



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

**Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 15 – December 4, 2012**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-Seventh Legislature**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Warren Michelson, Chair  
Moose Jaw North

Ms. Cathy Sproule, Deputy Chair  
Saskatoon Nutana

Mr. Darryl Hickie  
Prince Albert Carlton

Mr. D.F. (Yogi) Huyghebaert  
Wood River

Mr. Kevin Phillips  
Melfort

Mr. Warren Steinley  
Regina Walsh Acres

Mr. Corey Tochor  
Saskatoon Eastview

[The committee met at 20:14.]

**The Chair:** — Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. For this meeting I'd like to welcome you all, welcome the members. My name is Warren Michelson. I am the Chair. Other members of this committee will include Ms. Cathy Sproule, the Deputy Chair; Mr. Darryl Hickie; Mr. Yogi Huyghebaert; Mr. Kevin Phillips; Mr. Warren Steinley; and Mr. Corey Tochor. We also have with us participating member Mr. McCall, Warren McCall.

The Chair advises the committee that pursuant of rule 146(1), the supplementary estimates for the following Crown corporations were deemed referred to the committee on November 27th 2012: supplementary estimates vote 73, Corrections, Public Safety and Policing; vote 30, Government Relations; vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport.

Members have a copy of today's agenda. We have a small change to make within the agenda. If we are all in agreement, Parks, Culture and Sport will be first with Government Relations and Corrections, Public Safety and Policing to follow. Are we in agreement?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Thank you.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — November  
Parks, Culture and Sport  
Vote 27**

**Subvote (PC16)**

**The Chair:** — We will now begin with our consideration of vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, Regina stadium project (PC16). We have with us Minister Doherty and his officials. Mr. Minister, would you please introduce your officials and, if you like, provide an opening statement.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good evening to colleagues on the committee. Delighted to be here this evening. I will introduce a bit of a different format this evening. I have a colleague of mine from the Executive Council as well the Minister of the Environment, who is also responsible for the Regina stadium as assigned by the Premier, is joining me this evening. As well, Mr. Ron Styles who is the president and CEO [chief executive officer] of SaskTel, many members will know, but also the senior liaison on the file of the Regina stadium. And also with us is Wynne Young, the deputy minister of Parks, Culture and Sport; Margaret Huntington, my chief of staff; and Jason Wall, the chief of staff to the Minister of the Environment.

I don't have any set comments to open up the proceedings this evening, Mr. Chair, other than to say that we are here for supplementary estimates with respect to the \$5 million that is the initial payment from the Government of Saskatchewan to the city of Regina for the Regina stadium. It is \$5 million, as you pointed out, in my ministry of Ministry of Parks, Culture

and Sport. And I think members are well aware of what the project entails and the cost of the project. It is a city of Regina project that the Government of Saskatchewan is providing some funding for. And I think I'll just simply leave it to open up to questions from members.

[20:15]

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister Doherty. And welcome, Minister Cheveldayoff, and the officials. We'll go now into questioning. Is there any question for the minister? The Chair recognizes Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Ministers, officials, welcome to the committee. Thank you for joining us this evening for this consideration of supplementary supply on the current year's budget. Five million dollars is under consideration tonight. If you could place that in the context of the overall undertaking of the province of Saskatchewan for the project as a whole? If you could just state what the province's commitment to this project is, for the record?

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Sure. I'll turn it over to Minister Cheveldayoff.

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thanks very much for the question. An important question it is. The contribution will be \$80 million from the province of Saskatchewan towards the cost of \$278 million for a total cost. Seventy-three will come from the city of Regina, 25 from the Saskatchewan Roughriders, and the province will also be facilitating a loan to the city for \$100 million which will be paid back over a 30-year time period.

**Mr. McCall:** — So in terms of the \$5 million being put forward in this estimate, what does that represent? What will that . . . I guess in terms of the staging of the project I understand there's a projected completion target of the start of the season in 2017. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Sorry, what did you say at the end?

**Mr. McCall:** — The completion target is for 2017. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — That's correct. The stadium will be ready for use by the Saskatchewan Roughriders in the 2017 time period.

**Mr. McCall:** — So in terms of the \$5 million under consideration today, how does that fit into the overall disbursement of funds by the province to the city of Regina or to whatever the structure is that's going to be guiding this forward?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thanks very much for the question. We have been, you know, working very close with the city. And Mr. Styles and myself are part of a funding committee which involves the Saskatchewan Roughriders, the city of Regina, and ourselves. And it was determined that \$5 million

would be an adequate amount for the city of Regina to begin all preparations at this time, both land and site preparations, and to engage the necessary consulting services — architectural, engineering advice, project advice, project management, finance and business advice, fairness advisory services, and the like. So that, in consultation with the city of Regina, was determined the appropriate amount in this fiscal year.

**Mr. McCall:** — In terms of the governance structure for the project, going forward the minister has referenced a committee. Could the minister identify who's on that committee?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — I could go off the top of my head, but I want to make sure that we've got it all correct, and I don't want to miss anybody. The committee is the stadium funding committee, which is the proper title. It is chaired by Councillor Mike O'Donnell, the city of Regina. Other members representing the city of Regina is Mr. Glen Davies, the city manager; Brent Sjoberg, the RRI [Regina revitalization initiative] executive lead; Roger Brandvold, Chair of the board of the Saskatchewan Roughriders; Wayne Morsky, chairman of the board's stadium committee of the Saskatchewan Roughriders; Jim Hopson, president and CEO; and Mr. Ron Styles and myself.

**Mr. McCall:** — What sort of, adjacent to the committee, what sort of staff support is there? How does that get handled within the provincial government for example?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you very much for the question. As far as implementation and staff are concerned, there is the RRI business unit, and it's a project review committee and also the project management owner representatives. Both of those units are within the city of Regina. There's no staff per se from the Government of Saskatchewan other than some part-time work that has been done by a member of Mr. Styles's team.

**Mr. McCall:** — Are there terms of reference available for the stadium funding committee?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — What there is, is a committee mandate and I can read that out to you:

The stadium funding committee supports the development of a new stadium by representing each of the primary funding organizations — the province, city, Saskatchewan Roughriders football club. As the body responsible for monitoring the use of project funding, according to the requirements of the memorandum of understanding [MOU] and definitive agreements, the stadium funding committee is not involved in the detailed project plans and implementation methods. The stadium funding committee will only exist until the construction of the new stadium has been completed and the required funding has been provided and adequately accounted for.

So it's got a definite purpose and a definite time frame, and it's more an oversight committee than a hands-on committee. And the two groups that I referenced earlier from the RRI and the project management team from the city, they report up to this funding group.

**Mr. McCall:** — What's the staff complement like with the two units with the city of Regina? And in addition to that, what sort of work will be contracted to either consultants or third parties?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you for the question. I don't have that information. Both of those groups are within the city of Regina's auspices, and we don't have information as to the size of them or the components within. Really our involvement is on the governance side now and the other is left to the city of Regina.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. Stepping back a bit from the project as it's currently constituted. Certainly, Minister, there's been a fair amount of work done under the broader heading of stadiums or domed stadiums or pick your iteration, lo these many years. How much has been spent to date on subjects related to the stadium by the provincial government? And how much of that work is able to be used on a go-forward basis in terms of either the various of the studies that have been done or the schematics? How much of that has been able to be carried forward in the current work?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thanks very much to the member for the question. And yes, this is something that's been contemplated for quite some time. You know, we joke about it that we only seem to build a stadium every 100 years here in our province. And over the last few years, we've been looking at various decisions.

You know, it goes back a number of years to the first study which was a very, very modest study, and it was done by University of Regina professors Shupe and Giberson. And that study basically looked at the idea of what was needed to replace the existing Mosaic: do you go with a renovation, or do you go with a new stadium? And you know, the results of that again very modest study was a strong recommendation that we look at a new facility. And based on that recommendation, a partnership was brought together that included the federal government, the provincial government, the city of Regina, and the Saskatchewan Roughriders to look at, you know, possibilities.

And the total amount of funding for that study was \$1 million, which the province of Saskatchewan was one of the funders. And I don't have the exact dollar amount that we put into it, but it was only a fraction of the \$1 million. And that study was a very extensive, exhaustive study that looked at the feasibility of a new stadium and made the recommendation for an enclosed dome stadium, and the full costing was done around it as well. It was \$431 million, the recommendation for building that stadium at the time.

Again, the group was a partnership. The federal government was very involved in that study, but going forward, when decisions had to be made around funding the actual stadium, the federal government chose not to participate in funding in any way. And that really caused the province and the city to take a step back and look at other alternatives. If federal funding wasn't available, then they'd have to look at alternatives. From a province's perspective at that point, we gave the project over to the city of Regina and asked them to be the lead on it, and they indeed took that opportunity and have been the lead ever since.

So those are the two main studies that had taken place. Again, I don't have the exact dollar value, but I can certainly provide that for you tomorrow.

**Mr. McCall:** — I'd appreciate that, Mr. Minister. In terms of the work that was done, again, and these various studies, and one of the options contemplated was an open-air stadium. Is there any of that work that has been able to be salvaged and carried forward in terms of informing the current iteration of the project?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Again thank you for the question. And absolutely, each and every component of that study and all material was given over to the city so, you know, there was good use of that as a foundation for where we are today. So you know, all information was brought forward. And you know, the city was very appreciative of that, and we continue to use that information as a basis for the work that's being done on the current iteration of the stadium.

**Mr. McCall:** — Getting back to the initial work being done right now for the stadium funding committee, what money is the province or the other members of the committee, what dollars have been put up by those entities? Or is it just the \$5 million that's being utilized at this time?

[20:30]

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thanks again for the question. The Saskatchewan Roughriders are funding several studies right now to look more from a marketing analysis perspective on, you know, the number of suites that would be enclosed and what their primary market would be and any ideas that would be beneficial going forward. You know, I've had an opportunity to look at some of that information. And you know, for the members of the committee, some of the things that the public are coming up with through these studies are for example they want a green facility. They want it to be as environmentally friendly as possible. And you know, that's information that the Saskatchewan Roughriders are gaining, and they are funding those studies on their own.

The city of Regina is, you know, committing time and expense to this, and the committees that were outlined earlier are certainly a cost to the city of Regina. But as far as the exact dollar value of that to the city of Regina, I don't have that. But again the \$5 million that we're putting forward is covering the vast majority of the initial site work that needs to be done.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you for that, Mr. Minister. So in terms of the initial \$5 million, what is the schedule going forward in terms of the involvement undertaken by the provincial government, both on the loan side and in terms of the grant? How will those dollars be flowed?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Well we're just in the process now of finalizing the funding agreement and looking at how that money will flow over the next number of years, probably the next three or four years for the bulk of the money from the province. But again, we're consulting with the city of Regina and wanting to make sure that we're able to flow the money according to their needs over the next number of years. You know, the loan will start quickly as well, wanting to take

advantage on the loan of the low interest rates that are prevalent right now and wanting to make sure that we can take full advantage of those going into the future.

**Mr. McCall:** — I guess it trips into a bit of my next question in terms of when will the loan be fully extended to the Riders? How will that be amortized? I realize there's the \$12 ticket fee, but how is that money being borrowed? Is it coming out of a vehicle such as the Municipal Financing Corporation, or what mechanism of provincial government is being utilized in the extension of that loan?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thanks very much to the member for the question. The loan will be made to the city of Regina, not the Saskatchewan Roughriders. So the loan will be made through the city on a 30-year time frame, and it will be made at the provincial borrowing rate which is, as the member I'm sure knows, is a very advantageous rate and is of great assistance to the project. So that's the loan portion. And then the rest of the grant portion is being negotiated right now in how it will flow over the next number of years.

**Mr. McCall:** — When does the minister anticipate those negotiations being finalized and the schedule being available for the public's consideration?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Well I can tell you that the new city council is looking at that information, and as soon as new councillors are comfortable with it I think we'll be at a point very shortly where they'll come with a request on how they would like the money to flow over the next number of years. So I anticipate that would happen over the next three months or so.

**Mr. McCall:** — In terms of the work plan for the year to come, and just to make certain of this, should we be looking in terms of the remainder of the grant? Will that continue to flow from the Ministry of Culture, and can we anticipate further performances by yourself and the minister at prospective estimates attendant to the next year's budget? Or how will that be channelled, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Well thanks very much for the question. Minister Doherty and I think we make a pretty good tag team here. You know, I wish I had him beside me sometimes to answer the questions that come in question period in the legislature, but that's not always ... [inaudible interjection] ... He's right behind me there offering information. But yes, we go back a long way, the university days.

All kidding aside, you know, it's a bit of a hybrid. It's a bit of a situation that developed with myself leading the file and the ministry that Mr. Doherty is responsible for having the funding arrangements. We wanted to provide information for all members of the committee that could be answered by officials, and that's why both of us are here and Mr. Styles as well as officials from my office and from Minister Doherty's office.

So we anticipate that the funding will continue to flow through Parks, Culture and Sport, and we feel that that is the most advantageous way to do it from the Government of Saskatchewan's perspective.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you for that, Mr. Minister. In terms of the work that is set out under the broader heading of the Regina revitalization initiative, is there any involvement on the part of the provincial government in terms of planning work being undertaken for the fairly significant housing component of the RRI or any of the other sort of work that's involved under the heading? Or is the involvement of the provincial government limited to the funding of the stadium at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — When we answered the request from the city of Regina as the Government of Saskatchewan, through my involvement, we answered specifically to do with the stadium. And we requested that the city of Regina deal directly on all other aspects of the RRI with the appropriate ministry. So the city of Regina, for example you mentioned housing, would be dealing directly with the ministry responsible for housing and that minister.

So I don't have the information on how far those talks have progressed. You know, the city has made it clear that this is the first portion of the RRI that they want going forward. But I'm sure that they'll be initiating further discussions going forward, but that I can't report on at this time.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. So the minister's not aware of any other dollars that have been committed at this time by the provincial government in terms of the completion of the broader project?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — No. I'm not familiar with any other monies that have been allocated to this project at this time.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. In terms of, again getting back to the containment of the province's involvement, Mr. Styles is on record saying, you know, we hit the limit. That's it. That's all for the province of Saskatchewan. I guess for the record if the minister or officials could state for the committee again what is the commitment of the provincial government to the project, and in terms of addressing cost overruns, how that will be handled by such bodies as the stadium funding committee.

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Thank you very much to the member for the question. It's a very important question, and it's something that, you know, we have been adamant about from a provincial perspective. Provincial funding requirements . . . I'm quoting from the draft MOU:

The province will cap its participation in the project at the funding level outlined in this MOU. Any capital cost overruns will be the responsibility of the other parties. Also the province will not provide any operating funding, and therefore the financial model for the stadium will need to demonstrate self-sufficiency.

So we've been very clear from the outset, all partners involved, that, you know, this is the contribution from the province of Saskatchewan, and there won't be any more funding beyond that. And that concept has been agreed to by the other partners and, you know, provides the basis for the MOU that will be going forward.

**Mr. McCall:** — So the minister is ready to say here today that that's it. That's all. There's no way that there's some

unforeseen circumstance where there are cost overruns and then the province is into the equation for an even greater share.

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — We were pretty clear when we made the announcement back in July, the Premier and myself, that the funding is what it is. And you know, it was presented to the other funding partners in that way, and they fully understand that as well.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. I guess a broader question again in terms of the fairly long road that has led to this point. There have been different sort of contemplations of private sector involvement in the project. I believe the current proposal is limited to the \$25 million earmarked for naming rights and various of the activities that the minister has touched on earlier.

Could the minister, for the committee, state what sort of private sector money is being brought to the table for the project? And again, there have been different things said on this point over the evolution of the file, so if the minister could give us a sort of up-to-date status of private sector interest in funding the stadium project?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Sure. Thank you very much for the question. There have been various funding arrangements contemplated, and you know, one goes back to the fully enclosed domed facility that was being contemplated. You know, private sector involvement in a year-round facility that would operate 365 days a year certainly provided more opportunities for private sector involvement, but since we weren't able to afford that option and had to look at a scaled-back option that was more modest in cost, along with that are less opportunities for the private sector involvement.

As part of the funding arrangements, the Saskatchewan Roughriders, you know, they really stepped up to the table and wanted to take a lead in this regard. And you know, they will be negotiating with different private sector partners to associate themselves with the Saskatchewan Roughrider brand but also to contribute towards the \$25 million that's ultimately coming from the Saskatchewan Roughriders. So there will be private sector money that will be partnering with the Roughriders to provide that private sector funding through their commitment of \$25 million.

**Mr. McCall:** — I guess the — and I realize the clock is drawing nigh, Mr. Chair — but I guess one last sort of topical question.

**The Chair:** — Mr. McCall, I'll just caution you. We're talking about the \$5 million. The private sector funding would be different from what we are discussing at these . . . So we'll just stay on the track of the 5 million, if you would please.

**Mr. McCall:** — I guess I'm trying to ascertain why the \$5 million was arrived at, Mr. Chair, and certainly in terms of the different iterations of the project, different sort of speculation that was made about private sector involvement or just trying to gain information on the scope of private sector involvement in the current iteration. And that's why we're asking. But thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Please continue.

[20:45]

**Mr. McCall:** — In terms of the comparison with the earlier iterations of the project often got made to the Fargodome, the current iteration, different comparisons get made to what's happening in Winnipeg. And of course that's a differently structured deal. Some of the fundamentals are similar certainly, but for example, in terms of the involvement of the Winnipeg Blue Bomber football club, there's a substantially greater involvement on the part of the football club than is the case in Regina.

Does the minister have any sort of observations for the committee in terms of the different structurings of those two deals?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Yes, thank you. Well we looked very closely at the Winnipeg model. And you know, I have to say publicly a thank you to the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, the government of Manitoba, and they were very forthright in sharing information for us.

What we arrived at in Saskatchewan was, at the end of the day, a made-in-Saskatchewan solution. But what gave us all great comfort is the number one funding partner will be the patrons of the new facility through that facility fee and the repayment of the \$100 million loan. That was a critical part of the whole funding mechanism, and that drove the ability of other partners to come up with their respective contributions.

So we really feel that this, you know, it could have been structured in different ways, but we feel very comfortable with what we came up with at the end of the day, that the province of Saskatchewan, you know, we didn't just pull our money out of the air. It was based on percentage contributions that have happened in communities like Melville and Moose Jaw and North Battleford, Estevan, Warman, Weyburn, Shaunavon, Spiritwood, Swift Current, and then Regina, where contributions were in that, you know, 25 to 30 per cent range of the entire project.

So you know, we felt comfortable with that number, and the city of Regina felt comfortable with theirs. And again, the Saskatchewan Roughriders really stepped up to the plate as well, if I can use a baseball analogy in a football term. I guess it's all in sports. But no, we feel comfortable with it.

But again, you know, the CFL [Canadian Football League] has different models right across the country. Vancouver, in their stadium, had a different funding model. And you know, Ivor Wynne in Hamilton was successful in getting some of those federal dollars because they're hosting the Pan American Games, which is an international competition that we weren't fortunate enough to have. But again, we're very, very pleased and very confident in the funding arrangement that we do have.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for your comments. And thank you for the questions, Mr. McCall. As we conclude, Mr. Minister, would you have any closing comments you'd like to make?

**Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff:** — Just very briefly, Mr. Chair, to all committee members and members on both sides of the House,

we have felt all along that this is a project that rises above partisan politics. It's something that can make a contribution to our province for the long term. It was very much led by the need voiced by the Saskatchewan Roughriders and we compliment them. We compliment the city of Regina for the leadership that they've shown, and we compliment all members on both sides of the House for their questions and their support going forward. I truly believe this facility will make Saskatchewan a better place.

**The Chair:** — Mr. McCall, did you have any closing comments?

**Mr. McCall:** — Just that certainly we've got more questions to come. I thank the ministers and officials for appearing before the committee tonight.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Doherty.

**Hon. Mr. Doherty:** — Well thank you, Mr. Chair. And I just want to thank the honourable members, the opposition, for the questions, members of the committee. And I'm sure Minister Cheveldayoff was glad that I was here tonight to help him out with these very good questions. And I just want to thank Mr. Styles, Ms. Young, and other officials from our offices for attending this evening as well. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. We'll continue. Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, the Regina stadium project, subvote (PC16) in the amount of \$5,000,000. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27, \$5,000,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2013, the following sum for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of \$5,000,000.

Mr. Tochor. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Thank you. We will . . . thank you, Mr. Minister, and the officials. We will now take a very brief recess as we prepare for our next session.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — November  
Government Relations  
Vote 30**

**Subvotes (GR11) and (GR12)**

**The Chair:** — Well thank you and welcome back. We'll now continue with our consideration of vote no. 30, Government Relations, public safety, subvote (GR11), and gaming agreements, subvote (GR12). We have with us Minister Reiter and his officials. Mr. Minister, would you please introduce your

officials and proceed with an opening statement if you have one.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will introduce my officials, and then I have some opening remarks I'd like to read into the record. And then we'll certainly entertain any and all questions.

First of all to my left is Al Hilton, deputy minister. To my right is Karen Lautsch, assistant deputy minister. Behind us is my chief of staff, Angela Currie; Wanda Lamberti, executive director; Margaret Anderson, executive director; Jeff Markewich, director of financial planning; Sam Swan, director of gaming and agreements; and Tamie Folwark, program manager with provincial disaster assistance program.

As I said, Mr. Chair, I'd like to read some comments into the record and then we'll be available for questions.

Mr. Chairman, the supplementary estimates show that the Ministry of Government Relations is forecast to be \$85.2 million over budget for the fiscal year 2012-13. There's several reasons for this projected over-expenditure, but the primary reason relates to disaster assistance, specifically the higher than expected monies we paid out through the provincial disaster assistance program to Saskatchewan people affected by disasters. This one budget item accounts for \$70 million of the over-expenditure. An extra 1.2 million is also required to offset our emergency management response costs.

And finally, increased funding for gaming agreement payments of \$14 million is required to reflect and cover higher than expected casino profits earned by the Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority and the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation in 2011-12.

Now a bit more detail on the nature of the over-expenditures. The provincial disaster assistance program, or PDAP, works with individuals and communities across Saskatchewan to assist them with recovery from natural disasters. The program exists to restore property that is hit by disasters like the flooding that was widespread in 2010 and 2011 in our province. This isn't an insurance program. It exists for Saskatchewan people when disasters strike and when private insurance does not apply. It's really a program of last resort.

Members of the committee are well aware of the unprecedented flooding that occurred in the province in the last couple years. The severe damages from that flooding resulted in more than 15,000 claims being received under the program. Over 80 per cent of those claims are now closed. As individuals and communities repaired their properties, our program people found that the costs exceeded original estimates, and in some cases additional structural damages were identified. Of the \$70 million forecast to be over budget in this area, 63.5 million is for claims and 6.5 million is for associated operating costs.

I want to emphasize that PDAP is in place to help Saskatchewan people, businesses, and communities recover from natural disasters. The province made significant changes and improvements to the PDAP process over the last two years to better address people's needs when disasters affect their property. Some of the improvements included reducing the

deductible for private claimants to 5 per cent from 20 per cent; increasing the maximum assistance for principal residence claimants to 240,000, which is up from 160,000; and increasing the maximum assistance for small business, non-profit organizations, boards, charitable organizations, and owners of primary agriculture operations to half a million dollars, up from \$160,000. These are just a few of the many positive changes made to the PDAP program, a program that's in place to help people when they need it the most. And my ministry will continue to ensure that this program responds to the needs of Saskatchewan people.

As well, the ministry requires additional funding of just over \$1.2 million for the province's emergency response capacity, which includes a logistics team, two rapid response teams, and regional emergency services officers. They provide direct assistance to municipalities in planning and training and help municipalities when their own resources are overwhelmed by the scope or duration of emergencies.

[21:00]

In June of this year, emergency services officers, including a rapid response team which is commonly referred to as a hotshot team, along with support personnel and a command team responded to major flooding events in British Columbia. Through an interprovincial aid agreement, we were able to work with BC [British Columbia] officials, providing technical advice, equipment like sandbagging machines and flood barriers and crews to install flood barriers in strategic locations. Our teams were in place for eight days, working until the flood threat had subsided.

In Saskatchewan wildfires swept through the North Battleford area in April. Severe weather including plow winds and tornadoes caused widespread power outages in June. Overland flooding hit James Smith First Nation in August, and wild land fires were prominent in southwest Saskatchewan in September.

In all cases the province, through our emergency response teams, were there to help Saskatchewan people. If left unaddressed, resource gaps directly affect the health and safety of Saskatchewan's residents during major emergency.

Finally the other major area where over-expenditures have occurred is with gaming. Increased payments were provided to the First Nations Trust, the community development corporations, and the Clarence Campeau Development Fund. These payments are the result of higher than anticipated casino net profits. This is based on a reconciliation of the Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority's and the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation's 2011-12 estimated profits and the final actual year-end profits. This is a requirement of the gaming framework agreement between the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations and the province.

I think that outlines the issues for tonight, Mr. Chair. Now my officials and I would be pleased to entertain questions.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are there some questions? The Chair recognizes Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman,



Minister, officials. Welcome to the committee, and good to be here tonight with you to consider these supplementary estimates.

For the interest of being able to follow along in a relatively straightforward way, we'll try to deal with the expenditures as the minister has touched upon them in his introductory remarks.

And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the \$70 million being brought forward as a supplementary estimate for the provincial disaster assistance program, I guess if the minister could provide some context. And certainly in different years there's different activity on the file, but what's been the experience in terms of supplementary estimates over the past, say, five years in terms of the provincial disaster assistance program, understanding that there's usually a nominal figure put into the budget that is, again, sort of informed as best can be done by past experience, and then of course providing the dollars as needed on a supplementary estimate basis. But just to get that context for the committee in terms of what's happened on supplementary estimate basis for the line item that is PDAP over the past number of years?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — On that, it has been sort of my understanding for quite a period of years that, exactly as you outlined Mr. McCall, is that there be sort of a baseline budget. Because this isn't the normal sort of operation of government; you don't know what sort of disasters are going to hit, when they'll hit, or how expensive they'll be. So just to give you a few years context, the numbers I've been given in 2006-07 budget year, there was just over half a million dollars budgeted, and the actual was \$9.8 million. In 2007-08 again just over half a million dollars budgeted, \$31.3 million was budgeted. And it goes on. Do you want more?

**Mr. McCall:** — If the minister will undertake to provide that to the committee, that'd be great. In the interests of moving on to other questions, we'd be happy to take that option as well, but dealer's choice, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I'll quickly run through them. Numbers I've been given then: in 2008-09, again half a million dollars and 14.4 million spent; '09-10 — sorry, I'm rounding off — just over half a million, 10.4 spent; '10-11, just over half a million budgeted, 48.1 actual; and then in '11-12 it would be 14.8 million budgeted and actual is 157 million. So I think you can see historically this is the way the PDAP programs operated with sort of a baseline budget and then, depending on the type of year, typically go back to supplementary estimates.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. In terms of the year going forward, again taking into account what the minister has just described, is the minister anticipating that baseline, that nominal figure that is assigned to the budget would be going up or hold steady and then we'll flow the dollars as required? What sort of planning has been undertaken by the ministry in that regard?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — As far as the exact amount, you know, I can't tell you. We still need to go through the budget process and have that discussion with Treasury Board. But I would think the principle would probably stay the same, knowing that there's sort of a baseline dollar amount, which again I don't know what that'll be. And then, depending on the year as has

been sort of traditional for a number of years, we'd go back for supplementary if there was the sort of disasters that would exceed the baseline budget.

**Mr. McCall:** — The minister outlined the breakdown between claims and the support required in terms of the administration, the adjusters, and the like. Could the minister restate that figure for the committee?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Sixty-three point five million is for claims and 6.5 million is for the associated operating costs.

**Mr. McCall:** — That 6.5, is that an ongoing expenditure or is that a one-time sort of engagement of contractors? Could the minister describe that portion of the expenditure?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I'm going to give you an overview and then check with my officials. My understanding is, based on the amounts spent, those are . . . Many of the PDAP officials are hired temporary basis, as-needed basis. It's also things like adjusters that are hired and contract engineers, that sort of thing. I'm looking at our officials that . . . Okay. I'm getting nods, so I believe that's the case.

**Mr. McCall:** — Again the entire sum could be characterized as one-time expenditure, not necessarily involving ongoing FTE [full-time equivalent] increases, but just sort of a contract basis expenditure.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — That's right. It would be the one-time based again, sort of those add-ons like I said. The actual claims take up the bulk of it, the sixty-three and a half. And then the others would be the associated costs of hiring the adjusters, hiring the engineers, hiring the staff that are needed to process those.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. In terms of the dollars extended to claims and certainly, you know, the . . . We'll state this more fully in the other portions of the figures here under consideration tonight. But again, each of those claims represents some pretty hard circumstance, and again in terms of the ministry officials and those brought in on a contract basis to work with individuals out in the field, we commend that work that is done.

On the opposition benches, you know, oftentimes, oddly enough, we're around opposing things. But it's good, it's a pretty interesting program and makes some pretty critical interventions into some pretty hard circumstances. So I want to state that off the top for minister and officials, that gratitude.

In terms of what's happening with the PDAP caseload, could the minister characterize for the committee where we're at in terms of the dollars that are being put forward for claims? How many years back do those claims go? Are they largely derived from the 2010-11, or is there still a significant backlog of cases working its way through the system with PDAP?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Just a couple of comments and then I'm going to get assistant deputy minister Karen to walk you through the numbers.

First, your comments. Mr. McCall, I know you're well versed

in the program, and I appreciate those comments. The officials that deal with this program, as you said, I mean they're dealing with very difficult circumstances, people who are going through extremely trying times. And it's not an easy job, and certainly we try to make improvements to program where we can. And, you know, you try to answer the call for Saskatchewan citizens but you . . . It is a case of officials working with people who are in very trying and often very emotional times. So I appreciate those comments. And I'll ask Karen, if she would, to walk you through the numbers that you just asked for.

**Ms. Lautsch:** — Thank you very much. So I'll give you a breakdown in terms of progress we've made on the claims. So a couple of . . . And I'll maybe give you a bit more information than you need and then we can go from there. At mid-year we had 15,411 claims. So we've received for 2010, 2011, and 2012, that's the highest we've ever had. At, I guess, our peak we were processing about 8,000. We had a peak of about 8,000 claims that were active at any given time. So it was a peak of because they do close out and move through.

In 2010 we received claims of 6,414, and we only have 537 of those remaining active. In 2011 we received 8,603 claims, and of those 2,182 remain active. In 2012 we have received some claims, 394, and most of those are moving through the system. I'd have to find the exact number on that one for you.

**Mr. McCall:** — I thank the official for the answer. In terms of the certainly, the volume of claims under PDAP is something that, you know, there's spikes from year to year depending on the conditions in the year, but certainly the overall trajectory's been going up. So again there have been different expenditures brought to bear to make sure that the program is responding in a timely manner to people's circumstance. And again I think that's part of being a responsive, responsible government. In terms of the clearance rate, could the minister or officials provide some information to the committee in terms of average sort of processing times involved in PDAP claims and how that has changed over the recent past?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — If I could, just to clarify, so in a sort of typical year, how long it takes to get to what percentage of claims complete? Sure. If you'd just give us a second with that.

**Ms. Lautsch:** — So we've been doing a little bit of an analysis on this because you're right: there's been a significant difference in terms of our ability to move claims through the system. When we started, prior to 2010, we certainly were challenged in terms of moving those files forward in a timely manner. That was a combination of things, mostly because 2010 claims were coming in and we had 2011 flooding happening at the same time. So we did ramp up our staff complement significantly at that time to deal with the claims. We also actually reorganized how we ran the program. So that certainly helped as well.

So when we started, we were looking at about 230 days on average to close a claim. And we're now down to about 130 days to close a claim. So we have made significant progress. I did want to just let you know that for 2012 the total claims were 394, and we've actually closed . . . Well we've actually only got 307 open of those right now, so we've made some progress on those as well.

**Mr. McCall:** — And again there are no, before 2010, there are no files open at this time under consideration by the program? Be clear on that point.

**Ms. Lautsch:** — Okay. There were a couple of claims, about less than a dozen I believe, open in 2007. And those are claims that are highways that we're having trouble repairing the roads because they remain flooded.

**Mr. McCall:** — Any anticipation of those outstanding files being resolved in . . . Any anticipated timeline for those being resolved?

**Ms. Lautsch:** — It's very difficult to tell. Some of those ones were flooded in 2007, 2010, 2011, and then have had more damage yet in 2012. So it is a matter of when they can dry up enough to do the work.

**Mr. McCall:** — And you haven't brought your crystal ball into Government Relations in terms of the forecast or anything? Okay.

In terms of . . . One of the other sort of dominate aspects of the program over the years is the frustrations oftentimes involved with having the portion of the funds that the province is able to recoup from the federal government under the provincial disaster assistance program. Can the minister or officials describe the current state of affairs in terms of when claims are made under PDAP and you have expenditure represented, in this case by \$70 million, there's a portion of that that the federal government flows back to the province. But the processing for that aspect of the program in past has been pretty interesting to say the least.

Now you've got a deputy minister who's like an intergovernmental affairs infighter of some renown. So I don't know if that's loosened up the federal purse strings at all. But if the minister could comment on the state of play in terms of recouping the necessary funds back from the federal government.

[21:15]

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Absolutely that's helped. And I'll consult with my officials and tell you how in just a minute. I'll just get Deputy Minister Al to make some comments to that question, Mr. McCall.

**Mr. Hilton:** — Sure. Thank you, Minister. Through 2010 and 2011, we directed most of our staff resources and capacity to actually dealing with the emergency and processing the claims. Now that we have a little bit of breathing space, we are focusing on getting all of our files ready for audit, what we call a pre-audit.

And we've had discussions with the federal government, and they will come out and audit our files with a view for us to recover the max amount of money that we can from Ottawa. When the federal auditors will show up, I'm not exactly clear. But there's been communication at the officials' level and at the ministerial level about the importance of getting that work done. And Karen, or the assistant deputy minister, can probably provide you more details on that, but that's where we're at.

**Ms. Lautsch:** — So the province has requested . . . So for those of you who aren't aware, the provincial disaster assistance program actually reaches back into the federal government through what's called the disaster financial assistance arrangements or D-F-A-A. And that is a comprehensive guideline document in terms of which the eligibility for federal funds will flow.

So the province has requested and has received an audit on 2005 for our files, and we are awaiting the outcome of that audit. We anticipate it relatively soon. We've requested an audit of our 2006 files. That could happen as early as next year in terms of January, February, March session. We've asked for an interim payment in 2007. Because we have claims outstanding, the federal government will not provide a final payment or do an audit when we have open files. They will, however, give us an interim payment if that's possible. We've also asked for advances on our 2010 and our 2011 claims, and those are in the queue with the federal government.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you, Minister, and officials. Can you provide an indication . . . For example, the requested interim payments for 2010, 2011, what is the dollar figure involved in those requests?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Mr. McCall, the maximum amount that the federal government will pay out in an advance is 50 per cent, and then our officials use an 80 per cent figure as an average of total payout. In 2010 the amount requested was 97 million; 2011 was 203 million. But I would just add, my officials tell me that that's not just PDAP. That's also amounts included from other ministries, for instance Highways, those sorts of things. So if you'd like PDAP numbers taken out of those, our officials can do that and provide that to you as a follow-up if you'd like.

**Mr. McCall:** — That'd be great, Mr. Minister. I'd appreciate that. Thank you. So again just to be very clear, the last . . . In terms of reconciling with the feds, the furthest back it goes is to 2006. Am I understanding that correctly? Or 2005?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — 2005.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. Can the minister or officials provide the committee with any sort of a ballpark on what the outstanding sums of money involved are?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — For a specific year or for all years since?

**Mr. McCall:** — From 2005 to date. Are we talking tens of millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars? What is that outstanding, contentious figure with the federal government?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Mr. McCall, this is, as you know, this is a long-standing issue and going back a number of years. In the last couple of years, PDAP officials have made huge efforts to try to clear up the backlog in that. But as for specific numbers to your question, we don't have that tonight, but our officials will endeavour to do a follow-up with you to get you some reasonable estimates.

**Mr. McCall:** — I'd appreciate that very much, Mr. Minister.

And obviously I know you've got some officials that have some long-standing work on these files, and we appreciate that good work. But certainly the approach of the federal government in this regard is mildly frustrating. Anyway we'll wish you well in terms of advancing that cause.

In terms of where the staff complement is at, where the sort of support dollars are at in PDAP, is it . . . Again there have been some pretty impressive strides forward made in terms of processing files and getting that claim time down to 130 days. Is the ministry where it wants to be on PDAP? Or are there other improvements that are anticipated in terms of making the program as responsive and as best sort of attuned to the way that incidents are arising in the field?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I'm just not clear on the questions you're asking. As far as staff complement and that sort of thing, or as far as the types of changes we've made with changes to deductible amounts, those sorts of things?

**Mr. McCall:** — Yes. And it's a bit of both I guess, Mr. Minister. Have you got the troops to get the job done in a way that you're satisfied with? I know some ministers, they're just never happy. They just always want to make continuous improvement. Fair enough. But I guess, where are you at in terms of where the program is and your confidence in terms of it meeting those needs? Or are there additional resources that you're thinking need to be brought to bear in terms of making sure the program's all that it could and should be?

[21:30]

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I think to the part of the structure of the program, you know, as I mentioned in the opening remarks, significant improvements have been made as far as, for example, levels of deductible, those sorts of things that I think have benefitted people going through a difficult time, greatly. As far as, you know, the staff complement, those sorts of things, as I mentioned, officials have made huge efforts over the last couple years in particular to make a lot of changes to the program.

I think, though, having said that, we always look for ways to do things better, to be more efficient, to improve things.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. Just out of curiosity, Mr. Minister, has PDAP, has it undergone any lean exercises?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Our officials tell me that while it hasn't went through the lean exercise yet, they are planning on doing that.

You know, as you're well versed with this program, you understand how that works. As far as that — and I'm kind of going back a bit to your previous question too, staff complement, that sort of thing — I think PDAP's a little bit sort of unique compared to a lot of government programs or how a lot of ministry programs run in that you never know what's going to happen on a given year as far as a disaster. And so because of that, in an effort to be as efficient as possible, staff tend to bring on, you know, temporary positions, those sorts of things. So it's, you know, it's a big job for our management folks to try to manage that situation.

**Mr. McCall:** — I'll start to sound like the amen chorus. You know, agreed, Mr. Minister. But anyway, I guess if we could move on to the next tranche of expenditure under consideration, the dollars being brought forward for emergency management and fire safety, again if the minister could reiterate what those dollars represent and the need for them to be brought forward as a supplementary estimate.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Yes. It was \$1.2 million, and that was for the emergency response capacity. That includes the logistics team, two rapid response teams, and also regional emergency services officers.

**Mr. McCall:** — I guess again, as we agree, I mean it's a tricky thing predicting the future in terms of emergency incidents, and again it's a pretty fine calibration to know what you need to get staffed up and, you know, what you need to sort of special warrant as the situation arises.

But in terms of the overall expenditure for that particular subvote, could the minister just state for the record what the overall subvote was in the initial budget and again how this supplements that initial activity?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I'll just ask my assistant deputy, Karen, to run through those numbers for you if I could.

**Ms. Lautsch:** — Certainly. So the '12-13 budget for the subvote was \$4,693 million. The overage is, or the special warranted amount that we're talking about today is \$1.229 million.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. And again, do you consider that to be more of a one-time sort of pressure or is this something that will need to be rolled into the base of the line item and the expenditure in that area of the ministry's activities?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — You know, sort of reiterating a bit I guess what I said earlier in that it's impossible to predict disasters. So we're in this weird sort of anomaly where in any given year there's wild fluctuations, and so we don't know what's going to happen. More specific to your question though, these sorts of expenditures, as we go through the budget process, we'll need to have the discussions on whether we look at including a base budget for these type of expenditures or whether we fund these much the way PDAP has been funded historically, sort of on a, you know, a very minimal base level and then supplementary estimates as needed. But we haven't determined that yet, and we'll do that during the budget process.

**Mr. McCall:** — And again, like the PDAP analogy is quite apt because again you have disaster — you have emergency arise; you fight the fire; you fight the flood — you do what it takes to get the job done, and you reconcile after. You know, people aren't busy rolling out the calculators when there's these kinds of incidents afoot. But in terms of the post-incident analysis that goes on, it would seem to me that there's, you know, there are spikes within the kind of activity.

But in terms of these critical incidents as a whole, there would seem to be an overall sort of upward trajectory on those incidents and again how that relates back to the planning you do in the department to make sure that you've got that baseline

complement of resources ready to go and then whatever you need to do on a contingent basis following that. Am I correct in making that assumption? Is the overall sort of trend line steadily upward in terms of critical incidents and then the way that makes demands on resources from the ministry?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — I think I'm probably basing this a little bit more on, you know, the earlier numbers I went through with you. It's a little bit more . . . Rather than, you know, on a straight trajectory upward, it's a little bit fluctuating, but based on those numbers and then in recent years, sort of a dramatic increase. Now whether that's going to hold or not or drop again, I have no way of knowing.

**Mr. McCall:** — Well I guess again to restate, Mr. Minister, again our compliments to the men and women that are out there doing this very important and very demanding work on behalf of the province, so again to express our gratitude in that regard.

So that being said, Mr. Minister, if we could move on to the First Nations gaming agreement (GR12) and the sum involved of 14,006,000. Again if the minister could reiterate for the committee what that involves. And again, I realize there's a bit of a . . . Obviously these are flow-through dollars but if the minister could just describe the impact of those dollars as relates to things like the community development corporations, the Clarence Campeau Fund is referenced at the outset by the minister and certainly the First Nations Trust, how those different components of the gaming framework agreement are impacted by these dollars.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Okay, the breakdown on that money would be 14.3 million's required, and it's broken down as thirteen and a half million which comes from the 2011-12 reconciliation, 800,000 from the revised forecast for '12-13, and then there's a \$294,000 offset that the ministry did from expenditures elsewhere. So that's why the actual supplementary is 14.006 million.

And you asked about the breakdown between the trust and the Clarence Campeau Development Fund. For total for the First Nations Trust would be just under 9.4 million, the Clarence Campeau Development Fund would be 45,183; and the community development corporations would be just under \$4.9 million.

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. So in terms of the increase in the dollar sum and the need for the reconciliation, am I to gather from this that the Swift Current SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.] casino is finally turning a profit? How has this been impacted by the different revenue generators in the gaming framework? And then again, how is this represented in the reconciliation dollars here today?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — Sorry. The question is specific then to the Swift Current casino and how that impacts it?

**Mr. McCall:** — Yes, I just ask that in particular. I know that the start-up for that performed in a less than desirable way. So I'm just wondering, does this mean that the Swift Current SIGA casino is now turning a profit in a particular sense? And then more broadly, what's happening to result in these increased dollars here before the committee?

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — We'll just consult for a minute. My officials tell me these numbers come from Finance, deals with SIGA and SGC [Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation]. They get the forecasts, and then they do the revisions, and that's where our officials get the numbers from. Our officials tell me they don't have the numbers for the specific casinos, including Swift Current. Their suggestion was probably those numbers could come from SIGA directly. So I guess I'm at a loss otherwise. I guess that would be the avenue to get those.

[21:45]

**Mr. McCall:** — Okay. I guess in previous sort of iterations of discussion of gaming framework agreement dollars that flowed through the former First Nations and Métis Relations, they have been able to provide that level of detail.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — If you could, if you could leave that with us, then I'll ask our officials to check into that and see the appropriate mechanism to get those.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you, Minister. I guess that's about it for questions tonight in terms of supplementary estimates under consideration. I look forward to, as the critic for First Nations and Métis Relations, having a broader discussion under the general estimates with the minister and how that's working out in terms of the new configuration with Government Relations.

But with that said, thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Thank you to your officials. And if members are ready to vote the estimates, we certainly have no problem with that.

**Hon. Mr. Reiter:** — If I could, Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank you, Mr. McCall, for your questions and a very good discussion. I'd like to thank the committee members for their time tonight and the staff and also the ministry officials for a rather long day. And as you mentioned earlier, Mr. McCall, they do a very good job often under trying circumstances. So I'd like to thank everyone.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and thank you, officials.

Committee members, we do have some votes that we have to vote off, starting with vote no. 30, Government Relations, public safety (GR11) in the amount of \$1,229,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Gaming agreements (GR12) in the amount of \$14,006,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Government Relations, vote 30, in the amount of \$15,235,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2013, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of \$15,235,000.

Mr. Phillips. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — November  
Corrections, Public Safety and Policing  
Vote 73**

**The Chair:** — We'll go on to vote 73, Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, public safety (CP06) in the amount of \$70,000,000. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, vote 73, in the amount of \$73,000,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2013, the following sums for Corrections, Public Safety and Policing in the amount of \$70,000,000.

Mr. Hickie. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. We require a motion to present the report to the Assembly, the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice, third report. Committee members, you have before you a draft of the third report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We require a member to move the following motion:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

Mr. Hickie. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. That concludes our business for this evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, committee members. I would ask a member to move a motion of adjournment. Mr. Steinley. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. This meeting stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 21:55.]