



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 29 – May 28, 2018



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Fred Bradshaw, Chair
Carrot River Valley

Mr. Buckley Belanger, Deputy Chair
Athabasca

Mr. Ken Francis
Kindersley

Mr. Hugh Nerlien
Kelvington-Wadena

Mr. Eric Olauson
Saskatoon University

Ms. Laura Ross
Regina Rochdale

Mr. Corey Tochor
Saskatoon Eastview

[The committee met at 15:06.]

The Chair: — Well good afternoon. This is the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. I would like to introduce myself and the members. I'm Fred Bradshaw, who is the Chair. We have Mr. McCall substituting for Mr. Belanger. We have Mr. Francis, Mr. Nerlien, Mr. Olauson, Ms. Ross, and Mr. Tochor.

This afternoon the committee will be considering four bills and the committee resolutions for the 2018-19 estimates and the 2017-18 supplementary estimates — no. 2. The four bills under consideration today are Bill No. 76, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2017*; Bill No. 115, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2017*; Bill No. 121, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*; and Bill No. 122, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act, 2018*, a bilingual bill.

Bill No. 76 — *The Parks Amendment Act, 2017*

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now begin our consideration of Bill No. 76, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2017*, clause 1, short title. Minister Makowsky is here with his officials. Minister, would you please introduce your officials and make your opening comments? And I would like to remind the officials, when you speak please say your name for *Hansard*. Thank you. Mr. Makowsky.

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Thank you for that, Mr. Chair. I'd certainly appreciate the time this afternoon to consider Bill 76. To my left is Twyla MacDougall, deputy minister; Jennifer Johnson, ADM [assistant deputy minister], parks division; Chris Potter over my left shoulder, senior park planner; Dominique Clincke, park planner; and Paul Hamnett to my left, chief of staff in our office.

We're looking at several amendments to *The Parks Act*. Primarily we're proposing to establish a new provincial park in the Porcupine Hills area southeast of the town of Hudson Bay. We're also recommending a number of secondary amendments that include adding a statute of limitations for prosecutions, amending several park boundary descriptions, updating the forestry terminology, clarifying enforcement of alcohol-related offences, and minor housekeeping related to language usage.

PCS [Parks, Culture and Sport] is proposing designation of a new provincial park in the Porcupine Hills area southeast of Hudson Bay. Selection of this park area follows through on recommendations of the 1998 Pasquia/Porcupine integrated forest land use plan and this government's commitment to expand the provincial park system. Permanent protection would be placed on two blocks of land to form a single provincial park. The two blocks include the existing Woody River rec site in the east block and McBride Lake, Pepaw Lake, Parr Hill Lake, and Saginas Lake rec sites in the west block. Both blocks already include additional surrounding Crown lands that have already been excluded from the forest management agreement.

Extensive engagement with First Nation, Métis communities was included in the consultation process. Through 2015-16 the

consulting group Indigemetrics led a community-engagement process, engaging with Aboriginal communities and local stakeholders in a more detailed dialogue about the proposed park. The communication between the ministry, aboriginal communities, and other key local stakeholders continues to improve as result of the Indigemetrics process. This process helped to provide the province with a better understanding of the importance and the values of the park area to Aboriginal communities and local stakeholders.

Also in this past year ministry officials were able to address concerns related to hunting. Officials further established an ATV [all-terrain vehicle] working group to initiate dialogue and work toward establishing some ATV guidelines.

Following park designation, the relationship and knowledge developed through the consultations will be expanded upon and used to begin preparation of the park's management and zoning plans, offering opportunities to represent the rich Aboriginal history and contemporary use in balance with recreational use of the area.

More detailed engagement with stakeholders and Aboriginal groups will help shape the long-term management plan for the park. This permanent protection will also benefit Saskatchewan's commitment to increase protection of lands across the province to a target of protecting 12 per cent of our province.

There are a few House amendments to Bill 76. Since the second reading of this bill last fall, the ministry has continued dialogue with affected interest groups and has worked toward finalizing the name of the new provincial park. This work has resulted in two House amendments of Bill 76 this spring.

The first House amendment replaces clause 24 to bring forward the name Porcupine Hills Provincial Park as the official name of the new park. The change also removes the names for the two blocks which were previously proposed as the Woody block for the east block and the McBride block for the west block. The blocks would now be referenced in legislation as east block and west block, providing a simple geographical description to distinguish the two blocks. Future naming of the blocks will be considered through more detailed work in the park management planning process, with the guidance of Aboriginal and local communities.

The second House amendment replaces clause 26 to adjust the in-force date. Bill 76 provided for a separate in-force date of the park designation to be by proclamation to allow time for park naming. Now that the park naming has been completed earlier than expected, the in-force date is being adjusted to be through Royal Assent along with the rest of the bill.

On the statute of limitations, currently limitations on prosecution default to *The Summary Offences Procedure Act* which only allows six months to investigate an issue or to make a determination on how to proceed. The inclusion of and extended statute of limitations will aid enforcement investigations by allowing for prosecutions to commence up to two years from the time the ministry becomes aware of a contravention.

We have several park boundary descriptions being amended for clarification or to make some minor boundary adjustments. In addition the boundaries of Candle Lake and Crooked Lake provincial parks will be expanded slightly to include our own maintenance compound and an expired haying lease area that will eventually be reseeded to native grasses.

For forest terminology amendment, the new definition of “timber” is provided to replace the term “Crown timber” removed from *The Forest Resources Management Act*. The amendment also provides clarification that timber harvesting within parks can be authorized under both *The Forest Resources Management Act* and *The Parks Act*, depending on the type of project.

Clarification is also provided to more clearly state the authority of enforcement officers to enforce section 7 of *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulations*, which relates to evictions for contravention to the annual alcohol ban. Keep in mind, members, that the eviction is often a last resort. Enforcement officers apply warnings and tickets before they would so far as to evict a camper for alcohol offences.

Lastly there are a number of housekeeping amendments which include grammatical improvements and providing gender-neutral references. That concludes my remarks. I’d be happy to answer any questions from the members.

The Chair: — Well thank you, Minister. Are there any questions? Mr. McCall.

Mr. McCall: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, Mr. Minister, officials. Welcome to the consideration of Bill No. 76, committee stage.

In terms of the way that the creation of a new park under the legislation impacts the duty to consult policy of the provincial governments, could the minister or officials describe for the committee their understanding of the duty to consult policy of government, and in turn how this was applied in this circumstance?

[15:15]

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — So I think in general terms, the duty to consult when there is a change of land use or something — in this case, the designation of a park — the action, we want to make sure that there is no adverse impact on treaty and traditional use activity.

So we believe that in that consultation process that’s been happening over a number of years, there is no examples of how the establishment of this park adversely impacts treaty and traditional uses and activities, in particular hunting and fishing rights. Those will remain unchanged and continue as they have in the current iteration of the rec sites, and has happened for many, many years in the past and will continue in the future. And ministry officials noted we certainly feel that the duty to consult obligations were met and also exceeded as well.

There was a process, an extensive process that ministry officials went through in order to make sure everything was done properly. And so all viewpoints were heard, and so that process

has wrapped up, that part of it. Of course we’ll continue to consult and listen. And the park advisory committee will be formed if this legislation proceeds, and that will be very informative in decisions around the park in future years.

Mr. McCall: — Thanks for that, Mr. Minister. Can the minister describe to the committee the specific communities, First Nations and/or Métis, to which the duty to consult attaches, and how they were engaged in turn by the government or their agents?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Okay, Well, we have a fair amount here, so if you bear with us. So from 2011 to 2015: the Métis Nation of Saskatchewan; the Gabriel Dumont Institute; FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations]; Lands and Resources Secretariat; Métis Nation Eastern Region 2 and Métis Locals in the region; the Touchwood Agency Tribal Council, including the Day Star First Nation, George Gordon First Nation, Kawacatoose First Nation, Muskowekwan First Nation; Yorkton Tribal Council; Cote First Nation; the Keeseekoose First Nation; and independent First Nations; Fishing Lake First Nation; the P.A. [Prince Albert] Grand Council; James Smith Cree Nation; Red Earth First Nation; Shoal Lake of the Cree First Nation; Saskatoon and district tribal council; Kinistin Saulteaux Nation; Yellow Quill First Nation; Manitoba First Nations. Not as familiar with these, so, sorry: Opaskwayak Cree Nation, Sapotaweyak Cree Nation, Wuskwi Sipiik First Nation.

And so the responses I have here all received letters and numerous follow-up calls. And all were offered face-to-face meetings, and most had a minimum of one meeting. And of course, contact’s ongoing with ministry officials.

I mentioned earlier the Indigemetrics nine-step process from 2015 to 2017. Six Saulteaux First Nations — Cote, The Key, Keeseekoose, Fishing Lake, Yellow Quill, Kinistin — that view the proposed park area as their traditional territory, have entered into agreement with the ministry of PCS to undertake a nine-step process to bring First Nation, Métis, and municipal communities as stakeholders together.

And so I’ll quickly mention the Métis and First Nations as well. Eastern Region 2: Métis Local 58; Métis Local 22, I should maybe mention that 22 is Melfort; Local 99, Bjorkdale; 114, Hudson Bay; 137, Mr. Chair, Carrot River; 138, Sturgis; 222, Tisdale; 116, Wynyard; Métis Local 134, Nipawin; and Métis Local, Chelan Porcupine. That’s the list I have there.

Mr. McCall: — Thanks for that. So in terms of consultation in the meeting, what would typically take place in the meeting? How would that be conducted?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Chris Potter spent a lot of time on this consultation process over a number of years, and of course she was at many of the meetings, so I’ll get her to elaborate.

Ms. Potter: — I think the meetings were varied. There was not sort of one general approach because the project evolved over time. Initially they were larger meetings that were more providing information about what the proposal was, what the intent of the park was to do, and then, dependent on the particular Aboriginal group, the community, how significant

their interest was in the area. You know, there would be subsequent meetings perhaps with some council members and elders. There were several meetings where we met, you know, just with chiefs, sometimes in groups. The Yorkton Tribal Council we met as a group several times.

And then what we were finding is there still seemed to be a bit of a miscommunication in terms of what we were trying to achieve with the park. So that is when we brought in the Indigemetrics group to try and — rather than talking about, do you want a park or do you not want a park — talk to a little bit more about, what are some of the issues that you would like to bring out onto the table, so that we could begin to address issues one-off rather than, you know, taking positions that will never, ever come together.

And so that was the main sort of purpose of taking that approach. It was to build our understanding of interests in that area and hopefully lead to some improved relations, because what we're looking for is a long-term relationship with these groups.

Mr. McCall: — In terms of the issues that were identified to tackle one at a time, could the minister or officials describe that for the committee, please?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I think I briefly mentioned it earlier, but obviously access to traditional use in the area — hunting, trapping, fishing. There's also in general terms, in terms of grazing leases, some land use has been used for traditional activities. Education for youth I believe was mentioned. So just being able to still access the land with the change in land use . . . or land designation, sorry, I should say.

And also all-terrain vehicles, the use of those within the current rec sites, and if the amount of use would be increased. And of course there are some sacred sites within that land area, and not having those disturbed by in particular ATV use I believe was a concern as well. So again the ability for access and to carry on activities First Nations, indigenous people have used in that area for many years.

Mr. McCall: — So maybe to ask this a different way, in terms of the First Nations that are . . . the intensity of the impact of the park, or those that are the most involved with the park, would it be accurate to say that it's primarily with the Kamsack bands or what are known as the Kamsack bands, so Cote, Keeseekoose, and the Key? Would that be an accurate assessment?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I think that would be a fair statement.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of traditional use sites or sacred sites, what was identified and what accommodations were made in terms of the plan for the park?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Go ahead.

Ms. Potter: — Hi. We look at . . . Like, we really feel like we're in many ways at the beginning of the accommodation piece. We need to sit down, and we've made a commitment to those First Nations, to sit down with the folks that are doing the grazing in there and look at where the gravesites are and where they're picking medicines. Those are two sort of conflicts that

they're seeing right now. So we're 100 per cent committed to sitting down together and seeking some solutions, whether we do some fencing or . . . You know, we don't have the answer yet but we'll be sitting down and working with them on that, a solution to that.

For the hunting and access in particular, typically when you create a park, a game preserve goes onto the park area, and so that does affect treaty and traditional use. So I guess that would be our main accommodation. We worked with Ministry of Environment and got agreement that we will be amending *The Open Seasons Game Regulations* immediately to allow hunting to continue exactly as it does now. And we have examples of where we've done that in other provincial parks. Great Blue Heron that we recently created, we did the same thing and it was a seamless transfer where access was continued. So that's the main accommodation.

And the other activities are currently, you know, disrupting as ATVs and cattle grazing, and we hope to work to find some solutions through our park advisory group through our park zoning. We will improve the opportunities and the experience for those people in that area.

[15:30]

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of the undertaking on the accommodation, the prospective accommodation, how has that been communicated to the affected parties? And I guess, was it a written undertaking? How has that been substantiated?

Ms. Potter: — Primarily through the formal communication where we indicated that hunting will continue, that we've made that change, and that the park advisory group, we want their representation; we want to work with them. Also we've had of course verbal communication in the ongoing consultations, where we have discussed that and the opportunities, and you know, some of the excitement around working together with parks to protect that area.

Mr. McCall: — Okay. Is it possible for that information to be tabled or that an undertaking be made that that communication be tabled with the committee?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Officials indicate we're not sure that can be released. We will check with the Ministry of Government Relations to see if that's allowed to be put forward to the committee.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of who that undertaking was made to, I'm presuming it would have been made to the three — Key, Cote, Keeseekoose — First Nations. Is that correct?

Ms. Potter: — Well all of the First Nations that we communicated with would have got that information in terms of the ability to continue hunting, gathering, those kinds of activities, their traditional use activities.

Mr. McCall: — There's no sort of differentiation in terms of this is right in the three First Nations that I've described, right in their backyards? If traditional use is established, they're in for the broader communication? Is that accurate?

Ms. Potter: — It's in the broader communication. My understanding is that the Aboriginal communities have their own protocols in terms of accessing traditional use areas. So if someone from, you know, if a First Nation from further afield were to come into their traditional area, they would typically request permission through those First Nations. They have their own protocols for doing that. But as far as we're concerned, all First Nations will continue to have access to that area. It's up to the First Nations and their individual protocols.

Mr. McCall: — So in the case of a given First Nation where leadership is in dispute, how is that contended with by the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — My understanding, in the several years that this project has been under consideration, there have been changes in governance, in leadership, in different First Nations, and provincial governments and city governments along the way as well. But in terms of what was mentioned by you, Mr. McCall, there's all throughout, as councils change, as leadership changes, we continue to consult and inform and engage as that leadership has changed. And that will continue into the future as, you know, as we go along. Whoever happens to be chief or in the leadership of different First Nations, the process will continue with the park advisory group with those zoning issues that Chris had mentioned.

And so similar to I guess what happens provincially in our government's agreements or what had taken place isn't automatically, you know, discounted or we don't start back from zero each time there is change. And so again, the ministry is committed to continue on with that engagement process with First Nations, with all the community leaders in that area.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of, again if the minister or officials can help me understand, in terms of the communications and consultation that's gone on to date, is there a point at which approval or support is expressed by, in this case, the three First Nations that are most affected by the park? Was there a point at which Key, Keeseekoose, or Cote First Nations expressly supported, stated their support for the proceeding plan for the park?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I guess there's been from — as you mentioned, I think colloquially we'll call them the Kamsack bands — there hasn't been, you know, a definite yes, please proceed. I think the engagement process will continue and we continue to work on trying to allay concerns, and we talked about those, that basically surround the traditional use and the continued . . . We will continue to engage with those First Nations and any other in the province that continue to have concerns, but at this point there's been no definitive yes, please do this.

But again we continue to work with the groups. They'll be part of the park advisory group is the word I was looking for. They'll be invited to be a part of that and to help guide how the park will unfold. I think I've mentioned before in the House that this, this park will be different from some other parks.

Each park has their own assets and zoning and different uses. Certainly this park won't be a big recreational use. There won't be electrified sites. There's no plan for electrified sites,

planning a bunch of construction. This park will be unique in that it . . . Well again, as I said, each park has its own unique features. We want to preserve the natural beauty of this area, of which it has an abundance. I don't think campers, First Nations in the area, the municipalities surrounding, will see many, if not any, changes in the first few years as the park . . . if it does become proclaimed into law under *The Parks Act*.

So again, a bit of a long answer there, Mr. Chair. Certainly individuals within, I think it's fair to say, within the First Nation have been supportive. I think there has been some hesitation and concern among other members, and I appreciate that and I understand that. We're working hard to continue that engagement, continue talking so we can share that beautiful part of the province — and everybody has an opportunity, if they so choose, to enjoy the natural beauty of the Porcupine Hills area — and to enshrine it in legislation for future generations.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of, again the three most affected First Nations, have any of them expressly stated their opposition to the park proceeding?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I'd say when Chris has been in meetings or I've talked and been in a meeting with leaders from the affected areas, yes there is opposition. There is concerns. I don't know if that's the right word to use. There's definitely concerns about it being sort of a — boy, what would be a good example — maybe Duck Mountain, where in the area it's fairly highly developed, or places with golf courses and extensive amount of cabins, grocery stores, etc., lots of paving, a lot of electrified sites.

And so I think as that engagement and that talking and listening to concerns continues, I think some of that is alleviated. And certainly again the traditional use, the ability for band members to access for traditional uses, when that is all explained, and again that communication is ongoing and those things are worked through, I think there is some relief and some . . . Again, I don't want to put words in other people's mouths and misrepresent what they've said.

There are concerns, but I think those become a little more alleviated as you talk and explain the process and the situation, and how First Nations in the area will have a say as to how the park will be developed in the future. I think some of that is alleviated, but that work will continue, and we will engage as we go forward.

Mr. McCall: — So again — and I appreciate that there's a fairly wide swath of impact in terms of what has been identified at the start and, you know, it's sort of roughly analogous to Treaty 4 and First Nations therein — but again, as I understand the situation, the most immediate impacts concern the three Kamsack bands.

And amongst those First Nations, the announcement of the park was accompanied by the presence in the gallery of leadership from the Key First Nation. And there were different things being said by the individuals that were there on behalf of Key First Nation. And I also know that that leadership is in dispute. And it's not just, you know, I don't like the outcome of an election; it's in dispute, I believe, in the court of law. So in terms of who's speaking on behalf of Key First Nation, it's not

an unfair question to ask in terms of who has that authority, who has that legitimacy.

And then in terms of the other two First Nations, again in terms of what the minister is being . . . having communicated to the ministry, would you characterize them as supportive or opposed to the progress of the park?

[15:45]

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I appreciate your comments and concerns about the Key First Nation. I'd like to point out to the committee again the duty to consult framework and all the work that was done in that area. Again as I understand it, I believe that task or that undertaking is not a yes or no thing. It has to do with affecting traditional use. And I think that process, as the ministry has gone through that, those questions were answered. I won't discount the concern that First Nations leadership, whoever that may be . . . Again as those conversations continue and as we look to the future, those will continue.

I wouldn't mind pointing out to the committee that very similar, from what I understand, situation is what happened with Great Blue Heron Park that was undertaken in, I believe, 2013. There was some concern about designating that area as a park with the local First Nations. And from my understanding, after proclamation that relationship has gone very well in terms of the park advisory group working through concerns and questions that those folks had. And that work continues.

I also note to the committee members there are several people in the area that are very excited about having a provincial park in the area. We hear anecdotally, I get letters about people who were disappointed they couldn't reserve a site on a certain weekend, that they really wanted to come to Saskatchewan to go camping. Certainly I know stakeholders in the area, the town of Hudson Bay is quite eager and wanting us not to delay any further this opportunity for all peoples to share in that beautiful part of Saskatchewan.

I also note that this area has been under parkland reserve status designation for 20 years or so, and so that has protected the lands in that area from . . . I think it was Ms. Sproule, I recall back to her second reading speech when she talked about in her younger days that she was a tree planter in the area, and that there are a lot of forestry companies in the area. And I believe there still are; it's an important part of our economy, and that's important as well.

But for people interested in preserving that part of the province, that part of our beautiful natural heritage, this designation will protect that land, not only now, and as it has been as a parkland reserved designated area. Having it enshrined in legislation as a provincial park will give that area protected status, not only for cabin owners in the area, the beautiful surroundings that they have, the First Nations for traditional use — for gravesites, traditional gravesites, medicine wheels that may be in the area and those important parts of our heritage too — will be enshrined in legislation and are protected for generations to come.

Mr. McCall: — So as it stands right now as I understand it, one of the sets of concerns arises from the conflict between

identified gravesites and grazing on the part of cattle which, you know, that's usually cause for concern in any culture. So could the minister describe that particular situation and describe what steps are being taken to provide the protection that the minister's referenced in terms of this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — I think some of the work the ministry has done in terms of identifying known gravesites, I think that's important work being done. I think that shows we take that seriously. We respect that. It's in our thoughts certainly.

I think it's important to note that the land that is under question in terms of the grazing is not parkland. It is Crown land, but under Environment. So I think with the passing of legislation, I think there can be a conversation with the lessee and see if at least something can be done if we could. I don't want to preclude any actions or what may come of that, but at least, you know, it's now in the possibility if it is part of parkland designation, and we'd again, bring First Nations to the table and hear their thoughts and concerns and of course see what actions, working with the lessee, if there's something that can be done to accommodate those gravesites, maybe fencing them off, some other action.

Again, I don't want to state right now here, without knowing exactly what can be done, but I think at least at this point, you know, is it possible to move the grazing over a little bit? Again that remains to be seen, but I think, as we've been saying throughout the proceedings this afternoon, we'll certainly talk and work with First Nations and any lessees that have those gravesites, and hopefully come to a productive solution. And again I think that park advisory group will be part of that. And at least now there's a chance for all to be at the table to talk about it, whereas now that's not taking place.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of this particular work that would take place as part of the park advisory group, and again, who's been invited to come to the park advisory group table, and what does the work of that body look like going forward?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — So to answer your question, the grazing is an annual permit renewed every year. The park advisory group, of course it's not constituted yet. Once we hopefully get passage of the bill, that will begin shortly, immediately.

I'd also like for the committee members to also know that I referenced earlier the Great Blue Heron Park advisory group and its work. The membership of that group, I can give you some sort of sense as how these are constituted and how they work and who's on them. So that park advisory group at Great Blue Heron includes municipal, First Nations, Métis communities; recreation, conservation organization; and commercial interests. So specifically, the First Nation and Métis membership includes Lac La Ronge Indian Band, Montreal Lake Cree Nation, Fish Lake Métis Local 108, and Métis Nation-Saskatchewan western region 2.

And the Lac La Ronge Indian Band and Fish Lake Métis Local 108 participate regularly in park advisory group meetings. Montreal Lake Cree Nation is kept informed about the park advisory group, but is not always in attendance on all meetings. The Métis Nation of Saskatchewan western region 2 has not

been in attendance so far, but the Métis are represented by the Fish Lake Métis Local 108.

So again I don't want to say definitively here in committee who exactly will be on the park committee, but local stakeholders, including First Nations, will certainly be invited. And if Blue Heron's a good indication, I think we'll have good representation from local municipalities, First Nations, as well as cabin owners, commercial interests, etc., and to get as broad a range of perspectives as possible.

Mr. McCall: — So in terms of addressing the concern around the conflict between grazing, a grazing lease and identified gravesites, the minister has held up the park advisory committee as the preferred means by which to address these concerns, to accommodate these identified concerns. What's the timeline towards resolution of this problem? Can we expect to hear something within the year, as the minister's pointed out that it's an annually renewed lease? What can we expect in terms of this accommodation?

[16:00]

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Thank you, Mr. McCall, for the question. My understanding in this, in the specific grazing area, that would be a separate meeting. The grazing permit is an annual permit. Currently Environment deals with those permits right now. But officials, upon assent of the bill and Porcupine Hills becoming a provincial park, officials from the Ministry of PCS will talk with the leaseholder of the grazing and see if there can be a solution that can benefit all parties involved, all the concerns that would be present. And that would, I am told, would occur before the park advisory group would be established.

And so sooner than that, exact dates, I probably couldn't give you that. But would it be fair to say within a year? I think within the year would be a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. McCall: — I thank the minister for that. And at this time, Mr. Chair, I think we've exhausted our time and our line of questions. So I thank the minister and officials for joining us here today for consideration of this legislation.

The Chair: — Well thank you. Are there any more questions from the committee? Seeing none, we'll move on to the bill. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 23 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 24

The Chair: — Clause 24. I recognize Ms. Ross.

Ms. Ross: — Thank you very much. Chair, we have an amendment to clause 24 of the printed bill:

Strike out clause (e) of Clause 24 of the printed bill and substitute the following:

“(e) by adding the description of the following Provincial Park after the description of Narrow Hills Provincial Park:

‘Porcupine Hills Provincial Park

West Block:

All those lands including all areas covered by waters and excepting unsurveyed Highway Nos. 982 and 983 throughout described as follows:

(a) in Township 39, in Range 2, west of the Second Meridian:

(i) in Sections 10, 11 and 12, the north halves;

(ii) Sections 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35 and 36, including Parcel “A”, and Parcel “R1” and excepting the remainder of the Parr Hill Lake Subdivision, as shown on Plan No. CI 4653 in Sections 23 and 26; and excluding both Parcel “B” Plan No. 95Y03035 in Section 25 and in Section 36, all those portions of Plan Nos. 83YO1772, 83YO1050 and 102147612, all plans in the Land Surveys Directory;

(b) in Township 40, in Range 2, west of the Second Meridian:

(i) Sections 1, 2 and 3;

(ii) the north-east quarter of Section 4;

(iii) the north-east quarter of Section 7;

(iv) the north half of Section 8;

(v) Sections 9, 10, 11 and 12, excepting Parcel No. 161582081 in Section 10 as recorded in the cadastral parcel mapping system for Saskatchewan;

(vi) the south halves of Section 13 and 14;

(vii) in Section 15, the south-east quarter and that portion of the south-west quarter lying to the west of Highway No. 982;

(viii) in Section 16, the west half and that portion of the east half lying to the west of Highway No. 982;

(ix) Sections 17 to 20, inclusive;

(x) those portions of Sections 21, 28, 33 and 34 lying to the west of Highway No. 982;

(c) in Township 41, in Range 2, west of the Second Meridian:

(i) those portions of Sections 3, 4, 9 and 16 lying to

the west of Highway No. 982;

(ii) in Section 17, Legal Subdivisions 1 and 8, and that portion of the north-east quarter lying to the south-west of Highway No. 982;

(d) in Township 40, in Range 3, west of the Second Meridian:

(i) the east half of Section 8;

(ii) Sections 9 and 10;

(iii) Sections 13 to 24, inclusive, including Parcel “B” as shown on Plan No. CJ 413 in the Land Surveys Directory, and excluding:

(A) the remainder of the McBride Lake Subdivision as shown on Plan No. CJ 413 in the Land Surveys Directory;

(B) both the small portion of land in Legal Subdivisions 8 and 9 in Section 21 southeast of Plan No. CJ 413 and north of the north shore of McBride Lake as well as Parcel “A” as shown on Plan No. 101911980; and

(C) that portion of Parcel “B” lying east of a line drawn perpendicularly from the iron pin located 466 feet (142.02 metres) west of the eastern edge as shown on Plan No. CJ 413 in the Land Surveys Directory;

(iv) Sections 27 to 30, inclusive;

(e) in Township 40, in Range 4, west of the Second Meridian:

(i) Sections 13 to 17, inclusive;

(ii) Sections 20 to 29, inclusive.

East Block:

All those lands including all areas covered by waters and excepting the unsurveyed Highway No. 980 right of way throughout described as follows:

(a) in Township 39, in Range 30, west of the First Meridian:

(i) in Section 25, Legal Subdivisions 13 to 16, inclusive;

(ii) in Section 26, Legal Subdivisions 13 to 16, inclusive;

(iii) Sections 35 and 36;

(b) in Township 40, in Range 30, west of the First Meridian:

(i) Sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 23 to 36,

inclusive, excepting from Section 33 the following parcels:

(A) the Elbow Lake Subdivision, as shown on Plan No. 70Y03944 in the Land Surveys Directory; and

(B) from the south-west quarter, that land leased pursuant to instruments filed in the Resource Lands Branch of the Ministry of Environment at Regina and numbered 350078 and as shown on Plan No. 96Y01589 in the Land Surveys Directory;

(ii) the north half and the south-east quarter of Section 22, excepting Parcel No. 162087970;

(c) Sections 1 to 24, inclusive, in Township 41, in Range 30, west of the First Meridian”.

The Chair: — Ms. Ross has moved an amendment to clause 24. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Or did you want me to read it again? Is clause 24 amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 24 as amended agreed to.]

[Clause 25 agreed to.]

Clause 26

The Chair: — Clause 26, coming into force, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — Clause 26 is not agreed. The clause is defeated.

[Clause 26 not agreed to.]

The Chair: — I recognize Ms. Ross.

Ms. Ross: —

Add the following Clause after Clause 25 of the printed bill:

“Coming into force

26 This Act comes into force on assent”.

The Chair: — Ms. Ross has moved a new clause 26. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is new clause 26 agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 26 agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Parks Amendment Act, 2017*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 76, *The Parks Amendment Act, 2017* with amendment. Mr. Olauson has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Mr. Minister, do you have any closing comments?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Thank you to the committee members and the officials for appearing here today.

The Chair: — Well thank you, and thank you to the committee. And we will now take a quick recess to change ministers and officials.

[16:15]

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Bill No. 115 — *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2017*

Clause 1

The Chair: — Well good afternoon. We're now going to be in our consideration of Bill No. 115, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2017*, clause 1, short title. We have Ms. Sarauer is substituting for Buckley Belanger at this.

Okay, Minister Morgan is here with us, with his officials. Minister Morgan, could you please introduce your officials and make your opening comments.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined today by Darcy McGovern, Q.C. [Queen's Counsel], director, legislative services branch; Jane Chapco, senior Crown counsel, legislative services branch; Anne-Marie Cotter, director, Office of Residential Tenancies. And also from my office here, my chief of staff, Clint Fox, and Molly Waldman.

I'm pleased to be able to offer brief opening remarks concerning Bill 115, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act*. Mr. Chair, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act* will update a number of sections in the legislation to address pressing issues with the administration of the Act. We know, Mr. Chair, that the vast majority of landlords and tenants in Saskatchewan enter into tenancy agreements and maintain harmonious relations. These amendments will work towards ensuring that this state of affairs will continue.

The bill specifically gives landlords the right to impose rules about cannabis in their property. Mr. Chair, with the upcoming

legalization of cannabis in Canada, many landlords have been concerned about maintaining appropriate control of their property. Any rules imposed by the landlord, as with any other rule, must be reasonable. We are confident Saskatchewan landlords are reasonable and will act responsibly.

Another amendment will repeal the requirement that tenants are to deposit one-half month's rent with the court or prove that rent has been paid, to be able to appeal an eviction order for non-payment of rent. Instead there is a simple requirement for the tenant to continue paying rent for the duration of the appeal, to achieve fairness for both parties.

Mr. Chair, a third amendment will allow the time-consuming and wasteful requirement for landlords to obtain an order from the Office of Residential Tenancies to dispose of low-value property that has been abandoned by the tenant on the tenant's departure. This will eliminate hundreds, if not thousands, of applications to the ORT [Office of Residential Tenancies] each year.

Finally, Mr. Chair, the remaining amendments are housekeeping in nature and will enhance efficiency in the hearing process.

Mr. Chair, with those opening remarks, I welcome questions regarding Bill 115, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2015*.

The Chair: — Well thank you, Minister. Are there any questions. Seeing, oh . . . Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Minister, for your opening remarks. I, just for your knowledge, I broke my questions with respect to this bill into three main categories. The first will be 22.1, some questions around that. The next will be the funding provisions for an appeal. And then the third is around section 85 and the abandonment of personal property section.

So beginning at the top, section 22.1, could you provide some further detail as to why 22.1(1)(a) is being worded in the way that it is?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm not really sure that I'm able to just answer a question as general as that, but I'll certainly see if either of the officials are able to answer.

Ms. Chapco: — Jane Chapco, legislative services. The government was approached by landlords asking for some clarity on how rules could be made respecting the upcoming legalization of cannabis. And as to the specific wording of the provision, it is permissive in nature. So it says "a landlord may establish and enforce rules." And the requirement, as with any other rules made under this provision, is that the rules be reasonable.

If a tenant wishes to question a particular rule, he or she can request a hearing officer to make a determination as to the reasonableness of the rule. It can be expected that whether or not a rule is consistent with existing federal and provincial laws and with existing case law would be one of the key factors in determining whether or not a rule is reasonable.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Do you have any examples of what would be deemed a reasonable rule with respect to the addition in this new provision?

Ms. Chapco: — There could be, for example, a rule banning smoking in common areas, smoking in non-common areas.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. One of the portions of this provision that we've particularly heard some concern around is the ability for a landlord to make rules around prohibiting possession of what will essentially be a legal substance. Could you please provide some further information as to why that would be included in this new provision?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think the rationale was that the section was permissive and we give a landlord the right to be able to say, we will not allow you to grow cannabis, to use it, or to possess it in the property, which would be consistent with the provisions in the marijuana legislation that would say when you purchase it, you must take it to your point of consumption, rather than to a home.

So it would be consistent with that, that if it's not otherwise lawful, there would be no need to have it there. And I'm not saying that all landlords could or would use that. But that would be the underlying purpose, is to try and just control all of the aspects that would deal with cannabis, which would be the growing, the consumption, and possession.

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm not sure if I necessarily had my question answered, so I'm going to ask this in another way. Did the ministry receive any legal advice with respect to the constitutionality or the rights of a tenant? Is there confidence within the ministry that this will pass any type of Charter scrutiny?

Ms. Chapco: — The constitutional law branch of the ministry reviews all legislation ahead of its introduction.

Ms. Sarauer: — So that's a yes?

Ms. Chapco: — Those legal opinions are privileged.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. One of the things you mentioned, Minister, was about the rules around not being able to . . . Or you started to speak about the rules around an individual being able to possess marijuana, cannabis, in private locations but not in public locations. This piece of legislation and this amendment will make it very difficult for a renter — if a renter is subject to rules of their landlord that they cannot possess or use cannabis — to be able to possess or use cannabis when they can't use it in public or in their home. Has the ministry thought about this concern at all?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Let's break it into two parts. The issue of medical marijuana is fundamentally different because it's legal. It's prescribed. Landlords would have a duty to accommodate. So set aside the issue of medicinal marijuana used with a prescription.

So with regard to recreational use of cannabis, right now it's illegal. Period. So for the people that would be in a residential property where the landlord has chosen to do a ban, there's no

change. That's the situation. Before or after the passage of the law is no different.

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm not asking you about the situation right now. I'm asking you, once cannabis is legalized and the difficulty a renter will have in terms of being able to utilize something that is a legal substance, will be a legal substance, when they're not allowed to do it in their private residence.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — If a landlord . . . Right now the status quo is that they can't. So if it becomes legal in some places, there isn't an obligation on a landlord to follow that. The landlord can effectively opt out by saying, this is one of the rules of this particular tenancy. So a tenant, in considering where they want to be in the future, may want to consider relocating, or that may be a factor for a prospective tenant in seeking accommodation in the future.

But right now the status quo is they can't, so we wouldn't impose the obligation on the landlord, to say, well now that the tenant has a new right, we would impose that on you as a landlord because of the effect it might have on people that share a common space, people where the smell would transfer from one unit in a building to another. So we think the balance would be that if a tenant wants to have the right to consume marijuana and the landlord has said not to, they might have to find alternate accommodation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, and I do appreciate that, Minister. The examples that you're providing are normally around the usage of cannabis. However, this legislation also allows landlords to prohibit possession of the substance as well. Are there other examples where a landlord is permitted to prohibit a legal substance? And if so, could you provide them?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes, the landlord could have a non-smoking premise.

Ms. Sarauer: — But possession. So they can still have cigarettes. They just can't smoke them.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes. Pets or alcohol-free properties.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Let's move on to the medical cannabis piece. This legislation didn't exclude medical cannabis from the section, but you were mentioning that you feel that medical cannabis should be excluded from the section. Can you provide some more detail?

Ms. Chapco: — The regulation of medical cannabis is not a provincial responsibility. And I'll just note also, coming up later today, Bill 121 does contain a section saying that nothing . . . I'll just read the section now:

Unless otherwise prescribed, this Act does not apply to the consumption, possession, distribution, purchase or sale of cannabis for medical purposes that occurs in accordance with the requirements of the applicable federal law.

So that's confirming that the Saskatchewan Act doesn't apply to medical cannabis unless there are regulations saying otherwise. So what does apply is the federal regulation, the access to cannabis for medical purposes regulations. And there's also

existing case law on the issue.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify for the record, the province has not been delegated the authority to regulate medical marijuana and, as a result, this provision will not apply to medical marijuana.

[16:30]

Ms. Chapco: — I would say that the first point is correct. The province does not have the responsibility to regulate medical cannabis. As to the second point, all this provision is doing is a permissive option for landlords to make rules, and those rules need to be reasonable. And one key element of reasonableness would be consistency with both the federal and provincial laws in the area.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. Just for further clarification, can a landlord, once this bill is passed, can a landlord make a rule banning medical cannabis, banning the possession or use of medical cannabis in their rental units?

Ms. Chapco: — Speaking to that hypothetical example, I suppose what might happen is that the landlord could make the rule, and a tenant who felt that it was unreasonable could come forward and say no, for these reasons.

It's hard to, you know, give a blanket answer as to every case and as to what might be allowed in each circumstance for medical marijuana.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify again, despite the provision in 121 that you quoted about the jurisdiction around medical cannabis, a landlord could still utilize this legislation in 115 to prohibit the use of medical cannabis in rental units or possession as well?

Ms. Chapco: — The rule-making power doesn't distinguish between the reasons for the use.

Ms. Sarauer: — You've mentioned a few times that the rules are going to be subject to a reasonable standard, reasonableness, I suppose, and it will ultimately be left to the Residential Tenancies office and hearing officers should a tenant make a complaint. It's also putting quite an onus on a tenant because they will have to start the process in what is largely right now a bit of a grey field in terms of what's allowed and what's not allowed. Could the ministry provide some further information as to why this is being left so vague at this time?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We think it's reasonably clear. There is a reasonableness obligation. We have the Office of Residential Tenancies that has an obligation to balance the rights (a) between tenants, but primarily between tenants and landlords. For us to put in a blanket exception or change from one thing or another, there hasn't been a need for that so far. And you may want to ask Ms. Cotter whether there's been marijuana complaints that have come forward because medical marijuana is legal now and has been for a long period of time.

Ms. Cotter: — Thank you. My name is Anne-Marie Cotter. I'm director at the ORT. To answer your question, each hearing officer has the duty to look at a case individually and assess its

value. So we do look at reasonableness of rules; so for instance, if a landlord feels the need to restrict pets or noise complaints or alcohol or waterbeds, such things of that nature, he can do so.

Now a tenant is free to bring a case forward to complain that it is unreasonable, and the hearing officer would be there to judge what is reasonable and what isn't. We do hope, at the Office of Residential Tenancies, that our hearing officers decide cases alike and that we have a reasonable standard for people — the public, both landlord and tenant — to see how we decide our cases.

Now under this rule prohibiting cannabis, a landlord could bring a case forward saying, I've imposed this rule. Tenant, you're not keeping up your end of the bargain. This is our contract and you have possession of cannabis. Likewise, the tenant can bring a case forward, another tenant within the same building, saying that the person smoking cannabis, it's infiltrating into my rental unit and I have the right to reasonable enjoyment of my rental unit. So this provision would affect landlords and tenants both as a protection and a caution as to what type of behaviour is done within rental units.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now I'm hesitant to ask a question that the minister suggested, but I will. Has the ORT received any complaints about medical cannabis from either a landlord or a tenant since it's been legalized? Can you provide some information around what's been going on in that field so far?

Ms. Cotter: — I know we have on occasion gotten something like that. Recently it's been more along the lines of smoking infiltration, and I think, with the recent decision of last year, it's been pretty well-established what people can do within the rental units.

So to answer your question, at this point it hasn't really been tested. And of course when this clause, should it come into effect, we will probably have a lot more cases on that issue. And I would expect my hearing officers, again, to weigh the evidence and give a reasonable decision on it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — To the point you raised, I don't have any problem suggesting questions for you. And if you'd like me to suggest more, feel free to ask.

Ms. Sarauer: — I don't know why it feels like a trap, but I don't know. Anyways it was a good question, Minister, I'll give you that. So thank you for that. I do want to make it clear because when we're talking about this provision, the examples that are used — and fair enough — are more around use of cannabis, especially in its smoked form.

And it's hard to argue with that, but cannabis can also be used in other forms that does not inhibit or does not affect the enjoyment of a rental unit of a neighbour. As well this bans possession or can ban possession, and it also can ban growing plants in a traditional form; so not talking about inside a unit, talking about perhaps on somebody's balcony in a planter.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think we approached the entire cannabis legalization exercise with one . . . that we wanted to be

quite restrictive and adopt a very cautious approach, both with regard to driving, workplace safety, and what's taking place where people live, are accommodated, or transport. And it raised issues about transportation of liquor, among other things. And this should not be seen as, oh well now we want to look at relaxing some of the liquor ones. So we followed a lot of the existing liquor legislation, and I think at some point in the future there may be opportunity for a discussion about changing the direction or something.

But the intention was, and it was a conscious decision to start with a cautious, if not overly cautious, restrictive, and careful approach, and then look at it and see how it works. Maybe some of the things that we think are problems won't be at all. Maybe some other things will be. But we, you know, we're going to go through the first year and see what materializes. But the points you're raising are ones that we've heard.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I'm going to move on to the second portion of questions that I had, which were around the funding provisions. There is a provision in the legislation — and forgive me, I've lost which section it was — that requires an appellant, if a tenant is appealing an order, that they must continue to pay rent while that appeal is moving through its regular course. Could the ministry provide some explanation as to why this provision is being added?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The concern came from the residential housing industry association from situations where the tenant had stopped paying the rent. The landlord applied to the Office of Residential Tenancies Act for an order, and then the tenant appealed and was able to extend, in effect, a free living arrangement for a number of months while the landlord went ahead and went through the appeal. And some of the appeals went through a subsequent appeal as well.

And it would appear to be it was planned with the idea of just utilizing the system to have a free period of rent. So the theory was, you continue to pay the rent. If you have an issue, you can get free rent afterwards or whatever the court or whatever the Office of Residential Tenancies office ultimately orders. But it was to prevent the abuse that was taking place. And there appeared to be a growing number, and I don't have stats on it, but there was certainly a fair amount of media coverage at the time.

Ms. Sarauer: — Yes, that was going to be my next question, if the ministry had any numbers on how many instances of abuse they were seeing.

Ms. Cotter: — We don't have numbers specifically. We do see it on a case-by-case basis that it does happen sometimes. You do have some cases where, in immediate possession, the tenant will come in and say they did pay but it was late, past the 15th day mark. But we do see cases where obviously tenants have not paid, and they don't have the means to pay.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I'm going to move on to section 85, the provisions around dealing with abandoned goods by the landlord. Could you provide us some information as to how this situation is working now?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — If the tenant abandons the property or

gives notice and leaves or just abandons without giving any notice and leaves their possessions there, the landlord would not have the legal authority to dispose of what is somebody else's goods. So the landlord would be obliged to bring in an application to the ORT for an order to get rid of . . . That application would consist of showing the ORT what kind of goods were left and what the plan would be. And I understand that there are a large number of those applications. I'll certainly let Ms. Cotter speak to the number.

Ms. Cotter: — Well we do have a number of cases. Our latest statistics show in 2017-18, Regina had 216 cases and Saskatoon had 383 cases. The vast majority are the property left behind. There's a reason for that; the person doesn't want it anymore because it doesn't have much value, if at all any value.

We certainly feel that when an application comes into the office from a landlord we absolutely need full documentation. We require that they specify item by item what the value might be. They can't just put a blanket statement, I think this is worth \$10 for all the property.

And then my staff does checks to try to do everything possible to get hold of the tenant, to let them know to come and pick up their things. And then typically either myself or my deputy directors do a final check to make sure we've done everything possible, and we document that. In some instances, we've been able to contact the tenants and arrange additional time for them to come and pick up the property.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, right now the obligation to provide notice to the tenant is on the ORT, and this provision will move that obligation to the landlord?

Ms. Cotter: — Well typically what's been done is the landlord still has that obligation to try to contact the tenant. And so when they do fill out the application, we look and see what steps have been taken by the landlord and what has been documented. So we typically ask if you've done any phone checks or email checks or text checks to see if you've gotten through to the tenant.

Now we typically come into play when a landlord wants to make an application and they've had no luck in either contacting the tenant, getting through to them, or getting the tenant to come and pick up their things. Sometimes the tenant promises, I'll be there on a certain date. They don't show up. So our job is really to follow through with that and make sure everything has been done in order to safeguard the rights of the tenant and their property.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — In British Columbia our jurisdictional scan shows that if it's a value under \$500, the landlord can dispose of it without further proceeding. In Alberta, \$2,000 unless it's unsanitary or unsafe or something like that. So it appears to be there's a variety of provisions across the country. So 1,500 was, I guess it's always subjective as to what the value might be, but that was a recommendation. It actually, I think, came from the ORT as much as anyone else to try and . . .

Ms. Cotter: — We canvassed other provinces and saw what they were doing, and we felt that this was in line with the other provinces. Sometimes the property is so affected, for instance

by bedbugs, nobody wants them, the property. And it's just a health hazard for the landlord even trying to get rid of that property, dispose of it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Do the other jurisdictions allow for the application to be made without notice?

[16:45]

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — BC [British Columbia], no order is necessary, but the landlord must store the property for 60 days unless it's under the \$500. Yukon, they're required to get a director's order. Alberta, no order is required, but the landlord must store the property unless it's under \$2,000, but they must store it until there's an order made. Manitoba, no order necessary, but the landlord must store the property for 60 days unless it's a low value. It doesn't say what else.

Ontario, no order required; the landlord must store the property for 72 hours in case of an eviction. So it appears to be there's a variety of different methods. Nova Scotia, no order required and . . . [inaudible] . . . file with the director; the landlord must store the property for 60 days unless valued under \$500. Both Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland require an order.

Ms. Sarauer: — So when you're saying, no order required, I'm assuming that also means that the application be made without notice?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I would assume that to be the case.

Ms. Sarauer: — Subsection (4)(b) says that the worth of the \$1,500 is, and to quote the subsection, "in the landlord's reasonable estimation." Do the other jurisdictions also allow for the landlord to determine what an asset is valued?

Ms. Cotter: — Yes, I believe so, because they take into account the state of the property and reasonable wear and tear.

Ms. Sarauer: — Subsection (7), who will be monitoring this as being complied with?

Ms. Cotter: — So if the property is under 1,500, then the landlord's responsible for proper documentation. Because ultimately if a tenant feels that they're wronged, they could bring an application for breach of tenant rights and try to recoup the value of the property.

Ms. Sarauer: — So it's up to the tenant then to, if the tenant isn't happy, to make an application to an ORT office.

Ms. Cotter: — Right. That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. Subsection (7)(b). I'm assuming this doesn't exist right now. Is there any obligation for the landlords to pay any proceeds of sale to the director to the credit of the person who left the property? Is that happening right now?

Ms. Cotter: — It is happening, because it's in old subsection (4). So we are finding very few cases where the property is such that it can be sold for a considerable amount of money. And in a handful of cases, it's happened over the last three years, that we've been . . . Landlords have paid in proceeds to us.

Ms. Sarauer: — Do you have any specifics around those stats?

Ms. Cotter: — Yes, bear with me. So since 2014, we had one case in May 2014 for \$685.85. We had one case in September 2015 for \$2,484.91. And we have one pending, because we have to hold the proceeds for six months, one in 2018 for \$4,906.95.

Ms. Sarauer: — And what's the obligation on the director right now to retain that money?

Ms. Cotter: — The obligation is there, so we keep it. And then once the time period is done, we pay it over.

Ms. Sarauer: — Just to clarify, over to the General Revenue Fund?

Ms. Cotter: — That's correct. The tenant is given six months in order to come forward.

Ms. Sarauer: — Again, it's up to the landlord to determine first of all if the valuation of the assets are below 1,500 or below. And then also it's up to the landlord to essentially be honest with the proceeds of the sale and, if it is over \$1,500, to provide that to the ORT. Is that correct?

Ms. Cotter: — That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Or the tenant can step in at any time on this process. The tenant can bring an application or come in and say, I want my goods back, or I want this.

I mean, for the most part the landlords don't want these items. As Ms. Cotter had said, there is issues with bedbugs or whatever else, so the one every year or two that's got some value in it would be . . . I can't speak to the set of circumstances where somebody would have abandoned something that did have some value. But by and large, if there's any value to it, the tenants either take it or come back for it.

Ms. Cotter: — And there's value in the landlord trying to estimate it as accurately as possible, because when it comes time to try to sell those, that property, he's trying to recoup as much as he can anyways, because the longer he maintains that property, through renting a storage area for instance, the more cost there is to him. And we have those cases where the landlord has contravened the Act and disposed of the property. And we've had tenants come forward with an application to try to recoup that, the property that's been lost.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Can you explain what would be considered reasonable efforts to find a tenant?

Ms. Cotter: — Reasonable efforts would be they have to document on our application that they've either phoned the tenant, they've tried to contact the tenant in some way. So that is required of them. If we get incomplete applications, we put the onus back on the landlord to properly complete our application document very well, all the items, provide pictures if possible, and most of our applications do have pictures attached.

And so they typically say they've called the tenant at this number or they've emailed the tenant at this email address or texted the tenant. And so we go back and we typically, as I said, the staff does make that phone call and they document well. Oftentimes what we're finding is the numbers are no longer in service. So we do believe we do our due diligence to make sure that the landlord is honest and that the application is trustworthy.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Do you have any stats around how many times a tenant has made an application for return of their property?

Ms. Cotter: — No, I don't. I apologize. We do have general stats in terms of tenant applications but not specifically to property disposition.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate the answers to all of my questions. I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Thank you. Are there any further questions from the committee? Okay, we will continue on then. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2017*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 115, *The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 2017* without amendment. Mr. Francis so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Okay, we're going to recess here for five minutes, or three. Five-minute recess.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Bill No. 121 — *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*

Clause 1-1

The Chair: — Well we are back. We will now begin our consideration of Bill No. 121, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*, clause 1, short title. Minister, could you introduce any new officials and make your opening comments, please?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Certainly, Mr. Chair. I'm joined by Gene Makowsky, Minister Responsible for SLGA [Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority], so this is a tag-team event. I'm also joined by Darcy McGovern Q.C., who

was here for the last one; Neil Karkut, Crown Counsel, legislative services branch, Ministry of Justice; Dale Tesarowski, executive director, corporate initiatives, Ministry of Justice; Fiona Cribb, vice-president, regulatory services division, SLGA; Cam Swan, president and CEO [chief executive officer], SLGA.

I'm pleased to offer brief opening remarks regarding Bill 121, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*. Mr. Chair, this bill will implement a provincial regulatory regime respecting the possession, consumption, and sale of legal cannabis in Saskatchewan. This legalization is necessary in response to the federal Bill C-45, which will legalize the possession and consumption of limited levels of cannabis as well as other related activities.

Mr. Chair, as I've noted previously, a primary focus of our provincial legislation is to protect the health and safety of our citizens, particularly minors. The proposed legislation will achieve this through a number of measures. Saskatchewan, as with a majority of other Canadian jurisdictions, will prohibit the consumption, possession, or distribution of cannabis by minors under the age of 19. This mirrors the province's legal age for the consumption of alcohol.

[17:00]

Although the federal *Cannabis Act* sets a minimum age of 18 for the consumption or possession of cannabis, the federal government has been clear that provinces may adopt a higher minimum age, and we propose to do so. Police will have the authority to issue tickets to minors who are found in possession of cannabis and will also have express authority to seize that cannabis.

Mr. Chair, the proposed legislation will also prohibit adults from consuming cannabis in public places. This rule will help prevent public exposure of cannabis to minors, families, and other citizens. Once again, police will have authority to issue tickets to individuals who are in breach of this rule.

Mr. Chair, the proposed legislation also contains rules respecting the transportation of cannabis. In particular, this proposed legislation mirrors current rules respecting alcohol, and prohibits the possession of cannabis in vehicles unless the cannabis is being transported from a place it was lawfully obtained to a place where it can be lawfully kept or consumed.

Police are expected to take a practical and reasonable approach with this rule, as they currently do with alcohol. For example, individuals who legally purchase cannabis would not face sanctions for stopping to pick up groceries or gas on their way home. They may also transport cannabis from one lawful place, such as their home, to another lawful place where they may consume it.

Mr. Chair, in addition to rules respecting the possession and consumption of cannabis, the proposed legislation will also establish a framework for the cannabis retail system. In Saskatchewan, the retail sale, distribution, and wholesaling of cannabis will be conducted through permitted private outlets. This system will be administered by the Liquor and Gaming Authority as the designated cannabis authority.

Mr. Chair, this proposed approach will ensure the health and safety of the public, but also reduces the significant capital outputs that would be required for the government to create public retail and wholesale outlets.

Mr. Chair, the legalization of cannabis presents new challenges for all jurisdictions across Canada. However I am confident that Saskatchewan's proposed legislation provides an effective regulatory model that protects the health and safety of citizens while providing new economic opportunities for businesses within the province. With those opening remarks, I welcome questions regarding Bill 121, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*.

The Chair: — Well thank you, Minister, and thank Minister Makowsky for coming along here to tackle any problems that we have. Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, and thank you to the minister for his opening remarks. And I haven't been an MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] for very long, but this is my first time at committee where I've had two ministries and two ministers here to answer my questions. I must have missed the memo that this was a tag-team event, so I will be tackling this solo, but I'm assuming Minister Morgan . . .

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — You're very formidable.

Ms. Sarauer: — That's what I'm assuming is what this means, is Minister Morgan has decided he cannot handle my hard-hitting questions on his own and has brought in some backup. So I appreciate you being here as well, Minister Makowsky.

Let's start with a fairly easy question. Can the ministry provide some detail as to who was consulted with respect to this bill?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It was an online consultation process. It was, I think, one of the largest consultations that the province has ever undertaken. It was an open consultation and I believe there was in excess of . . . over 34,000 responses to the questionnaire.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Were there any further consultations beyond the online survey?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Karkut will tell you about the stakeholder consultation that was conducted, but I think we received questions, queries. And I don't think we turned down a lot of requests for meetings with either municipalities, potential retailers, whatever it was. People were asking a lot of questions and had a lot of opinions, and it was an enlightening experience, but I'll let Mr. Karkut talk about the stakeholder.

Mr. Karkut: — So Neil Karkut, Ministry of Justice. So in addition to the public consultation that was held, there was also a stakeholder survey that was held, and there was 560 respondents to that consultation. And just for a sampling of the type of respondents that were included, there were health care organizations, urban and rural municipalities, educational organizations, community-based organizations, First Nations communities, industry organizations, and special interest groups.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. The government ultimately, after some leadership contest speculation, decided on 19 being the legal age. Could you provide some information as to why that age was determined?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes. There was discussion back and forth and I think you would likely have heard the same type of comments that we did. People that were concerned about schools and school-age children were concerned that if it was 18 — that would be the typical age of a grade 12 student — it would make it readily available for a grade 12 student; it would filter into high schools. Nineteen would be at least one step removed from that age.

There was certainly some thought by some people that thought marijuana was particularly damaging to developing brains and would affect people's learning abilities. So there was a push that it should be 23 or 25 or 21 or another age. So it wasn't necessarily tied to alcohol, except to the point that alcohol was 19 to keep it out of schools.

So that was the rationale, and — I don't think I'm saying anything inappropriate — there was certainly divided opinions. Most people were certainly willing to listen to and accept other views, but there was opinions from across the spectrum.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. We talked about this a little bit in the other bill, but it's important that we talk about it here again. Section 1-4 explains that this bill will not apply to medical cannabis. Could you provide some information as to why?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Well this was an election promise made by the federal government, by the current Liberal government, that they were going to legalize marijuana. Medical marijuana had been legal and has been legal for some time, so the purpose in this was not to interfere or change the existing regime with regard to medicinal marijuana, but to create a separate regime for the recreational use.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. And just for further clarification, because I know there has been some confusion on this in the wider public, the federal government has not given the provincial government any mandate with respect to regulating medical cannabis. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — And just to further clarify, the federal government has not given the provincial government any authority to issue permits for retail locations for medical cannabis retailers. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. 2-2 provides an offence to a minor that might contravene this Act. Is this similar to how it's treated for alcohol?

Mr. Karkut: — Yes, we definitely tried to mirror the alcohol regulations as close as we could with respect to many aspects of this bill, but in particular minors. It does mirror what's in the liquor provisions; for example, the offence amount in 2-2 mirrors what exists in *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Act*.

And part of the policy behind that is to make sure we're not sending a message that, for example, cannabis is less dangerous than alcohol or one is more dangerous than the other. So we tried to maintain parity where possible for that reason.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. And just to go further on that, is the fine limit, is that the same as it would be for alcohol?

Mr. Karkut: — Yes, that's the same fine limit that minors would face under the alcohol legislation. However in most cases we would expect that minors who, for example, are caught in possession of cannabis in public would just be issued a ticket through *The Summary Offences Procedure Act*. There's still some regulatory amendments that are necessary to list out the cannabis offences, but that's definitely the plan of action with that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Section 2-8, which provides for the limits in terms of possessing cannabis, is this simply mirroring the federal legislation?

Mr. Karkut: — That's correct. This section and a lot of its language in fact mirrors what's in the federal Act.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Now I just want to ask a few questions around the definitions for "private place" and "public place" in the definition section. Could you provide us with a bit of a jurisdictional scan in terms of what, if there are any, differences between our definitions of "private place" and "public place" and other provinces' definitions of "private place" and "public place"?

Mr. Karkut: — So the definition of "private place" and "public place" within this legislation actually mirrors again our alcohol and gaming regulation Act already. With respect to the approach that's being taken in other jurisdictions, there is some variation. For example, Ontario adopts a similar approach to Saskatchewan, which is no consumption in a public place. They don't go into, I guess, great as detail with their definition of "public place." It simply says "public place."

Some other jurisdictions — Alberta's a good example — they're taking a bit of a different approach. They're following the line of tobacco, that cannabis can be consumed in public in certain instances, but they're limiting that, for example, near schools, near zoos, that type of situation. So theirs is, I guess, a little bit more liberal on where it can be smoked.

And you see, kind of, that those are the two main approaches that are being adopted across Canada, is the no public consumption, with maybe some minor clarification of what that means, to having a certain amount of public consumption allowed but with limits placed on that to protect minors, for example.

Ms. Sarauer: — So I guess my follow-up question is, why did the ministry and the government ultimately decide to take an approach that's similar to alcohol as opposed to tobacco, like we're seeing in Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — When I'd answered the question on the residential tenancies, I think I indicated that we felt that there was a conservative approach had been taken with alcohol, and

that it was something that the people in Saskatchewan were comfortable, had some knowledge of, and it was a good, workable starting point. It may well be that at some point in the future some of those things might be under review, but we did not want to use the marijuana legislation as a reason to be seen to water down or review the alcohol legislation. The alcohol legislation is there, maybe out of date, but it's been there for decades.

So we thought, we'll mirror that, follow that process that was the recommendation that came from the ministry, that that was a workable method of doing it. So it was something that Saskatchewan has had. And certainly, you know, as we go forward a year or two from now, there may be situations or reasons that we would want to update one or the other. But as Mr. Karkut had suggested, we don't want to make one seem to be better, worse, more dangerous, more safe than the other.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister, and I think that provides a good segue to talk a little bit about section 2-10, which is possession of cannabis in vehicles. Could you provide some information as to why this provision was deemed necessary?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — There's two parts to it. One is the transportation. Right now the existing requirement, as I indicated earlier, is the same for alcohol as it is for cannabis. You take it from your point of purchase to your place of consumption. And the expectation has been over the last number of decades that if you stop at the grocery store on the way home or take it from one place to the other, it's a non-issue. So the expectation is, I would expect, that that would continue.

I can remember when I was in my teens and 20s, before the Great War, there was always the issue of, oh well the police won't give you a ticket if you can't reach it, if it's in a trunk or whatever else or it's behind this or that, that you were there. And it was felt people knew how that worked and there was not an issue for most people in the province. So we thought that was a really good starting point; there's a comfort level with it.

Ms. Sarauer: — And this is the interesting thing with this provision. I frankly did not know that that existed as a rule for liquor. And I think most people I've spoken with don't know that that exists, but they know it in an iteration of something that they thought it was a rule back from when they were teens. Like the example you gave, Minister, about it's fine unless you can reach it, or it's fine unless it's not open is another one, or it's fine if it's in the trunk, but actually the rule is significantly more restrictive and isn't exclusive to minors. Is there any concern about the enforceability of this provision?

[17:15]

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — No more so than there has been on marijuana for the last number of decades. I'm going to refrain from making comments on the adequacy of the bar exams on newer students because it was certainly covered when . . . I'm sorry. I shouldn't go there.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is that a dig on me?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Just saying. No, Mr. Karkut, I think,

was in your class.

Ms. Sarauer: — I was going to say, you've got officials that are in the same year of call as I am, so be careful where you're throwing daggers.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Setting aside my terrible sense of humour, you know, the issues and the questions about enforceability or the adequacy of those provisions have existed for a long time in the current legislation, and it was a conscious decision that we wouldn't review or change those. It was decided, it was, this works. It's here now. We'll use it the same for this with the expectation that the same sense of reasonableness would continue to be applied. And at some point in the future it may be an appropriate discussion to have, but not now.

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm not sure if you can answer this, but is there any consideration to opening up the rules around liquor, considering this work has been going on with cannabis and it's shedding some light on some of the, frankly, archaic rules around alcohol in this province? Is the ministry planning, or a ministry planning, on reviewing these in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'll let Minister Makowsky answer that.

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — Yes, I think on the alcohol side we have seen, in the last few years, this government make quite a few changes to some of the, as you described them, archaic rules around transport, the sale, the distribution, and some of the rules around alcohol in the province. Certainly wouldn't rule out any changes to the Act in the future, and I think there's a regular scan of those that take place. How regular, I'm not quite sure, but certainly something to stay on top of and wouldn't say it's not going to happen. Those things are again reviewed every once in a while and SLGA, I'm sure, will continue to do that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that. So again, just to clarify, Minister Morgan, the hope is that this will be used, this provision will be used by authorities reasonably as it is currently being used in its form around alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That would certainly be the hope and the expectation. You noted, in my remarks which form part of *Hansard*, I said that it's acceptable to stop at the grocery store on the way home, so that may well turn up somewhere. I didn't write those comments, but I read them and I accepted them. Yes, our expectation is that the police would be reasonable and not looking for reasons to, you know, follow somebody home from an SLGA outlet to see whether they stop for gas on the way home.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. I can imagine how difficult it would be for the authorities to be able to follow this rule unless they were literally following someone from point of purchase to private residence.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I should probably have let Mr. Karkut answer the question. He said the police were part of the working group, and their intention and expectation is that the application that exists now would continue.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Yes, those who are 2010 year of

call are actually quite knowledgeable, so thank you, Minister.

2-14, which states that "No individual who is older than a minor shall consume cannabis in a public place or any place other than a private place except as allowed pursuant to this [legislation]..." How are authorities going to be able to distinguish public consumption of recreational cannabis from public consumption of medicinal cannabis?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think you're asking an operational or an evidentiary question. You know, the practical advice, if I was giving advice to somebody who's a medical user: carry your prescription with you, whatever you're doing. It's not regulated right now except federally and I think the onus would be on you as to show that you're under the federal regulation... [inaudible interjection]... Once again, class of '10 says that you get a licence.

Ms. Sarauer: — For medicinal cannabis is what you're saying, yes. So like, as you're indicating, the hope is that users will know to carry their licence with them.

The other concern I've heard is around vaping. Vaping tobacco in public places is legal, while vaping cannabis in a public place is contrary to the rules in this legislation. Again, are there any concerns about the ability of enforcement when that is quite difficult to distinguish the difference between?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm going to defer to 2010.

Mr. Karkut: — I guess as a starting point, this is definitely an enforcement issue that will need to be considered as we move forward through implementation. But at least initially, my understanding is that vaping would require cannabis concentrates, which will not be legal upon the initial introduction of this Act. They will become legal about a year from now at the same time as edibles. So at least for that initial period, legal vaping should not be an issue.

I'm not sure I can speak any further to how police would actually be able to sense that out and enforce it, other than if an individual was vaping cannabis in public and they were able to detect that. They would be breaking the law as no form of public consumption is legal at this point.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Is the ministry planning, as has been indicated already around some of the rules, to monitor how this works with respect to public consumption and the banning of all public consumption, to perhaps open that up a bit into the future?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It's certainly not under consideration at this point in time. It might be at some point in the future. I think it would be fair to say that the ministry, or both ministries, would want to monitor all aspects of the legalization. It's something that nobody had contemplated prior to the last federal election, so I think there's a large number of challenges. Some may be far less than what we anticipate. Some might be far greater.

You know, when we went through the process — and I'm sure in your party would have been the same as ours — the concern was the safety of people operating vehicles, the safety on the

workplace, and keeping marijuana away from young people. Other than that it became more a matter of, what are the appropriate convenience or inconveniences that you want to oppose? And the trade-off was if there was an inconvenience, live with the inconvenience for the time being if that added the necessary safety in there. The starting point became, well this is what we do with alcohol; this is what we do with alcohol. So that was followed.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Moving on, 2-17 allows for the minister, if needed, to be able to ban cannabis in campgrounds. So just to clarify, cannabis is not banned in campgrounds unless the minister makes an order saying that it will be?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The definition of “private place” includes trailer, camper, mobile home, tent, or combination. So once again it’s the same as it is with alcohol. If you’ve got your beer in your tent, you’re okay unless it’s one of the weekends where it’s been banned across the park. So this would mirror that provision as well. So in an ordinary weekend you would be able to smoke in your tent or at your campsite, but on the weekends where it’s banned because it’s a long weekend or whatever . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, you can smoke around a campfire at your campsite, for example.

Mr. Karkut: — Okay, so this goes back to the definition of a private place. And while a private place does include the attached land to a private place — so for example, your house with the attached yard would be a private place — there is a clarification that that attached land only applies to a lease of at least 30 days. So a longer-term cottage rental would I guess be treated more as a house whereas typically in a camping setting you’d be expected to consume within your tent or motor home.

Ms. Sarauer: — So the ministry is creating a situation where, just to clarify, hotboxing your tent is allowed but smoking a joint around a campfire is not allowed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It would appear to be so. I’m not sure I’m really familiar with the term of hotboxing a tent, but if you’re meaning smoking in a tent, that would become a dwelling or a residence according to the Act, and the place around the campfire, unless you’ve got a 30-day or longer lease, would not be . . .

A Member: — Correct.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — If I’m understanding the class of 2020 . . . 2010, sorry.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. That seems a little odd to me but I will leave it at that. Maybe that’s something that we can consider opening up a bit in the future, if possible. Again this is mirroring the rules . . . Moving aside from the practicalities of that, but towards the order that can be made . . .

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The discussion that we had about consuming in public places was that we were mirroring alcohol, but because of the potential for second-hand smoke, you know, you may have a situation where you would consume alcohol at a picnic ground or somewhere else, maybe a . . . [inaudible] . . .

You wouldn’t want to do that where the second-hand smoke would be as existing, like . . . The other example is in an automobile where, you know, there’s no way that a driver wouldn’t become impaired.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. So in that light, Minister, when edibles are allowed a year from now, will the ministry consider reopening up this provision as well as many others, frankly, that are created because of the concern around second-hand smoke?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think the second-hand smoke is one that’s sort of front and centre right now. You know, I think whatever happens with regard to edibles or to oils or other things that may take place in the future, I think obviously you would have to do fresh consultation and see what the other factors would be. But certainly you’d want to have a look at what else would be required to make those changes practical and workable.

[17:30]

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister. Moving on to section 3-1, now I’ve had the opportunity to ask a few questions about this at SLGA estimates, but I think it’s important to put some of that information on the record here for this committee as well. So could the minister provide some information as to this cannabis authority that will be created, and who will be the cannabis authority, and what their role will be?

Mr. Karkut: — So right now the way the Act was drafted was in many regards to provide maximum flexibility. So you’ll see that cannabis authority is a person or body that’s designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. So that will allow the specific cannabis authority to be designated through an order in council. However, at this time it’s been determined that the Liquor and Gaming Authority will be the cannabis authority.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. 3-2 talks about good character. Can you provide some further information as to what is meant by good character?

Ms. Cribb: — So the concept of good character is found in several places in the industries that SLGA regulates, including gaming and liquor and horse racing. And it appears again here in cannabis. And we look at a number of indicators in determining whether good character exists. Often from a legal point of view it’s more referred to as the absence of bad character. So you go looking for things where there was somebody would have demonstrated a lack of good character through conviction of criminal offences, charges. In some cases we will be asking for information on history of being sued. So if they’ve been sued for breach of trust, fraud, that kind of thing would all be examined in determining whether or not there’s good character.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is this the same as around the regulations for alcohol?

Ms. Cribb: — Yes. It’s the same as alcohol and gaming suppliers, gaming employees, and horse racing, although the markers do vary, depending on what your role is in the industry, how stringent the requirements would be.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I did want to ask a question specifically around 3-20(2) which states that no cannabis permit is transferable, subject to this Act and the regulations. And I, forgive me, I didn't pull up the recent news article I had seen. It was speaking about transferring and selling of some of the liquor permits, but I thought I read in the article that cannabis permits were going to be able to eventually be sold as well from a permittee to a permittee. Is that correct? Because I feel like that's different than what I'm seeing in this, in 3-20.

Ms. Cribb: — So the concept of transferability, which we have in the liquor permits as well, the term "transfer" more applies to a case where, you know, somebody might have been carrying on as a sole proprietor and then they want to incorporate. So then we talk about where they're going to be the sole shareholder, so then the reference is to a transfer so they don't have to pay the application fee over again.

When you hear the permit can be sold, it's a bit of a shorthand in that they can agree that they're going to sell their permit — their liquor permit, retail store permit, or their cannabis permit. But it's all subject to them meeting the requirements to be issued a permit. So the new owner still has to apply to SLGA and still has to be cleared and issued the permit before they will actually be a permit holder. Somebody can't just hand over their permit, but of course the layman shorthand is that I sold my permit.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. So just so I understand, when we're talking about transferring a permit, that only applies to a sole proprietor who wishes to incorporate, and they're not allowed to transfer that permit to the corporation?

Ms. Cribb: — No, sorry that's just one example of when you can.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay.

Ms. Cribb: — So it could be a partnership that decides to become a corporation or so on and so forth, under the different ways that people organize their businesses. As long as the ownership stays the same because those people have already been cleared for good character, then we'd transfer the permit by issuing it in the new name without making them go through the full application process.

Ms. Sarauer: — Could you provide an example, subject to this legislation, when a cannabis permit would not be transferable? Because 3-20(2) says, "Subject to this Act and the regulations, no cannabis permit is transferable." I'm just trying to understand that provision.

Mr. Karkut: — I could maybe step in here. So the basic rule is that a permit is not transferable. That "subject to this Act and the regulations" allows for, I guess, carve-outs to that rule. So I guess, just as an example, the regulations are currently in development, but what Ms. Cribb was describing, the instances where a permit would be transferable, we can expect that those will be clarified within the regulations. So that's what that "subject to" language means.

Ms. Sarauer: — So likely the regulations will also allow for the sale of a permit from one permit owner to a prospective

permit owner as well?

Mr. Karkut: — That's correct, but it would mirror the rules again that Ms. Cribb described with alcohol, where the transfer of the interest, I guess, would still require the recipient to receive a new permit from SLGA.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. That helps to clarify the confusion I had. I really appreciate both of your answers, both of the officials' answers, I mean. I'm moving on to Part 4, Administration and Enforcement. Is there anything here that's different than alcohol?

Mr. Karkut: — When developing these provisions, we focused primarily on alcohol. There are a few areas that, I guess, there might be some clarifications; for example, in the inspection powers, that we also look to the tobacco control legislation to model some of the language off that. There are a couple instances where we found language within the federal Act that we felt was appropriate to include in the provincial Act, so that there's some similarities between the enforcement on both the federal and the provincial side.

However the core of these provisions are definitely based on the alcohol legislation. And there's nothing particularly new about the language in here, that it is largely based on existing precedent for investigation enforcement provisions within legislation in the province.

Ms. Sarauer: — My reading of some of these provisions allows for both police officers and cannabis enforcement officers to ask about information about customers in addition to their age, so not just asking for whether or not they are minors. I've been hearing a lot of concerns about privacy of customers, especially considering this will be legal, and the stigma attached still to cannabis and its connection perhaps to crime.

So some concerns around prospective customers and the privacy of their personal information. Can the ministry provide any further detail with respect to that in particular?

Mr. Karkut: — So I guess there's two, just to step back a bit, there's two aspects of inspection that are dealt with under the Act. The first is 4-3, and that's the inspection powers of cannabis enforcement officers. Cannabis enforcement officers, their work is specifically limited to permitted premises or permit applicants. So much as the liquor world exists, they're concerned more about the monitoring of the actual legal premises that are operating.

In those cases, it would be quite limited instances where you would see them questioning a customer. Just as a purely hypothetical example, a store could maybe be . . . It could be alleged that they're selling customers beyond the 30-gram limit, or else that they're selling product that contains nicotine, which is prohibited. So just, I guess, examples that might come to mind where there'd be limited instances where they might want to inquire with a customer, have they sold you this product, that type of situation.

Where you're more likely to see this type of inspection power to come into play is with the inspection powers for police officers at 4-4. Police officers have broader inspection powers;

in particular, they extend beyond permitted premises or permit applicants. They would deal with probably one of the most . . . The primary example would be a store that's operating, or an outlet that's operating without a permit that's selling cannabis illegally, selling illegal products. So in those instances, the inquiries would probably be, or hypothetically be more related to the actual illegal sale of cannabis. And that might be where you would see that type of power coming in more commonly, in the entirely illegal situation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. 4-4, which was what I was going to ask a few more detailed questions about, is in fact a little bit more broad than the situation you're talking about. It covers more than just if the retail location is operating without a permit. Now is 4-4 similar to what is allowed for alcohol and tobacco?

Mr. Karkut: — This specific provision is actually based on the tobacco control legislation, and that provision that you're talking about does come from the tobacco control legislation. So it's a similar power that exists in the tobacco world.

Ms. Sarauer: — Just for certainty, there is legislation in the tobacco world that allows for, and I'm reading, a police officer may:

(f) with respect to a person who is in, or has been in, a premises and to whom the police officer believes cannabis may have been furnished . . .

(ii) make other inquiries of the person.

Mr. Karkut: — I'm just bringing up my tobacco control legislation here to refer to.

Ms. Sarauer: — I will say, while we're waiting, I'm still wrapping my head around, frankly, that the Sask Party is banning smoking cannabis around campfires in the summertime at campgrounds. My attack ads are already forming in my head, so I do hope that the ministry reconsiders that in the future.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We'll certainly take it under advisement.

Mr. Karkut: — I apologize for the delay there. However the provision that that was modelled on is found in clause 17(2)(j) of *The Tobacco Control Act*.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you so much. Sorry to make you look into that separate legislation. Similarly the section 4-7 around power to demand names seems to grant a lot of power to the police, frankly. Is there a similar provision in another legislation that this is copying?

Mr. Karkut: — That specific provision's modelled after the alcohol legislation.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify for the record, the alcohol legislation allows a police officer to demand not just the name but the address of any person found in a premises?

[17:45]

Mr. Karkut: — I can bring it up again, but yes, I believe so. We did try to mirror the language the best as possible.

Ms. Sarauer: — And similarly to that, it's mirroring a provision in the alcohol legislation for the police to be allowed to apprehend a person without warrant if they fail or refuse to provide their name and address. Is that correct?

Mr. Karkut: — That is correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — The other provision I was curious to know more about was 4-10, which is powers in exigent circumstances. Could you provide some, an example of when this provision would be necessary?

Mr. Karkut: — Once again that mirrors the provisions under the alcohol legislation. And that would be, I guess, for example if you found an individual who is in possession of 60 grams of cannabis in public, that there wouldn't be the . . . It's clearly a breach of the Act, and there wouldn't be an opportunity for police officers to necessarily get a search warrant to come back to that individual to seize that item. That would be an example where that might come into play.

Perhaps a better, stronger example would be if there is a risk to human life or safety. So for example, a substance that's been tampered with or it might be fatal or dangerous to a member of the public, that would be an instance where there would be circumstances to seize that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I'm moving on to part 5, Offences and Penalties. Who will be enforcing part 5 of this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think there's a combination. Most of these are the requirements around the SLGA requirements. So SLGA's inspectors would deal with things on the administrative penalties on the inspection side, but would certainly have the ability to use police if there's that requirement.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. BC's similar legislation stated that the revenue received from the legalization of cannabis and the taxes that would be obtained by the province will first go to administration of the Act. Why has nothing like that been included in this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We made a conscious decision not to include either the revenue or the expenditure side on either the licensing or the enforcement provisions. We weren't able to certainly determine with any great degree of certainty what the revenue or the expenditures would be.

So if we were to put something forward that was clearly going to be wrong or a guess, we would end up having to change it or deal with the issue of being wrong or make appropriate adjustments. So we, in this year's budget, included neither revenue nor expenses on it. In a subsequent year, we would be able to make better estimates, but we felt that to do so would be a shot in the dark we didn't want to take.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. So just to clarify, the revenue received will be going to the General Revenue Fund?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's correct. There would be certainly

. . . Certain things would stay within SLGA as part of their fee process. I'm not sure what those would be. But the penalties and that side would certainly come back to the GRF [General Revenue Fund], and then the licensing portion of the business side of it would be in SLGA.

Ms. Sarauer: — But the taxes would be going to the GRF. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes, provincial sales tax. Yes, it would all come back.

Ms. Sarauer: — So none of it has been earmarked specifically to flow to any specific funding for SLGA or funding for municipalities or funding for . . . well I was going to say police as well?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Not at this time, no.

Ms. Sarauer: — What about cannabis in the workplace? You mentioned it already there. There's a few, three concerns, but can you speak a little bit about how that will be handled?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The opinions that we have from both employers' counsel and from our own are that we don't have a great deal of opportunity to have random testing in the workplace, as you're likely aware. So the approach that's being taken by the ministry and most employers right now is one of education, awareness, and training.

The underlying issue is fitness for work, and if an individual arrives for work or at work becomes visibly impaired, then the employer has to treat it either as a disciplinary issue or perhaps an addictions or a duty-to-accommodate issue. So those are the type of education that's taking place within that ministry.

There was some discussion but no decision on it, whether it would be appropriate to random test in extremely high-risk jobs like using explosives or crane operators, and we're looking to see what is taking place in other jurisdictions. And nobody has indicated to us that they're going ahead, but I think the other jurisdictions are looking or having some similar discussions.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Other jurisdictions have and are talking about potentially implementing and creating space for cannabis lounges in their regulations. And when we're talking about mirroring alcohol, then I suppose an argument could be made for that here in Saskatchewan as well. Could you explain why that is not being allowed here in this province?

Hon. Mr. Makowsky: — As Minister Morgan has indicated, we want to take a cautious, safe approach initially. At this point, that is not under consideration at this time.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Is there space in the regulatory structure that the province has created for craft cannabis producers or small-scale cannabis producers?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Production would be federal so that wouldn't be something . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. It's my favourite question to ask: any idea when legalization will be coming forward? When?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I can tell you that we have a lot of people with us today so we will be able to give you a lot of different answers.

Mr. Tesarowski: — I'm Dale Tesarowski. I can say that I have no certainty at all of when it's going to pass. I can say several things though, and I'm a lawyer and I'm supposed to say different things. One is that the Senate, which is currently studying the federal *Cannabis Act*, has set June 7th as the date that it will have third reading on that piece of legislation. If there are any amendments to be made — and there's always an if — to the *Cannabis Act* federally, then those amendments have to go back to the House of Commons for its review and potential approval or rejection. If the Commons accepts the amendments, then the bill will go forward as amended. If they reject those amendments, however, and it sure sounds like that may be a scenario that will develop, then they kick it back to the Senate to really question whether they want to do it or not. And then the Senate can say at that point, yes we do, and they kick it back to the House of Commons. And then the tennis game starts.

If everything goes without amendment or without controversy, then the federal government has also publicly stated that, in order for a retailer to get lawful product on the shelf that is properly labelled according to federal regulation, that there's a time period that's required for that as well. And the time period that they've talked about is between 8 and 12 weeks, post Royal Assent.

So if everything goes forward, as June 7th being the third reading vote, and everything goes ahead quickly from that point, as early as August the 7th or September the 7th. If there are any hitches in any of that process, then clearly there's going to be issues based upon that.

I'm also aware that the federal government wants to avoid certain periods or dates that could be problematic. They want to avoid frosh week for example, in university, as being a date that . . . just as I suspect they wanted to avoid Canada Day being cannabis day, July 1st. They want to avoid certain things like that too. They also want to avoid provincial election dates and things like that. So there is no certainty about when it is. It could be as early as August the 7th or September the 7th, depending on the 8 or 12 weeks, or it could be later than that if there are any issues.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I really appreciate that. I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Thank you. Are there any more questions from the committee? This bill has over 100 clauses and I'll be asking leave of the committee to review the bill by parts and divisions. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. We will proceed the vote on the bill. This is going to take a little while. Preliminary matters, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1-1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 1-2 to 3-24 inclusive agreed to.]

[18:00]

Clause 3-25

The Chair: — Clause 3-25. I recognize Mr. Nerlien.

Mr. Nerlien: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With respect to clause 3-25 of the printed bill, I move that we:

Amend subsection (5) of Clause 3-25 by striking out “to whom cannabis permit has been issued” and substituting “to whom a cannabis permit has been issued”.

The Chair: — Do committee members agree? Oh, sorry. Mr. Nerlien has moved the amendment to clause 3-25. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 3-25 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 3-25 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 3-26 to 8-1 inclusive agreed to.]

[Schedules 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 121, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act* with amendment. Mr. Nerlien has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Bill No. 122 — *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act, 2018/Loi de 2018 corrélative de la loi intitulée *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act**

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 122, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act, 2018*, a bilingual bill. We'll begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Minister Morgan, do you have any opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm once again joined by Neil Karkut, Dale Tesarowski, Fiona Cribb, Cam Swan, and the officials from my office. I'd like to make some very brief opening remarks regarding Bill 122, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act*.

This bill will make consequential amendments to the bilingual legislation that are required to implement the cannabis control Act. Mr. Chair, this bill will update the Liquor and Gaming Authority's legislation to clarify that SLGA is responsible for any other matters that may be assigned to it by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. This change is necessary to ensure that SLGA will have authority to carry out its powers and duties as the designated cannabis authority under the cannabis control Act.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, this bill contains a number of other housekeeping amendments to other pieces of bilingual legislation. These changes will not have a substantial impact on the operation of those Acts.

With those opening remarks, I would welcome any further questions regarding Bill 122, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act*.

The Chair: — Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I don't have any questions with respect to this bill. I think we've canvassed this issue sufficiently in Bill 121. But I will say that you can see how large and serious these changes are — legalizing cannabis is — when you see that the many changes that are needed to be changed, made in other legislation, both in 121 and 122.

So I do just want to highlight that I imagine this was a lot of work for both the ministries, the Ministry of Justice and SLGA and all the other accompanying ministries that have had to deal with this legalization coming shortly.

The Chair: — Thank you. Minister, do you have any comments? Or are there any questions from anyone else in the committee? Minister, do you have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — No, Mr. Chair, just some brief closing comments once you're done, just thanking officials and making some references to the class of 2010.

The Chair: — Okay. We will continue on then. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act, 2018*, a bilingual bill.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 122, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Consequential Amendments Act, 2018*, a bilingual bill without amendment. Mr. Francis moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Minister, do you have any closing comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank a lot of the officials that did a lot of work on it. The critic quite rightly pointed out that there was a lot of work that went across a lot of different areas. And she referenced that in the context of how much work it was for the officials, so I'd like to thank the officials for that work.

But I think it also is an indication of how broad reaching this legislation is, and it's something that ought not be taken lightly. And as we go over the next year or so, and we see how the legislation is implemented and rolls out, I think all of us will want to watch it, including members from both sides of the House.

So with that, Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank you, the committee members on both sides, the officials from Hansard, the building staff that put in time, and the staff in the ministry and at SLGA, who did a large amount of work in preparation for today, as well as in getting the bill ready, and who will have ongoing amounts of work as they go forward, as the bill is executed.

And I will try and refrain from making comments about the class of 2010. There were some very good people in the class.

The Chair: — Well thank you, Minister. Do you have any foreclosing comments, Ms. Sarauer?

Ms. Sarauer: — Sure, I'd like to join with the minister in thanking all of the officials from both SLGA and Justice for their thoughtful answers to my many questions this afternoon, as well as committee members for their work, and you as well, Mr. Chair. I'd also like to thank both ministers for taking time to be here this afternoon, and committee staff for their work, as well as Hansard as well.

The Chair: — Well thank you. And boy, there's a lot of stuff within that, so it is going to be interesting to see. I think we will take now a brief recess for a couple of minutes until we move into estimates.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**General Revenue Fund
Corrections and Policing
Vote 73**

The Chair: — Okay, we are now into estimates. Vote 73, Corrections and Policing, page 39, central management and services, subvote (CP01) in the amount of \$1,033,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Demand reduction and modernization, subvote (CP17) in the amount of 4,982,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of 221,886,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody, supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of 175,932,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Police Commission, subvote (CP12) in the amount of 1,476,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections and Policing, vote 73, 405,309,000. 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, 2019, the following sums for Corrections and Policing in the amount of 405,309,000.

Mr. Olauson so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Government Relations
Vote 30**

The Chair: — We now move into vote 30, Government Relations, page 69, central management and services, subvote (GR01) in the amount of 9,201,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. First Nations, Métis and Northern Affairs, subvote (GR12) in the amount of 78,254,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal relations, subvote (GR07) in the amount of 481,795,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (GR06) in the amount of 1,786,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Public safety, subvote (GR11) in the

amount of 10,127,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial public safety telecommunications network, subvote (GR13) in the amount of zero dollars. This is for informational purposes only. There is no vote needed.

Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 2,881,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Government Relations, vote 30, 581,163,000. 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, 2019, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 581,163,000.

Ms. Ross: — I make that motion.

The Chair: — Ms. Ross makes the motion. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Integrated Justice Services
Vote 91**

The Chair: — Vote 91, Integrated Justice Services, page 93, central management and services, subvote (IJ01) in the amount of 48,796,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Integrated services, subvote (IJ02) in the amount of 35,097,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Capital and improvements, subvote (IJ03) in the amount of 13,319,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 6,483,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted. Integrated Justice Services, vote 91: 97,212,000. I would now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2019, the following sums for Integrated Justice Services in the amount of 97,212,000.

Mr. Tochor has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Justice and Attorney General
Vote 3**

The Chair: — Vote 3, Justice and Attorney General, page 97. Central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of 1,205,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of 46,608,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Innovation and legal services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 38,104,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards and commissions and independent officers, subvote (JU08) in the amount of \$38,526,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3: 124,443,000. I would now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2019, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of 124,443,000.

Mr. Francis moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Parks, Culture and Sport
Vote 27**

The Chair: — Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, page 105. Central management and services, subvote (PC01) in the amount of 9,134,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, subvote (PC12) in the amount of 25,379,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Resource stewardship, subvote (PC18) in the amount of 6,409,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community engagement, subvote (PC19) in the amount of 29,132,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 4,637,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27, \$70,054,000. I would now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2019 the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of \$70,054,000.

Mr. Olauson has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Tourism Saskatchewan
Vote 88**

The Chair: — Vote 88, Tourism Saskatchewan, page 121. Tourism Saskatchewan, subvote (TR01) in the amount of 13,101,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Tourism Saskatchewan, vote 88: 13,101,000. 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, 2019, the following sums for Tourism Saskatchewan, the amount of \$13,101,000.

Ms. Ross has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
Integrated Justice Services
Vote 196**

The Chair: — Vote 196, Integrated Justice Services, page 156. Loans to Victims' Fund, subvote (IJ02), in the amount of 5,000,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Integrated Justice Services, vote 196: 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, 2019, the following sums for integrated justice services, in the amount of \$5,000,000.

Mr. Nerlien has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Justice and Attorney General
Vote 3**

The Chair: — Vote 3, Justice and Attorney General, page 8. Boards, commissions, and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of 5,250,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03), in the amount of 4,773,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3, \$10,023,000. 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 . . .

[18:30]

Oh, excuse me. I'll just start this again.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2018, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of \$10,023,000.

Mr. Francis has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

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

Mr. Nerlien so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Seeing we have completed our business for this afternoon, I would ask for a motion of adjournment. Mr. Olauson has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — This meeting is adjourned to the call of the Chair.

[The committee adjourned at 18:31.]