



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 40 — April 10, 2019**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-Eighth Legislature**

## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY**

Ms. Colleen Young, Chair  
Lloydminster

Ms. Vicki Mowat, Deputy Chair  
Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. David Buckingham  
Saskatoon Westview

Mr. Terry Dennis  
Canora-Pelly

Mr. Delbert Kirsch  
Batoche

Mr. Warren Michelson  
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Doug Steele  
Cypress Hills

[The committee met at 17:59.]

**The Chair:** — Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the Standing Committee on the Economy. Tonight we have in as committee members myself, Colleen Young, as Chair; committee members David Buckingham, Terry Dennis, Delbert Kirsch, Doug Steele. Sitting in for Warren Michelson is Everett Hindley, and sitting in for Vicki Mowat is Ms. Sproule.

**General Revenue Fund  
SaskBuilds Corporation  
Vote 86**

**Subvote (SB01)**

**The Chair:** — We will now begin our consideration of the estimates for vote 86, SaskBuilds Corporation, subvote (SB01). Minister Wyant is here with his officials, and I want to ask all officials to state their names and their positions the first time they speak at the mike. Minister, please introduce your officials and begin with any opening remarks you have.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well thank you very much, Madam Chair, and to the committee. Before I begin, I would like to introduce the SaskBuilds officials that are here with me today. To my left, Kyle Toffan, president and chief executive officer of SaskBuilds. Kyle joined SaskBuilds as its new CEO [chief executive officer] in December, and this will be his first role in estimates. If he looks familiar, you may know that he's had some experience in the civil service before, including previous roles at SaskBuilds as well as roles within the ministries of Government Relations and Finance.

To my right is Teresa Florizone, vice-president of corporate services and chief financial officer. Also with us today, vice-president of Priority Saskatchewan, Reg Howard; chief procurement officer, Greg Lusk; director of corporate services, Alicyn Miller; executive director of strategy and engagement, Lisa Danyluk; and my chief of staff, Julie Leggott. I want to thank them all for being here today and for the important work that they do on a daily basis for the people of Saskatchewan.

Madam Chair, this is my second opportunity to serve as the Minister Responsible for SaskBuilds and Priority Saskatchewan, and I'm happy to be back in this portfolio during what promises to be a very exciting time for our organization. As I said, this is an exciting time for SaskBuilds as an organization. It is undertaking new and important work on behalf of the government and indeed the people of Saskatchewan, and that is reflected in this year's budget.

As the Minister of Finance said, the 2019-20 budget strikes the right balance for Saskatchewan. It focuses on carefully managing spending while making important investments in needed services, programs, and infrastructure for the people of Saskatchewan. This budget also fulfills our government's commitment to return the province to a balanced budget. It is within that context that we're here today to discuss the budget allocation for SaskBuilds and the important work that this budget will enable our organization to do.

SaskBuilds's mandate has evolved since it was created to plan

and prioritize major infrastructure investments and to drive innovation in infrastructure delivery. Through that mandate, SaskBuilds has managed a portfolio of four public-private partnerships or P3 projects worth more than \$3 billion that are delivering critical infrastructure for Saskatchewan people and communities: The Meadows long-term care centre in Swift Current; 18 joint-use schools in Regina, Saskatoon, Warman, and Martensville; the recently opened Saskatchewan Hospital North Battleford; and the Regina bypass project, which is on track to open on time and on budget this fall and whose first phase has been open for more than a year now and has already significantly improved traffic safety and reduced collisions along the Trans-Canada corridor east of Regina.

I know that members of the opposition don't like to hear that, Madam Chair, but it simply must be said that using the P3 model allowed our government to save nearly \$600 million overall compared to the costs of the traditional builds: the Regina bypass, \$380 million in savings; joint-use schools, \$100 million; Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford, \$90 million; and The Meadows, \$16 million.

P3s also support local businesses and local jobs. More than 250 Saskatchewan-based companies have been involved in the four P3 projects, 70 per cent of all businesses involved: on the Regina bypass, 106 Saskatchewan-based companies; in the joint-use schools, 73 Saskatchewan-based companies; the Saskatchewan Hospital North Battleford, 31 Saskatchewan-based companies; and with The Meadows, 54 Saskatchewan-based companies. Saskatchewan's P3 projects have created more than 12,000 jobs during a time of low resource prices.

Saskatchewan's experience with these four projects proves that P3s work. They allow government to invest in critical infrastructure while saving money and transferring risk to the private sector. Saskatchewan Hospital North Battleford, or SHNB, has been a good example of how P3 risk transfer protects government and taxpayers. While we would always prefer that projects be completed on time, in the case of a P3 like SHNB, government and taxpayers are protected against risk and associated costs in the case of delays.

The private sector partners on the project were not able to meet the original service commencement date of June 1, 2018. In the end, service commencement was achieved on September 6th of 2018. Costs related to the delays are the responsibility of Access Prairies Partnership and not the government. Thanks to the unique protections of the P3 agreement, government saved \$3.9 million in forfeited service payments, plus 484,000 for delay-related expenses.

I would also note that, as indicated in the October 2018 Speech from the Throne, we will continue to use both P3s and traditional procurement models to support the infrastructure needs of our province, by using the model that makes the most sense with each new project.

So, Madam Chair, that's a quick overview of where we're at with our P3 portfolio. The P3 projects have been an important part of our original mandate. And, as I've mentioned, that mandate also includes infrastructure planning. As part of that original mandate, SaskBuilds developed a new integrated capital planning process

for government, a first for Saskatchewan.

Integrated capital planning allows government to take a strategic approach to identifying, prioritizing, and funding infrastructure investments. SaskBuilds leads government's annual integrated capital planning process, working closely with ministries and Crowns to ensure that decision makers have the best information possible to meet Saskatchewan infrastructure needs now and into the future. The integrated capital planning team has developed an integrated capital planning manual to support ministries and agencies meet the objectives and requirements of the annual call for capital plans.

This integrated capital planning process also plays a role in one of our newest infrastructure-related mandates, working with our partners in the Ministry of Government Relations to coordinate long-term federal infrastructure funding under the Canada-Saskatchewan Integrated Bilateral Agreement through the Investing in Canada infrastructure plan.

The agreement was signed in October of 2018, securing \$896 million in federal infrastructure funding over the course of the next decade to improve community health and safety, economic growth and sustainability, environmental protection, and the quality of life through investments in northern and rural and remote communities, municipal and regional infrastructure, greenhouse gas mitigation, and cultural and recreational facilities.

SaskBuilds officials will coordinate what we call provincial projects, those put forward by provincial government ministries, agencies, and Crowns. We will also coordinate overall reporting to Canada which, with an agreement of this magnitude, will be no small undertaking.

Our colleagues in the Ministry of Government Relations will coordinate what we would call the public intake process to seek projects from the municipal, not-for-profit, for-profit, and Indigenous sectors. They are currently engaged in a two-stage intake process, with the first stage being an expression of interest, a process which opened March 15, 2019.

The second piece of our mandate came about in 2014 with the creation of Priority Saskatchewan. Priority Saskatchewan is tasked with ensuring that public procurement in Saskatchewan is fair, is open, transparent, and based on international best practices. Priority Saskatchewan is committed to ongoing consultation with industry and stakeholders and continuous procurement improvement.

Historically government procurement has operated in silos, has failed to focus on value, and far too often left Saskatchewan suppliers, who offer homegrown solutions, unable to compete with larger, out-of-province operations. Those concerns were a major reason why we created Priority Saskatchewan and since then, Priority Saskatchewan has spent the past four years in widespread consultations across the private sector with industry and government to identify ways to make public procurement better and working in partnership with ministries, Crowns, and agencies to implement those improvements.

That important work includes implementing best-value procurement legislation, ensuring that procurement staff across

government have access to a simplified suite of modern procurement tools to achieve value, building Saskatchewan supplier capacity through supplier development, building best-value procurement training for public servants, and developing a vendor performance framework.

However, Priority Saskatchewan's role has been limited to advice, guidance, and training, and while that gave Priority Saskatchewan room to accomplish a great deal, it didn't let us go all the way. So in a nutshell, we created a team to make procurement better, but we left procurement decentralized across government. That limited government's ability to fully transform procurement, and that's been a frustration for Saskatchewan suppliers at a time when changes in other provinces are posing challenges for them too. British Columbia last year released a comprehensive procurement strategy designed to protect BC [British Columbia] suppliers. Alberta is becoming increasingly protectionist in their procurement framework as well.

So to address these important concerns and ensure government is able to fully and truly modernize public procurement, we announced in the October 2019 Throne Speech that the government is changing the way it does business by moving to a single procurement service for nearly \$2 billion worth of goods and services which are procured every year.

Creating a single procurement service will ensure that the Government of Saskatchewan procurement continues to treat Saskatchewan suppliers fairly, recognizing that they are increasingly being cut out of doing business with our western neighbours. It also provides a more strategic and efficient procurement service that will make it easier to achieve savings that could be directed to other government priorities.

The 2019-20 budget supports the implementation of a new single procurement service as a new division within SaskBuilds. The new procurement service will be responsible for conducting procurements for all ministries across government in a way that ensures best value for taxpayers and fair treatment for Saskatchewan suppliers, and has commenced in April of this year.

The addition of the procurement service to our organization is responsible for the significant increase in funding reflected in this year's budget. SaskBuilds' total 2019-20 budget expenditure is \$10.714 million, an increase of \$5.834 million. This is a direct result of the implementation of the new procurement service, as procurement functions and expertise which were formerly housed in the Ministry of Central Services and Highways and Infrastructure are being moved to the new single procurement service within SaskBuilds.

The recommended General Revenue Fund expense grant for SaskBuilds is \$9.214 million, with a \$1.5 million to be drawn down from SaskBuilds' accumulated surplus. The \$5.99 million includes salary and operating costs for 43 full-time equivalents to be transferred from ministries, and \$500,000 in one-time funding for renovations as the organization moves to a central location. It's understood that the cost to government will be neutral. No jobs will be lost through this initiative, and existing salary and seniority levels will be maintained. Employees who are covered by the collective bargaining agreement will remain in scope and bring all the protections and provisions that that

brings.

Of course, budget 2019-20 also supports the important and ongoing work in our other key business lines, including Priority Saskatchewan, which will continue to scrutinize public procurement in Saskatchewan as well as SaskBuilds' role in capital planning and oversight, which includes monitoring P3 compliance, leading integrated capital planning across government, and implementing the 10-year federal-provincial integrated bilateral agreement.

I'm happy to say that a new single procurement service will be part of SaskBuilds. This provides an important separation between the line ministries who will be using the goods and services, and it supports the ability to build a strong procurement team with the necessary skills and understanding to provide quick, responsive procurement assistance to ministries. This new branch of our organization is headed by Saskatchewan's first-ever chief procurement officer, Greg Lusk.

I know we'll have an opportunity to discuss SaskBuilds' estimates in greater detail shortly, so in conclusion I'll just say this year's allocation of \$9.214 million will support SaskBuilds' evolving work as a strategic partner helping ministries, agencies and Crowns achieve real results for the people of this province. So thank you, Madam Chair, and with that I'm happy to answer any questions that the committee has.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister Wyant. I'll now open the floor to committee members. I recognize Ms. Sproule.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Minister, for that comprehensive report. Welcome, Mr. Toffan. I know you're not new to this organization but your new position. And I've seen some of your YouTube videos on P3s, so I know you're a big champion of those.

Okay, where to start. Just one comment you just made right now, Mr. Minister, was that the idea of the new procurement model is to centralize the line ministries' approach to procurement. I'm just wondering if you see Central Services as a line ministry or a central agency.

**Mr. Toffan:** — Kyle Toffan, president and CEO. So very different functions really: Central Services is a central agency for many services that government provides, including accommodations, IT [information technology], CVAs [central vehicle agency] and the like. I would suggest SaskBuilds is also a central agency for a lot of different functions that government provides, including capital planning, asset management, and now the single procurement service. So I think it's just very different functions, but both central agencies in their own right.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Do you think it's inconceivable that both of those functions could be fulfilled by one central agency? Or why do you think there needs to be two?

[18:15]

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well the original plan was, as I'd mentioned in my opening remarks, was to centralize procurement. There was no discussion with respect to centralizing or bringing the other important work that Central

Services does for government into SaskBuilds. So there hasn't been that conversation.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So it was just assumed that SaskBuilds would take over procurement when Central Services had been doing that for decades?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well the idea, of course, is to bring all the procurement for executive government into one place, as I mentioned in my comments.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes, I understand that.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Procurement is siloed within the different ministries and specifically with respect to Highways and Central Services. So the idea is to bring them all together and bring all the procurement expertise into one place. So that was the guiding principle. Because we think that there's some significant savings that can be achieved by centralizing that procurement, by bringing all our procurement expertise into one place as opposed to having it decentralized across government.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I certainly understand that concept and I think it makes sense. The question I'm asking though is, why can't Central Services provide that central service? Bring Highways procurement into Central Services then if you want to locate it all . . . Why your ministry and why not the Ministry of Central Services?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well I think procurement goes hand in hand with the work that we're doing at Priority Saskatchewan in terms of enhancing the mandate of Priority Saskatchewan to enhance Government of Saskatchewan participation with Saskatchewan companies in procurement. So it made sense that if we were going to centralize procurement, it should be done in concert with the work that's being done by Priority Saskatchewan.

**Ms. Sproule:** — It seems to go in conflict with what one of your colleagues said in Central Services here last week. Because a quote from Minister Cheveldayoff is that "Central Services conducts the actual procurement . . . on a daily basis, to ensuring they're working with all the different ministries to make sure that they're understanding what those procurement needs are . . ." So that seems to be a bit of a different aim than what you're telling the committee here tonight.

I'm sorry, Mr. Minister, that was last year, not this year.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That would have been correct, I guess, until March 31st because those functions were being done by Central Services.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And I guess what I'm trying to find out is why that changed, why it's being taken from Central Services. And you're saying it's because it makes a better fit in SaskBuilds, but Central Services has done it for decades. So what has changed in terms of the role of that central agency?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well there's a number of things. When we created Priority Saskatchewan and we developed the 13 action items with respect to how we were going to procure instead of having that decentralized across government, and given the work

that Priority Saskatchewan had done with respect to procurement transformation — which has been quite successful — that having the actual procurement done by the entity that was responsible for moving forward with procurement transformation seemed to make a lot of sense.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Will that include all procurement across government? Things like pens and papers and photocopiers and toilet paper?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Yes.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. I guess the next question is then in terms of centralizing, why do we now have two ministers involved in the full gamut of procurement build managing? Why do you think there's a need for two ministries to do that? Priority Saskatchewan can certainly sit within Central Services. There'd be no reason for it not to. I'm just wondering why the government sees a need for two separate ministers to handle what seems to be one central service.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well as I said, procurement will be centralized. There is still a significant role for Central Services to play with regard to the work that they do in terms of management of assets for the government and some of the other things that Mr. Toffan has already commented. So there is certainly a continuing role for the work of Central Services within government.

**Ms. Sproule:** — How many total FTEs [full-time equivalent] are now in SaskBuilds?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — There's 66.

**Ms. Sproule:** — How many of those are in Priority Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Seven.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And last year how many were in Priority Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Five.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And what are the two new roles there?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — There's one position with respect to SaskTenders and one with respect to supplier management and reporting.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And are those new positions or ones that were previously filled in Central Services?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Those were positions that were transferred from Central Services.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. What was the dollar value in terms of procurement in 2018-19 from the First Nations or Métis business community, and what are you projecting for this year?

**Mr. Toffan:** — This is an area where we're going to be focused on in the future. Obviously we know there's more to be done here. We haven't been tracking this amount to spend but we will

be, going forward.

One of the things though that we have been focusing on through Priority Saskatchewan is not just executive government but also the commercial Crown sector, for instance SaskPower. And we do have some partnership success stories on that for Indigenous procurement: since 2014 for instance, \$201 million in procurement to Indigenous business and communities alone through that file. There's also been over 50 contracts since that time that were awarded to Indigenous businesses.

So like I mentioned, it's something that we know that we need to do more on and something that I know First Nations are up to the challenge on. We haven't been tracking it for executive government to date.

**Ms. Sproule:** — You mentioned SaskPower. Is your corporation involved with that kind of procurement in tracking?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So SaskPower is a partner of ours. We have been working very closely with them through Priority Saskatchewan to ensure that Saskatchewan businesses receive fair treatment. And they've made quite a few very positive strides on that file. So we work with them in the sense of training, in vendor and supplier development, and also on sharing of templates, processes, and policies. So we don't do their procurement. We don't have that role, but we do work quite closely with SaskPower through their commercial Crowns on this file.

**Ms. Sproule:** — You say you're focusing on the future and you aren't tracking it right now. What is it you're focusing on in the future in relation to First Nations and Métis procurement?

**Mr. Toffan:** — One of the things we first want to understand is the capacity and ability of First Nations companies and individuals to provide services to government. So we've been working on building those relationships, and we'll continue to do that going forward. And it's things like supplier development. So maybe they are providing services to private sector companies. Maybe there's an opportunity for them to do that for governments.

The other thing that we're interested in is, trade agreements actually exempt First Nations from certain thresholds, so we want to take a good, hard look at that as well and look at that opportunity. We haven't done that analysis yet but we're looking at doing that in the future. Now that we have one single procurement service we're able to look at this more holistically across government.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Do you intend to have . . . Do you have any targets for this year, this fiscal year?

**Mr. Toffan:** — No, we don't have any targets at this time. We are looking at developing those, but not at this time until we analyze the opportunity a little bit more and understand which First Nations businesses are able to provide these services that we very much need in government.

**Ms. Sproule:** — In terms of your staff, how many people are working on this project?

**Mr. Toffan:** — That would be the Priority Saskatchewan team,

so that team of seven individuals all have a role to play. I would say it's broader than that, though. We do have myself. I mean, you know, I'm very interested in this file. And our whole corporation frankly understands the need to do business differently, and this is part of doing business differently.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I understand you're interested in it, but I'm really looking for concrete sort of action items that you have identified within your organization in Priority Sask.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I might just add a comment to this because this has been an interest, not only of management, but certainly of me as the minister. But we are working with Government Relations in terms of ensuring that to the fullest extent possible we have First Nations participation in our contracts, of course subject to our trade agreements. So that's going to be a focus as we go forward, and we will be spending some considerable energy with respect to ensuring that we meet goals and targets that we're going to set for ourselves.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So you're expending considerable energy to set targets, is what you're saying. So we won't see targets for a while.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — As I mentioned in my opening comments, the work that we're doing on procurement in terms of integrating the procurement within Priority Saskatchewan only started on April the 1st. So there's a considerable amount of work that needs to be done to analyze the data that's currently out there as we move forward to developing a strategic plan in this area around procurement generally. So I think it would be fair to say that, given the fact that we have been in existence as an organization or at least a subset of this organization for nine days.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So you're saying the government hasn't put any energy into this at all before April 1st, 2019?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — No. There's considerable work that had to go into ensuring that we had . . . We moved the employees over in a timely and efficient and effective way. So certainly there is a lot of work that needed to be done both between SaskBuilds and Central Services and Highways in terms of identifying the people that needed to come over for the procurement, to fulfill the procurement strategy that we set for ourselves. So in terms of that planning, there's a significant amount of work that needed to be done to identify those individuals and set the game plan. But now that we have our organization in place, we will be moving to set the targets and developing our strategic plan around procurement.

**Ms. Sproule:** — For First Nations and Métis?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well, for everything.

**Ms. Sproule:** — That's what I'm specifically talking about right now. And I can't believe the government hasn't done any work on this prior to April 1st, 2019. I mean, this isn't new.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It's certainly been a focus of the Crown corporations for a very long time. And as I've said before, as Mr. Toffan has said before, the coordinating work that's being done between Priority Saskatchewan and the Crowns, they're partner agencies in terms of delivering on our procurement strategy.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So the two new individuals that have come over to Priority Sask, who are basically looking after Sask tender and supplies, how does that change how you're targeting Indigenous and First Nation, Métis procurement? It sounds like their jobs haven't changed really at all.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Their roles haven't changed but the fact that we brought all our procurement specialists together, that's where we'll be able to not only find efficiencies with respect to executive government procurement, but set the strategies in these various areas.

[18:30]

**Ms. Sproule:** — How many people were working in procurement in SaskBuilds prior to April 1st?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — 23.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So the 33 that are coming from Central Services, I think you said, or is that the total? 30. I lost it already.

**A Member:** — There's 29 from Central Services.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Twenty-nine from Central Services and the remainder are from Highways, MHI [Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure]?

**A Member:** — There's one . . .

**Ms. Sproule:** — How many?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — And one from Parks, Culture and Sport.

**Ms. Sproule:** — PCS [Parks, Culture and Sport]. Well I guess this will just be a question we'll have to ask next year, is if you've made any progress on this file without any targets to sort of measure your performance by.

Okay, I'd like to turn now to public accounts, payee details \$50,000 and over. The most recent numbers we have are from April 2017 to March 31st, 2018 because obviously that's your last annual report. My first question is, why aren't these numbers published online with your annual report? The only way I could find them was to go to the library and get a paper copy.

**Ms. Florizone:** — Teresa Florizone, vice-president of corporate services and CFO [chief financial officer]. So as part of the legislative requirement, we are preparing the financial statements based on the PSAP [public sector accounting principles] requirements. And as part of the . . . [inaudible] . . . we have to put the financial statements and the dollars that are salaries and payees greater than \$50,000 included as the Legislative Assembly package. There isn't any requirement that we do have to put it onto the web at all, so we are following legislative requirements. And we do understand that from a financial perspective our Finance partners are also looking at this from a wider perspective and thinking about it from more than just a SaskBuilds view.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you, Ms. Florizone. I mean it's about transparency and, as you know, most people go to the internet to find reports. And it doesn't say anywhere in your report that these

numbers are only available on paper. And certainly I think, Mr. Minister, we may have had this conversation in the past, and I know other ministries we have as well . . . or not ministries but Crowns, treasury board Crowns. I think it's really in the interest of transparency that you could somehow post it online as well as just putting a paper copy in the Legislative Library. Is that something you would consider?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well as Ms. Florizone had mentioned, the Ministry of Finance is working kind of in a broader sense with respect to how this reporting is handled across the treasury board Crown sector, so we'll let them do their work.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So that's no?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — No, not necessarily. I think it's an important . . . Transparency across government, whether it's executive government or whether it's treasury board Crowns, is very important. And so it will be something that I will be raising with the Minister of Finance.

**Ms. Sproule:** — In your public accounts payee details \$50,000 and over, there's a payment to Crown Investments Corporation for \$97,000. Can you share with the committee what the purpose of that payment was?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That was payment for employment of an individual that was seconded from CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] to run SaskBuilds. The former acting president.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Payment to SaskPower for 92,000?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That was for another secondment.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And I assume . . . I guess I can't really go back to 2015, but there was the same amount for SaskPower in the two years previous, so can I assume that's a . . . Thank you for that.

I notice that your payee reports have really plummeted from 2015, which was . . . It was at \$12 million. Then it dropped to \$9.7 million, 1.7 million in '16-17, 1.5 in '17-18. Can you share with the committee the direction we'll see in '18-19, once your annual report is filed?

**Ms. Florizone:** — So going forward, as the organization is growing and as our minister had mentioned we are transferring FTEs to our organization, you'll see a larger amount of salaries and benefits on the supplier side. There will be similar expenses going forward.

**Ms. Sproule:** — It looks like your suppliers outside of the secondments would be basically architects, engineers, and accountants. So why would those be increasing commensurately with the staffing?

**Ms. Florizone:** — So the expenses you see on those are for specifically our P3s. As the P3s decrease, as they are completed, getting to substantial completion — so we've had one going into substantial completion in '17-18, which is in September, and there will be the bypass which goes into substantial completion in October of 2019 — and as those projects come to completion and get into their first year of operations, you'll see a decrease on

those as well.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay, thank you. You mentioned, Mr. Minister, there'd be \$500,000 for renovations. Are you staying in the same location or are you moving the whole organization?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Still looking at how the organization is going to be located. So there's a number of different options that the organization is looking at. We can't say for sure at this point in time.

**Ms. Sproule:** — You've just budgeted that as a marker, 500,000?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Yes, tenant improvements for the new staff that are coming over.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So they started on April 1st. Where are they sitting right now?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So right now the staff are located at their current, or at their former locations. So in the case of Central Services they're on Rose Street, and in the case of Highways they're on the sixth floor of 1855 Victoria.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So you're just managing them remotely, basically? Thanks. Okay.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Just for clarity, the Highways procurement people are in the same building as SaskBuilds, so in terms of kind of managing it, it's a little bit simpler when they're in the same building.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. Of all the payees that you've had in the last few years — and the biggest year was a few years ago at 12 million — is that cost factored into the cost of the P3 project itself when you're doing your final accounting of the P3 project?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It's all included in the value of the project.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay, thank you. In the budget document we have the capital plan, which you're very involved with, and the budget for capital, the capital plan in '18-19 was 1.241 million. The forecast is currently at 1.172 million. I'm just wondering what the difference is there — I think it's about \$70 million — why it's dropped in the forecast.

**Mr. Toffan:** — So I had assumed it's the SaskBuilds or Saskatchewan Builds capital plan. Is that what you're referring to?

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes.

**Mr. Toffan:** — Okay. It's just a matter of some projects finishing and other projects coming on stream. It's just the nature of the construction phases of these projects and some coming to completion and others starting. So it's just . . . It ebbs and it flows.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Does SaskBuilds prepare this summary for the budget documents?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So we prepare a lot of the information that goes into the preparation of it, but we don't prepare the Saskatchewan



Builds capital plan itself. That's a Finance document.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Finance does that. I'm just curious about projections for municipal programs. Last year, infrastructure, it was targeted at \$106 million. But in this budget it's actually more than doubled at \$229 million. I don't know if you're involved in any of that or if you can share some information or not. But if you can, that would be great.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well that's not in our budget.

**Ms. Sproule:** — You're not involved at all in the municipal infrastructure programs? I thought you identified several that you are involved in.

**Mr. Toffan:** — One of the things I will share is that we did sign the integrated bilateral agreement with the federal government. We are monitoring and managing that agreement; that's our responsibility. The budgetary dollars though for those particular programs are managed and provided to the Ministry of Government Relations. And so although we do have a role to play, sort of at an oversight level and a management level, we aren't administering the contracts directly with municipalities and wouldn't have the budget in our budget.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Now that you're taking over procurement, will you have any role in that?

**Mr. Toffan:** — No. That's really program administration and not procurement. So they do have contracts and agreements, funding agreements with municipalities, but that's different and outside of the realm of procurement.

**Ms. Sproule:** — In terms of the work you're doing with Government Relations on the integrated bilateral agreement with the Government of Canada, first of all, I'm wondering is it possible to get a copy of the agreement that was signed in October 2018.

**Mr. Toffan:** — Absolutely. It's online for sure.

**Ms. Sproule:** — On your website?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Yes, it is on our website.

**Ms. Sproule:** — All right, I can get it there.

**Mr. Toffan:** — Okay. Just for clarification, it's on the federal website, and I believe there's a link to it but we can provide that as well if you would like.

**Ms. Sproule:** — If it's online I think I can find it. If not, I'll let you know. Thank you. In terms of that \$896 million, almost a billion dollars, has there been any determination through your integrated plan as to what projects will go ahead or is that still in the planning stages?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well it's still in planning. As I mentioned during my opening remarks, there will be a . . . It's a two-stage process. We'll be looking at expressions of interest, which is open March 15th for municipalities, for non-profits, and for for-profits to submit program, the simplified process for getting their expressions of interest into Government Relations.

Then from there that analysis will be done and a further second stage will occur where there will be a full program application. And then of course, depending on which stream that the project is allocated to will depend on where the government participation is, either provincially or federally or locally. And it will also depend because this is a nine-year agreement in terms of where . . . It's certainly not all going to happen in one year.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. Is there a percentage allocation for each one of those four sectors? I'm including Indigenous in there as well. And if it's on the agreement I could probably just find it.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — So I'll read this into the record: of the total allocation for the Government of Saskatchewan of 896.323 million, 307.871 million is allocated to public transit; 416.334 million and a bit is dedicated to climate change and mitigation. There's \$56.211 million which is dedicated to community, culture, and recreation; and rural and northern communities has an allocation of \$115.905 million.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So it's broken down by topic rather than by sector at this point.

[18:45]

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That's right. And so once the expressions of interest come in, we'll know where those allocations, or at least which funding pool those will come from. There's a number of cost-matching requirements in each one of those, and so it really depends on which stream how much cost matching has to come from, either a municipality or for the provincial government. So there's different funding, matching stuff.

**Ms. Sproule:** — No commitment as to dollars by the provincial government as of yet?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I think that's a question that's probably better put to the Minister of Government Relations. There's certainly no allocation in our budget, in terms of any of the matching funds for any of these projects.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And your role as SaskBuilds in this agreement then?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well as Mr. Toffan indicated, it is to oversee the program requirements between the federal government and the province.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — And the provincial projects through the integrated capital plan.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So maybe then we can move to the integrated capital plan. I see it's online as of January 2019. What is the connect between that planning manual and the integrated bilateral agreement with the Government of Canada? Is there any direct link with that, or is the manual to be applied across all capital planning projects?

**Mr. Toffan:** — The direct link is that provincial projects are eligible if they meet the federal criteria. The integrated capital planning process — which is attached to the planning and

accountability management system of government; so the strategic planning portion of our planning structure — started several months ago and closes on May 31st of this year. Once we get an idea of what those applications from different ministries and organizations look like, we'll match them up against the federal criteria to see eligibility, and then obviously determine from there whether they're suitable for federal funding or whether they're not. That's the connection.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. There's a quote from the manual that says, and I'll just read it to you. I think it's on page 1, but I'm not positive about that. I'll find it: "In addition to identifying new assets . . ." Where is that located? Can't find the page it's on. Okay, I'm going to leave that for now because I can't locate it.

I just want to make sure I really understand this. So this manual is not for capital planning on across the board, yes or no?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Yes.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes. Okay. So it's not just that . . . Last week in estimates, Minister Cheveldayoff said that "The ministry prioritizes projects to ensure that necessary maintenance is undertaken, which extends the life and value of the asset."

And your integrated capital planning manual talks about identifying critical and strategic assets that are in poor condition, and potential repurposing, I think, is part of the goal of that manual. So whose role is it to identify, you know, the life and value of an asset or whether it needs to be repurposed or not? Is that SaskBuilds or is that Central Services?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Yes. So I can shed some light on that. So the way I would view it is Central Services is one program that government provides in addition to Education, Health, Advanced Education, all of those different portfolios. So you're right, Central Services does do that for the assets that they manage, which are typical to government-owned buildings and other like assets.

So we also do the integrated capital planning process for other assets that government either owns or funds, including hospitals and schools. So our process is broader. It captures all the programs. And what I would suggest is that Central Services is just one of those programs.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I always think of it as a central service. So you're saying the schools and hospitals are being managed by Education and the Health Authority, presumably the Ministry of Health, and not by . . . So therefore Central Services isn't really central at all; it's just government services. It used to be called Government Services, I believe. I can't understand why it's called Central Services and identified as such, but I'm just thinking out loud, Mr. Minister. Just let me get a hold of myself here.

Which ministries' deputies are on the infrastructure steering committee?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — So the steering committee is chaired by Mr. Toffan. The membership includes deputy ministers from Highways, Finance, Central Services, Health, Education, Advanced Education, as well as there's an ex officio member.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Pardon me?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — There's an ex officio member from the Premier's office.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Is that the deputy minister to the Premier?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It is the deputy minister to the Premier.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And that is currently . . .

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Cam Swan.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Cam Swan. Okay, I'm just looking on page 2 of your integrated capital planning manual. You've got SaskBuilds board reporting directly to cabinet. What's the relationship with the SaskBuilds board and treasury board?

**Mr. Toffan:** — The relationship is that they're separate first of all, separate functions. But the relationship is the Vice-Chair on our board is actually the Minister of Finance. And so there's a linkage but they are separate functions. And we come to treasury board just like everyone else for budgetary reasons. And our minutes of our board are submitted to cabinet, directly to cabinet, not to treasury board.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I'm just looking at the comment on page 2 where it says: "SaskBuilds reports all findings and recommendations to SaskBuilds Board who then considers further recommendations to Treasury Board and Cabinet." But the way the drawing is drawn on your little drawing is that there's no relationship between SaskBuilds board and treasury board. So I'm not sure what . . . But you're saying that maybe the drawing isn't entirely correct?

**Ms. Florizone:** — So you're looking at the capital manual, right? The Integrated capital planning manual, that diagram there? So that diagram basically shows the relationship of the integrated capital planning process. So we at SaskBuilds prepare the review of the business cases as they come in. And as the business cases come in, they are also shared with the treasury board branch. The treasury board branch is part of treasury board where they report in and that helps them make business decisions for their capital planning process on treasury board. So that's the relationship that you're seeing within the integrated capital planning diagram.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. There's also mention of a review committee. Could you provide the names of the people that sit on the review committee, please?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I don't have the names of the individuals but the ministries that are supported are Environment, Central Services, Finance, SaskBuilds of course, Government Relations, and the Economy.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Could you provide those names to the committee and table them at a later time?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Sure.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. Now there's this SaskBuilds screen that's injected into the integrated capital planning cycle from June to August in the planning cycle for the provincial budget.

On page 5 you talk about this screen and the function it serves. There are three lenses, two of which are supposed to be achieved by this screen. First of all, “Project readiness is assessed to ensure that business cases are complete.” And then secondly, “New projects are prioritized based on their alignment to government goals and ranked based on their comparison to each other.”

Just wondering if you could provide the committee with a little bit of explanation on the ranking and how that’s achieved.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — With respect to the criteria for the ranking, there is three. There’s contribution . . .

**Ms. Sproule:** — I think the third one is done by Finance though, isn’t it? Affordability?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — There’s contribution to growth. There’s health and safety, and there’s improved quality of life.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And what sort of measurements do you use to establish that? Like quality of life, how would you quantify that?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well under contribution to growth, we look at the economic impact. Utilization and capacity are two of the . . . And then there’s a number of comments under those with respect to health and safety, condition of existing asset.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Is that document something you could table?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well it’s part of the integrated capital plan.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I don’t think . . .

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — [Inaudible] . . . treasury board. So the other factor with respect to health and safety, there’s health and safety drivers that are part of that. With respect to improved quality of life, we look at improved access to programs, so social impact, functionality and efficiency, and environmental impact.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And where is that document located?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It’s not.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So that’s not something you can table with the committee?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — No.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. Transparency. There’s also on page 6 in determining project readiness, apparently that falls on your ministry as well. How many projects have you reviewed that were rejected because they weren’t ready? In even the last fiscal year.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — We don’t reject projects; they’re just reprioritized. So I wouldn’t say that we reject any particular project but . . . their ranking with respect to prioritization.

[19:00]

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. SaskBuilds’ findings and recommendations are summarized in the annual integrated

capital plan. Is that something we can get a copy of? Or is that a treasury board document as well?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That’s a confidential document that’s prepared for budget purposes.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I assume then the capital projects and programs list is also confidential, as are the business cases?

**Mr. Toffan:** — The first one, yes. But not the business cases. The business cases themselves by project are confidential, but the templates have been online in the past and will be online again in the near future.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Well I’m looking for the projects, so . . . And then same with the capital asset plan. I know you have a template and guide for that as well, but the actual filled-out plans would not be available for the committee to review them. Is that correct?

**Mr. Toffan:** — That’s correct, yes.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Just want to share on page 6 of the manual, you’ve identified that “To prioritize projects, SaskBuilds uses an evidence-based scoring matrix that was developed based on . . . best practices.” In estimates last year, CEO Dedman said:

It’s not our role or our goal to necessarily set priorities for the projects and say this project is better than this project. It’s how we bring them all together so that the project list is available to look at as one package as opposed to the normal process where you’re bringing projects forward one at a time for consideration.

So the way I read this is that your planning manual says it’s based on a matrix. But in a committee last year the CEO said it’s not at all a matrix; it’s bringing them together and looking at it as a package. Is there a connect between those two statements?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So one of the comments I’d make on that is it’s really about just providing options to decision makers to make decisions. And we’re not saying which projects must go forward. We’re basically just ensuring that a certain level of due diligence is done in advance to make sure that decision makers have that information.

It is a package. It is a complete, prioritized list of projects. So matrix maybe could mean the same thing, but at the end of the day it really is about providing options and an understanding of the health and safety, quality of life, and ability to drive economic development.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So this evidence-based scoring matrix, is that what you were reading from earlier, or is that a separate document?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That was the matrix tool that I already spoke to.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So I can’t see that. Thank you. In terms of the matrix then, how do you make government-wide decisions prioritizing health over education?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well it’s based on the criteria which we’ve

already spoken about, whether it's contribution to growth, or health and safety. So those, I've already spoken to those, but that's how the matrix is applied.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Would you say it's fair that these are things treasury board and cabinet would have done before this document existed?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So what I would say is that treasury board and cabinet still does do that. So they still do . . . They take our information and just use it as one piece of the puzzle to make their decision. We're providing some insight into these criteria, but there's financial considerations as well. There's of course political considerations and others. So it's one facet of information that we provide so that decisions can be made, but it's definitely not the only factor that's looked at.

**Ms. Sproule:** — But in terms of the screen that you do in the months of June to August, are you saying you would never screen out a project? So it's not really a screen then.

**Mr. Toffan:** — So what we try to do from a screening standpoint is provide an understanding of where they're at in the cycle. So there's some projects that aren't ready, that they just need more work, and so we would screen them in the sense of understanding where they are in their planning cycle, and not screen them out in the sense of saying they're not worthy.

**Ms. Sproule:** — In terms of the business cases and their readiness, do the proponents — I don't know what word you call them when they're bringing forward a project — do they have to have a value-for-money audit as part of their business case?

**Mr. Toffan:** — No they don't, unless it's a project that is ready to proceed and it's over a certain threshold. And so 100 million is the number that we have used in the past for these types of projects. But for projects underneath that threshold, typically we wouldn't have that as an expectation at all.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So would value for money be used in any circumstance other than a P3?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Not in the terms of the calculation as set out in our P3 guideline. No.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I know the auditor recommended that some of the positives of the P3 management process be applied to the traditional build processes. Is that something you're moving toward? I mean value for money can mean many things. It doesn't mean necessarily a private-public partnership. So how much work do the proponents have to do, and like what kind of money are we . . . I guess you wouldn't even know what kind of money they put into it, but it's a very expensive process to get to the business case readiness stage. And has that changed with the advent of SaskBuilds, or would they not have had to do a business case before SaskBuilds existed?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So the benefits of SaskBuilds has been adding consistency to the level of rigour done on each individual project. Prior to that, there were business cases that were completed on individual projects but it definitely wasn't consistent. And I would suggest that the quality of business cases now that government has at their disposal is much better. It's just much

more rigorous. We have templates, as I pointed out earlier, and it's based on threshold of project size.

So to address your value-for-money comment, really from a P3 standpoint the purpose of value for money is to calculate the savings that government could achieve by doing an alternative delivery model compared to a traditional delivery model. That's really what we're trying to achieve. If we're going down the road of a traditional model anyway, there's nothing to really compare. But there is still value; it's just a different calculation.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So what method would you use to establish the value?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Yes, so we would look at things like, you know, return on investment. We would look at jobs created. We would look at GDP [gross domestic product] impacted, any sort of economic value. But it wouldn't be comparing it to a different procurement model. It would be more value in the sense of the traditional value proposition of the project.

**Ms. Sproule:** — In terms of the matrix and the quality of life versus health benefits, does that shift depending on what ministry . . . Like I'm thinking a school brings large quality of life, but it may not be economically viable. So does the matrix shift depending on the type of projects that come forward? Instead of a warehouse for, you know, Highways?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I'm not sure this is going to answer your question very well. So for instance, for highways we would look at things like the current level of service at peak time, but for dams we'd look at inflow design for flood rating. So different factors apply to different projects.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So how do you put them all together in one package? Like how do you quantify the value when the values are so diametrically opposed?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well that's the whole idea of having a matrix. When you bring all the different factors together and you assess those, you make your decisions based on . . . you prioritize based on the matrix, right.

So you're right, every project brings different value or different intrinsic value. A hospital, for instance, brings a certain value in a certain demographic. Schools bring different value. And so those all have to be assessed not only with respect to scope and budget but with respect to schedule. And so these decisions just get made as a result of application of the matrix. But again, there's a lot of other factors that go into those kinds of things as well.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Like?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well things that are set out in the matrix, right. I mean so for instance, we may decide that it's a larger priority for us as government to do a joint-use school in Lakeview than it would be to do a different kind of project in a different part of the province, right. And so assessing those kinds of things in terms of need. But at the end of the day it's the matrix that brings that value together, that proposition. But then we sit down and have a conversation about what's priority for government.

**Ms. Sproule:** — It sounds to me there's a combination of objective values and subjective values, and they're quantified very differently. And I'm not saying that's right or wrong. I don't know how else you can do it.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I think that's fair to say, that there's a combination of objective and subjective values, sure.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So the matrix would be limited in terms of its objectivity?

**Ms. Florizone:** — So the information that comes in is from the business case. So as we bring the information together, the information could be a bit subjective but it also is based on evidence that comes in from the business case. So that way it actually . . . There is data or there is a recommendation or a process. It could be in regards to location. It could be in regards to utilization. It could be any of those matters. And you take all of those items into consideration and then you develop the differentials between the projects.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And how are those differentials developed?

**Ms. Florizone:** — Well based on what the minister's already mentioned about the different main three areas in regards to the contributions to growth, the economic factors. And what we do is we look at . . . Let's just use economic growth for an example. We don't just look at just the size and dollar of a project. Because if you're just looking at the dollar and size, dollar and size would automatically win over if it's a huge project. That might not always be the case if you've got a small community that actually has long-term care, that has people that need to be serviced, right? You take all of those things into consideration. Not that it's the dollar of the project; it is the impact that it actually has

So we put that information together, so that way your big projects aren't the only ones that have the economic value.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes. I think the enormity of what you're trying to do and the ultimate subjectivity of it is a role the government has always played in terms of making these kinds of decisions and it's laudable to create a matrix to try and capture that.

But I've been doing some reading on value-for-money audits in the P3 context and the three Es that are measured: efficiency, economics, and I forget the third one. You'd probably know it. But in terms of efficiency, when you apply the subjectivity test, I mean what does efficiency mean? So I think this is a very subjective process. And I think as I understand based on your answers tonight, I appreciate the depth of understanding I'm getting about this.

So I don't want to get into a philosophical discussion on the definition of efficiency, but I do want to turn to the auditor's reports from 2015 and 2017. And I know you've already had this discussion in committee. One of things — I was actually talking to her about it today — was you've agreed to make some changes in terms of the minimum content required. That was one of the recommendations and it was implemented. One of the things I'm wondering about is, are you going to make those changes retrospectively to the value-for-money audits that you did prior to making that change?

[19:15]

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — So Swift Current was the first one that went out. We didn't retrospectively apply those changes that we had brought forward to that one, but they were all incorporated in the subsequent ones.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And in terms of the recommendation of a minimum estimated savings, I understand that you are now requiring less than 3 per cent variability on that minimal value-for-money savings.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — That's correct.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes, okay. Then are there any value-for-money audits that are going forward at this point in time? Do you have any P3 projects that you're at that stage?

**Mr. Toffan:** — There's nothing at this time that we're working on, no.

**Ms. Sproule:** — And in terms of the announcements for capital in the budget this year, will any of those exceed \$100 million?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well there was planning in the budget for Prince Albert and for Weyburn.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Schools?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Hospitals.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Hospitals. There was a project for four schools.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — The Saskatoon perimeter highway project, there was some planning money for that as well.

**Ms. Sproule:** — There was a joint-school project in Moose Jaw?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — The joint-school project in Moose Jaw and the joint-school project in Regina will be traditional builds. They're not in the range where we would look at doing a public-private partnership.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Can you explain why 100 million is sort of the threshold that you look at for those projects?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So the 100 million is an industry guideline standard. I of course had the luxury, before I came back here to the second stint, to be all across Canada. And what I can say is that most jurisdictions use that 100 million as sort of the threshold. Can P3s be done less than 100 million? Yes, and they have been. In Saskatchewan we've used 100 million as our benchmark. Anything kind of above that, we believe, we should at least do the analysis. Is it guaranteed to be a P3 above 100 million? Absolutely not. We want to make sure that the right procurement method is chosen in each individual case and do the analysis to show that.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So in terms of the efficacy of a P3, if I understand it correctly, the risk transfer certainly would be a huge factor over \$100 million. I just want to understand why that's sort of the target. Risk transfer obviously being one, what other factors would go into it or make that 100 million such an

attractive marker?

**Mr. Toffan:** — So one of the other factors that's heavily considered by our private partners is the interest from their perspective. And a lot of times once you get below \$100 million, the amount of equity left in the project that they would be interested in taking as a company, it just gets too small. And lots of times they have company policies and processes too, and it's just too small to even trigger their company processes. So it's just we can't find the private partners to be interested in it, is really the easy way to look at it.

**Ms. Sproule:** — All right. I'm moving on just to some comments that actually were made last year in estimates by Minister Marit, and I just want to get a follow-up on some of that. One of the things he identified — this is a Priority Saskatchewan question — is Priority Saskatchewan's work, one of the things they do is listening to and responding to private sector complaints. And I would just like to get a sense of what those types of private sector complaints might be.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — One of the things that they do is look to, for private sector contractors who may lose a particular bid, to do a debrief with them to see what they can do better with respect to the next bid. So a lot of the conversations that our officials have with those companies is around issues in terms of their loss of a contract and what can they do to improve the next time that the government does a procurement in a particular area. And that's really, I think, the lion's share of the work that they do in terms of that, that debrief.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Fair enough. In terms of The Meadows, I'm just wondering, the project is done and last year it was still in transition to a takeover by the Health Authority. Do you know if that has now been taken over by the Health Authority?

**Mr. Toffan:** — It has, yes.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. On October 9th at The Meadows there was an outbreak of an unconfirmed illness. Visitation was restricted. Enhanced cleaning and infection control protocols were implemented. Public health infection control teams were actively involved. Within eight days the outbreak was declared over. Now the private partner on The Meadows project is Plenary Health and the maintenance partner is Johnson Controls. So what was the working relationship with these partners, and were you guys involved at all in that outbreak?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — The interface of those companies would have been with the Health Authority because they had control of the facility.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. So they had taken over by October 9th of 2018. If it had happened prior to their takeover, what government ministry would have been involved, or agency?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It would have been the Cypress Health Authority.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. Getting near the end here, but I've got a few more questions. Carbon tax. What will be the impact of the carbon tax on your budget this year?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — There may well be an adjustment in our lease costs with respect to it because there would be an escalator clause in the lease with regard to the accommodations. But apart from that, I'm not . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, maybe some fuel costs in terms of transportation, but apart from that, we don't see a significant impact on our budget.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Okay. We're just checking out across government what that impact will be for this year, so we're trying to get a feel of . . .

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It certainly wouldn't be very significant, but there would be a factor in our lease, you know, for accommodations.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Is your utilities included in your lease costs then, or do you pay SaskPower separately?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — It's included as part of the operating costs in the lease.

**Ms. Sproule:** — All right. Summary financial statements now from Public Accounts '17-18. The Access Prairies Partnership with the hospital, I'm just reading my notes here, the contract for operation and maintenance has gone to SNC-Lavalin. Is there any concerns about them being convicted and deemed ineligible for federal contracts?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Well they were selected as the preferred proponent based on Graham's evaluation and the meetings with the key individuals who were assigned to the project. And they would have gone under the same due diligence with the authority as the original proponents on the SHNB projects.

**Ms. Sproule:** — The existing contracts would be not affected by a federal decision?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — So we'll continue to monitor this particular issue. I've mentioned this before that we always have the right in certain circumstances to call on the partners to replace any one partner. But for the time being, we're just simply monitoring the situation developing with SNC.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. In terms of note 7 to the summary financial statements, page 54, Public Accounts, there is a description of contractual obligations the government has in relation to operation, maintenance, and life cycle rehabilitation payments under P3s. This is '17-18, so these are projections. And it looks like in this fiscal year it'll be almost \$12 million. It's going up in 2020 to 17 million. 2021 it's going up to 25 million, and then 2022 it peaks at almost \$30 million.

Now there's significant growth over those four years of projections. I don't know what they're going to look like in this year's Public Accounts because we won't see that until July, but how are these impacting the operational capacity limitations of these P3s?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — I'm not quite sure we understand the question.

**Ms. Sproule:** — I'm actually not sure either. I think I'm going to rephrase that. It's late.

Why are they increasing so significantly over that four-year period?

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Which page are you referring to, Ms. Sproule?

**Ms. Sproule:** — Page 54, for Public Accounts.

**Mr. Toffan:** — '17-18, right?

**Ms. Sproule:** — That's the latest.

**Ms. Florizone:** — So the payments that you see in contractual obligations is the payments made by each ministry over those cumulative years that you see in front of you. That would be for each of the projects, from bypass to The Meadows to the schools and to the SHNB. Those would be the rehabilitation payments year over year on those projects after the construction because there'd be some work in regards to maintenance, but then there's also rehab if there is a wall that has to be fixed or those items. Those kind of costs are called rehabilitation. So then those would be annualized on their budgets based on the schedules.

**Ms. Sproule:** — So the increase is due to what? If it's annualized, why wouldn't it be the same every year?

**Ms. Florizone:** — So there's annualized, but on the agreements there's also indexing based on indexing on the CPI [consumer price index] annually as well.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Seems to me . . .

**Ms. Florizone:** — Just on the rehab and the maintenance dollars.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Yes. There's some very sharp increases here though that can't be attributable to CPI.

**Ms. Florizone:** — So on the Regina bypass project, they're not annualized equally. There are actually lumpy payments within the bypass. And actually by doing so, by having non-averaged costs, you actually get better pricing because you're only paying for the rehabilitation at the time that the work is being done. There's actual savings, so those are actually great for the taxpayers.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Thank you. I'm not sure I understood what you just said, but I will think about it and I'll reread it in *Hansard*.

One last question. When I was talking to the auditor today about value for money, as she pointed out, value-for-money audits are really nothing more than an estimate, like we're talking about right now for this fiscal year, and that to fully reveal whether or not those estimates were accurate, you would have to go back and do another audit at the end of the project. Is that something that you're doing on the P3s that are in place in Saskatchewan right now?

[19:30]

**Mr. Toffan:** — It's something that's very quickly becoming common across Canada. Frankly, we want to make sure that we do get the value that our value for money has suggested we will, and so the intent is, going forward as the projects progress, that

we will be checking and making sure that we have that value for money realized.

**Ms. Sproule:** — When do you think we'll be able to see the first of those in our P3s?

**Mr. Toffan:** — It's probably a little bit of time. We only have a couple years of operations, and the first years there's not really much maintenance going on, not much rehab. So it'll be a little while; I would say probably seven years, usually around that range.

**Ms. Sproule:** — Is that the average?

**Mr. Toffan:** — Well I don't know that it's the average, but it's something that we've been considering, something around that timeframe.

**Ms. Sproule:** — All right. I believe I'm out of time. I would like to ask more questions, but there's always more questions. So thank you very much, Madam Chair, and Mr. Minister, Mr. Toffan, Madam Florizone, and for an informative evening. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Seeing that there are no further questions, we will adjourn our consideration of the estimates for SaskBuilds Corporation. And, Minister, if you have any closing comments you would like to make or remarks, please do.

**Hon. Mr. Wyant:** — Thank you very much. Well first of all I'd like to thank my officials for being here and taking time out of their evening to support me this evening. I'd like to thank the committee members for their patience and for you, Madam Chair, for your patience as well, and Ms. Sproule for her very respectful questions. I appreciated those. And to Hansard as well, thank you very much for your time tonight.

**The Chair:** — We will take a few minutes' recess just to change out officials before we begin the next part of our meeting.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

### General Revenue Fund Saskatchewan Research Council Vote 35

#### Subvote (SR01)

**The Chair:** — All right, folks, we will now begin our consideration of the estimates for Saskatchewan Research Council, vote 35, subvote (SR01). And we now have Ms. Vicki Mowat in for consideration of this estimate. Minister Harrison is here with his officials, and I would ask that all officials please state their names before speaking at the microphone the first time. Minister Harrison, you may begin with introducing your officials and any opening remarks you may have.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Sure. Thanks very much, Madam Chair, and thank you to committee members for being here this evening. It's a pleasure to be here on behalf of the Saskatchewan Research Council for estimates.

Joining me I have Mike Crabtree, president and chief executive

officer of SRC [Saskatchewan Research Council], on my left. On my right, Mr. Ryan Hill, our vice-president of finance; and behind, Wanda Nyirfa, our vice-president of communications, growth services and risk.

And I'd like to start by welcoming Mike to his new role as SRC's president and CEO. Mike joined SRC over five years ago as the vice-president of the energy division, and he was appointed president and CEO just last Monday. So he's kind of into this immediately here in estimates, but Mike has over 35 years of research and development experience spanning a range of industrial sectors and has held numerous senior positions in corporate, government, and international organizations throughout his career. And I very much do look forward to working with Mike as we continue to make this province a leader in research and innovation in Canada.

And I'd also like to take a moment to thank Dr. Laurier Schramm, SRC's former president and CEO, whom I've had the opportunity and pleasure to work with throughout the last number of years, and who many of you will have met previously. Laurie served as president and CEO since 2001 and in that time led the organization to become one of Canada's premier innovation-enabling organizations, with exponential revenue growth and a solid track record of over \$8 billion worth of demonstrable economic impacts in Saskatchewan alone. And I really do want to thank Laurie for the legacy he's left, not only for this organization but for the province.

And as all of you here today know, SRC has a very long history, 72 years in fact, as one of Canada's leading providers of applied research, development, and demonstration. SRC adds value to the Saskatchewan economy through the responsible application of science and technology for the mining, energy, environmental, and ag-biotech sectors in the province.

SRC's 2017-18 economic impact assessment shows impacts of more than \$772 million in direct economic benefit to the province, plus jobs created or maintained in Saskatchewan that are valued at \$42 million. This means that for every dollar invested in SRC by the provincial government, a 37 times return is achieved.

In addition, in 2017-18, 84 per cent of SRC's project expenses were aimed at creating positive socio-environmental impacts. SRC's work contributed to energy savings of more than 40 million kilowatt hours per year and to the reduction of more than 21 000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions. These are significant achievements and identify how SRC's positive impacts expand beyond just economics and jobs.

How does SRC accomplish this? By directly supporting industry and finding solutions to their toughest challenges and providing high-quality analysis that helps them in their decision making. SRC is a dynamic organization that's always working on exciting new projects to ensure it's meeting its mission and creating positive impacts for Saskatchewan.

I would like to share some examples that help provide an understanding of the breadth of work SRC does in helping industry. SRC provides services to support all aspects of the mining industry, from geoscience, exploration, extraction, processing, and tailings management through remediation. SRC

helps clients in all stages of the mining cycle, such as improving production rates and finding cost-effective ways to transport slurry. By helping companies prove out resource deposits to eventually mine and process, SRC is part of a mining cycle that creates and maintains jobs in the province.

SRC geoanalytical laboratories operates three of the world's largest and best geo-assay laboratories for uranium, potash, and diamonds. These accredited facilities have become the external labs of choice for the largest mining and mineral companies in the world by providing a large suite of services that can be performed in-house, creating efficiencies by reducing shipping costs and providing clients with convenient access to experts in one location.

SRC geoanalytical laboratories' diamond services offers an extensive range of services that are unique to the Canadian market, which provide convenient processing for diamond companies. Building on core capacity, the lab is now the only place in Canada that characterizes diamonds for recovery attributes, providing clients with critical information earlier in the process, giving them the ability to evaluate economics sooner, which will result in lower processing costs, environmental impacts, and overall project costs.

SRC's advanced microanalysis centre uses advanced technologies to analyze sizes, shapes, and abundances of different minerals. The variety of services and tools used at the centre provide some of the simplest, most accurate, and economical methods for minerals analysis.

SRC has a unique-to-Saskatchewan mineral processing pilot plant. The plant provides the capability to support initiatives in rare earths and other minerals such as potash, uranium, gold, base metals, oil shale, and coal. The facility ensures industry has the leading-edge support capabilities it needs to develop mineral deposits in the most cost-effective way.

SRC's pipe flow technology centre is internationally acclaimed and allows the resource sector to conduct commercial-scale studies for safe, cost-effective extraction, transport, processing, and tailings disposal of uranium, potash, and oil resources.

SRC provides Saskatchewan industry with a broad range of environmental solutions to assist with cost-effective sustainable development, allowing industry to meet regulatory requirements and protect our diverse ecosystem. SRC provides services that relate to all aspects of the environment, including air, soil, and water monitoring and testing; environmental impacts measurement and modelling; industrial site remediation; and sustainable practices.

SRC works with resource managers in areas such as grasslands, aspen parklands, boreal forests, subarctic woodlands, and natural vegetation to help them determine the impacts of climate change on these ecosystems and the birds and animals that inhabit them. Ultimately SRC's work helps to prevent the decline of prairie ecosystems and facilitates adaptation to a changing environment.

SRC continues the remediation work at 37 abandoned uranium mine and mill sites in northern Saskatchewan. This project will ultimately remediate the sites with positive economic, environmental, and social impacts. Thirteen years into the



project, significant progress has been made. The Lorado mill site has been completely remediated. The Gunnar mine and mill sites are currently undergoing major remediation with the completion scheduled in the next five years, and 10 of the satellite sites have been fully remediated and are waiting entry into the provincial institutional control program. SRC has delivered success throughout the project by integrating stakeholders, rights holders, and local knowledge into the work, by creating various training opportunities for local people, and by building substantial, quantifiable capacity for the region going forward.

SRC has been working with the Canadian oil sands industry for several decades to provide technological solutions that enable the extraction and transportation of bitumen in economic and environmentally responsible ways. SRC has been working with companies interested in developing Saskatchewan's oil sands and oil shale to help them assess, develop, and deploy new technologies that could enable economic and environmentally responsible development.

SRC's three-dimensional high-pressure scaled physical model is used to model an operating heavy oil field in the lab to develop thermal- and solvent-based heavy oil recovery technologies. It provides performance predictions to determine the best operating strategies for a given oil sands deposit. This model is the first of its kind in Canada and is expected to help industry by speeding up the full-scale development of cost-effective and environmentally sound processes for Saskatchewan's heavy oil reservoirs.

Through its Centre for the Demonstration of Emissions Reductions, SRC helps the petroleum industry identify, test, verify, and deploy the methane reduction technologies that are best suited for their unique needs. The centre is expected to play a leading role, creating environmental benefits and helping sustain primary natural resource industries in Saskatchewan by encouraging and enabling the adoption of greenhouse gas emissions reduction technologies.

[19:45]

SRC's Post-CHOPS [cold heavy oil production with sand] Well Centre is a fee-for-service facility that provides field and pilot scale testing, monitoring, and validation of new post-cold heavy oil production with sand, or CHOPS, technologies using end-of-life but still active CHOPS wells, addressing 23 billion barrels of oil in place. For industry this offers the opportunity to significantly extend the lives of their existing oil reservoirs, largely using their existing well stock while increasing both production and reserves.

For more than three decades, SRC has been active in research, technology development, feasibility assessment, and technology application in the bioprocessing sector. Driven by the desire to reduce climate change emissions and a greater need for energy security, technology development has experienced accelerated growth around the globe. Innovative biomass thermal conversion solutions are a cornerstone to this growth.

Through its biotechnology laboratories, SRC is working with microbes that help crops become very tolerant and resilient to stresses. This makes crops more robust, with increased yields in unfavourable environmental conditions. SRC continues to

conduct work involving animal veterinary health, agricultural products, as well as food and beverages in terms of fermentation.

SRC's Aboriginal mentorship program, or AMP, connects Indigenous post-secondary students in the science, technology, engineering, and math disciplines with SRC mentors to help students take their education and work experience to the next level. Since its inception in 2015, AMP has matched 22 students with mentors at SRC. Two of these students accepted permanent, full-time employment with SRC upon graduation and are still with the company today.

In closing, SRC is well recognized by citizens of this province and around the world for their leading-edge and technologically advanced work. And I look forward to questions from committee members.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister Harrison. I will now open the floor to questions from committee members and I recognize Ms. Mowat.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. And I want to first of all thank the minister for his opening comments and to the officials who have joined us here today, and congratulate Mike on his new role. But I also want to recognize on the record all the years of hard work that Dr. Schramm has put in. I understand that he's not necessarily leaving but has taken on the role of chief scientist and, you know, after 18 years in the role I think that we should all take a moment to acknowledge the type of dedication that takes, to stick with something for that long and to see it be so successful. So I wanted to take that opportunity to thank him, and thank him for his continued service as well, but also to welcome the new CEO and president.

I guess we'll start with Estimates, page 111. So in terms of the overall funding for the Saskatchewan Research Council, the estimated number is 19.968 million for 2019-2020, compared to 20.376 million which was estimated for 2018-2019. By my math, that's a reduction of \$408,000. I'm just wondering if you can explain sort of why the SRC saw that reduction over the past year.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. And one thing I would just, for kind of the purpose of context as far as the overall budget of SRC, only about 28 per cent of SRC's actual funding is from the provincial government. The rest comes from partnerships and from contracts with private industry. So the reduction referenced by the member was purely a function of a 2 per cent reduction in the GRF [General Revenue Fund] contribution, which was a direction from the call for estimates.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay. There has been a trend of funding declining over time, over the past five years. So by our numbers we have, from 2015-2016, we're looking at twenty-two and a half million; 2016-2017, just over 22; 2017-2018, just over 21 million; 2018-2019, just over 20 million; and then 2019-2020, we're looking at nearly 20 million. So just we've seen a declining trend over time in terms of funding. So we're just wondering how this drop can be explained.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. I think what you would see as well over that, the GRF contribution as a percentage has gone down but you would see the overall budget of SRC going up. And I

think you would see that attributed to the success that the company has had in continuing to build and market itself and be a partner of choice with private sector contract partners. So you would have seen the overall budget for the company going up.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay. So there's no drop in projects or staffing that we've seen as a result of that change?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — No. No. I mean officials could maybe speak to the specific details but I think I would be on fairly solid ground to say that there haven't been any reductions in staffing or decisions of that nature because of the GRF change, simply because the company has been very successful in bringing business through the door, working with the private sector.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay, thanks. And in terms of the return on dollars that have been spent this year — I believe you referenced it in your opening comments — 37 times?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So I think that's correct. Can you indicate how that has differed from years past?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well maybe I'll ask Mike or Ryan to speak to that specifically. But I think as a general statement, it would be fair to say that we've seen very, very significant success from SRC in terms of leveraging GRF contributions in impacts across the rest of the economy.

And as far as kind of the specific number, I'm not sure if that's varied. I think it's always been historically very high, whether that's . . . We do have it here. So you would have found that number varying significantly I think between years 2011-2012, 36 per cent, to 37 per cent this year but going as low as 18 in '16-17. And the rest are in the 20s.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you, and thanks for finding the specific numbers as well. And so one number that I found quite staggering in your opening remarks was the economic impact assessment for 2017-2018. So I noticed that last year, the 2016-2017 economic impact assessment was 404 million in direct economic benefits. And the number you cited for one year later was 772 million. So I'm wondering if you can speak to what appears to be a significant jump in terms of the economic impact.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well I couldn't speak to the specific number, but perhaps one of the officials would like to speak to that.

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Yes, Mike Crabtree. We use a well-established methodology for calculating the economic impacts. It varies year on year depending upon, you know, the status of the resource industries that we work with. So typically we will see if there is a drop in uranium or potash business, we might see a reduction in those impacts and then as they come back we see an increase. And this is largely around the investment that we can make and our commercial clients can make into the research and development technology that we take forward.

**Ms. Mowat:** — And so what you're indicating is that this . . . or seem to be implying is that this variance occurs naturally and this is a normal sort of amount of variance to see in terms of the

economic benefits that have been modelled?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Absolutely. I mean if you look at the variance in uranium and potash pricing and obviously oil and gas pricing, the economic impact to some degree tends to track resource pricing to some extent.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. And so if we were to talk about the economic impact historically, where are we at in terms of, you know, if there's a lot of variance, like how does this look when we compare it to historical models?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — With some variance it's tracked upwards over the recent years, very much in line with our own revenue. So our own revenue is a good indicator of the sort of multiplier. You know, in the early 2000s SRC was probably, in terms of total revenue, in the sort of 20, \$25 million range. We're now approaching the \$80 million range. So, you know, our impacts tend to track with that, with the variances around resource pricing.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, you were also identifying in your opening comments that the jobs that are provided through SRC are valued at 42 million. And I notice last year you'd indicated 109 million and said that there were 1,564 jobs. So I'm wondering if there's been a change or how that value has changed so significantly or if one of those numbers was off.

**Mr. Crabtree:** — So the figures that we quote here are figures that we receive directly from our clients when we ask them how we've . . . The technology and commercialization of technology has either maintained jobs or created jobs. So these are figures that we collect from our clients, if you like, and there is a sort of natural variance year to year on that.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. So has there been any substantial change to the client base, or you're saying these are reductions that have taken place within all of those different sectors?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — There has been some reductions across sectors, as you would expect given particularly oil and gas pricing and uranium. So you know, we would hope as we see those prices start to pick up in both sectors that we would see an improvement in that figure going forward.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. And do you have a number of the actual figure of jobs provided to compare it to the 1,564?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Not for that, not for this fiscal year yet, but we can provide that data as soon as we have it.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. Just deciding where to move next. So I'm wondering if we can get a bit of an update in terms of the CLEANS project, cleanup of abandoned northern sites. Can you provide some update on the progress of the talks that are ongoing with the federal government about the cleanup of the Gunnar site?

[20:00]

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Right, yes I can speak to that, at a high level at least. I think for the specifics of the litigation, the Ministry of Justice are handling that so they can speak to that.

But I'm happy to speak to the overall policy issue, which I've spoken to in previous estimates on this, and I've been, you know, fairly vocal on this question over probably 15 years. Because I was in . . . I remember asking questions about this in parliament back in the days when I was an MP [Member of Parliament] and it's been a continuing source of frustration that the national government have not been willing to live up to the commitment that they made a long time ago now. It's been over . . . well it's been near 15 years if not longer since they made the commitment to pay for half of the cleanup of the northern abandoned uranium sites, which were initiated and started life as a federal Crown corporation for the national security purposes of the country and our allies.

So they, I think, had come to a recognition of that, that there was incumbent responsibility on them to partner with the province in cleaning up those sites, which were essentially left completely abandoned in the 1980s when Uranium City was essentially shut down overnight. And there were very significant environmental issues that came from that, including the leaching of tailings ponds into Lake Athabasca in addition to significant other environmental damage in that area on the north shore of the lake. So an agreement had been reached and executed by the government of Premier Calvert at that point to have each side pay for 50 per cent of an estimated \$25 million remediation cost.

Since then we've had not just this government but the Martin government, and there had been obviously a Harper government in there as well, who had co-operated as far as the Nuclear Safety Commission giving direction as to what remediation would look like successfully and all of those things.

We as a province made a decision to pay for it, that this needed to be done, that it was not just environmentally important; it was important for all of those who lived in northern Saskatchewan that this work get done. And we, you know, will sort out the details as to the financial component at some future time. So we've paid for and booked a \$250 million, I believe, liability a number of years ago to finance the remediation project. And SRC is doing the work, or the primary contractor doing the work in the remediation and working with a lot of local businesses and companies and individuals as well who have done a lot of the work on the ground.

You know, we've made significant progress. Lorado has been remediated. A number of the satellite mines have been as well. I think we completed nearly 10 last year on the remediation of the satellite sites. Gunnar is continuing this year. My understanding is that we had a pretty successful winter as far as having equipment moved into place and we're going to have a very productive year in remediation of the Gunnar site. But the federal government have been definitive in the last year that they were unwilling to pay for anything other than half of the \$25 million commitment which means, you know, twelve and a half million dollars as opposed to the \$125 million which would have been the 50 per cent necessary to completely remediate the site.

So you know, we've been working in good faith, trying to convince them that if they genuinely have a commitment to environmental stewardship and remediation as a general policy thrust of their government, that maybe this would be a pretty good place to demonstrate that. And they have refused — not just refused, but they have not even been willing to live up to the

twelve and a half million dollar commitment on the original 25. We've only, from Natural Resources Canada, I think received a million dollars or thereabouts from the Government of Canada as any contribution towards remediation of these sites.

So this has been a source of continuing frustration, particularly given the rhetoric from this federal government about their environmental credentials. So we initiated a statement of claim that will compel them hopefully, after being considered by the appropriate legal authorities, a.k.a. [also known as] a Court of Queen's Bench Justice, that they have a responsibility to pay for half as their agreement stated initially. So specifics of the litigation, Justice would have to speak to that but that's where we're at in terms of a policy direction.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. And so you said we've received about a million dollars from the feds. Can you just recap on how much we've paid into remediation?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I'll ask our officials to kind of give a specific number but we have booked a liability of over 200. So from 2016, \$15.5 million; 2017, 17.8; and then this year 25 million . . . or sorry, 2018, \$25 million. And a claims total . . . or sorry, up until 2018, \$132.7 million was what we've spent thus far.

**Ms. Mowat:** — And can you provide a little bit more specific information about where we're at with remediation at the Gunnar site?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. Maybe I'll ask Mike to speak to that, but I would just say as a general overall assessment we've made significant progress. There's more work to be done, but Mike can speak to that.

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Thank you. As mentioned, the Lorado mine and mill site is now completed and long-term monitoring is under way.

We have two major areas of work with the Gunnar site. The first is the replacement of the contaminated topsoil. So this year and probably for the next two or three years going forward, that will be the process that we'll be undertaking, sort of large-scale addition of topsoil which will stabilize the situation, prevent further leaching. So that's one area of work.

The other area of work, which is best described as "everything else," is under another contract and that looks at the disposal of, basically, the waste. So the surface structures have been demolished but the actual waste is still there. So that waste needs to be collected, handled carefully, and disposed of. And that's quite a significant task. So those two contracts will be under way simultaneously for the next two or three years.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you very much. And can we get some information about the relationship between SRC and Environment in terms of roles and responsibilities and how you're working together?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Yes. Our role is very much as the prime contractor to this and project management. Our responsibility to Environment is of course that they have overall oversight on the project so we report regularly to them.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, and I would just kind of add, I mean the regulator in this instance isn't the Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment; it's the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. And they're the ones that have basically ordered the clean-up work. And the pace at which the work is being conducted is done under their regulatory authority.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. I want to shift gears a little bit to the Aboriginal mentorship program. So I think you mentioned that there's been a total of 22 post-secondary STEM [science, technology, engineering, and math] students that have been matched with mentors at SRC. Have any of these students . . . So you said that two of these students have accepted permanent full-time employment, but I think that was the same number last year. So I'm just trying to get a sense of if there's any new students who have been offered employment and what that looks like.

**Mr. Crabtree:** — At this stage, no, but we still have. . . We haven't come to the end of their particular cycle of the current students. We'll be moving into another one in the summer. So we anticipate that we will have another four or five students going into the program in the summer. But as of the moment, to answer the question, no, it remains the two.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. Can you speak to what portion of funding is dedicated to this program?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — It's an extremely cost-effective program in the sense that we will provide support for the students in terms of their daily attendance, if you like, at SRC, but it's a voluntary program from our own professional staff. And what we do is we make sure that the hours that they spend with the students are covered by SRC. So one of the things we're particularly proud of is that it's really effective and it's cost-effective also.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. So there's no specific funding to speak of, or program funding?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — The program funding from an SRC standpoint is in-kind, if you like.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Fair enough. And so how many participants are currently participating? You mentioned there's a new cycle. If you could just elaborate a little bit on that.

**Mr. Crabtree:** — We've just admitted another four students, actually just in the last month.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. And do those four students all have separate mentors?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — Yes.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay. I'm just looking a little bit at contract revenue. You've indicated that your contract revenue is going up. Just wondering if you can provide an update on those, what those numbers look like for the 2018 year and then what we have so far in 2019.

**Mr. Hill:** — Ryan Hill. The contract revenue within the 2018 year, we saw an increase within some of the sectors that we deal within. One of the largest increases was, of course, within the

northern mine remediation work as the tailings work continued and really took off full force within 2018. Within the 2018-19 year, we are still working off the draft numbers so I can't give you any specifics with regards to it yet. However, we have seen a continuation of the tailings work done at the northern mine remediations. We have seen some slowdown within certain sectors that we deal within, but overall the contract revenue will remain relatively consistent with the current year, we believe.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. I'm looking at the SRC annual report for 2017-2018. There's sort of a scorecard here of key performance indicators for that fiscal year, and there's five different goals. It looks like SRC performed relatively well against these benchmarks, you know, in most cases meeting or exceeding the benchmarks. Can you speak to how these benchmarks are exceeded and what work is going into making sure that SRC is performing at this level?

**Mr. Crabtree:** — We take these key performance indicators extremely seriously. It's something that at staff level, at management level, and at executive level we communicate throughout the organization. So things like achieving the economic impacts of 500 million a year, we're exceeding that. We gave you some indication of how we looked at that.

Eighty-four per cent of our projects are focused on achieving substantial, positive socio-economic impacts. I'm not sure how we got quite to 84 per cent because I have difficulty thinking of projects that we don't have significant socio-economic impacts. I'm sure there must be something, but I think that . . . so very, very high levels there.

The areas that I think are particularly important to us are around diversity and inclusion. Twenty-two per cent of our staff self-identify as visible minorities. We have seven people who self-identify with disabilities. This level of diversity is core to what we look to achieve because diversity gives us creativity. Innovation gives us our growth. So that's implicit within these key performance indicators as well.

[20:15]

In terms of quality and feedback from our clients, our last figures were that we got 98 per cent positive feedback from our commercial clients. Coming from another commercial background, I wish we could have had 98 per cent. But that gives some indication of the sort of support that we have in industry.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. I will ask one more question. I think we can get in, in time. I see in the notes to the consolidated financial statements, a note about a line of credit that's been authorized by the Minister of Finance to establish a line of credit, you know, not to exceed \$5.1 million. I understand that as of March 31st, 2018, the council wasn't utilizing the line of credit. I'm wondering if this has changed since then, why this authorization was made, when, and do you expect that it will be utilized any time soon? So I guess that's four, four last questions. Tell me about the line of credit.

**Mr. Hill:** — The line of credit was authorized a number of years ago. I can't honestly remember when it was authorized, but at the time it was authorized, the council was seen as potentially needing it, the use of the line of credit. In the last at least eight

years, we have not used the line of credit, and so it continues to be on the books there. It continues to have the ability for us to be able to use it if needed, but we're in a rather strong cash position within the 2018 financial statements. We don't see the requirement to be able to utilize that any time soon.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay. Thank you so much.

**The Chair:** — All right. Thank you, Ms. Mowat. We will now adjourn our consideration of the estimates for Saskatchewan Research Council. And, Minister Harrison, if you have any comments or things you'd like to say.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I'll very briefly just want to thank officials for being here tonight, thank committee members, and thank Hansard as well. Thank you, Ms. Mowat, for your questions.

**The Chair:** — We will now take a brief recess. Do you need to change officials?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, for apprenticeship we do.

**The Chair:** — All right. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**Bill No. 136 — *The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Act, 2018***

**Clause 1**

**The Chair:** — All right, folks. We are back to begin consideration of Bill No. 136, *The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Act, 2018*, clause 1, short title. And we have joining us this evening as well is Ms. Beck.

I will open the floor now to Minister Harrison to begin. And if his officials, the first time they speak at the mike, could make sure that they state their names and their positions, that would be great. So, Minister Harrison, if you want to introduce your officials that have joined you here and make your opening remarks.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Sure. Thanks, Madam Chair. I'll introduce my officials and then just have very brief opening comments, and then we can move into questions from Ms. Beck and Ms. Mowat if she wishes to ask as well.

I'm joined this evening by Deputy Minister Alastair MacFadden on my left, assistant deputy minister Darcy Smycniuk behind me, SATCC [Saskatchewan Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Commission] chief executive officer Jeff Ritter to my right, and chief operating officer Loreena Spilsted, also seated behind.

This new Act will replace *The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Act, 1999*, which will be repealed upon the new Act coming into force.

The SATCC proposed three substantive legislative changes and led extensive stakeholder consultations on these amendments, and all proposed changes have been endorsed by industry. These changes will modernize the Act, which is nearly two decades old.

They will enhance the regulatory function of the commission and position the Act to address current and future industry realities.

The first proposed change will allow the SATCC to designate and certify occupations and subtrades in addition to trades, and is the direct response to requests from industry to pursue this enhancement as other jurisdictions have.

The second substantive change to the Act will provide the commission the authority to designate trade, subtrades, and occupations "for certification only." In other words, the SATCC will be able to administer certification exams and offer certification without having to provide and develop corresponding training programs.

The third substantive change will provide the commission the authority to issue work cessation orders if, during an on-site work inspection, it is determined there are no journeypersons present at a work site to supervise an apprentice in a compulsory trade.

In addition to these three substantive changes, there are a number of general housekeeping amendments which will update the Act to reflect current legislative language. And with that I will take questions, and officials are happy to respond as well.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister, and I'll open the floor to questions. And I'll recognize Ms. Beck.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Minister Harrison, and thank you to your officials, committee members for being here this evening.

I've had some time to look over the new bill, the new proposed Act, and have some meetings with stakeholders also to review some of your comments on second reading, Minister Harrison. So I do have a few questions. I'm not sure that we will be here right until 10, but we'll see where this leads us.

One of the things that you noted in the second reading and as well this evening, that all of the changes in this Act have been industry driven and endorsed by stakeholders. I wonder if you could start with describing some of the reasons for the legislation that we see in front of us today. I know that you mentioned it's been 20 years, and I think that that's a reasonable starting point, but some of the other things that you were noticing that led you and the ministry to pursue this legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Right. Well I'll maybe let Jeff speak to some of the specifics. But as I had referenced in my second reading remarks and even in the introductory remarks — and you referenced them as well — the Act hasn't been updated for two decades. And you know, a number of things have changed, and there have been a number of, you know, requests that have been put forward at different points by different groups that they would have liked us to look into and we've, you know, been doing that over that period of time. So it seemed the appropriate opportunity to update the statute, and significant work has been put into that by a number of folks. But maybe Jeff can speak to some of that.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. Thank you very much. You know essentially these changes will allow the SATCC to more effectively manage our regulatory function and more fully

achieve our vision and mandate to develop a relevant, accessible, and responsive training and certification system that meets the needs of employers, apprentices, journeypersons, and tradespersons. Some of the changes will also help improve the operational efficiency of the SATCC's activities while ensuring that we're able to exercise our regulatory responsibilities.

I can talk specifically about a few of the changes. The authority to designate occupations and subtrades is an amendment that will provide Saskatchewan workers with an opportunity to achieve formal certification for their skills and expertise. A designated occupation is a little bit different than a trade. It is something that would have standards for training and certification but wouldn't necessarily require a certificate or participation in a training program in order to work. Some people have referred to that almost like trade lite.

[20:30]

And an example of an occupation that, you know, that people commonly use where, you know, industry and consumers might benefit from having a certification system would be something like overhead door installer, right. Earlier this winter, you know, my garage door stopped working and I needed to call a company to come and repair that. And you know, I called around and hired a reputable company that came recommended, but the actual employees that were coming to do the work, which is complicated and, you know, sometimes, you know, carries . . . Because those springs — I don't know how much you know about overhead doors — have a lot of tension, can be dangerous. I didn't know anything about the training of the employees that were doing the actual work. So that kind of a, you know, having a certification system in place for occupations provides some assurance for employers that the people that they're hiring have training and been tested in their knowledge, and also on the consumer side. Okay?

I can talk a little bit more about the certification-only pathway, and I'll give you an example of that. We have a number of designated trades within the province. I think we have 49ish, 49, 48. There are trades that we do not have designated in the province because there really wasn't interest on the part of industry and employees in participating in an apprenticeship pathway.

The example I like to use is the trade of concrete finisher. In some jurisdictions that is a Red Seal trade, and it is a Red Seal trade that exists in a number of jurisdictions across Canada. There was never any significant appetite within Saskatchewan on the part of both employers and employees to participate in the apprenticeship system. Nevertheless, we understand and know there are a whole bunch of people in this province that work finishing concrete.

If we are able to have a trade that is designated for certification only, what it would allow us to do would be to access the certification exam that we develop co-operatively across Canada through the Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship, and allow us to provide a path forward for certification for workers who are able to sufficiently demonstrate experience working within that trade. So even though they may not choose to pursue an apprenticeship, they could nevertheless become a certified journeyperson. That would be something that would

only be available to us if we have this legislative amendment.

The other substantive change around work cessation really has come about as a result of industry's desire for us to effectively regulate compulsory designated trades within the province, and the realization that some of the tools in our regulatory tool box are a little clunky. And they want us to be able to develop and administer a meaningful sanction that is easily remedied. And the proposal that we've put forward for work cessation is specific to unsupervised apprentices working in compulsory designated trades.

So we have to be clear. It doesn't mean that we shut down a work site. It just means that if we were to come across, say, two apprentices working by themselves in the electrical trade and there was no journeyperson on the job site, that our field staff would be able to say, you need to put your tools down and call your journeyperson back. I mean they may have gone for parts. And as soon as they return, you can resume work. So it is structured around being an easily remedied but significant enough sanction that it will encourage compliance. So the next time somebody has to go for parts, maybe they send the apprentice instead of the journeyperson.

Those are the substantive changes. I could go into some detail around some of the housekeeping amendments if that would be helpful but I'm conscious that you have other questions.

**Ms. Beck:** — The questions are piling up in my head right now. So maybe if we go through . . . And thank you for that. I think that you have answered some questions in anticipation already, but I do have some questions stemming from what you just noted. The first is around the designated occupations. You noted some benefit to having, as a homeowner for example, some place that you could be assured that someone coming to do work on your home had a certain set of skills.

I'm just wondering the mechanism by which consumers or those in those designated occupation, where that would be registered, how there would be access to that list of those who have that designation. And just a little more about the nuts and bolts of how that would be displayed to the public and to those within those designated occupations.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. Okay, thanks. That's a very good question. So I guess first we'll have to assume that a number of trades eventually get designated, or sorry, a number of occupations eventually get designated. And there is an industry-led process for that to occur. But assuming that, you know, we'll pick that overhead door example that I gave. Once that is designated as an occupation, if consumers are interested in finding out if the person that is going to work on their door has that certification, they're able to contact our offices. We maintain a registry of who, you know, who would achieve that certification, just as we do for journeypersons, right.

You know, it's maybe a message for the public to understand that if you hire an electrician or a plumber and they come to your house and you want to find out if they are certified, you can ask to see their certification. If they're not able to provide it, you can phone us and say, I have Joe Smith here at my house; he says he's a journeyperson. Our staff are able to look them up and confirm whether or not that is the case. So it would be very

similar with people who would achieve certification in an occupation, either some kind of identification or a phone call to verify.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. Would there be a registration number, something like that, or just on the website or phoning your office?

**Mr. Ritter:** — We maintain a toll-free number during regular office hours. We don't publish lists of certified journeypersons on our website out of concern for privacy, but we can confirm whether or not somebody has a certification over the phone.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. Could you describe the industry-led process that would lead to an occupation becoming designated?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Okay. First of all, it's important to understand the governance structure around the commission, right. The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Commission is an industry-led agent of the Crown. So I report to a board of directors. There are 20 members on that board. Twelve of the 20 members are nominated directly from industry, representing . . . The bulk of them are from the construction sector but there are also representatives from manufacturing and agriculture and motive repair. Within those 12 industry-nominated members, there is an equal composition of representatives from the employer side and also from the employee side.

The remaining members of the commission board of directors include two members from government, one from the Ministry of ICT [Immigration and Career Training] and one from the Ministry of Education. And then there are a number of other members who represent equity groups, so we have a representative from, you know, who represents northern Saskatchewan, an individual who represents women in predominantly male trades, a representative for Métis people, and one for Aboriginal persons as well.

So that's the primary, you know, governance and decision-making model within the commission. Providing advice and input into that process, we have a series of trade boards. We have a trade board for each of the designated trades within the province, so each of those 49 trades that I mentioned earlier have their own trade. These are typically more individuals who are working on the tools. And again we strive for equity on the employer and the employee side within those trade boards.

And then there are a number of other boards like curriculum and examination development boards and trade examining boards. So all told, we have well over 600 individuals that are helping provide advice into making sure that we have a relevant and an accessible training and certification system.

The process that we would use for the designation of an occupation would be very similar to the process that we use for the designation of a new trade. It would require that it be an industry-led initiative. So we don't, as a commission staff, lead these initiatives. We respond to requests from industry, and we would shepherd them through those processes.

The process would likely involve consultation and discussion with a number of trade boards. You know, one of the things that our industry would be concerned about and that we would be very sensitive to would be the notion of fracturing, right. People

don't want to see their trades watered down or in any way devalued. So an occupation would need to work through a consultative process to ensure that that would work seamlessly within the other skill trades.

An example of one where, you know, there might have been at first blush a little bit of an overlap, one of the most recent trades that we had designated is recreational vehicle technician. Is that the right . . . recreational vehicle service technician. So these are the people that fix your recreational vehicle — your RV [recreational vehicle] or your camper, your motorhome. There's plumbing in those vehicles, so we would have had a conversation with the industry that is advocating for that to be designated a trade, with the trade board that represents plumbers to say, how do you feel about that. And there's wiring in those vehicles so we would have that conversation with the trade board that, you know, works with electricians and also, you know, heavy duty and truck and transport mechanics.

So it would go through all of those and at the end of all of those consultative processes, each of those respective trade boards felt that, you know, in that particular instance there wasn't any conflict and the recommendation came forward to the commission board of directors and then was ultimately passed by them and put into a new designated trade. So it would be a process very similar to that for occupations, right.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you that. And I think you've answered largely my question. The only other piece of that is just curiosity about what conditions would exist in order to have an occupation considered for that process. What would be the conditions that would take an occupation from as it currently exists to one that would be considered by the commission for designation?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Thanks. Ms. Spilsted informs me that it typically would require broad-based industry support. Generally it would be, you know, 50, over 50 per cent of employers and employees, you know, a strong measure of consumer support. There might be some requirement for, you know, consultations obviously with these trade boards that I mentioned earlier.

The threshold is pretty significant. In our experience, groups have to feel pretty passionately about a particular issue to undertake that work, because it is industry-led. They, you know, they would typically form, you know, some kind of a working group or committee that would undertake this work on behalf of the entire sector.

**Ms. Beck:** — So would it be typically in a situation where there was difficulty finding qualified employees in a certain sector? Is that typically how this would come about?

**Mr. Ritter:** — You know, it could be. It could also be, you know, just an effort to try and maintain or to drive more efficiency within the system.

One of the groups that talked to us about their desire to see designated occupations was the underground facility locators. So these would be the people that would identify buried cables or natural gas lines, that kind of thing. Lots of people do that work. The representative who met with us to ask us to pursue this said the solution within industry, because they don't have confidence in the training of the staff that do the work, is to simply load up

on insurance, and they pass the cost of those insurance on to their customers. And their belief was that with, you know, with some kind of certification system that would demonstrate that the people performing this work know, in fact, know how to do it, that they would be able to lessen their insurance bills.

So I think the reasons behind pursuing designation of an occupation would vary greatly from circumstance to circumstance. That's just one of the examples in the rationale that sort of struck out from some of the conversations I've had.

[20:45]

**Ms. Beck:** — No, I think that's a good illustration. That was what I was looking for.

With regard to the certification-only pathway, so if I'm hearing you correctly, these would be occupations or designations: Red Seal in other provinces, but one that we don't currently have an apprenticeship program for in the province. Is that correct?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Yes. In order to gain access to the Red Seal products, so essentially the certification exam, a trade has to actually be designated in our province. So even though concrete finisher exists as a Red Seal examination and is in use in a number of other provinces, because it isn't designated in Saskatchewan — and it's not designated in Saskatchewan because there really wasn't enough appetite for people to participate in the apprenticeship side of the training — we don't have access to that certification exam.

So if we were to designate it as certification only, our colleagues at the Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship would allow us to grant access to that exam, and we'd be able to administer it to tradespeople who are able to demonstrate sufficient work-based experience.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you. I think a couple of times there has been some reference made to extensive stakeholder consultations prior to seeing this bill in front of us. And I'm just wondering if you could describe those consultations both in scope and timeline.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I'll let Jeff speak to some of the details on that. But I can speak to the high-level consultation part of this because this is an important part of a bill of this nature that we have significant input and involvement of those who are directly impacted by it.

So we had invited 31 groups to be a part of the consultation process. Twenty-eight took us up on the offer and did actively participate. So you know, from industry associations to trade board members to post-secondary education institutions, there were representatives from right across that spectrum. You know, we can provide the list for you of all of the organizations involved, ranging from the Saskatchewan Construction Association to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to the Home Builders' Association to Sask Poly, GDI [Gabriel Dumont Institute]. The regional colleges were all invited as well, the compulsory trade boards as well.

So it was a very broad-based consultation process. And I'm not sure, Jeff, if you want to add additional comments on that, but I think that that would be kind of a fair statement as a general

outline.

**Ms. Beck:** — The only other clarification or level of detail that I would be looking for is just the timeline, when you started those consultations.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. The consultations began on Thursday, August 10th, 2017, and the final consultation took place on Friday, November 17th, 2017.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you. Okay. I know that you mentioned that you've met with the regional colleges and with SaskPoly. Were there any student groups that you consulted with at the Polytech?

**Mr. Ritter:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — No, the answer to that is that we weren't consulting with the student groups directly on that.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. I just was noting on the commission website a number of . . . the mandate, I suppose: designating trades for apprenticeship training and certification; generating, retaining, and expending revenues; registering apprenticeship and journeypeople, monitoring training; determining fees for products and services; entering into agreements for training and delivery; and representing Saskatchewan on interprovincial initiatives.

I'm just wondering, do you see that there any substantive changes to these roles in legislation? I notice there were some changes in comparing the old legislation to this legislation, with regard to mandate. I'm just wondering if you could describe.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I would say I don't think that we would have any particular changes to overall mandate. I think that there's probably been a progression as far as a focus on elements of the mandate over time. You know, I can speak to the role that Jeff has played nationally in leading a lot of work that has been done to harmonize apprenticeship regulations across the country to allow for mobility of apprentices in different jurisdictions, and well-recognized across Canada for the work that he's done on that, chairing the Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship.

And I know we've gone to many FPT [federal-provincial-territorial] meetings where Jeff has played a very significant role in the meetings themselves, with ministers from across Canada in presenting work that has been done, that he has led that's been very significant. So I think it's something that, frankly, as a province we can pretty proud of, and it's work that Jeff's been responsible for.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you for that good work. So no significant change in mandate. No. Okay, going back to your second reading comments, Minister Harrison, one of the things that you noted, some of the stated goals with this change in legislation was modernizing the Act. And I'm just wondering if you could provide a brief overview of the ways that you see this new Act as being modernized over the existing legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, I think that that would probably be in reference to some of what we've categorized as the housekeeping changes. We've been, I think, speaking to the



substantive changes up until this point. And you know, I might again ask Jeff to perhaps speak to the details of the housekeeping.

But you know, primarily within government — you would find this not just here, but across Canada — there's been an effort to make sure that we're modernizing language and statutes. And that means, as much as possible, going to plain-language sort of initiatives so that they're more comprehensible statutorily to the average person who would be reading the document: gender neutral language for example, a number of drafting standards that we've been working to modernize and update when statutes are opened up. But Jeff can speak to some of that directly.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. Thanks for that question. Thank you, Minister. So what we would consider as an effort to modernize the legislation is to remove the authority for us to designate sectors. That's a legislative provision that's never been used and is no longer required.

We have in our legislation the ability to collect social insurance numbers in records that are provided by employers during our inspections. That, because of privacy concerns, is not a power that we've ever executed or haven't exercised for several years. We already have social insurance numbers on file for tax slip purposes, so our staff don't go out and ask, show me your social insurance number. And we just felt it was appropriate to remove that provision within the legislation because it's not something we would want to have.

There are some changes, you know, replacing the word “department” with “ministry.” There is some clarification of the approval process to handle the removal of a compulsory apprenticeship trade designation. There is an amendment of the definition of journeyman to better align with labour mobility provisions of the Canadian Free Trade Agreement and just some general other updating of formatting language, as consistent with current practices.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you. The second stated goal, Minister Harrison, was enhancing the regulatory function of the commission. Now just a couple of questions: how this new legislation does that, and what the perceived deficiencies were of the current Act with regard to that regulatory function. I think you mentioned earlier, Jeff, about perhaps some of the tools that were at hand with the fines for example, for when job sites were found without a journeyman. But I just give you the opportunity, Minister, to expand on that.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, sure. And again I'll probably ask Jeff to make some additional comments. But just on the point that you made with regard to some of the tools that were available on the cessation front, I mean they were pretty blunt instruments, and we weren't entirely sure that that was appropriate.

So we are going to be able to, you know, as Jeff had indicated in his response to one of the questions, have some additional tools that are more common sense in nature, as opposed to immediately going to administrative penalties. There will be the opportunity for our folks on the ground to be able to utilize other measures to ensure that the job can continue to go ahead without there being kind of the blunt instrument of administrative sanctions immediately.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. I think the minister gave a pretty good answer. I'm not sure what else I could add to that other than employers have told us the fines they can build into the cost of doing business. Really the regulatory function that we play around ensuring that, you know, only certified journeypersons or apprentices under supervision are conducting the work of compulsory trades is one of fairness within the industry. If there's a company that is sending unsupervised apprentices out to doing work, their competitors know that they're probably undercutting them on the bids as well.

So this is the kind of thing that industry wants us to police. They want us to have an active deterrent. And they felt that fines weren't sufficient because, you know, the chances of us catching someone and going through sort of the progression of steps to get to the place where the fine was, we just heard over and over again that you don't have a lot of teeth in that. And they were looking for something a little more meaningful and a little more immediate.

**Ms. Beck:** — Is this more in line with what happens in other jurisdictions, in other provinces?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Loreena just had indicated that there are a number of other jurisdictions that do this: Nova Scotia, Ontario, and others.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. Thank you. Another stated goal, Minister Harrison, was to position the Act to address current and future industry realities. I'm just wondering if you could describe some of those realities and trends that necessitated these changes, and how far out you sort of anticipated the challenges and opportunities over the next decade.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. You know, what we're going to be able to do now with the new measures in the statute is basically respond in a more rapid way. The world is changing. There's new potential trades and certifications that are emerging that might be here in 10 years that we can't even really fathom right now.

You know, a good example Jeff pointed out, at different points in the past here, a locksmith had been a very significant trade. And you know, there had been a process for becoming a designated, certified locksmith. That's something that you just don't see a lot anymore. And it speaks to a whole number of factors that can move and change, flows you would see into different trades, largely driven by technology.

**Ms. Beck:** — So I guess what I'm looking at is the specific changes in this legislation that are more responsive to changes in industry, such as you've described.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Principally around the designation of occupations and the ability to administer certification-only exams.

[21:00]

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. I'm going to go back to the first proposed change that you noted was around allowing the designation and certification of occupations and subtrades in addition to trades. You noted that it was a direct response to requests from industry to pursue the enhancement. Can you describe in a little more detail some of the concerns that were being expressed and how

they were being expressed with regard to the SATCC only being able to certify trades at this point?

**Mr. Ritter:** — I'm sorry, can you repeat the question, please?

**Ms. Beck:** — What the nature of the concerns were that were being expressed and where they were coming from and how those concerns were being expressed. They were being expressed to the commission or generally within industry.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Okay. So I guess one of the observations that industry has provided to us when they met with us around some of these issues is, well, first of all, the legislative authority exists in some other jurisdictions, right. It exists within Alberta and British Columbia. So the people that we've talked to are sometimes industries that operate across multiple jurisdictions. So, you know, they were just a little bit unsure why it existed there and didn't here and explained to us the rationale.

In some instances they were seeking to pursue the designation of an occupation in Alberta and thought it made sense to try and work on a parallel track for that to happen in more than one province. That's the example of the underground facility locator group that I spoke to earlier. That is something that their industry is pursuing actively in Alberta right now. I'm not sure if it's been designated since; I haven't talked to them in some time. But they swung by to talk to us to see if, you know, we could work in tandem because they were already undertaking the work for that.

Really the other reasons that individuals might want to pursue are pretty varied, and I'd have to get into a pretty significant level of granularity to try and explain further.

**Ms. Beck:** — I'm not sure that that's the level that I'm seeking. So as a result of these changes to the legislation, what are some reasonable goals that you have? I know one of the things that was noted was increased labour mobility. I believe that you mentioned in your second reading speech, professionalizing these occupations and subtrades. What are the intentions, what are the goals with this legislation? What do you seek to enhance?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Right. Well, you know, I think we spoke to some of those, but I do welcome the opportunity to speak to the labour mobility component. I mean we have Saskatchewan companies who are bidding on projects across Canada that often, you know, are needing to have certain certifications for their employees to work in particular areas on projects in other jurisdictions. So that's a part of the reason why we're looking at the certification provisions within our own Acts.

But we have worked hard, I would say, nationally as well to create conditions for there to be compulsory tradespeople and also apprentices to have mobility between jurisdictions. And there's a number of reasons for that but, you know, we have worked nationally at the FLMM [Forum of Labour Market Ministers] table in a pretty concerted way over, you know, probably the last six or seven years to move the ball forward on that file.

And it can be challenging because very quickly it becomes very detailed and it becomes very complicated, and there are often reasons why there are different provisions for particular trades in different areas of the country than others. But I think, just on the

face of it, most rational people would say if you have a designation in New Brunswick, you probably could also be working in that field in Alberta or British Columbia or Saskatchewan. And all too often, that hasn't been the case historically.

So we've been working on that in a diligent way, and that's what I referenced earlier. Some of the work Jeff's done has been very significant in moving forward the number of certified occupations, designated occupations that are recognized in jurisdictions across the country.

And I think you're going to see continued pushes in that direction from labour market ministers and senior officials in working on creating even more opportunity for that to be the case, the overall objective being that we create a functional national labour market, which we are still far from having in this country. So that will be something that we continue to work on.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay, I know that there have been some specific concerns about jobs that are already represented by the Saskatchewan Building Trades. Have you heard those concerns about the potential for reducing opportunities for apprenticeships, for example, by designating the subtrades and occupations?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. I mean, I haven't spoken directly to the Building Trades, I don't think, about their concerns on this particular bill. Their response to the consultation though was they had no objection. I think there are elements of the organization who would have a degree of concern about dilution.

But I think, you know, Jeff had spoken to that earlier as far as the sensitivity that would exist and the degree of consultation that would exist, that we would go through, the commission would go through in a designation of an occupation. So there would be the opportunity for trade boards to weigh in on any of that. And the example of the recreational vehicle technician, I think, is a pretty illustrative one as to how that process would work to ensure that there would be wide-ranging opportunity for input into any decision.

**Ms. Beck:** — So if I might just lend voice to some of the concerns as I hear them and ask for a response from you, Minister, the thrust of that is that the jobs that apprentices would typically be doing on job sites, or would initially be doing on job sites — of course you need to have a job to be an apprentice — would potentially be the same jobs that would be done by those who would be in a certified occupation or subtrade.

I think that's the gist of the concerns that have been expressed. I think if I understand the concerns correctly that, you know, there are a number of places where that designation makes sense. Where the real concern comes in would be within the trades that are already represented by the Saskatchewan Building Trades.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Right. Yes. Like I had said in my earlier response, I think that there are elements that are, you know, not unanimous, which is why I think that the Building and Construction Trades Council response was that they're not opposed to the change that is in the statute. And I think that's a reflection of some differences of view within the members of the council. But to the specifics of the consultation, maybe I could

actually ask Jeff or Loreena to speak to that.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Sure. So I understand very well the concerns that exist around fracturing of the trades. As best I can I've tried to explain the process upon which the designation of a new trade or occupation would follow, and that is it is an extremely consultative process where considerations around and concerns around potential fracturing of a trade get . . . there's an opportunity for those to be raised for, you know, for those concerns to be addressed or not, right, or for other remedies to be made and the decision-making body within the Apprenticeship Commission is an industry-led commission that has broad-based representation that includes equal representation from both employers' perspectives and employees'. So I understand the concerns that some specific members may have raised. I don't believe those to be, in a practical sense, something that would be realized.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay, and if there were particular concerns with a specific designation process that what I'm hearing you say is that there would be a thorough vetting through that process of those concerns and consideration.

**Mr. Ritter:** — Yes, that's correct.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. I guess one of the other concerns as I understand that had been expressed, and I invite comment on this, would be a concern about narrowing specialization of workers could actually contribute to lack of mobility if their skill set was reduced and specialized to an extent that it would actually reduce their ability to move, not only within Saskatchewan to different job sites, but also across borders. I'm wondering if you could provide comment on that.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, I'll maybe ask Jeff to speak to this. This is something he knows a great deal about.

**Mr. Ritter:** — So thanks for that question. So the scope of each individual change is explicitly defined within the . . . within each trade is defined within the regulations. So a narrowing of the scope of a trade would require a regulatory change that would require consultation with the affected trade boards and also the commission board of directors.

**Ms. Beck:** — If I said specific trades, I misspoke, meaning subtrades and occupations.

**Mr. Ritter:** — So subtrades are currently designated and defined in the regulations. Occupations of course don't exist yet and would similarly be defined within the regulations.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. I think I did ask this question, but I want to make sure that I did. There are provinces that currently designate and certify occupations and subtrades. Did you say it was Alberta and BC that currently do that?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Yes.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. Thank you. It's another question that I think we got to already, but around designation:

An application demonstrating strong support will need to be completed by members of an industry in order to request an

occupation or subtrade designation.

I believe these are from your second reading comments again, Minister Harrison. I'm just wondering about the application process that triggers that process. How is that initiated?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well I think Jeff had spoken to that already but . . .

**Ms. Beck:** — Is there a formal trigger, I guess, is what I'm looking for.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Loreena can speak to this directly because she is directly involved in this.

**Ms. Spilsted:** — Loreena Spilsted. So when an application, when it triggers is an industry will come forward to us and express an interest in designating something. And so we actually have a formal application that is developed, that we then work with industry. So as we've said, we don't lead the process but we guide them through it.

So when we get a request for an application, we give the application to industry. The application specifies everything that they need to do in order for it to go forward, for us to put it forward, and it also has to go through a standards committee which is comprised of the members of the board of directors.

[21:15]

In the application when we talk about industry support, that is employers and employees that are in the trade or associated with the trade, when we talk about an occupation that may have overlapped with another trade, the trade that overlaps, if there was, would be considered part of industry. So if they weren't in favour of that, then that wouldn't have the industry support that we would require to see the threshold for it to change. Then once they do that, there's also a number of others. So we actually specify in the application what they need to demonstrate, and then they have to form their industry association and basically determine who all in the province is affected by this and is considered part of that industry. Then they have to show letters of support from all of them, and they have to do extensive stakeholder consultations which they have to provide the feedback, whether it be positive or negative, and how they answered that feedback.

So as Jeff mentioned, it is quite a process. And then when they're done, it actually goes to the standards committee to make sure that they've answered all of the criteria that were set out in the application to meet the standard required for it to move forward. And then if it gets approved at the standards committee, it still goes to the commission board of directors then for approval. And they look at that application to ensure it answers. So it usually takes about a year to 18 months obviously to gather all of the information and to work with all of the stakeholders.

And as I said, it's not just the owners of the businesses, it also has to be the employees who have a desire to do that. And then there also has to show that there's a benefit to it. There also has to be a demonstration that they actually are going to participate in the system once it is designated because there's no point in designating something if nobody's going to ever do the

certification or do that. So they also have to provide us with the documentation to show that they have this many employees who they intend to put through either certification.

Now if it's a trade that they're going to put them into the apprenticeship system and train them and get them certified in an occupation, the training is done outside of the apprenticeship purview usually. So it would be we have this number of people who currently do this training and work in this industry and we would have this many that would do the testing. And really what it typically is, is that they want a test to show that they've got a competency because the training varies from each of the places.

So in most places where we've had people express interest for occupations, they're already out there doing the work. They just want some formal way to professionalize what they do and to actually get acknowledgement for that. So that application will have that where they would have to demonstrate that yes, the training's here, the people are already doing this, and we just want to wait to designate that and professionalize it.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you. That, I think, answered all of my questions. A very thorough answer, thank you.

One of the things, Minister Harrison, that stood out a little bit in your description in the second reading comments was a comment that the SATCC is not interested in moving away from apprenticeship training. And I'm wondering if you suspect that the reason was that some of what had happened, what you had said before might lead some to believe that that was the case. Would you like to respond to that and explain the ways that apprenticeship is still being pursued and encouraged in the province?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well yes, absolutely. You know, the apprenticeship training and the system that provides for apprenticeship training and certification is obviously what SATCC does and does very well. And you know, I think we've seen the results, and they've been highly successful over the course of many years.

But you know, I often have the chance — as I know you do as well and other members — the chance to speak to groups in school and students in high school that are making decisions about what they're going to be doing with their futures. And I always say, and it's entirely true, the people that I went to high school with that went afterwards and got a designation, a journeyperson certificate, are often doing better financially than the people I went to law school with. It's not untrue. And I say that to encourage high school students to consider very much a career in the trades because you can make a very, very good life in a very rewarding occupation by doing so.

So you know, we continue to show our commitment through very significant levels of funding for the commission and for apprenticeship seats, which are very much dependent on demand. And we work very, very closely with the institutions delivering that training and very, very closely with industry as well to ensure that we have the appropriate balance and that we are responding to demands in the labour market.

So you know, I guess I could just kind of leave it at that, but we work very closely to make sure that resources are there and the

appropriate training exists and is available.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you for that. It's Saskatchewan Construction Week, and I think both sides of the House had opportunity to meet with delegations. And this topic of things like labour mobility and ensuring a skilled workforce and access to workforce were a number of the themes and, I think, the themes that you're tasked with here.

One of their main points in lobbying was around human capital planning and investment and future labour planning. Their solution that was asked for, and I'm sure it was the same on both sides, was working in close partnership with the private sector to develop economic data focused on long-term investment and labour availability, training decisions and the like. Is there any opportunity within this discussion or within these changes of legislation to allow the province to better meet the needs of that future labour planning?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, and it's a good question. It's something that very much we have been seized with across the Ministry of Immigration and Career Training, and working very closely with SATCC on that as well because matching labour market training to future labour market demand, it's vitally important. It's something we put a very significant amount of effort into to make sure that our investments are going into the right places. That means working very closely with educational institutions, regional colleges, Sask Poly, GDI, SIIT [Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technologies], and also with industry as to where future demand growth is going to be for their labour market needs as well.

And this isn't just within the province. Nationally there's an effort in this regard as well. We've been, I think it's fair to say, a driving force in the formation of a labour market information council at the national level. I think you would find a general consensus across governments that the labour market information we have nationally is a bit spotty, and the actual mechanisms for gathering labour market information historically have been not necessarily, probably, the best way of doing it.

So you know, we've put a significant emphasis on that. And Alastair actually led a lot of that work with his colleagues in equivalent ministries across Canada in designing and putting in place a labour market information council, which I think we've hired the executive director now. Alastair's chairing the board of the council and we're going to be, you know, working with our other jurisdictions in staffing that organization up to provide better labour market information, which is incredibly important as far as subnational governments allocating funding in different areas. The best labour market information we could have is necessary in order for us to make the best decisions that we can.

**Ms. Beck:** — Thank you. It just occurred to me in preparing for committee this evening, a number of the conversations that we had at that table kept coming to light. I think there was a representative from masonry talking about . . . I think something that you had mentioned earlier, Jeff, was there is a base level of skills, and then some changes between Saskatchewan winters and southern Ontario, for example. But the same basic skills are there.

The other thing that was noted was around the decision of

students going into the trades, you know, catching them at the right time. There may be a shortage or there may not be jobs right now, but by the time you're done your apprenticeship we're going to need, there'll be a glut of retirements, and we're going to need those workers stat. And you know, you're three to five years away from being finished your apprenticeship. So all that to say that I understand that this is complex. And I guess what I was looking for was comment around how some of these changes might help us better adapt to some of those concerns and those challenges.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, I think that that is, you know, that's part of the objective from the apprenticeship commission's perspective in being able to adapt to changing technological requirements and labour market requirements on the basis of changing technology. And that would be around the certification or designation of subtrades. I mean that's part of the ability to react to some of those changes, without question is a consideration in all of this.

**Ms. Beck:** — I was just wondering around some of the recent trends in the province with regard to the numbers of new apprentice registrations. Is that something that has remained stable?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well you would have seen a decline in the overall number of apprentices in the province in the last number of years. It's very closely aligned with demand by industry. It's very clearly a reflection of the fact that we've had significant challenges in areas where there is a high component of skilled tradespeople — in the energy sector primarily, where we have had significant challenges — but that would be in the last couple of years there would be fewer.

But what you would've seen over the course of the last decade is a very significant increase, an increase in the numbers and increase in the resources put into the apprenticeship system. From '07 till now is a 55 per cent increase in terms of the numbers of individuals in the apprenticeship system, the number of seats in the . . .

**A Member:** — Construction jobs.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — In construction, yes. So that's been an increase. I think the overall funding has gone up over 60 per cent for the apprenticeship program in the last 12 years. So you know, you'd find year-to-year fluctuations, but the overall trend has been one of significant increase.

**Ms. Beck:** — I guess I'm curious about the information, you know, that future forecasting for where we're going to need these workers, how that gets to the level of not only the university or the polytech student, but to the grade 10 or grade 11 student who's trying to make decisions about career paths and opportunities, you know, what the communication mechanism or the public messaging is to ensure that that information is getting to the right places.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I'll ask Alastair to speak to that.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay.

**Mr. MacFadden:** — I'm Alastair MacFadden, deputy minister.

We work very closely with the Ministry of Advanced Education, and Education to consider how we need to adapt career education in our schools. There's no doubt that jobs are evolving as rapidly, or perhaps more rapidly, as we see the global environment in which Saskatchewan operates changing.

[21:30]

What is clear I think to those of us that are invested in the system is that it makes sense to forecast the skills that are required in the future, and competencies, more than trying to predict the jobs themselves. What's expected is that many of the jobs that children of today will be taking on in the future aren't even invented yet. So it's really essential for Saskatchewan to be focusing on the resilience of young people, and providing them with skills and opportunities so that they're exposed to work, that they're building some of the professional or soft skills that are transferrable to any occupation, and that we're giving them the tools so that they can adapt as they graduate into the world of employment and move between different jobs.

Workers of today are expected to change jobs between 10 and 12 times within their career. It means that a career is not what it used to be. Many of us would have thought that a career is just one job, and you continue to ladder up. Nowadays it's a constellation of several jobs that defines a person's career, and I think the best thing that Saskatchewan can offer is a focused commitment to help people to map that path and to be agile in the labour force.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. Thank you. I had a few questions under the work cessation orders and I think some of this has been spoken to, but the person who actually completes the on-site inspections, who does those on-site inspections of the work site inspections?

**Mr. Ritter:** — So these would be field consultants that work within the SATCC. We have a number of them located throughout the province. Largest concentrations would be in Regina and Saskatoon, but we have offices in a number of other communities throughout the province, and that regulatory work is performed by those staff.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. And how many people do this work? How many FTEs are there?

**Mr. Ritter:** — 15.

**Ms. Beck:** — 15? Okay. And how many work sites typically would they be responsible for?

**Mr. Ritter:** — It varies a bit, but typically they would visit between 2 and 300 job sites per year.

**Ms. Beck:** — Oh, wow. Okay. And with the current legislation, what's the compliance rate of those sites that are inspected?

**Mr. Ritter:** — 98 or 99 per cent.

**Ms. Beck:** — And is this a complaints-based system or a scheduled system or just a random inspection? How currently does that work?

**Mr. Ritter:** — It varies. Certainly we respond to complaints or tips. We also track building permits in the case of construction

sites, right? We'll get a copy of the permit list and our staff will visit those projects on a regular basis.

**Ms. Beck:** — And that will remain the same under this legislation as well?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Yes.

**Ms. Beck:** — That was the other point that I wanted to bring forward from the Construction Week consultations was just — and I'm sure this isn't anything new to you, but it was new to my ears — was around the need to manage the skilled workforce within the trades. Once someone left the trades it was very difficult to call them back after that. So that was just one of those comments I wanted to bring forward.

The other thing that I wanted to ask was around under-represented groups within apprenticeship. And I'm just wondering specifically, I think, with women and Aboriginal apprenticeships and women in traditionally male trades, is there anything in this new legislation that might encourage higher rates of participation? Anything specifically?

**Mr. Ritter:** — Not specifically under the provisions of this legislation. The work that we undertake in that regard would typically fall under our promotional aspects.

**Ms. Beck:** — Okay. I think I've come to the end of my questions.

**The Chair:** — All right. Seeing as that there are no more questions from anyone this evening, we will proceed to vote on the clauses. And I do ask you committee members to bear with me. There are 66 clauses in this bill. Actually before we vote on this, I would offer the opportunity, Minister, for you to make any closing remarks and any officials that want to leave then can.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well very briefly, thank you very much to committee members. Thank you, Ms. Beck, for the questions, and thank you very much for officials who are here today, who are very knowledgeable and very professional. And thank you, as well, to Hansard.

**The Chair:** — And you would like to say?

**Ms. Beck:** — Only to reiterate my thanks for your time, for being with us in the late shift this evening. I appreciate the answers and, you know, the work that you do towards apprenticeship in the province. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. All right, we will begin with clause 1, short title. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 66 inclusive agreed to.]

**The Chair:** — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Act, 2018*.

I would now ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 136, *The Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Act, 2018* without amendment. Mr. Dennis so moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. That concludes our business this evening and I would ask a member to move a motion of adjournment. Mr. Buckingham has moved. All agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. This committee stands adjourned until the call of the Chair.

[The committee adjourned at 21:41.]