the very end, it says, any other prescribed use or purpose. So really at the end of the day, the municipality and authority that's being created can use this land by way of this legislation for any purpose it chooses.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well, in creating these types of things, I guess I would just ask your indulgence a little bit, that it's hard to anticipate every eventuality into the future. The intended purpose of this authority is to create a transportation logistics hub. We haven't moved outside of that and we have no intention of moving outside of that. But to look down the road 10, 15, 20 years or longer, it's difficult to assume that that may not move or change a little bit somewhat in the future. At this point we don't see that happening, but, you know, there is always those eventualities that could come along.

We want to as well make sure that we have, you know, the opportunity for improvements for roads, for utilities, for your further drainage ditches, that sort of thing. So that would sort of — and storage for, you know, significant rainfalls, all of those kinds of things — so those are what is anticipated when we look at that.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So the last bit that was described would fall within this area of public improvements, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I think so, yes.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — But to your other point there, I still find it unnecessary and possibly dangerous to have legislation that's as wide open. Something that's been built by the taxpayer largely with, as I say, lawsuits on the table, little information provided back to the taxpayer as to what total investment has been made, now granting full authority, pulling out from the local municipalities, in essence pulling out from those partnerships, giving full control to this authority. And now all land use planning is subject to the board. That's a very broad definition. And the minister references that maybe in 10 or 15 years, it may be a desire to shift the usage of that land.

But the intended purpose that's been laid out is for transportation, as the minister has highlighted here. So I find it

unnecessary and arguably dangerous to leave it that open. I mean the statement is any other prescribed use or purpose. So one could only, you know, imagine any sort of development that may or may not be desired by the city. And at the end of the day, the public dollar was utilized for the express purpose by this government to develop a transportation hub. With the kind of broad legislation that's in place here, many are left to wonder exactly what those public dollars are creating.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Many or yourself left to wonder. I guess I would say that if you want to paint these things in the most poorest light, as you're quite capable of doing, it would seem that you could do that. On the other hand, if you look at the very significant amount of investment that there is out there by the private sector, you look at the very significant number of jobs that are out there, and you look at the business activity that has come to Saskatchewan and will continue to come to Saskatchewan and will expand our opportunities in the future, I think the glass is much fuller than half by far.

And I would say that this is a reasonable compromise that we've come up with in consultation with our partners around this, both in the private sector and the city of Regina. And they are comfortable with all of those factors. You will never get an absolute clean slate of pluses and minuses all on the plus side — simply doesn't happen. You wish you could. You try and minimize the minuses as much as you possibly can in any of these types of things.

But I would say that, on the whole, the fact that we're seeing more and more private sector development and interest in the facility, the more business activity that is taking place out there, I think indicates to me that there is strong acceptance of the Global Transportation Hub and the activities that they are actively engaged in and will continue to be engaged in well into the future.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Right. So as you're embarking on these changes, I do believe it's fair to the public though to have the dollars that they've invested into it accounted for and made public. I'm disappointed we haven't been provided that information. I believe that's important.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — We will try and . . . Your question last time — and let's not minimize this and try and make it such that we're not going to give you any information or anything else like that — you asked for very, very detailed information about every public sector dollar that went into that. Now that takes some time. And I'm going to explain this a little bit.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Great.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Because as an example that I used was the exchange at No. 1 Highway there that's being built right now. There is obviously a significant amount of taxpayer dollars that are — all taxpayer dollars — that are being built, that how much of that, I'm asking you, would you assign to the Global Transportation Hub? We're trying to come up with a reasonable estimate as to what that would be based on the experiences in other areas. How about the bypass and some of those kinds of things? We just don't want to pick that information out of the air because you'll start picking it apart. So we're wanting to come up with that detailed information.

But we can provide you with some of the components that have been put into it so far in terms of public sector, the Government of Saskatchewan's dollars that have gone into it. But if you ask very, very detailed questions, we want to provide you with very, very detailed information to support that and the rationale behind it. But we can provide you with some of that information so that . . . I don't want you to lead people to the conclusion that there's a bottomless pit out there of money that the taxpayers have put in there and you don't have any information about it because I think you do have a fair bit of information about it. And we'll provide you with more right now.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — We just don't quite know. We know it's a deep pit. We just don't know how deep that pit. And I'm not suggesting it's bottomless. I am concerned about, you know, as it relates to bottomless pits, I am concerned by the financing structure here that seems to be a fairly preferred structure than to any . . . You're creating a municipality with a lot of direct control of government and doing so with preferred financing of government, something that municipalities certainly don't have the same sort of luxuries with access to. So certainly this is important information, I believe, in creating a new entity that's fully controlled by your government. And to be frank, I am disappointed to date that we haven't had a full accounting of those costs.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well we'll provide you with some of the information right now. The CEO will help you here.

Mr. Dekker: — Thank you. Chris Dekker, interim CEO of the Global Transportation Hub. As the member had discussed in estimates and as was written in written questions, the question was what was the provincial capital investment. And as we had discussed and agreed to at estimates, the direct costs within the GTH are more readily available. These costs are or will be paid for by the GTH authority with our own funds that we have through our own loans and whatnot, and so will ultimately not directly affect the treasury of the province of Saskatchewan.

So I'll just go through the GTH footprint itself. First there was the purchase of land which was, as was noted, accomplished by the Ministry of Highways and is still in the title of the Ministry of Highways. But as this investment is being repaid by the GTH's land as sold, so that's about \$13.1 million, so once all that land is sold by the GTH, that land, or that amount is being repaid to MHI [Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure]. There was a power line relocation in the amount of \$7.4 million; \$2 million of which was paid directly by the GTH. So again, that's not on the provincial books. And 5.4 million was paid by Ministry of Highways.

There was a grant from the Ministry of Highways of the amount of \$700,000, which represents an initial operating funding from MHI to GTH in 2009 and '10. There was initial capital funding of MHI of \$1.7 million, and that was the estimated cost of the construction of Fleming Road, completed in 2008. That was done in conjunction with a lot of regional work. So we had to take those dollars out and say, okay, if Fleming Road is right in our GTH footprint, so that should be applied to the GTH. That was 1.7 million from the Ministry of Highways.

Then there's the GTH capital plan itself, which is again being

funded directly by the GTH, which amounts to about \$32.8 million. This is for the completing of infrastructure build-out for the roadways, drainage, utilities streetscape in this fiscal year, and it's being funded directly by the GTH. That got us to a point where we had about 400 acres of land developable, and again is being paid directly by the GTH. So within the footprint itself, there's about \$55.7 million of provincial investment, of which 48 million ultimately will be incurred directly by the GTH.

As mentioned by the minister and again by yourself, member, there is a number of scheduled regional infrastructure investments which may have been accelerated as a result of the development of the GTH, but certainly have a broader use than just the GTH. There's benefits to the city of Regina, benefits to the RM [rural municipality] of Sherwood. Regional businesses and industry will benefit and of course the province of Saskatchewan.

So for those provincial investments it was agreed that we just provide a list of dollar value. So to date in a regional basis: regional road infrastructure from Ministry of Highways, which is about 9.7 million. That amount includes upgrades to Pinkie Road and Dewdney Avenue. Then there's the west Regina bypass: 6.9 million had been spent to 2009, which was the date of your original written question. To date an additional 2 million has been expended, and an additional 37.5 million was allocated by MHI in 2013-14. That's for the west Regina bypass project. Then there was an additional \$10 million in regional utilities, and that was a grant provided to the city of Regina to develop regional infrastructure, including water, waste water, and drainage infrastructure.

We're working on some other data, but that largely completes both GTH footprint and the regional footprint, a total of about \$121.8 million, of which a good portion again will be ultimately borne by the GTH in the funding provisions we have from within.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you for that information. Thank you as well for endeavouring to, as you had to put that into writing, and to make sure that it's inclusive of all Crowns, all ministries, all public dollars, and all municipalities' dollars. The borrowing into the future, just explain the provisions here for borrowing for the GTH. I see some preferable structures that have been built in with the Government of Saskatchewan.

[17:00]

Mr. Dekker: — Thank you for the question. The legislation sets out in typical fashion what the limits of our borrowing can be and what the process is for going about asking for that permission to borrow the monies. Currently there is an order in council that was passed in 2009 that also restricts and limits our current borrowing, which is \$5 million limit on sale or purchase of real property and a 40 million limit on borrowing, 40 million. So this sets out the provisions and sets in legislations how we go about doing that. The OC [order in council] sets the limit. So together that is the requirements for us to go out and get any loans or financing.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — And borrowing would be at the Government of Saskatchewan rate, is that correct? Borrowing

would be done through the province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Dekker: — Borrowing is done directly through our financial institution, and a set rate was negotiated with them.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — But the structure moving forward gives a borrowing power of the Minister of Finance to the authority, so it lays out sort of that preferable borrowing rate that's provided to government.

Mr. Dekker: — That's correct.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Are there any other municipalities with a similar structure with . . . To the minister: or are they borrowing at the more expensive . . .

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — No. We would have to get information on that. I don't know of any others.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So this is a commercial entity as described by the minister but it's being given, I guess, preferable borrowing rates than the municipalities from across Saskatchewan? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I don't know that you would characterize it as that or not. I think we'd have to get some more information on that to answer your question more fully.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Sure.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — This would have the borrowing, you know, ability of the province of Saskatchewan in a normal fashion.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Has the minister heard or received any, or the ministry or the authority itself, concerns of private sector commercial developers of similar types of land use sites as it relates to potential undermining of their market case or their investment that they would like to make by . . . What they fail right now, I think there's some concern that there certainly hasn't been any quantified expression made to the public as to the amount of dollars that have been invested into this and then sort of the cost recovery or return that's required.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I would say that we've had I think a very good working relationship with the commercial realtors that you're talking about here in Saskatchewan. We invited the sector to come to an open house to have some discussions about the Global Transportation Hub and opening it up to commercial realtors for, you know, thoughts and ideas, and also bringing forward prospective clients that they may have that would be interested in operating at the Global Transportation Hub. I think there was some, I believe it was in the range 30, 35 companies that were represented that day. I think there was, at that point in time at least there was, you know, pretty good support for the opportunity being presented to them.

As you move forward from there, as you know, we are working on an agreement with Morguard as a good example of that I guess. So it sort of changes I guess at that point in time where people — the successful group — are obviously very happy. Others that aren't as successful aren't quite as happy and I think that's a normal type of thing that you would expect under these circumstances.

There isn't any . . . When you say commercial property of a similar type, I think we want to again emphasize that there really isn't any property of a commercial type that's similarly available right close by here. There are much smaller lot sizes available for commercial development in the city of Regina and area but nothing quite comparable to this, as well as the types of opportunities that the global transportation system affords for the future. So again I would say that on large measure there still seems to be very solid support for the creation and moving forward of the Global Transportation Hub, but there are always the view that this is competing with them. And I guess to a certain extent it is.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The model that's . . . And that's why certainly the public cares about the total investment that's been made into this as well. And I guess the question back to the minister is: what's his plan for cost recovery on this file and what's sort of the timeline to recovering those dollars? Of course if it were the private sector entering in, they would be outlaying an investment and then be tracking, and they'd be able to state that investment on the front-end and then they would be able to track it all the way through to quantify when return on investment had occurred. So I guess, is it simply a cost-recovery model? And if so, what's the timeline and what's the return on investment that the minister is looking to?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — When it comes to the GTH proper, the cost recovery will be based largely on the sale of the land that is being developed. As the land is developed and sold, then the cost recovery at that point, as we build the facility out, will then go back to the Ministry of Finance. It will certainly, when you look outside of the GTH, then it becomes much more challenging to make that assertion, I guess I would say. Again you know, what amount of the bypass can you assign to the GTH? What amount of some of the other infrastructure that's there be assigned to the GTH? But I would say that it would be our intention, based on the cost-recovery model for the land sales, to recover the investment that the taxpayers have made into the facility.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — And you know, some of those dollars of course, of that external infrastructure, some of that certainly has to be accounted for into the business case of the GTH, so I'd look forward to seeing that determined. But the minister is talking about this returning the investment. And what's the timeline that the minister is looking for that to be and where are we at right now in achieving that?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well we put forward to the Government of Saskatchewan on a yearly basis a budget for prospective land sales and for cost recovery. I would say that we're reasonably on track in terms of that at this point in time. But it's all of course based on forecasts of what sales are going to be, land prices, should they change, and all of that sort of thing. So it's our intention over the next number of years to continue to chip away at this to recover the taxpayers' dollars going forward.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — And that would be on some portion of the investments external to the hub as well?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well I would say not necessarily. Again that would be, that's a difficult question to answer because it . . . Again if you're building a bypass around the city of Regina

... And I would be interested in your thoughts. What percentage would you assign to the Global Transportation Hub of that total infrastructure?

We will try and come up with some rationale around the infrastructure and all of that, but the business model is predicated on the cost recovery within the GTH footprint.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — It just seems absent of a full economic costing or business case to not have some understanding of the cost of some of that infrastructure as well, but we'll look to that in the future.

Where do we find this data in the future? Is this going to be publicly reported?

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I'm guessing you're going to continue to ask about it and so we will try and endeavour to come up with some rationales around those types of investment the taxpayer is making.

But again I mean if you're going to ask for those kinds of things, we'd be interested in your thoughts. What would you assign to the Global Transportation Hub when you're building a significant bypass around Regina? You're from Regina. Perhaps you could be helpful in those discussions.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I'd be more than pleased to engage and be working with folks to be understanding what necessitated some of the changes to infrastructure and what were the drivers and what were the ... what factors should be placed on the hub, but it would be absolutely reckless for us to be making this up on a napkin in committee as to percentages around bypasses. And it gets to the point that I find it irresponsible that we have the creation of a municipality, the creation of an entity with debt, preferred borrowing structures to the government, no formalized agreements with municipalities, a lot of taxpayers' dollars on the line, yet none of that accounted for in a true business case sort of environment when we're making these decisions here today. And as well, I mean the fact that ... And I'm pleased now to see that the minister's going to accommodate the freedom of information requests that have been previously ... in the structure of the legislation, were not allowable. Those are going to be really important to the people of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Do you want me to respond to that?

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I didn't offer you a question there at that point. I do have a concern. Has the minister ... Who has he consulted with on this legislation beyond the city of Regina? And I guess I'll let him go through the list of it. And is everyone aware of the very broad abilities for this authority to basically use this land in any way it sees fit?

Mr. Dekker: — Chris Dekker, CEO. The notion of a logistics and transportation hub began quite some time ago, roughly in 2007-2008. But the first form of the GTH took place as a result of the OC that was passed in 2009. That was an initial form. The notion then was to go forward and find out what would be the best governance structure to develop the GTH as a logistics and transportation hub. And the GTH went out and did very extensive secondary research, best practices research across the

country as it relates to various different kinds of agencies, various different kinds of authorities, seaports, inland ports, and that was from not only just in Regina but in Saskatchewan and around the country.

We then engaged the services of our two advisory committees to the GTH who have extensive experience in these fields. We got extensive input and received a review from our board of directors, which is a highly regarded and very experienced board in the fields of transportation, logistics, business, and government. We were well guided from government officials from different ministries and agencies both in terms of the Ministry of Justice and from Government Relations, more specifically, Municipal Affairs.

And then, as was noted here, we've had discussions with the city of Regina for quite some time on the various themes and forms that ultimately the inland port would take and on Bill 81, both before and after, and on the chosen model, with the city of Regina going back a number of years.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — And the minister, at this point in time I suspect is ... Or is there a willingness to look at tightening up this legislation to not include provisions such as ensuring that it can be used for any purpose, as it currently states?

[17:15]

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Chair, I think we adequately answered that question. We wanted to ensure that we would have opportunity to look at, you know, further utility types of necessities that may come along, drainage ditches, things of those natures that aren't and wouldn't be characterized as transportation logistics type of activity. So I think we need those provisions to address some of those concerns going forward. So we feel that they are adequately placed as such.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — It dictates the different areas for which development ... or the different formats development could occur. And it highlights this area that I think you're describing as public improvements. That'd be section 5(c), public improvements; (e) is "any other prescribed use or purpose." And the minister today certainly did describe that in 10 or 15, 20 years, there may be some desire to develop it in a different fashion or different industries. And I'm not sure exactly what he's contemplating, but certainly that is of concern. Does the minister have ...

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — I don't think it is of concern to anyone other than yourself that has had a look at this legislation. When we had discussions with the city of Regina, they weren't concerned about it. When we had discussions with others, they weren't concerned about it. So I'm not sure your concern is, frankly, very well-founded.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Well we've placed on to the record our concern with the creation of this new municipality with significant powers of government, a very heavy-handed partner within the region. We've placed that on to the record. I've placed my concerns as it relates to the lack of stating of the investments of the public into this entity, stated concerns around the very broad potential usage of that land as opposed to being consistent with the mandate objectives of the Global

Transportation Hub.

I've stated concerns as to lack of relationship formalized with municipal partners in making sure that adequate benefits flow back to those jurisdictions. In this case, the hub is actually being peeled out of the city of Regina. I've stated some concerns about making sure that we receive a return on investment, the proper return, and to do that we need to soon see all of the investments that have been made and some costing as to the plans. And I've also raised some concerns that some have shared with me as it relates to ensuring that the cost of this land is reflective of the costs that have been, the investments that have been made into it because certainly the private sector, if they're to go develop a commercial site, they need to receive that return. And certainly this is potentially undermining some of their investments.

That being said, I think with some of that clarity and hopefully the information that'll be provided, we'll have a greater understanding of what the minister's achieving. But as it stands right now, certainly in the preferred borrowing structure that, you know, this has been built by the taxpayer, that hasn't been quantified how many dollars have been placed in. And then sort of the preferred financing structure that the minister's placing on his municipality into the future are concerns as well. But at this point in time, I've placed those concerns on to the record.

I believe the minister's intent on moving this legislation forward. I am appreciative of the consultation with the city of Regina, and I'm thankful for the leadership of the city of Regina, Mayor Fougere and council for making their concerns known and for working together to see some of those concerns addressed. Moving forward, if the minister's intent on pushing this forward right now, certainly I'll continue to be consulting with many to make sure that this authority's providing the benefit that it should, being managed by this government in the way that it should. But at this point in time, I don't have any further questions with this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well thank you. I just would want to close then, if you have no further questions, by just indicating that we feel this has been a good development for the city of Regina and for the province of Saskatchewan. We see very significant private sector dollars, some \$340 million and counting quickly. The latest development, if it continues to move forward in the fashion that we think, will be another few hundred million dollars of investment that will be very, very positive again for the province of Saskatchewan.

We will continue to see job growth at the Global Transportation Hub, which will definitely benefit the province and the city of Regina. We will continue to see further exports from our province, now a province that exceeds in exports the province of British Columbia — something that I don't think many people would ever dream would've happened. All of these things have happened in a very short period of time. And I think the investment of public sector dollars has been a wise investment to create all of this type of activity for the province of Saskatchewan, and it'll continue to grow into the future. And as conditions continue to change and warrant either a further investment into the facility or additional changes, we'll look at those in the future as you would in any other type of business venture.

So on the whole, I would say that this has been a pretty successful development for the city of Regina and for the province of Saskatchewan, one that largely has received significant support from Mayor Fougere and the city of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan in general.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you for those comments, Minister. The one other piece that I wouldn't mind that's not right within this legislation — but you're, as I say, the minister and maybe the mayor of the GTH at this point — I want to make sure I fully understand the commitment on this front.

The one piece that has been a major concern is the heavy-haul truck traffic down Dewdney Avenue. I believe I've recognized that the GTH has identified that there's some concerns here. This is certainly something that cannot continue to simply go forward the way that it is. It's certainly, I would contend, a risk to safety and certainly an attack on the peace of mind of many and as well certainly poses risks to degrading infrastructure and even foundations of homes and otherwise. I guess I'd like to hear from the minister as to where he's at on ensuring that that heavy-haul truck traffic is not the issue that it is down Dewdney Avenue.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Well it's not as significant as it once was by far. As they were transitioning the CP [Canadian Pacific] yards from downtown to the Global Transportation Hub, there was obviously a period of transition there that there was a lot of very significant truck traffic there. That's diminished a fair bit now where we don't have that, where the CP centre is now up and active at the Global Transportation Hub. The Global Transportation Hub did make fairly significant investments into the maintenance and construction of Dewdney to address some of those road issues that were there at the time.

And so, you know, we're hopeful. Any time that you see a transition like that of moving, literally moving a very, very long-standing, significant operation like that, there's going to be, unfortunately, some disruption that occurs. And there certainly was and we don't want to diminish that in any fashion. But I think it's much better now than it was at that point. And as we see further infrastructure being put in place, that will be diminished almost entirely.

And just for the sake of the record, I'm not looking to be the mayor of the GTH. There will not be a mayor of the GTH. There's no mechanism in place for anything of that nature to be contemplated or anticipated or expected.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I didn't know if the member from Regina South sitting across the table here might have run against you in that election. But I appreciate, you know, you've provided the chance to state some real concerns. We have the abilities to continue to track those concerns. There's also a lot of great opportunity that lies within this file. We just need to make sure that we're maximizing that return. Thank you to the minister and thank you to officials that are here today.

Hon. Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, and thank you to the officials. And I trust that the opposition will continue to do its job with respect to holding the government accountable.

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

Any further questions of the minister? Seeing none, we will vote. First of all, clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clause 2 agreed to.]

The Chair: — There are some 50 clauses here and I will again ask for leave to move by parts. And is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clauses 3 to 31 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 32

The Chair: — Clause 32. I recognize Mr. Doke.

Mr. Doke: — Mr. Chair, I recommend that the committee vote against Clause 32 as I plan to move an amendment that inserts a new clause.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Doke. According to Erskine May 23rd edition, page 608, “An amendment to leave out a clause is not in order, as the proper course is to vote against the clause standing part of the bill.”

Clause 32, is that agreed? Those agreed? Those not in agreement? It’s not agreed to? Okay. Clause 32 is not agreed.

[Clause 32 not agreed to.]

[Clauses 33 to 35 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 36

The Chair: — Clause 36, is that agreed? Oh, pardon me. We’re at another amendment here. I recognize Mr. Doke.

Mr. Doke: —

Clause 36 of the printed bill.

Add the following subsections after subsection (3) of Clause 36 of the printed Bill:

“(4) The authority is deemed to be the local authority or municipality for the purposes of any Act that applies to property located in the transportation logistics hub or persons who carry on business with the transportation logistics hub unless

(a) the authority and the city enter into an agreement pursuant to which the city agrees to act as the local authority or municipality;

(b) the Lieutenant Governor in Council orders otherwise.

“(5) If the authority acts as a local authority or municipality pursuant to subsection (4), the authority shall indemnify the city against all claims for damages and costs that may be made against the city arising out of or resulting from the authority acting as a local authority or municipality”.

The Chair: — Mr. Doke has moved an amendment to clause 36. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried. Is clause 36 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Thank you.

[Clause 36 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 37 to 55 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Doke.

Clause 32

Mr. Doke: —

New clause 32 of the printed Bill

Add the following Clause after Clause 31 of the printed Bill:

“Agreement respecting services, taxes, and assessments

32(1) The authority and the city may enter into an agreement:

(a) establishing each party’s responsibility to provide property located in the transportation logistics hub with public highways, sanitary and storm sewers, water, garbage disposal, fire and police protection and other services normally provided by the city to other property located in the city;

(b) determining how property taxes and any other assessments, fees or other amounts charged by the city to property located in the transportation logistics hub are to be divided between the city and the authority; and

(c) subject to subsection (2), determining the amount of compensation that the authority shall pay to the city for services provided by the city to property located in the transportation logistic hub.

(2) Any compensation payable by the authority to the city for services provided by the city to property located in the transportation logistics hub must be determined on a cost recovery basis.

(3) If the authority and the city are unable to reach an agreement respecting the matters mentioned in subsection (1), the city is not required to provide the services mentioned in clause (1)(a) to property located in the transportation logistics hub.

(4) The authority shall indemnify the city against all claims for damages and costs that may be made against the city arising out of or resulting from services provided by the authority to property located in the transportation logistics hub”.

[17:30]

The Chair: — Mr. Doke has moved an amendment to clause 32. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read? Agreed. Carried. Is new clause 32 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 32 as amended agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Global Transportation Hub Authority Act*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 81, *The Global Transportation Hub Authority Act* with amendment. Mr. Doke. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I believe that completes the work of the committee to this point. I would entertain a motion of adjournment. Mr. Hutchinson. We're agreed. Carried. This committee stands adjourned. I thank the minister and his officials. This committee stands adjourned until tomorrow at 7.

[The committee adjourned at 17:32.]