



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 37 – December 1, 2014



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Seventh Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Ms. Laura Ross, Chair
Regina Qu'Appelle Valley

Mr. Doyle Vermette, Deputy Chair
Cumberland

Mr. Darryl Hickie
Prince Albert Carlton

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

Mr. Paul Merriman
Saskatoon Sutherland

Mr. Warren Michelson
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Warren Steinley
Regina Walsh Acres

[The committee met at 19:39.]

The Chair: — Thank you very much. My name is Laura Ross and I'm Chair of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. Welcome, everyone. This evening we have with us Darryl Hickie, Paul Merriman, Warren Michelson, Warren Steinley, Doyle Vermette, and Cam Broten.

The Chair advises the committee that pursuant to rule 148(1) the supplementary estimates for the following government ministry was deemed referred to the committee on November 27, 2014.

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

Subvotes (GR12) and (GR11)

The Chair: — We will now start on with our consideration of vote 30, Government Relations, First Nations and Métis relations, subvote (GR12). We have with us this evening Mr. Reiter and his officials. Mr. Reiter, would you please introduce your officials and if you would like to provide an opening statement.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Thank you very much. I would. I'll introduce the officials and I have some comments that I'd like to make. They're intertwined comments under the provincial disaster assistance program as well as the gaming issue. So I'll just make a few comments at the outset, read those into the record, and then be prepared to take questions in whatever format you wish.

My chief of staff behind me, Angela Currie; Al Hilton, my deputy minister; Jenna Schroeder, executive assistant in the deputy minister's office; Jeff Markewich, acting executive director, corporate services; Kelli Bzdel, acting director, financial planning; Margaret Anderson, executive director of the provincial disaster assistance program; Tamie Folwark, program and customer service director of the provincial disaster assistance program; Justin Moen, financial manager, federal cost recovery; and Sam Swan, director of gaming, trusts and grants.

As noted in our government's mid-year report released last Thursday, the Ministry of Government Relations is projected to be \$94.4 million over its expense budget for the current 2014-15 fiscal year. Almost all of our ministry's overexpenditure, \$92.4 million, relates to the provincial disaster assistance program, or PDAP. The PDAP overexpenditure is a result of an additional 70.3 million towards actual, known PDAP claims relating to 2014 disaster events; an additional \$15.2 million towards outstanding claims from prior years; and an additional \$6.9 million towards administration costs, including salaries, adjusters, and engineering services. An extra \$2 million is also required for unbudgeted reconciliation payments for gaming agreements.

Let me deal first with the additional money required for PDAP. Members of this committee are well aware of this program and

how it has worked with individuals and communities across Saskatchewan to help them with recovery from natural disasters. It exists to restore property hit by disasters such as the floods we've experienced in recent years. It exists for Saskatchewan people when disasters strike and when private insurance does not apply. It's really a program of last resort. We continue to be responsive to the needs of PDAP claims. Costs for this year have resulted from 345 designated disaster areas and over 3,800 claims to date. I note that we continue to receive claims on a weekly basis so that total continues to increase.

The overexpenditure in prior year municipal claims is attributable to municipal claims where necessary project work was not initially identified by an engineer. In these, higher costs and claims for both this year and previous years have obviously resulted in the additional expenses we've had to incur for adjuster and engineer services in our current fiscal year.

Let me now turn to the additional \$2 million required for gaming agreements. As a requirement of the gaming framework agreement and *The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act*, during the second quarter the ministry received 2013-14 audited results from the Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority and the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation. The review of these audited results compared to estimated revenue requires reconciliation payments to be made to the community development corporations, the First Nations Trust, and the Clarence Campeau Development Fund. The reconciliation of prior year revenue payments is a normal occurrence and a requirement of the gaming framework agreement. And now we'd be happy to entertain any questions.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Minister Reiter, and the floor is open for questions. Mr. Broten, were you wanting to ask a question?

Mr. Broten: — Yes, I'm just waiting.

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. Broten: — We're good to go? There we go. Light's on. Thank you, Minister, for your opening remarks. I'll have some questions on the gaming agreement and then Mr. Wotherspoon will be joining shortly for the next component.

So starting off on the First Nations gaming agreements, I've had a number of conversations, many conversations about the crossover and how it works, but I'm sure a majority of the people who are perhaps watching the legislative channel don't necessarily understand what exactly it is. So for the purpose of the folks at home who might be watching, could you please explain how the crossover works.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — In June of 2002, the government entered into a 25-year gaming framework agreement with the FSIN, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations. Please excuse my voice; it's kind of going on me today.

The agreement has been amended a couple of times. The revenue-sharing formula requires that gaming profits be distributed, and I'll just quickly run through how those will be distributed.

[19:45]

Profit generated by the SGC [Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation], 50 per cent goes to the General Revenue Fund, 25 per cent to the First Nations Trust, and 25 per cent to the Community Initiatives Fund. That amount is split 80 per cent for the CIF [Community Initiatives Fund] and 20 per cent for Clarence Campeau on the first 10 million, and 50/50 on the balance.

And then for profits generated by SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.], 25 per cent go to the General Revenue Fund, 50 per cent to the First Nations Trust, and 25 per cent to community development corporations.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. So those are the profits that Sask Gaming provides to the CIF and to the First Nations Trust. How does it work with the SIGA dollars flowing to the province?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes, that was the last component I read. Twenty-five per cent goes to the General Revenue Fund, 50 per cent to First Nations Trust, and 25 per cent to community development corporations, of profit generated by SIGA. The first ones I spoke to were the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. So the additional amounts today, so Casino Moose Jaw, Casino Regina made more money in 2013-14 than the government had anticipated, and that's why there's an additional 1.9 million flowing to SIGA?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — You had said the Gaming Corporation had made more profits than initially anticipated?

Mr. Broten: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. Broten: — So how much is flowing from the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation to . . . No, if you'll excuse me. How much is flowing from SIGA to the province this year, in looking at the crossover issue?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — That's the 25 per cent you're referring to? How much is flowing? The GRF [General Revenue Fund] gets 25 per cent of SIGA dollars. So you're asking what that amount is?

Mr. Broten: — What that amount is, correct.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — That would be \$21.9 million.

Mr. Broten: — Okay. And how much is flowing from the province to SIGA?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — In that case you're asking about the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation under that share?

Mr. Broten: — Yes. Yes.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — So none of that money actually flows to SIGA. It flows, as I mentioned earlier, to the First Nations Trust and to the Community Initiatives Fund, which is split. I gave

you that breakdown earlier. That would be 12.6 million flows to the First Nations Trust, the same amount to the CIF, for a total of 25.2 million.

Mr. Broten: — Okay. So just to recap, so for the amount that flows from Sask Gaming to the First Nations Trust, that amount was 12.6 million. And then the amount from SIGA to the province is 21.9 million?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes, that's right. Again though, I would point out though, 12.6 to the First Nations Trust but also another 12.6 million to the Community Initiatives Fund as well.

Mr. Broten: — Yes. How does that . . . I guess that difference in the crossover between the amounts flowing, the crossover of the two directions, how does that difference compare to the amounts in previous years? Do you have that information available?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — I'll just check with our officials.

Our officials don't have that information with them but we'd be happy to provide it to you. If you could give us an idea how far back you'd like to go, the officials will certainly do that and follow up with you.

Mr. Broten: — Yes. I mean whatever information could be provided since the agreement's come into place with respect to . . . and recognizing that there have been changes to the percentages over the years, but if the amount of that crossover difference could be provided in a bit of an historical perspective, that would be helpful. Going to, you know, 2002 would be great. And so providing that information to the committee would be greatly appreciated, and I thank the minister for his willingness to table that.

I know as we've discussed these types of funds, the Premier has expressed some interest in the past with changing and reducing the types of things that CDC [community development corporation] dollars could be spent on. And I know with the First Nations Trust, there's a very similar list of items where those dollars can go to with the addition of a couple of extras.

Has there been any moves to do with limiting, from the minister's perspective, a desire to limit what those dollars could be used for?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — To date no changes have been made.

Mr. Broten: — I understand no changes have been made, but in the discussion around CDCs, there was a pretty explicit desire that was stated to look at reducing the types of things that CDC dollars could support. And in looking at the First Nations Trust, right now they can still go to a variety of really important initiatives. They include economic development, social development, justice initiatives, education and education facilities, development and operation of recreational facilities, senior and youth programs, cultural and spiritual development, development and maintenance of community infrastructure, health initiatives — and those all have significant overlap with the CDCs — but then as well as governance activities as well as treaty protection.

So just to be clear, there's no . . . I know there haven't been changes, but is there any desire to move away from that list as it currently stands?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — You know, the comments that you're referring to were about, you know, trying to focus on things like employment and education, those sorts of things. Those continue to be a priority, but as of right now there's nothing imminent as far as changes.

Mr. Broten: — Okay. Thank you very much. Roughly how much does it cost the Ministry of Government Relations each year to administer the legal obligations under *The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act* and the gaming framework agreement, please?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — My deputy advises just roughly, it's about \$100,000, one FTE [full-time equivalent].

Mr. Broten: — And that's been a similar amount over the years? There's usually been one FTE devoted to it?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. Broten: — Thank you. I can appreciate that the gaming framework agreement itself is negotiated between the FSIN and the Minister Responsible for SLGA [Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority], but as we pointed out, it's the Ministry of Government Relations that's responsible for administering the crossover. And I know we've had some discussion about this in the past, and I do again thank the minister for your willingness to follow up and table the crossover amounts in a bit of a historical perspective.

I'm just curious if the minister has an opinion or a view or a position on whether the crossover should be eliminated at all or if that's a preferred course that he would like to maintain?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Just to clarify what the ministry responsibility is under the gaming framework agreement, I'm just going to get our deputy, Al Hilton, to elaborate on that.

Mr. Hilton: — Al Hilton. So our responsibilities with respect to the gaming framework agreement are essentially to ensure that the monies flow to the organizations that are supposed to get the money, consistent with the agreement that the government has with the FSIN. And we're also responsible for ensuring all the proper auditing takes place. Beyond that, that's where our, sort of, responsibilities begin and end.

[20:00]

Mr. Broten: — Thank you to the official for the response with respect to the responsibilities. I guess my question is backing it up one earlier, I suppose, to the minister from his view. With respect to the crossover, certainly there's a role for the ministry in looking over the framework agreement to ensure that the right dollars are flowing to the right place. There is the policy question with respect to these estimates as to whether or not that crossover is something that should carry on or whether a different course should be taken. And my question to the minister is if he has a position on whether or not the crossover should be eliminated or if its continuation is his preferred

course.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — It's not a case of me having a position on it. It's a long-standing agreement signed in 2002 between the government and the FSIN. And you know, any sort of changes to that, to the formula, would require some discussion and negotiation between the two bodies again.

Mr. Broten: — It certainly would require negotiation, so I was curious if that's something that the minister has considered or that he is open to.

Okay, with that I've covered the ground I'd like to cover this evening, and I thank very much the minister for his responses and the officials for their time. And I will pass it on to another colleague for more discussion on another vote. Thank you so much, Minister.

The Chair: — Mr. Vermette, were you wanting to ask a question? Are you ready to vote? Okay, excellent. Thank you very much.

Vote 30, Government Relations, page no. 10, First Nations and Métis engagement, (GR12) in the amount of \$1,982,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

And we will now begin our consideration of vote 30, Government Relations, public safety, subvote (GR11). Again Minister Reiter, are you ready to go? Okay, thank you very much. If you'd like to continue.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Okay. For PDAP, Madam Chair, as I mentioned earlier, I read the brief comments into the record. We would be happy to take any questions.

The Chair: — Okay. We'd like to open the floor for questions. Mr. Vermette.

Mr. Vermette: — Thank you for the opportunity to ask a few questions. I'm just curious if I could find out about the community of Cumberland House. And as far as PDAP goes, is there files or claims that are still open or have they been closed and dealt with, the ones that, you know, happened a few, well I guess over a few years they've had a number of them. I'm just curious to see what the numbers are, if they've, you know, everything's been settled or if there's some still that you're still dealing with.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — To your question about past claims from Cumberland House, there was claims, our officials tell me, 2010, 2011, and 2013, and they've all been closed.

Mr. Vermette: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Joining us we have . . . Would you like to introduce yourself?

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Sure. The member for Regina Rosemont. And pleased to join you here tonight. I was just

upstairs with the folks in Education. I missed the opening remarks that you may have had around PDAP, and if I could just get a quick understanding of where these \$92 million are going, and then we can go from there.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — There's an additional 70.3 million towards actual known PDAP claims relating to 2014 disaster events, an additional \$15.2 million towards outstanding claims from prior years, and an additional 6.9 million towards administration costs, but that includes salaries, adjusters, and engineering services as well.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. And as far as the outstanding claims, I have written questions that you responded, or your ministry responded back on October 27th, 2014. And for just 2013-2014, there was 134 for 2013 that remain open. And then for 2014 there was 2,941. I suspect that number's probably changed. And I guess if you have a number readily available for 2011, 2012, 2013, and then the current year . . .

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — In response to your question, for 2013 the claims went from 134 to 117. And for this year because of course claims are coming in, they're daily really, the number is going to 2,975.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The member from Cumberland shared one specific community. I guess I just want to follow up on to see what response . . . I know we had engaged with your office awhile back, and I think there had been some follow-up with the community. And it was a community that there wasn't a specific program at first that was built for it, and that would be Grandview Beach.

I'm just wondering where that . . . I believe there was at least nine cabins that were directly impacted, but not just the cabins. In this case they actually slid. So they didn't just have overland flooding; they actually had their property slide. So they were in a really difficult spot there.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Absolutely. I'm going to ask my deputy minister, Al Hilton, to give you the specifics of that.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Sure. Thank you.

Mr. Hilton: — So with respect to Grandview Beach, I can offer the committee the following update: the community continues to extend their declaration of local emergency. Given the current weather and hillside conditions, cleanup operations are not possible at this time. The perimeter safety fencing erected in September has been moved further back in November because of increased sliding.

So one of the immediate priorities at Grandview Beach that we worked with the community on was to address the basic public safety issue. And as a consequence of that, perimeter fencing was set up and people were asked not to go to their cabins and the area was isolated.

The roadway directly behind the cabins has heaved to the point that vehicle traffic is no longer possible. And although there's a lot of ice chunks along the shoreline at the moment, the lake was still open as of November 18th. None of the cabins yet have reached the lake.

The administrator at Grandview Beach was still waiting for the demolition release letter from their lawyer allowing the local authority to demolish a cabin or two. And another cabin owner who had braced his cabin, who was thinking that they would want to lift it up, has abandoned that plan because of public safety issues. And the reality is, is that if the top of the bank continues to slide, other cabins along the top could also be threatened.

All of which is to say that we've been working with the community extensively since all this happened with a view to put in place and support them in developing a plan around what we would do, depending on what happens there. So you know, we'll continue to support the community in helping them plan for whatever public safety or environmental issues might happen as a consequence of what happens, you know, down the road — two, three, four months from now or immediately — depending on how the geotechnical things evolve there. So it's been a challenge and we've been working with the community, like I said, for months on this.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I know it's a big concern to the community as well who's been, of course, actively managing this disaster. When you talk about some of the public safety, environmental possibilities, could you lay out what a few of those may be and then what the response from the ministry would be?

Mr. Hilton: — Sure. So obviously from a public safety perspective, the immediate concern was to do what we could to ensure that, you know, children don't go into the site. That could pose a danger to themselves, particularly with winter coming on. There's a whole variety of different things that might be in these cabins, from propane tanks to other things. If they actually fall in the lake, there's an environmental risk there, and obviously we would have an interest in mitigating that risk to whatever extent is possible.

And the costs of recovery, if cabins fall in the lake and other things go in the lake, that could very well be a cost and an operational challenge that goes beyond the community's capacity to sort of deal with. And we've let it be known that we would be there to support them in that regard. And we also had conversations with the federal government about how all of that might or might not qualify under the DFAA [disaster financial assistance arrangements].

The operational realities on the ground are such that we're going to have to wait and see sort of what happens and then, depending on the ice cover that happens along the shore, our recovery operations would depend on sort of the circumstances at the time.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — So the ice conditions. So you're looking. . . There might be some sort of a cleanup or recovery effort that occurs coming on from the lake but it depends obviously to make sure that it's, the timing around making sure that it's thick enough and you're able to access it. Is that what you're talking about on that front?

Mr. Hilton: — Yes. And just unfortunately, the reality in that part of the lake, as I understand it from my operational guys, is that the freezing along that particular piece of shore, it tends not

to be as solid as the rest of the lake. So obviously before I put any of my people in a situation where they're attempting to recover things that might fall onto the ice, I would want to make sure that the ice is completely safe. And there are different technologies that are available in that regard. So we'll have to wait and see what situation presents itself and then make some really practical operational decisions at the time.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. And there's active consideration of activities to . . . I mean so that's the full sort of I guess removal or demolition or something of a property. Is there some plans I guess, if that's not able to be accomplished, to make sure that you're mitigating any impacts of contaminants and whatnot back into the lake if you're not able to accomplish the entire demolition?

Mr. Hilton: — Yes.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — What about the property owners themselves? I know I had connected with the minister's office on their behalf, and it's a really unique circumstance they're dealing with here. It's not, you know, at first they were being told that they, you know, weren't going to be covered at all through PDAP, through its sort of traditional rules. And this is a very non-traditional event to actually have a landslide and where you don't just have overland flooding, which is a devastation in itself and a fiscal impact on it, but you've also lost the land title itself so really rebuilding is near impossible.

And so at that time I was urging the direct relationship with the ministry to those cottage owners and property owners to arrive at a program that, build a program if you will, that would support those property owners. Have you come to terms on that, what that may look like?

[20:15]

Mr. Hilton: — I just wanted to consult with my officials to make sure I wasn't in any way misleading the committee.

What we're able to offer and what we've been in discussions with the community on is compensating them through PDAP for the costs of recovery. So whatever costs the municipality might incur as a consequence of all of this sloping happening, we've been in discussions with them about compensating them for that. And we've also been in discussions with the federal government around how the DFAA, you know, would view that. Initial indications are positive.

The PDAP program does not offer assistance to cottage owners, only to principal residences, nor does it cover land that might be lost. So the individuals that have been personally affected are going to suffer a financial loss as a consequence of what has happened.

But the municipality, in terms of the cost that they might incur as a consequence of, you know, sort of recovering from the event, would be, they would be supported financially through the PDAP program.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The property owners themselves, so it's dependent then for the support through the program that you're operating as to whether or not they're a primary resident or

whether it's a residence or whether it's a cottage. Is that correct?

Mr. Hilton: — That's correct, yes.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Out of those nine, how are they classified? Are some of them residents or are they all cottages?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Our officials tell us they're all cottages.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Through PDAP's history, has it ever supported in maybe a special circumstance or extenuating circumstance a property owner as it related to cottage property?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — No. I had to look to AI for that because he's a lot older than I am, and you said, in history.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. So in previous years, in other circumstances, in other locations, PDAP dollars haven't gone to someone who owns a cottage?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — No. I can confirm that from personal experience, having had my own cottage flooded.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Which lake are you at?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Round Lake.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. Yes, this year you had high water.

Thanks for the responses there. I know that those that are owning the property certainly still have some definite real challenges that they're dealing with there. And certainly we'd urge you to continue to work with them and listen to some of the hardships they're facing and see if there's not some level of reasonable support to respond to some of those pressures and certainly responding to the municipalities. Needs are significant when you're talking about the changes to the land, the changes to the geotech, the changes to the road, and all the other factors there.

So this year was a really difficult one again for a lot of properties across Saskatchewan, unfortunately. The minister referenced the number of open files for 2014, which is significant. When I go back and just look at the cost, so this budget brings forward supplementary estimates of \$70 million to respond to claims. And that timely response is really important of course. I know that you would understand that, and I suspect that's your aim. But if I look back at some of the estimated amounts that haven't been paid out in years previous, we'd have a couple of million in 2010, \$27 million in 2011. It looks like we've missed 2012 in those dates there possibly, but 2013 would be 11.5 million. And then this year was at 70 million at that point in time. This was on October 27th, 2014.

So certainly the outstanding PDAP claims are well in excess of the supplementary estimate, so I'm just wanting to reconcile, sort of. There's the ask, the 70 million, doesn't meet the need when it comes to the outstanding claims. So maybe if the minister could just, or officials comment on the discrepancy.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — So in the dollar amounts that you're

referring to, the \$70 million that we're discussing here today is for 2014. The others, the 2010, '11, and '13 you referred to, 15 million of that total is part of the amount we're discussing today. The rest of it's already in accrual.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay, so thank you for that answer. So just to clarify again the outstanding amount, the 70 . . . So what's the outstanding PDAP claim values then? So I know in 2014, when I had this response come back on October 27th, it said \$70 million at that point. Where is that number at right now?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — That was in my original notes that you had asked. Because you weren't here at the time, I repeated. That was the first amount I stated, the \$70.3 million.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — That was in 2014?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Got you. All right, I'm getting this here now. This is making sense. You've got 2 million . . . So still on that front, you've got about \$37 million of outstanding claims for those other years. You've dedicated \$15 million in response. Is the feeling that those other claims aren't going to be able to be settled in that time? Because certainly going on two, three, four years for folks that have those claims . . .

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes. The 15 million, 15.2 million I referred to is part of those others, and the rest is in accrual.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. What's the goals of the ministry to respond to claims in this current year, in 2014?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — As far as . . .

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The timeline to have them settled and have the payment in the hand of those that have been impacted.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — I'll ask Al to speak to that. Those targets we've been trying to improve as we go along, so I'm going to get him to give you some detail on that.

Mr. Hilton: — So I'll talk about private residential claims because municipal claims are more challenging, more difficult, and they only get paid out when the work gets done, you know, where the final reconciliation happens. So if we look at what has happened since the written questions, which is October 27th I think we provided you information, since then if you look at the December 1st numbers, what you will find is that the difference over that five-week period for private residential claims — between the files that have been closed and the number of people that have actually been paid, based on the adjuster's report — is 477.

So if you do a bit of math, if you have 2,066 open residential claims and if we can repeat that 477, then four, four and a half months from now they'll all sort of hopefully be closed or be paid. But, and this is a big but, we continue to get claims in, and we'll have claims coming in until the end of December. So as claims come in they have to be processed, which takes time and energy of staff.

So I can't guarantee obviously that the 477 will repeat itself, you know, over the next five weeks as well. But that gives you a sense of the amount of activity that's happening.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Do you have on hand something that you could table or is it something that will be able to be supplied back to me, is the breakout of where the claims are occurring? Of course we know the damage along the Qu'Appelle lakes and in through Crooked. We know in a lot of municipalities across the province, through a lot of RMs [rural municipality], just in so many spots. Whether it be Melville or damage right here in Regina, are you able to . . . do you have a bit of a graph of some sort that shares where the number of claims and where they're coming from?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — I wonder if, you know, I know what you're getting at kind of geographically where that would be, and as you pointed out, you know, predominately along the east side of the province, southeast. As of right now there's 334 municipal designations. So I wonder if we could do a follow-up with you and provide where, sort of which municipalities are impacted. Would that suffice?

Mr. Wotherspoon: — That would be fine.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Yes.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Are there any — of course on an individual claim there might be some back and forth as to; there might be some discrepancies — are there any great discrepancies that you're noting right now with any specific municipality or any specific region where property owners or a municipality are feeling that the program should apply and it doesn't, or any discrepancies in place right now?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — So you're wondering if there's municipalities that have applied for designation that have been refused?

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Right. Or certain properties in a certain area, or just if there's those that are feeling that the program should apply to them, that the program either doesn't apply in its current form or that you don't feel it should apply.

[20:30]

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Our officials tell me they're guessing that there was about five or six municipalities that applied for designation but that our officials are going to need to follow up on because there's criteria they have to meet to be designated — for instance, amount of rainfall. So our officials will be following up with those municipalities to get more information before a final determination is made.

As far as individual claims, they tell me that there are at times — they're dealing with, as you know, thousands of claims — there are some claims occasionally that somebody has claimed but may not be eligible. For instance, Al mentioned earlier about individual claims, that it has to be a principal residence. It can't be a secondary, like a cabin. In some instances people aren't aware of that, so they're not eligible.

There could be cases where people apply, for instance on sewer

backup, where that's insurable so it's not eligible. So our officials work very hard to, you know, to communicate with people with their claims, if there's any problems with them, to help them with them. And in some instances there are claims that aren't eligible.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Well thanks for that information. The five or six municipalities that there might be a discrepancy right now that you're seeking more information, are you able to share who those municipalities are at this point in time?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Actually right now off the top of their heads, our officials aren't sure which municipalities they are, but we typically wouldn't until the final determination is done.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. Where do PDAP and your ministry connect to some of the mitigation or the, I guess, some of the efforts that you would embark on as a municipality? I know there's lots of projects that have applied to see some flood mitigation projects come to be. I guess just from a . . . looking for an update from the minister as to how he connects to those efforts.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — You know, the bulk of the mitigation projects fall under the Water Security Agency, not PDAP. But certainly there's communication all the time, including at the minister level. So if there's a . . . You know, if you're just wondering generally, that kind of covers it. But if there's a specific one, I may be able to help you or I might be able to follow up with some information.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Sure. You know, just for example, one like the Quill Lakes. You know, we're getting concerns from people in that area and people that would be impacted if it breaches the banks. I guess what are the actions being taken on, as it relates to the Quill Lakes to ensure that there's not a devastation that occurs, something that is sort of . . . that many are witnessing the growth of that watershed. And certainly it seems that there's an important place for some intervention.

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Absolutely. It's a huge concern. Minister Moe is the lead on that one though. The question would be probably better put to him, but rest assured we're well aware of it and he is concerned and is looking at possibilities.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — I've had some correspondence back and forth with the minister on it, and I'll continue to do so. What would you rank, as far as from a priority perspective, the highest risk areas as it relates to water right now?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — You're referring to highest risk upcoming, what, as far as spring flooding?

Minister Moe had released or the Water Security Agency had released, I believe last week or the week before, kind of the runoff forecast. I think that probably speaks to it better than I could, but certainly we're concerned. You know, as you've seen, the chances of flooding again in the spring are quite likely or possible so, you know, that of course means that PDAP needs to be prepared. And certainly we intend to do that.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Okay. Well I think at this point in time, relating to the budget that you've put forward here and we've

discussed it in detail on supplementary estimates, we certainly, you know, urge the continued timely response. And you know, we'll certainly track and invite anyone who's struggling with their claim to connect and work directly with your offices as well, and certainly continue to urge those mitigation efforts that can, you know, place property and people out of the way of devastation and crisis and save some real dollars hopefully on the PDAP side of the equation down the road. So I think I've satisfied all the questions I have here tonight.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Any other questions? If not, we will now vote on public safety, subvote (GR11). Public Safety, subvote (GR11) in the amount of \$92,428,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Government Relations, vote 30, 94,410,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — 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 the 31st, 2015, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 94,410,000.

Mr. Michelson.

Mr. Michelson: — I will so move. I move:

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

The Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Any closing remarks?

Hon. Mr. Reiter: — Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to thank Mr. Wotherspoon for your questions. I'd like to thank the committee for their time, and also all our ministry officials for being with us tonight.

And I'd also like to just put on record a big thank you not only to our emergency response folks that helped out with the flooding this past summer but all the municipal people who responded. There's just case after case of people going above and beyond, and also volunteers as well. It just speaks to the spirit of Saskatchewan people, so I'd like to publicly acknowledge them as well.

The Chair: — Yes, Mr. Wotherspoon.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Yes, thank you. And I'd just like to follow up on that. Thank you so much to the minister for his time here tonight, the officials that are here tonight, all those that are doing the important work for many of the PDAP files. When you're dealing with those, it's responding to a real stress

in someone's life, a real hardship that they've taken on. And as well, those emergency responders really are an impressive bunch, whether those that are contracted, the volunteer spirit that comes together in communities.

And you know, I witnessed it first-hand here this summer with rubber boots on out at Crooked Lake and certainly out at White City and also in through Melville, and went out and observed as well and met with folks in around Grandview and some of the places. There's a lot of important efforts that are done in a voluntary basis by municipal leaders and by everyday people, and certainly those within the employ of the ministry as well, so we thank all of those that respond.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Minister Reiter, and all of your officials and all of the members for attending. And we are now going to move a motion to present report to Assembly, Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice, seventh report.

Committee members, you have before you a draft of the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We require a member to move the following motion:

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

Mr. Michelson: — I so move.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Michelson. Is that agreed by everyone?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Thank you. I have to sign and . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Pardon me? Okay. Could we have someone move to adjourn?

Mr. Hickie: — I so move.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Hickie. We will clean up and the committee stands adjourned until the call of the Chair.

[The committee adjourned at 20:41.]