



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 47 — June 23, 2020



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Greg Lawrence, Chair
Moose Jaw Wakamow

Mr. Buckley Belanger, Deputy Chair
Athabasca

Mr. Dan D'Autremont
Cannington

Mr. Ken Francis
Kindersley

Mr. Delbert Kirsch
Batoche

Ms. Laura Ross
Regina Rochdale

Ms. Nicole Sarauer
Regina Douglas Park

[The committee met at 15:00.]

The Chair: — Good afternoon. I want to welcome the members of our committee. We have Mr. Francis, Mr. Kirsch, Ms. Ross, and substituting in we have Mr. Wotherspoon. Today the committee will resume its consideration of the estimates and supplementary estimates for the Ministry of Government Relations. We will begin with vote 30, Government Relations, central management and services, subvote (GR01).

Minister Carr, please if you will introduce your officials and any opening comments you may have.

**General Revenue Fund
Government Relations
Vote 30**

Subvote (GR01)

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Thank you. So good afternoon, and I'd like to introduce my officials that I do have with me today and highlight the additional funding that we have for municipalities. I'm joined here by my senior officials from the Ministry of Government Relations. That includes Deputy Minister Greg Miller, assistant deputy ministers Laurier Donais, Sheldon Green, and Giselle Marcotte. And I have several other officials with us here today, and if they are so fortunate to be able to come up and help answer a question, they will introduce themselves at that point in time.

So COVID-19 is an unprecedented time for our municipalities. Our government has responded with unprecedented support for the municipal sector. In regards to the budget, there is more than 571 million in direct provincial supports to Saskatchewan municipalities in 2020-2021.

This year is a record year for municipal revenue sharing. Municipalities have already received 278.1 million, an increase of 26.5 million or 11 per cent. Government already distributed the funding in one lump sum to mitigate cash flow pressures municipalities may have resulted in because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

We also announced \$150 million for the municipal economic enhancement program. This will stimulate Saskatchewan's local economies by building or improving infrastructure. Just yesterday we announced the first 55 projects under the MEEP [municipal economic enhancement program] program that have been approved. Highlights of some of the recently approved projects include a local roadway improvement for the city of North Battleford; a new community hall for the northern village of Ile-a-la-Crosse; new water wells for the town of Balcarres; water and grid road projects for the RM [rural municipality] of Stonehenge; and culverts, streets, and dust control projects for the village of Ridgedale. We look forward to seeing many more projects being approved in the coming weeks.

We are also investing into municipalities through the Investing in Canada infrastructure program. Through this initiative, the province has secured nearly 900 million in federal funding to support local priorities. The province is also targeting a \$50 million investment from federal, provincial, and municipal

sources for landfill remediation, contributing to Saskatchewan's solid waste strategy. Effective waste reduction and management is essential for responsible growth and contributes to the well-being of the province, its people, and its future.

We have also increased consultation with the municipal sector. Since the middle of March, I've personally met with . . . over 80 meetings with municipal leaders. My officials have had many more. This includes regularly scheduled meetings with City Mayors' Caucus, SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association], SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities], and New North. I've also directed my officials to create working groups within municipal staff to discuss budgetary pressures. These working groups will closely monitor the effects of COVID-19 on municipal budgets and determine appropriate budget options, if needed.

This year's budget truly provide an unprecedented support for our municipalities. Items like the \$150 MEEP program, the \$45 million emergency payment to First Nations and Métis organizations, and the lump sum payment of municipal revenue sharing are brand new, innovative, and not cut-and-paste items. So with that, I would welcome any questions.

The Chair: — Mr. Wotherspoon, I'm guessing you might have a question or two.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, committee members. Thank you, Minister, and all the officials that have joined us here this afternoon. Also thank you to the officials and all those other officials and civil servants that are involved in the very important work of this ministry in what's been a really challenging time for not just Saskatchewan households and families but for municipalities, rural, urban, smallest villages through to towns, northern through to the South. There's been a lot of pressures.

The one area that maybe I'll focus in on first is with respect to the public safety side of the budget. I'm just looking for an update from the minister as to the actions on this front.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay, so thank you very much for that question. I guess when you talk about public safety, you're talking about it fairly broadly here. So one of the things that I'd like to highlight, I can break it down into three areas. First of all we have the Saskatchewan Public Safety Agency, which we had the opportunity to roll under our umbrella and bring in different areas from Environment. And so now on the Saskatchewan Public Safety Agency, the budget for that area comes out at about \$85 million, and we've reallocated from several different areas to be able to do this.

And last night we had the opportunity in this venue to be able to answer questions specifically to Saskatchewan public safety with regards to, I guess, the workings of it, the efforts that happened in the North. So I'm not sure if you're looking for that kind of information here today, but I can tell you that its first year of operation has been very, very busy, starting with wildfires in December where we actually deployed people to Australia to help out there.

And then of course with the COVID-19 response. When you

think of public safety, it's not your traditional type of movement when you think of floods and fires, but we were fighting a different kind of enemy. And so the Saskatchewan Public Safety Agency took the opportunity and was able to help out with the EOC [emergency operations centre] centres. We were able to embed people within those emergency centres in the communities and help those communities build capacity so that they could deal with that kind of stuff without our staff there on an ongoing basis.

That staff was able to provide supports with PPE [personal protective equipment], cleaning kits. There were trailers brought in. I believe it was 16 trailers that we were able to use for self-isolation units. We had taken some of those trailers out of there, and we have actually redeployed some of them just in case they need them if their numbers do start to go up again. Kind of a what-if scenario. So they were very happy that we moved those back up there for them.

And of course with the personnel, they were able to help out basically with anything they needed. They cleaned houses. They helped out with contact tracing. Whatever was required of them, the Saskatchewan public safety would jump in. And most importantly, they helped out with checkpoints that took place throughout the NSAD [northern Saskatchewan administration district] during that time period.

So it was a pretty big rollout, and what I heard was . . . Throughout that time frame we had lots of opportunity to speak with stakeholders, speak with First Nations groups — PAGC [Prince Albert Grand Council], MLTC [Meadow Lake Tribal Council], FSIN [Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations] — as well as northern mayors, and we really had some good dialogue. And based on some of the information that they were able to bring forward, it helped with the Public Safety Agency and the direction that they took as far as dealing with all of that kind of stuff in the North.

And then also, within the Ministry of Government Relations, we have PDAP [provincial disaster assistance program] and we also have our building standards branch. So with the provincial disaster assistance plan, the total budget for that one is \$2.8 million and of course the objective of this area is to assist individuals and communities to recover from natural disasters by providing financial assistance to eligible claimants due to substantial loss or damage to uninsurable essential property and to maximize reimbursement of disaster recovery expenses from the federal government.

So this is a cost-sharing program with the federal government that we work on together. And that program has been up and running for quite a few years and really does become successful for those people that do become uninsurable and then they are able to draw on this.

And the other part of it is, of course, I mentioned our building standards and licensing branch. So the objective of this area — the budget for this one is 877,000 — is to administer the development, adoption, and implementation of construction codes and technical safety standards for the design, construction, licensing, and operation of buildings, facilities, and equipment; administer effective licensing programs for gas fitters, electricians, and building officials; and promote safety and

growth in the environment.

So I think we had the opportunity to be in committee last week so you had a chance to ask questions around TSASK [Technical Safety Authority of Saskatchewan] and the transfer of that agency and how that all works, so that would fall under this area.

So I guess as far as public safety goes within Government Relations portfolio, that probably gives a little overview. If you have any further questions, feel free.

[15:15]

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank so much. I'm recognizing the limited time that we have together here this evening, so I know we could spend a fair amount of time on this very important area. I just would want to say thank you so much to all those that are involved in ensuring the safety of the public over at the Public Safety Agency. I know that these are stressful times where they're in demand, and all the efforts from contact tracing and efforts to keep the community safe are important. And we're not out of the woods. We don't know where this virus goes in the weeks and months ahead. So just to offer a thanks to those individuals that are working to protect us all.

I'd like to focus a little bit more specifically on some of the impacts of COVID-19 on the sector and on municipalities. And I'm wondering at this point, I guess the question I would have, is the minister tracking and receiving updates on the fiscal impacts of COVID-19 on respective municipalities across Saskatchewan?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay, so I guess what I just would like to start with is through municipal revenue sharing. On May the 7th we announced that as part of our government's response to the pandemic, municipal revenue sharing would be fast-tracked for the '20-21 year. So all municipal revenue-sharing funds were paid out in full directly to all compliant Saskatchewan municipalities on June 15th, 2020, rather than instalments throughout the year.

So this stable, consistent, no-strings-attached funding for municipalities can be invested into the programs or services that they see fit. So if there are truly some shortfalls between now and when they're able to collect taxes or when they're able to start charging fees again, then this can fill that gap in the short term.

Specifically to municipalities and how we're engaging with them, we have established a working group focused on municipal sustainability and property tax. So the ministry has organized four municipal working groups to discuss municipal sustainability and property taxes with the cities, urban, rural, and northern municipalities. The mandate of each group is to share information and discuss any in-year financial challenges facing local governments as a result of COVID-19, discuss adequacy and use of existing financial tools such as borrowing and debt and suggest changes where needed to support municipal sustainability during the post state of the emergency, provide advice to the ministry on how to best align '20-21 property tax, local tax tools, and the 2021-2022 municipal funding framework to ensure the long-term viability of the sector and support Saskatchewan's economic recovery.

These three groups have started regular discussions while northern group has not been convened yet basically because of the nature of what's been happening in the North, so they're busy with other stuff. But we will definitely be touching base with them. Conversations are focused on information sharing and assessing of adequacy of existing tools such as immediate impacts of revenues and expenditures as well as access to debt.

So I'm just going to ask Elissa Aitken to come up and just address a few more specifics right around that working group for you.

Ms. Aitken: — Thank you. Elissa Aitken, executive director of policy and program services with Government Relations.

So the working groups started, you know, we started contemplating them in April and then they really got started, specifically the cities got started in May. The conversations we've been having with the cities group has been around really the different types of expenditure, both revenue and expense side, the changes that they're seeing. It's pretty early in the year for many municipalities and some of the municipalities have been doing updates to their councils regularly. Other ones are more waiting to see what happens. Some of those cities' updates you've probably seen in the public. Specifically Regina and Saskatoon have given those kind of updates.

Really the work that we're doing right now is to develop a process for surveying the cities to collect that information on a regular basis as they go through the year and as they start to quantify and get a better sense of those changes that they're seeing.

Specifically what we're seeing in some of the cities, the major changes are, I would say, on the revenue side. They're about fees and charges. So transit fees and charges, parking revenues are down, those kinds of things. As well I would say some of the recreational and cultural facility revenues are down. So those are the big pieces that the cities are seeing. And again I would say within the cities group even, there's a fair degree of fluidity around those pieces and a lot of difference between the specific cities, just based on what their budgets comprise and what their revenues comprise.

We're just in the process of doing that survey and we'll have better information, we think, over time and working closely with the city managers to collect that information. And then it'll evolve as we go through the year.

The urban group, excluding the cities, the urbans, we've had fewer conversations with them. They're again, I would say, are even earlier in their fiscal year to try and assess the impact of COVID-19. Basically what we've seen, they've had some small changes in their revenues and some small changes in their expenditures. Again huge diversity within that group in terms of the impact, but again pretty early in the year. And some of them are seeing the costs and the savings offset each other quite nicely, so kind of a mixed bag.

What we've heard, I would say, from both cities and urbans, as well as rurals, is that the changes that government has made around advancing revenue sharing and investing in MEEP have provided them the fluidity and addressed a lot of those cash flow challenges that they've seen. So lots of them have been

appreciative of that investment to just assist with that cash flow early in the year.

The rural group then, we've only met I think once, and we have another meeting coming up right away. Rurals, typically their taxes aren't due till fall and so many of them haven't seen any impact yet in terms of their revenues at all. So again we'll survey them probably later in the year and get a better sense after we're through that piece. And then, as the minister mentioned, we're starting the northern one shortly.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you for the update, and the work you're engaged in on these fronts and these working groups is really, really important. So thanks for those commitments. As well, you know, I identified before as well the fast tracking the dollars was of course appreciated by the sector as it relates to revenue sharing, and the MEEP dollars are important and valued. I do have some questions around how those are getting out the door and the criteria. And certainly they're important to communities, but they're important to workers and our economy right now.

Just to track back on the question around assessing the fiscal impact for municipalities, I'm hearing that it's a bit of a mixed bag where a city like Regina can quantify the loss in revenues and what they're dealing with there, but some other municipalities might not be in that position right now. I guess, what's the operating assumption that you have as a minister at this point based on the consultation and the dialogue with municipalities by way of the fiscal impact across Saskatchewan on . . . I guess by way of the deficit, largely impacted by the revenue side of the equation?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So I think it's fair to say based on what Elissa just talked about is we're in very early talks with all of these municipalities, and they're having regular dialogue. Obviously the cities have had more interaction than the smaller municipalities at this point in time. So that was one of the reasons for advancing that municipal revenue sharing the way they did. And until they actually really get down and look at their books and things start getting back to a new normal, they're not going to know what their true shortfalls are in their revenues, which was one of the reasons we advanced that municipal revenue sharing.

And with the creation of the municipal economic enhancement program, which was rolled out on May 6th, it was part of a two-year announcement of \$2 billion of economic stimulus, investment into our economy. So the stimulus plan includes 320 million for municipal infrastructure, and that does include 130 million through the Investing in Canada infrastructure program; 46 million for targeted funding for municipal roads and airports, so those would probably be, you know, more of the smaller municipalities that would take upon that kind of stuff; and then, of course, the 150 million that the new municipal economic enhancement program will have.

And it's providing that to municipalities to support investments and infrastructure to stimulate the economy, the economic recovery, and encourage local job creation. So on May 19th, we announced the specific funding allocation for all communities within the province. MEEP is providing approximately \$143 per capita to municipalities to support investments in infrastructure

to stimulate the economic recovery and encourage local job creation.

Allocation highlights for the MEEP program include the city of Saskatoon is \$35.5 million, and I know that they have a plan on the way. They're going to allocate some of their capital funding and ensure that their operating deficit doesn't happen through adjusting the way they're spending some of their money. And we're just completely fine with that, because this is totally intended so that they don't have an operating deficit at the end of the day. City of Regina, \$31 million; Prince Albert, 5.2 million; Moose Jaw, 4.9 million; Swift Current, 2.4 million; Yorkton, 2.3 million; and the city of North Battleford, 2.1 million.

So just this week, June 22nd, the province announced the first 55 MEEP projects. So with more than 7.4 million of provincial investment, these projects are approved and can move forward. Highlights of some of the approved projects include the local roadway improvements for the . . . Oh, I mentioned these in my opening comments, so I won't repeat them.

So through these investments like the new MEEP program, which focuses on municipal projects and initiatives which will help residents get back to work, we are confident that Saskatchewan will recover from the devastating economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. It is very exciting to see the communities taking advantage of this program by submitting a variety of projects that will improve their local infrastructure capital assets to provide services and ultimately strengthen their communities.

And I think it's worth noting that the first 55 projects that were approved and announced, within two weeks they should have money in hand to be able to start these projects and get things going. So it won't be a case where they have to come up with the money first and then be reimbursed based on it. Of course within the program we have checks and balances to ensure that the money is being spent accordingly and as per the guidelines of the program. But we didn't want to put any more added pressure on the community with projects where they had to pay first and get the funding back later. So through this program, it's really exciting that we were able to advance those ahead of time.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thanks for the information. Certainly, you know, our larger centres with transit and recreation assets and the parking revenues, as was identified, have taken a significant hit by way of revenues, which puts them in a challenging spot which, you know, you've spoken to the measures around fast-tracking the revenue sharing. It still leaves a hole for them, particularly if we're wanting to make sure that we're utilizing the MEEP program for stimulus, if you will. So it's not just being shuffled around, you know, cuts in one area or deferring certain spends in some areas to have these dollars transfer. And we really do need a stimulus right now to get people back to work and to take on these important projects.

So specifically to the operating grants and the pressures that these larger centres are facing due to this decline in revenues, I know the federal government has indicated some interest in possibly stepping up on this front. I know that the federal municipalities have made calls on that front. Certainly it's a challenge for our municipalities in Saskatchewan.

So I'm just looking for an update from the minister in working with municipalities, in either working to provide some supports, some operating grant funding, to help fill that gap. Or, I guess, where this government's been at in advocating and working together federally to help fill those gaps.

[15:30]

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay, so thank you very much for the question once again. So the working group that I had spoke about earlier, that Elissa's group is leading up with the municipalities. Right now it's just a little bit too early for those municipalities to actually quantify exactly what type of operating deficit they may have. But as we mentioned, we are continually in communication with them and monitoring exactly what the situation will be.

With the municipal revenue sharing, it's actually up 11 per cent over last year, so they do have that little bit of a bump there to help them out. I know that SUMA and SARM have been actively lobbying the federal government for \$10 billion for municipalities, and of course we support any effort to get money at the doors of municipalities. I've been actively engaged in provincial and territorial calls where we talk specifically about where municipalities are at and the pressures they may be feeling down the road and any money that comes from the federal government and advocating for that money.

We actually sent a letter to Minister McKenna, who's responsible for this side of the portfolio, and stressed how important it was that if money does flow down to the municipalities, that we really want it to be kind of like our municipal revenue-sharing program here in the province of Saskatchewan: a no-strings-attached program that truly does allow municipalities to spend that money on where the gaps fall for them specifically, you know. So whether that's their operating budget that they need to backfill, or if they want to continue on with some capital projects that they don't have enough money to use, then they can use that money to be able to do that.

And of course I just touched on the MEEP program, and I think one of the things that we heard that our departments have been hearing from construction associations and stuff is they were really concerned when COVID-19 hit, and they were fully aware that municipalities might take a bit of a hit to the bottom line. And they were concerned that capital projects were not going to be able to go ahead and in all likelihood, if we hadn't come up with some extra funding, that absolutely would have been the case.

So now that we have this MEEP funding, the majority of municipalities are still going to be able to carry on with the capital projects that they had planned. And depending on the financial situation of the individual municipalities, they will very well be able to actually do some extra capital projects which will be very helpful for the stimulus of the economy, as we've already talked about, and kick-starting it and getting things moving again for our industries and our municipalities.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thanks for the responses and for the continued attention to the operating deficit situation and being there to, I guess, certainly be a voice with the federal government but also making sure that this doesn't become some, you know, battle between different levels of government. The supports are

going to need to flow.

And for us to maximize the economic benefits from MEEP, it's going to be important that municipalities aren't left in the lurch or ultimately property tax payers, who are in a really difficult situation right now as you know. So many people that have lost employment; an economy that's in a really tough spot right now; so many local businesses that are also in a very trying situation right now — continued attention on that front's going to be important.

And I think there was some mention to some of the planning around property taxes based on the sector or the meeting groups that are going on right now. I know one of the calls from the sector has been to work with municipalities who could be aided by some sort of lending structure with the province or the province backstopping some of the financing or interest-free loans to support the deferral of property taxes for those within their municipalities. So I'm just looking for a status of where that consideration is or where that project is at.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay, so thank you very much for that question. And I know that the SUMA president has actually talked publicly about some sort of a lending program, but there actually has been no formal presentation or request for that to happen. So that's where we're at on that.

But in my conversations with municipalities, obviously, they were very concerned about this. And you know, to start with at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic we were actually having daily calls. And then we went to three times a week. And then one time a week. And so we did have some really good conversations, and a lot of them were around how are we going to fill this hole if we can't manage it ourselves.

And I did a lot of talking about, you know, you need to use the tools that you have in your toolbox. So with municipalities, you know, it might be going back and looking at your budget and seeing exactly what expenses you have had. And maybe you need to be making some cuts somewhere or whatever the case may be. That's a municipality-by-municipality decision. The province of Saskatchewan is going to have to borrow to get through this very trying time for the province. And I fully expect that the municipalities may have to do some borrowing for some of their capital projects that they decide to go ahead with that they may not have anticipated.

But hopefully with the programming that we've put in place we've maybe addressed some of those concerns for them. So I guess, number one, by advancing — I'm going to sound repetitive here but I think it's worth saying again — by advancing that municipal revenue sharing, they're able to do what they need to do and then see where they actually do sit come, you know, whether that's October or November. Are the tax rolls coming in? Are things as bad as they thought they were going to be? Where were we able to make up some revenue? And then really evaluate it from there.

And, regarding their capital projects, we've put the MEEP program in place. And of course that stands for municipal economic enhancement program, and as we have heard from the municipalities, they are very, very thankful for this money. We just rolled this out a month ago. We already have 55 applications

in and the money going out the door. So there's lots of uptake on this program. And that will definitely be one of those tools in the toolbox that they're going to be able to use to help get them through this time.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thanks to the minister for the remarks. The dollars have been fast-tracked, but of course there's no additional dollars by way of the revenue sharing. I do appreciate and I know municipalities appreciate the flexibility. It aids them in these uncertain times, in times where they've lost revenues to meet obligations from a cash flow perspective.

But just to loop back to the call for support by the municipalities with respect to potentially some sort of an interest-free loan or some sort of lending mechanism to work with them on property tax deferrals. The minister stated that there's not work that they're engaged in with the sector right now on this front. But the options for municipalities aren't as many as they are for a government. They can't run a deficit. There's, you know, really very few revenue lines that they have access to. And property taxes themselves are really the main revenue generator, and they're in a precarious situation as households and businesses are in a precarious situation this year.

[15:45]

So just looking to the minister, I know you said there's not ongoing work on this front right now. Do you have openness on this front to engage with the sector in this discussion and look at what that could look like to support municipalities so that they could defer property taxes for ratepayers?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So I think what I would actually say to that is the group that Elissa is working with, with the municipal sector specifically, will be looking at all options if there is a crunch down the road. All options would be on the table. We would look at what that would be. Is it going to be something that you're talking about? I'm not sure. But as they move forward and they have those conversations, we want to ensure that our municipalities are as successful as they can be as they're moving forward.

And I would say that there is new money on the table for these municipalities in the form of MEEP. That's \$150 million specifically for that. And let's not forget the \$2 billion total stimulus package that is going out there. Another portion of that is going to municipalities, as I already talked about, for airports and roads and some money within the ICIP [Investing in Canada infrastructure plan] program.

So all of these are funding avenues that municipalities will be able to access, and some of them are cost-sharing basis with the province of Saskatchewan that we're partners in on them. So I think just as we move forward, it's just a little too early to determine exactly where these municipalities are at. But we are committed to working with them, listening to any options that they may have, and through Elissa's group and the information that comes from there, we will hear all of their concerns and any options that we need moving forward.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thanks. That openness and commitment to work together in the way that the minister is describing is going to be really important.

With respect to the PST [provincial sales tax] that's paid on construction labour, and of course there was a change a few years ago where the PST was added to construction labour. And it, you know, certainly has had a dramatic impact on many within the province and on our economy in a negative way. I know the minister identified the construction association just a little bit earlier.

I know there's been many voices that have identified their strong concern with respect to that measure. But specific to the municipal sector, I'm wondering. Certainly the municipal sector's been outspoken in their concerns that ultimately they're collecting, they're paying for municipal construction projects with property tax dollars. And there's one taxpayer, and they're collecting those dollars there and then paying a portion of those dollars back to the provincial government. I'm just wondering for the previous fiscal year and the years prior, I suspect you're documenting this, just what the total value of the PST was that was paid through municipal construction for the PST that was imposed on construction labour?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So, thank you very much for that question. At this current point in time, we're not aware of any municipalities that have indicated that any projects have been put on the back burner because of the PST.

As far as tracking the PST and how much is spent — and I'm sorry I don't remember everything you were asking along that vein — but all of those questions would actually be questions that would fall under the Ministry of Finance. That would be something that they would be looking at and tracking. That's not something that our shop has been tracking, so we don't have those numbers. But right now, there's no municipalities that have actually told us that a project has not gone ahead because of the PST.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — The reason I bring it to this table here is just ultimately it impacts the sector, and it's something I hear regularly when meeting with municipalities throughout the province. Certainly it's something that's, you know, a big concern at the SARM convention, at a meeting with rural municipalities who are undertaking these projects. And it's a big concern to our cities and our towns; in fact, I haven't found a municipality that doesn't identify it as a fairly serious concern.

And the reason I think it's important to track in this ministry is (a) it's a concern that's really being identified by the sector. They understand and are concerned by the economic impacts, the negative ones, the job loss within the private sector, within the community. But importantly, they're concerned by the precious dollars that they control. And as you know, municipalities have a lot of demands upon them. Certainly those have been intensified through COVID-19.

But it's important as well to put in context some of the other supports that flow to the sector. I know I had heard from many of the municipalities that they said well, there was a . . . I think government was touting that there was a little bump the previous year in municipal revenue sharing. But as I sat down with communities like Moose Jaw and Yorkton and Regina and many towns, many rural municipalities, they said that the little bump actually was in fact a fraction of the increase that they're paying for construction, for the PST on construction labour, and often

sort of a 1 to 3 or 1 to 4, even a 1 to 5 relationship: \$1 of new revenues, \$4 of additional spending on just the PST portion of construction labour. And so it wouldn't be that hard for us to quantify what that construction labour, what the price is. And ultimately it's paid for by property tax payers. I guess we could total the value of permits and of infrastructure projects within the sector.

Do you have the total for the previous fiscal year, and hopefully the year before as well of construction projects within the sector?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So once again, thank you very much for the question. And after talking with my officials, this is just something that we don't track, and it would not be that easy to find all of the information that you're looking for. Not all of the municipal capital projects or projects go through the Government of Saskatchewan. They do the lion's share of the work out of their existing budgets, and there is no way for us to track that type of information. So we do not have that information for you.

And I would add that I have not had one municipality indicate to me that the increase in revenue sharing is not appreciated by their community. And that's municipal revenue sharing that comes from the province of Saskatchewan. I have not heard one municipality, especially last year, tell me that the increase is a bleep or a small increase. It was 11 per cent higher last year for municipalities. That's 26 million more dollars into all of those municipalities, so that is not a small increase year over year.

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Yes, I've never had somebody state that they don't appreciate the program. What they were characterizing is that with respect to the significant additional costs that were brought forward by the imposition of the PST on construction labour that it far more, you know, certainly took those dollars, utilized them and many more, and left their situations ultimately in shortfall to respond.

The PST is just very expensive on construction labour. It's impactful of that sector, and it represents one level of government taxing another. And I know I've heard that song from the government on another tax that gets discussed. But on this one here, this one hits home. Municipalities are paying the price, but it's ultimately property tax payers, you know, homeowners and businesses and farms across the province.

Seeing that I have time for maybe one more question I think, if the minister will indulge, I'm just interested on the MEEP program. I know there was an update as to sort of dollars that have been committed at this point in time. Getting those dollars out and getting projects moving forward is a very important part of having the economic benefits that we need to have as a province with this project.

So just looking for, I guess, some timelines around getting those dollars out the door, and sort of when the minister expects that program will meet its full subscription or that those dollars will be fully extended.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So for the municipal economic enhancement program those dollars will go out the door just as soon as municipalities get their applications in to us for those projects. It's a two-year program; it sunsets in two years. Each municipality actually knows exactly how much money they are

eligible for already. They have all been sent links to our website that has the application on it. So it's a matter of them just filling out the application and sending it into us. Once the project is approved, the cheque is to them within approximately two weeks. So it moves fairly quickly, and as I said, at the other end there are checks and balances in place to ensure that that money is being spent accordingly.

[16:00]

Mr. Wotherspoon: — Thank you to the minister. I see that my time allocated here today is up. I know we could go on. This is a really important sector. I thank the minister for her time here today. I'd really thank the officials that are here today and all those other officials and civil servants, and importantly, municipalities across the province that are involved in the important work in this sector. Sending care to all, recognizing the challenges and pressures that folks are facing as a result of COVID-19, and wishing them well in their continued work locally and their engagements with government.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Great, thank you. So I'll just need a couple minutes to switch out my officials, if that's okay.

The Chair: — We'll take a five-minute recess.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

The Chair: — Welcome back, everybody. We will reconvene and, Minister, remind your officials to introduce themselves if you have extras use the stand-up . . . And do you have any opening comments?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. So good afternoon. I'd like to introduce the officials I have with me today and highlight the funding we have for the Provincial Capital Commission. I'm joined by my senior officials from the Ministry of Government Relations and the Provincial Capital Commission. This includes Deputy Minister Greg Miller, and the CEO [chief executive officer] of the Provincial Capital Commission, Monique Goffinet Miller. And I also have several other officials that are here, and if they have the opportunity to come up to the microphone and speak, they will introduce themselves at that point in time.

So \$7.2 million has been allocated for the Provincial Capital Commission to provide for the operation, management, and stewardship of provincial assets that include Government House and Wascana Centre, enhancing quality of life and creating pride in the capital city through educational programming, public events, and celebratory opportunities. The commission acts as a regulator for all land use in Wascana Centre. The funding includes an increase of \$83,000 for Finance's mandated salary increases and \$5,000 for IT [information technology] enterprise costs. And at this time I'd be happy to take questions.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister, for your opening remarks. Minister, Wascana Centre is host to about 700 events a year according to the annual report for last year. Could you provide some information as to how many have been cancelled this year due to COVID-19, and what impacts on visitation you can

anticipate?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So thank you very much for the question. So obviously since COVID-19 broke out and all of the restrictions came into place, it's fair to say that all events have been cancelled since then. And we actually haven't started any of them back up again yet. But we're looking towards . . .

And the types of events that would have been cancelled, there were small weddings; conventions are held sometimes in this area; unfortunately the Dragon Boat Festival. Our Canada Day celebrations, which is really unfortunate because it is the biggest event that's held every year at the lake, had to have been cancelled. But the PCC [Provincial Capital Commission] took the initiative to actually move that celebration online. So for those that care to take part, they can go to the website and find the link and take part in Canada Day celebrations that way and celebrate with us.

But come July 15th is when we're going to be starting to look at reopening some of the venues and some of the events that can start taking place. With the new guidelines that have been brought down through 4.2 of the Re-Open Saskatchewan plan, we'll be able to start doing some of those sorts of things and, of course, as we move forward and new initiatives are rolled out and the plan is updated, things will start to get back to a new normal.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Do you have an estimate of the financial impact that these cancellations have had?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I'll check. So once again, thank you very much for the question. So the PCC [Provincial Capital Commission] is projecting a reduction of approximately \$200,000 maximum in revenue. So that's in the form of interest, service contracts, donations, event, and rental revenue due to COVID-19.

Now having said that, we have some savings because obviously some salary has been offset through some term positions until we get things back up and running. We've cancelled events that are being hosted, different things like that. Maintenance and repairs, the cleaning — all of that stuff that goes on on a daily basis doesn't have to happen quite so frequently when the building isn't getting used. So they have estimated that approximately \$400,000 in savings because of not spending on events that are happening and activities that are happening in the park, Government House, whatever the case may be.

[16:15]

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. The PCC annual report shows that a Gregory Lawrence is a payee of the PCC for \$5,502.02. Could you provide details as to the nature of these payments?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I think I can answer that right now. Gregory Lawrence is our military liaison officer. So those events are outside the duties of a normal MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] and/or a ministry. So he attends events that are military in nature on behalf of the Saskatchewan Government and the Provincial Capital Commission. He's our representative that goes to those. So sometimes he may be travelling to different communities. You know, it might be an air cadet event or whatever the case may be. So it's just reimbursing him for travel

costs. And at times he may have to stay overnight depending how far the event is away, the nature of event. So that is 100 per cent for the military liaison position.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. The Truth and Reconciliation Call to Action no. 82 recommends building a residential schools monument in a provincial capital. It seems like potentially a good project for Wascana Centre. Is this something that is being considered by the PCC?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So thank you very much for the question once again. And so as you are aware, we have been working on the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action. And of the 34 that are designated for the province of Saskatchewan, we are actively working on and continue to work on 26 of them. And we continue to try and understand the remaining eight in consultation with our First Nations and Métis groups to see how we will move forward on those remaining eight. And of course, what you're talking about falls in there.

Ms. Sarauer: — So what specifically is being worked on with no. 82, which is the residential schools monument recommendation?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So right now at this current point in time, we're focused on the 26. As we move forward we will start looking at that, but right now there is nothing.

Ms. Sarauer: — So there's no plans to move forward with anything at this time?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Well, we definitely have plans to look at the last eight recommendations that are left. Those are one of them. So as we move forward and as we consult with our First Nations and Métis, this is definitely one of the items that would be discussed.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is there a timeline for when that discussion is occurring?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I do not have a timeline.

Ms. Sarauer: — I have a few questions about the Brandt project. Could you provide an update as to what stage that project is at right now?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay, so thank you very much for the question. So the Provincial Capital Commission board is committed to ensuring any developments in the centre is done in a responsible manner, one where input and feedback from the community is taken into account. On February 7th, after careful consideration and review of the Provincial Auditor's recommendations, the Provincial Capital Commission board decided to allow the continuation of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind project within Wascana Centre. The proponent is currently in the detailed design phase of the development checklist, involving steps 23 to 28 of the 38-step process.

In an answer to the auditor's recommendations, this checklist can be found on the Provincial Capital Commission's website. This continuation is dependent on the following conditions: the proponent shows all land use would be compliant to the five

pillars of the Wascana Centre master plan; and the proponent is also asked to conduct additional public communication and engagement to discuss the benefits of the project and engage regarding the land use of the complete building, rather than just the Canadian National Institute for the Blind portion of the building.

So as the regulator, the Provincial Capital Commission has asked the proponent to meet these expectations, and we look forward to hearing from the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the architectural advisory committee regarding this project. And step 23 to 28 of the detailed design phase, step 23 has one full page, two full pages, three full pages of steps within step 23. So there are probably 30 or 40 steps just within this step. So when they say detailed design, they really do mean that. So that is where they are at still.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Do you have a timeline for when those public meetings that you had mentioned in your response will be occurring?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So once again, thank you for the question. So we understand that the proponent, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, had actually planned on doing this communication and engagement earlier. But due to COVID-19 those were cancelled. And right now this is something that will be initiated once again by the proponent, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. And they are going to be the ones that are going to be setting those dates up. So that's actually something that you would have to ask them for those exact dates. But when they do set up those dates, they will let the board know what they are, and we will be posting those dates on our website.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay, thank you. So based on my understanding of the steps, they will not be moving forward until those meetings are held though. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — That is correct.

[16:30]

Ms. Sarauer: — Now in your remarks a few questions back you noted that it's important, I believe you said important to the PCC that input and feedback from the community is taken into account when moving forward with this project, unless I'm attributing those words from the auditor to you. But you have remarked that you take the auditor's report and their recommendations seriously.

I'm just wondering what the PCC is requiring of those meetings, and whether the project will be . . . what sort of communication will be happening at those meetings, whether or not it's an exercise in having the proponent provide information to the public, or will they be soliciting feedback as to the details of the project, and whether or not the project's design will be changeable after these meetings have occurred.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So once again, thank you very much for the question. So we actually sent a letter to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and advised them of an example of good engagement and communication that would be acceptable, and they have actually posted that letter on their

website, “CNIB in the Park,” so that can actually be found there.

And you talk about, at the sessions. Of course information will be provided by them. People will have an opportunity to tell them what they think of the plan. At the end of the day, once the full plan has gone through the architectural advisory committee, we will see if it’s something that fits under the standards or not, and that’s where it’ll come out.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, ultimately it’s up to the proponent to determine whether or not changes will be made to the project as a result of the feedback that’s received at these meetings.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I think it would be fair to say that. The proponent, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, this is their project. But of course whatever they bring forward, whatever plan it is, has to go through that architectural advisory committee and pass through that process to be accepted in the park.

Ms. Sarauer: — At this current stage, is there a prospective building design before the PCC?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So thank you for the question again. So the current state of the detailed design is before the architectural advisory committee at this current point in time. Once the architectural advisory committee comes up with their recommendations, those recommendations will come back to the Provincial Capital Commission board.

Ms. Sarauer: — In the detailed design, what percentage of square footage is the CNIB [Canadian National Institute for the Blind] intending to house?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So the answer to your question of what percentage is the Canadian National Institute for the Blind intended to house, the Provincial Capital Commission board has not seen the detailed plan. The detailed plan has gone to the architectural advisory committee, and within those steps and processes they will evaluate the plan as a whole. And then when those come back to the Provincial Capital Commission board with the recommendations, they will see exactly what is housed and what is where.

Ms. Sarauer: — So currently there is no design before the PCC right now. It’s with the architectural advisory committee. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — That’s correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Has the Saskatchewan government or any of its ministries had any discussions or plans to relocate already existing offices or house offices in this building?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Can you repeat that for me? Sorry.

Ms. Sarauer: — Yes. That’s fine. Has the Saskatchewan government or any of the ministries had any discussions or have any plans to either relocate existing offices or house new offices in this proposed building?

The Chair: — Can you make sure your questions are tied to the

budget? We allow wide scope on the questions, so make sure it’s tied to the budget, please.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Chair, but I would argue that this is about the budget. This is in relation to ministries, government work, as well as it’s in relation to the Provincial Capital Commission, which this could potentially be a financial implication on the PCC.

[16:45]

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So no.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. In light of COVID and the ongoing pandemic, will there be some sort of feasibility assessment included in the considerations to this project as to whether there is a need for the building as it will be recommended in terms of size and content?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So thank you very much for the question once again. So no, as far as I know. But of course, this is an independent project by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, so that would be something that they would have to decide. I’m not privy to those types of discussions.

Ms. Sarauer: — There’s no point where the PCC steps in on a project and says, hey, this probably isn’t good for the park right now because of what’s going on. Ultimately what you’re saying, Minister, is that as long as the private organization is comfortable with the building and the design and of course follows all the steps . . . But in light of what we’re seeing with the economy and the pandemic right now, yourself and the PCC will be comfortable with allowing it to go ahead.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So once again I would just say that this is an independent project by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and they would have to decide what the impacts of COVID-19 are on their project.

Ms. Sarauer: — Minister, why was there such a long delay for the government to direct CNIB to tender the project that, as you know, will be built on government land?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So the answer to your question is the government did not direct the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. That is an independent process. And so that would have been determined by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind.

Ms. Sarauer: — Minister, has there been any thought of limiting vehicular traffic in Wascana Centre? There’s been some calls for it during this time.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I think it’s fair to say that Wascana Centre and the park is a welcoming area for all individuals. And not everybody walks. Not everybody rides a bike. Not everybody drives a car. So we want to have that area open and accessible to people of all avenues, whether they’re driving a car and/or walking. So we are not limiting traffic in Wascana Park.

Ms. Sarauer: — As you know, at this point in time outdoor activity and that sort of safe leisure has been quite widely regarded and recommended in most jurisdictions, as it has here as well, as long as it’s done in a safe way. Other jurisdictions

have closed down streets to allow for that in a more robust way. Why has the PCC not considered it in this particular instance?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Okay. So obviously safety is paramount in our park, and we monitor stuff that goes on in the park and any accidents that may happen. And to date we haven't been made aware of any accidents, so there's been no reactionary thing that has happened there. But you know, having said that, back to my previous answer, Wascana Park is a park that is truly designed for the use of all people. And not all people are able to walk or able to ride a bike. They have accessibility issues. So really, truly, driving is one of the true pleasures that they have or being in a vehicle. And missing out on Wascana Park because areas are blocked off to road traffic would be really unfortunate for them.

So one of the things, I guess, as we went through COVID-19 and the restrictions that were in place and distancing and all of that kind of stuff, I think you might have noticed we took the initiative to actually make the walkway that goes around Wascana Park a one-way avenue. Because when we were going two directions and we were walking, you truly didn't have that social distancing that you needed.

And I'm not sure if you walk around the park, but it has made an amazing difference when you're going one direction. Even though it's busy, you are not running into people. You're not worried about, you know, someone coming up at you. So I think that's one of the changes that we made, and it has gone really well over COVID-19 for safety reasons.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister. Although I have many more questions for you, I understand that our time, as agreed upon previously, is almost up and we need to make some time for voting the estimates.

To answer your question, I have walked around the park nearly daily, especially when I have a crying baby that I need to quiet down. And I do want to take this time to thank the officials, your officials, your staff for doing such a fantastic job, not just in answering these questions today, but more importantly, during a really, really difficult time.

And in particular, the one-way change is, I think, a great example of adapting to a difficult situation in a way that did help a lot of people. So thank you to the officials for being here today and for all the work that you do every day. And thank you, Minister, for answering my questions.

The Chair: — Seeing that we have reached our agreed-upon time for the consideration of these estimates, we will now vote off the estimates.

Vote 30, Government Relations, central management and services, subvote (GR01) in the amount of 7,959,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (GR06) in the amount of 2,014,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal relations, subvote (GR07) in the amount of 628,327,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Public safety, subvote (GR11) in the amount of 88,935,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. First Nations, Métis and Northern Affairs, subvote (GR12) in the amount of 49,173,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial Capital Commission, subvote (GR14) in the amount of 7,206,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 130,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Government Relations, vote 30, 783,614,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2021, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 783,614,000.

Mr. Francis has so moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[17:00]

General Revenue Fund Supplementary Estimates Government Relations Vote 30

Subvotes (GR07) and (GR11)

The Chair: — Vote 30, Government Relations, municipal relations, subvote (GR07) in the amount of 10,000,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Public safety, subvote (GR11) in the amount of 8,900,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Government Relations, vote 30, 18,900,000. 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, 2020 the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 18,900,000.

Ms. Ross. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I just would just like to briefly thank my officials for being here today once again. Their support is greatly appreciated. They are the ones that are actually down in the trenches doing all of the heavy lifting. So I thank them for being here and helping me out today. I would like to thank the committee members for being here on both sides of the House. And of course, once again, the staff in the building, Hansard, and the Clerks for facilitating these meetings for us and allowing them to happen. So thank you very much.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer, do you have any closing remarks?

Ms. Sarauer: — I already gave mine earlier, but I echo what I had already said a few minutes ago. Thank you for all of the answers. And committee members, I'll see them again soon, so I'll save my thanks for them for later. I'll leave it to be determined whether or not I'll be thanking them in a few hours.

The Chair: — Thank you everybody for being here. We're going to take a 15-minute recess and be back at 5:15 for our next set. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

The Chair: — Welcome back, committee members. This afternoon we have three bills and the resolutions to consider tonight. The three bills under consideration this evening are consideration of Bill No. 203, *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*; consideration of Bill No. 204, *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*; and consideration of Bill No. 212, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*.

[17:15]

Bill No. 203 — *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 203, *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*. We will begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Minister Morgan, would you like to make some opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined tonight by some officials: Jane Chapco, senior Crown counsel, legislative services branch; Janette Seibel, director, insurance and real estate division, Financial and Consumer Affairs

Authority; as well as Darcy McGovern, who lives here; and staff from my office.

I'm pleased to be able to offer opening remarks concerning Bill No. 203, *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*. This legislation will protect consumers and investors by ensuring that persons acting as financial planners and financial advisors have the credentials and education required to provide those services. Regulating these titles will recognize the significant knowledge and skills of financial planners and financial advisors and will ensure that these titles are only used by qualified individuals.

Mr. Chair, this legislation is modelled on Ontario's *Financial Professionals Title Protection Act, 2019*. The Act will regulate two titles — financial planner and financial advisor — as well as related similar titles. The Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority will approve credentialing bodies and will approve the credentials offered by those credentialing bodies. The legislation also provides the authority with a full suite of enforcement powers similar to the powers in other Acts administered by the authority.

Mr. Chair, this bill is the first step in setting the process of setting out how these titles will be regulated in Saskatchewan. As with the Ontario Act, many of the details of the legislation will be set out in the regulations, including the specific requirements for improving credentialing bodies and approved credentials. The regulations will be made consistent with Ontario's regulations as much as is possible to support national consistency. Officials at the Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority have been in contact with their Ontario counterparts on the regulation development process in Ontario and will continue to work closely with those Ontario officials when developing the Saskatchewan regulations.

The authority will also consult with industry stakeholders when developing the regulations. A number of stakeholders have already expressed interest in being involved on the regulation development process. Draft regulations will be circulated to all stakeholders for comment, likely later this year.

Mr. Chair, this new legislation will provide important protection to consumers and investors, and promote consumer confidence in financial planners and advisors in this province.

Mr. Chair, with those opening remarks, I welcome your questions respecting Bill 203, *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister, for your opening comments. And I appreciate the detail you've given us in terms of this stage you're at in the regulation, consultation, and drafting process. You anticipated a number of my questions. With respect to the bill itself, could you provide some information as to what consultation occurred during the creation of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The officials will give a bit more detail on that. The process was we were in contact with . . . by a number of the life insurance companies who provide financial counselling services. So it wasn't a matter of us going to them

and saying, what's your opinion. They were actually seeking support from governments across the nation and this fit with what we're going with other things. So we chose to go ahead with it. But I'll let one of the officials . . .

Ms. Chapco: — So as the minister mentioned, FCAA [Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority of Saskatchewan] consulted with over 50 industry stakeholders in the fall of 2019, and that was by a letter that was sent to representatives from the securities, insurance, banking, and credit union industries. The consultation letter asked for industries' views on the legislation regulating financial planners and financial advisors generally, including the use of the titles, and specifically asked whether Saskatchewan should follow the same approach as taken in Ontario.

The consultation responses generally indicated support for the regulation of these titles and certainly favoured following a similar approach to Ontario. A lot of the questions and concerns were about, you know, what are the details going to be, what's this going to look like. And those will be answered, as the minister said, in a more fulsome consultation process when we get to the regulations.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you.

The Chair: — I just want to make sure the officials know to state your name for *Hansard*.

Ms. Chapco: — I apologize. I'm Jane Chapco.

The Chair: — No, that's fine. Just a reminder.

Ms. Sarauer: — Ms. Chapco is also here so often, I thought everyone just knew who she was, but fair enough. Do you know how many consultation responses you received to that letter?

Ms. Chapco: — I have a detailed list of the responses. I would say, roughly a dozen. I do have a summary chart, but we did receive some that were just, you know, very short, some long letters, and some didn't provide a response. But of the 50, I would say at least two-thirds is a fair estimate.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I appreciate that. You mentioned that the legislation is mirrored closely with Ontario's and you're working closely with the Ontario officials. Could you provide some information as to what the experience has been in Ontario with their legislation thus far?

Ms. Chapco: — Sure.

Ms. Seibel: — Janette Seibel from the Financial and Consumer Affairs Authority. We've been working quite closely with Ontario. They've had quite a bit of meetings and different types of consultation, in person and through written submissions with the industry. So far our understanding is the interaction's been quite positive. The industry is interested in the regulation. It's working on the details.

Ms. Sarauer: — Have they had to undergo any enforcement mechanisms or punitive measures toward anyone yet at this time?

Ms. Seibel: — Their Act is not yet in force. So they are also still working on their regulations.

Ms. Sarauer: — Does the ministry have any idea how many individuals might be using these titles in Saskatchewan right now?

Ms. Seibel: — We don't have an exact number. It's hard to say because there is no one body that captures all of the individuals that might use these titles. We do know that one of the major . . . financial planners Canada, FP Canada, their membership is around 726, something like that.

Ms. Sarauer: — In Saskatchewan?

A Member: — In Saskatchewan.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. Thank you. Does the ministry have any idea how many credentialing bodies may exist in Saskatchewan, will want to exist, I suppose, in Saskatchewan once the legislation is complete?

Ms. Seibel: — We're not sure of the exact amount, but we can think of at least five that would likely be interested.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is the ministry anticipating any changes in the future other than, of course, the creation of the regulations to strengthen these mechanisms?

Ms. Seibel: — I'm not sure . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm wondering if this is a phased-in approach in terms of enforceability and accountability, if the ministry's contemplating whether or not there'll be more harsher penalties in the future for those who are not complying with the legislation.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think we would regard this as the first step in becoming a self-regulating profession. So I think we would look to the profession. Right now it's regulating the use of the names. But I think, as they emerge with the accrediting bodies there would likely be further discussion as to how the accreditation takes place, but also how accreditation might be removed or what disciplinary processes or what else would take place. And I think that's something that would be contemplated at a later time after the bill's been operational for a while.

When they were doing it in Ontario they were sort of not very much further down the road than we are, but certainly moving pretty much in the same direction. As we went through the process there was the government change in Ontario so I thought, well maybe there would be a change in direction or something. So I talked to my counterparts in Ontario shortly after the government change, and it was something that they were strongly supportive of, and if not as supportive as the previous government, even more so. So I think we've continued on. I know we're getting some calls from some other provinces, but I can't say where anybody else might be.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Can you provide some information as to how this bill will provide safety to the public?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I can say this at this point in time, that the use of the names would be regulated, so if a person sees that somebody is holding themselves out as a financial planner, that they would have gone through an accreditation process of some type. So we would want to work with, make sure that the

accrediting bodies were competent, professional, and able to ensure that there was some amount of due diligence.

As I mentioned before, this is the early stages of a process to get greater detail and a greater mechanism in place. So right now this protects the use of the names from somebody that would have no skills or minimal skills or bad history. So that's where it's at, and I don't want to hold it out as being something more than what it's not right now.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. No further questions.

The Chair: — Seeing there's no further questions, clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 54 inclusive agreed to.]

[17:30]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 203, *The Financial Planners and Financial Advisors Act*, without amendment. Mr. Francis so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Bill No. 204 — *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*
Loi modificative de 2019 sur le jury

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now begin considering Bill No. 204, *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*, a bilingual bill. We will begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Minister Morgan, do you have opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined once again by Jane Chapco, senior Crown counsel, legislative services; as well as Glennis Bihun, executive director, court services. I can tell you that in Glennis's life some very good things have happened to her. She worked for me at the Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety and left, and I think was quite saddened. And then when she heard that I'd come over to Justice where she landed, her life could not have gotten any better.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to be able to offer opening remarks concerning Bill 204, *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*. This legislation amends *The Jury Act, 1998* to improve and modernize the jury selection process and to encourage increased juror participation. The amendments are the result of a multi-year review of the jury management system.

Mr. Chair, these amendments will make the jury selection process more efficient and help make juries as representative as possible. The amendments will authorize the Inspector of Court Offices to determine the specific geographical area from which to summon jurors for a particular trial. Targeting specific geographic areas will allow us to better take travel time for jurors into account.

The amendments will also revise the grounds for exclusion from jury service. Chiefs and council members of Indian bands will now be excluded from jury service, similar to the current exclusion for municipal council members. The amendments will also remove the current exclusion for spouses of reeves, councillors, mayors, coroners, and school board members, which will allow for increased juror eligibility and participation.

Mr. Chair, these amendments will also provide increased protection of the personal information of jurors and prospective jurors. The information will no longer be part of the public record, but will now only be available to parties to a proceeding and under any terms and conditions imposed by the courts.

The amendments will also introduce the new option to conduct the jury empanelling process electronically. Building this option into the Act now provides the flexibility to adopt an electronic system in the future.

Finally, the bill contains several other amendments proposed for housekeeping and improved administrative efficiency. A number of amendments are also being made to the French version, only in order to improve the translation.

I would also note that we will be introducing two House amendments today. The first House amendment will set out how and when an alternate juror can be selected and sworn in for civil proceedings. The second House amendment will confirm that four peremptory challenges are available for civil trials. While the federal government removed the option of peremptory challenges in criminal trials in 2019, those challenges continue to be available in civil trials and this House amendment will simply confirm the existing law.

Mr. Chair, serving as a juror is an important civic duty. These amendments will ensure that Saskatchewan's jury management system uses modern processes that will support jurors in this role.

Mr. Chair, with those opening remarks, I welcome your questions respecting Bill 204, *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. And thank you, Minister, for your opening remarks. Minister, added to section 6, those who are excluded from serving as jurors, is now subsection (1):

persons who have been convicted of an offence for which they were sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 2 years or more and for which no pardon or record suspension is in effect;

Why has this group been added?

Ms. Chapco: — It was added for consistency with the federal legislation of the Criminal Code.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. What changes are being made to the geographical area for jury selection?

Ms. Bihun: — Good evening. We are intending to consult on the appropriate changes or methods or criteria that would be prescribed in the regulations. We appreciate that while current state, and in fact for many years, has been to utilize the judicial centres, we want to consult with not only the legal profession but also the elders to receive their thoughts on if there is criteria that would help us do things like minimize travel and encourage participation for jury trials in certain centres. So there would be more to come on that as we have a chance to do those consultations.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Do you have a timeline for those consultations as well as a plan that you can share with us? And if you also want to correct the minister on the record about his opening remarks about you, you're welcome to as well.

Ms. Bihun: — Well maybe I'll encourage him to get some new material.

As to whether we have timelines, to be perfectly honest, with all of the events of the last number of months, undertaking the consultations in regards to prescribing criteria in the regulations was something we had intended to do this spring, and we have not accomplished that yet. So we're now turning our mind to what some timelines might look like.

It is our hope to undertake those consultations late summer so that we can return with regulations at some point during the fall.

Ms. Sarauer: — Fall of this year or fall of next year?

Ms. Bihun: — Fall of this year.

Ms. Sarauer: — And just clarify, who will you all be consulting in that work?

Ms. Bihun: — So we will certainly reach out to our elders. That's a forum that we've sought the wise counsel of for many years. In addition to that, we will include the Trial Lawyers Association, the CBA [Canadian Bar Association], the Law Society, Legal Aid, Crowns, etc.

Jane, did I miss any?

Ms. Chapco: — Got it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Could you provide some information as to how this will help strengthen Saskatchewan's jury selection process?

Ms. Bihun: — So as we've been having our conversations with various stakeholders, we know that we really need to take a systematic approach and a broad approach to do a number of components. And we've done the work to increase the per diems that are available, try to remove some of those financial barriers.

What we've really heard is that we need to find additional ways to further reduce those barriers, do some educational activities to create that support and that understanding of the important duty that it is, to further encourage people to attend jury selection.

Ms. Sarauer: — How do you anticipate that this will help those who are less represented be able to participate in jury selection?

Ms. Bihun: — So if we think about some of the distances that some folks may need to travel and the time associated with being away from home to accomplish that travel, that's a key change that reconsideration of the jury boundaries can accomplish. That's the first example that comes to mind for me.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is the ministry considering any sort of payment for prospective jurors for travel, for example?

Ms. Bihun: — So prospective jurors are already covered for travel. In fact Saskatchewan has been and continues to be one of the few jurisdictions who supports prospective jurors for their travel.

Ms. Sarauer: — My apologies. Thank you for that. Could you provide some information about the electronic jury empanelling process?

Ms. Bihun: — That was really included in this legislation simply to create the ability in the event that the Criminal Code changed. There has been some discussions at that level that that was something to be contemplated, and because our Act was being opened we wanted to create the ability. At this point in time we've done very little planning in that regard. We would estimate that it would require a system that would cost about \$1 million along with, you know, a couple hundred thousand dollars each year for sustaining that system and licensing.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Minister, there's been no changes in this bill to section 28, which is the challenges for cause section. Why has the minister determined that no changes are needed at this time?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — For purposes of challenges for cause?

Ms. Sarauer: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I was anticipating you asking about peremptory challenges. But challenges for cause, I'm going to let the officials answer that.

Ms. Chapco: — That was not one of the issues that came up during the review. And we are aware, of course, that at the federal level there have been changes to the challenges for cause. We are monitoring the changes at the federal level to both the peremptory challenges and the challenges for cause.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Who was consulted during the creation of this bill? I understand and I appreciate the detail about the regulatory consultations. But for the bill itself, who was consulted?

Ms. Chapco: — I can go over the consultations. We conducted full consultations on the entire proposal and embargoed bill with the Canadian Bar Association, the Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission, and the Saskatchewan Trial Lawyers Association. And of those who responded, the comments were largely supportive of the changes.

There was one change in our initial proposal about which the

STLA [Saskatchewan Trial Lawyers Association] provided some comments, and that was about potentially removing the peremptory challenge provision. Based on their comments and further review internally — and again, looking at what was happening federally — it was determined that it might be better to wait to make any change in that area.

Outside of those larger consultations, we did a targeted consultation with SARM and SUMA, specifically on the changes to the exclusions from jury service. SARM didn't have any concerns and SUMA did not respond.

And finally, as Ms. Bihun has mentioned, we had in-person consultations with the elders last fall.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Now included in the amendments today — and I know the minister wants me to ask this question — is a change to the section about peremptory challenges, just clarifying that this section is for civil proceedings. Can you provide some context about this, please?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The changes there is actually sort of a reinforcement, restatement of what the existing law is, and will serve to prevent confusion on the area around civil trials. And we think it's probably not something that should be contentious.

We know that the issue of peremptory challenges in criminal trials may be contentious over time. The federal government made the changes to the Criminal Code eliminating peremptory challenges. And we understand that that was (a) not well received by the defence bar that felt it was a fairly effective tool in defence matters. It was introduced by Minister Wilson-Raybould as an idea to do exactly the opposite, so it's still under some discussion as to the effectiveness of it.

But there's also a court challenge that's going through the courts right now. So I think I wouldn't want to make a lot of comments as to what I think the outcome of the court case might be, but we'll certainly want to follow suit. My guess is that we'll end up with a determination from the Supreme Court as to what the outcome can or should be on it. And at that point in time, I think we would want to engage with both the Crown prosecutors and with the criminal defence bar as to what would be a preferred method or not.

[17:45]

I don't have a lot of experience with criminal jury trials but always felt that it was an effective defence tool. Sort of as you go through the preparation for it, that's your final best shot. If somebody appears by their body language or whatever as you're going through the empanelling, it is your last, best out to remove somebody that you think may be problematic to your defence on it. So I've always been supportive of those kind of reasons for keeping it, and a lot of times it was done by a gut sense by either the counsel or by the client. So to me it was something that made sense to have, but obviously we'll wait for a judicial determination and then go forward from there.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you and I appreciate that. I just want to make it clear for the record — you have already, but clear again for the record for folks who might be looking at this amendment — that it is just clarifying what already exists. It's not removing

a peremptory challenge option that exists for criminal trials. This section was always related to civil trials, and that this wording is just making that more clear.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Could you provide some information as to why there has been a determination to add the alternate juror option?

Ms. Chapco: — I can speak to that. After this bill was introduced in December of last year, I believe, the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal issued the Racette decision, which was related to something else. But at paragraph 153, literally the second-last paragraph of the decision, Mr. Justice Tholl noted that the trial judge had chosen seven jurors and then discharged one before the juror deliberations commenced. And he acknowledged that "... this was a pragmatic decision [here I'm quoting from the decision] given the projected length of the trial," but noted that there's no authority in the Act to actually swear in a seventh and alternate juror that way.

So this is really just kind of catching up to that decision and allowing for really a pragmatic approach, when there is anticipated to be a long decision, to have an alternate juror. On the criminal side one or two alternates can be sworn in, so it just makes sense to allow it on the civil side as well.

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

The Chair: — Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 14 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 6

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Francis.

Mr. Francis: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to put forward a new clause 6 to the printed bill:

Add the following Clause after Clause 5 of the printed Bill:

New section 17

6 Section 17 is repealed and the following substituted:

"Alternate juror

17(1) If the judge presiding at the trial considers it advisable in the interests of justice to have an alternate juror, the judge shall so order before the registrar begins to empanel the jury pursuant to Part IV.

(2) If the judge presiding at the trial considers it advisable in the interests of justice, before the registrar begins to empanel the jury pursuant to Part

IV the judge may order that 7 jurors instead 6 be sworn in in accordance with that Part.

(3) An alternate juror shall:

(a) attend at the commencement of the presentation of the evidence on the merits; and

(b) replace any absent juror if there is not a full jury present.

(4) An alternate juror who is not required as a substitute juror shall be excused.

(5) If one juror dies or, in the opinion of the judge presiding at the trial, becomes unable to continue to serve as a juror for any reason, the judge may direct that:

(a) the trial shall proceed without that juror; or

(b) the alternate juror, if any, shall replace that juror.

(6) If a trial proceeds in accordance with clause (5)(a) without an alternate juror, a verdict may be given by the remaining jurors if they are unanimous”.

The Chair: — Do the committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is new clause 6 agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 6 agreed to.]

Clause 9

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Francis.

Mr. Francis: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to put forward an amendment for new clause 9 of the printed bill:

Add the following Clause after Clause 8 of the printed Bill:

New section 27

9 Section 27 is repealed and the following substituted:

“Peremptory challenges

27 Every party to a civil proceeding has a right to exercise four peremptory challenges”.

The Chair: — Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is new clause 9 agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 9 agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*, a bilingual bill.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 204, *The Jury Amendment Act, 2019*, a bilingual bill, with amendment.

Mr. Kirsch: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Kirsch so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Bill No. 212 — *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 212, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*. We will begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Minister Morgan, please make your opening remarks.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined tonight by Neil Karkut, senior Crown counsel, legislative services branch, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General; Jan Turner, assistant deputy minister, Ministry of Justice and Attorney General; as well as Dale Larsen, deputy minister of Corrections and Policing.

I'd like to offer some brief opening remarks regarding Bill No. 212, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*. This bill will implement numerous enhancements to the oversight of policing in our province.

The first set of changes will update the investigation observer process by transferring administration of investigation observers to the Public Complaints Commission, or the PCC; secondly, by expanding the instances where investigation observers are appointed to include sexual assaults and off-duty incidents involving police officers; expanding the persons who can be appointed as investigation observers beyond current and retired police officers; requiring the appointment of two investigation observers, one of whom must be First Nations or Métis ancestry where the victim is of First Nations or Métis ancestry; and finally, requiring the Chair of the PCC to publish a public summary of investigation observer reports.

Mr. Chair, the second set of changes will implement a new complaint and review process through the PCC for members and staff of police services who experience workplace harassment. The government recognizes that harassment within police

services is a matter of ongoing concern across the country and believes it is important to be proactive in providing a neutral, third party review process to address this issue.

The third set of changes will implement a new review process through the PCC respecting public complaints for prescribed classes of special constables, including conservation officers and highway traffic officers. Additionally the proposed changes will add regulation-making authorities respecting special constables. This is an administrative change that will allow for future uniform regulations to clarify rules for special constables.

It is important to stress that these changes represent government's first steps in moving towards a Saskatchewan-designed, civilian-led serious incident oversight model. It is essential for residents and citizens to have trust in their government institutions and know that government is listening to them. In 2019 seeing and hearing that Saskatchewan residents had concerns over PCC from lack of trust in police oversight of serious incidents, I made it a priority to make changes to build capacity, increase oversight, and transparency.

This legislation requires — but more importantly, reconciliation demands — that our First Nations and Métis partners be part of major discussions of the future of police oversight in this province. I personally started those discussions in earnest, but they will continue over the course of 2020 while the changes I've described build the needed capacity and hopefully, trust.

The Premier has already acknowledged that systemic racism exists, and that it is incumbent on all of us to confront it. I fully recognize that my and most people in this room will have experiences with the police that may differ from those of minority and marginalized groups in this country and province. Robust oversight is necessary to ensure the few officers that are preoccupied by their ignorance don't taint the good work of the many police that are excellent, committed community members.

Mr. Chair, with those opening remarks, I would welcome any further questions regarding Bill 212, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister, for those opening remarks. I do appreciate them. The bill makes three categories of changes, so we'll approach them one at a time. The first one that I want to discuss is the expansion of the role of the PCC to allow a member or former member or staff to make a complaint about workplace harassment. Could you provide some detail as to why this change has occurred?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — This was a suggestion brought forward by Minister Tell. She'd spent a good portion of her working life as a police officer. And the concern that she raised was that a police officer that had a concern was left to internal mechanisms with that particular police force to try and address those concerns. That there was no entity that was outside, or that was removed from the individuals that were there, that would have the ability to want to make a strong recommendation totally independently of that police force.

So when she raised the issue, we had some discussion with a

variety of police forces, and there was quite strong support for having moved in that direction. And I thought this was something that should have been dealt with probably years ago, and I think this is a good place to lodge that process.

Within the PCC there may or may not be the expertise, so they may choose to involve the services of the Public Service Commission or a third party entity to try and work through whatever they might have to on a specific complaint. But we would leave that to them and the regulations to try and develop the processes for how that might work. Or they may decide they have the capacity to deal with it internally.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why was it determined that the Public Complaints Commission was an appropriate place to house this?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The suggestion was made by Minister Tell, and I agree with it, that the entity was independent. It was removed and it was designed specifically to deal with allegations regarding police officers, so it seemed to be a logical place to do it rather than try and house it somewhere else. And I thought, given the independence and the fact that it was an external agency and tasked specifically with investigations, I thought it was a good place to have it.

[18:00]

Ms. Sarauer: — The PCC is the Public Complaints Commission. It's, as you know, tasked with receiving complaints from the broader public about members of policing and others who conduct policing activities. I suppose my question again is, why is the minister wanting to expand the role of the PCC beyond what has been its original intent as a forum for members of the public outside of policing to achieve resolutions of issues?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think to say that a police officer can't have public interest, I think it's part of the broader public interest to try and have the PCC assume the additional roles. I don't think it's necessarily fair or right that we would say oh, because you're a police officer you can't access a different mechanism or a separate mechanism. So I think it's a reasonable place to have it.

I've had discussion with different police officers, and by and large they're supportive of having it there and I have heard minimal complaints. It was raised to me by Senator Cotter. He said it wasn't sure that it was necessarily a good fit. But we are at this point in time expanding it, PCC, to deal with the oversight issues, including other officers in it. So I thought, yes we're expanding it anyway. This is, I think, a good fit and I don't have another option for it. And I think the people that are on the PCC would have good expertise or would be able to recognize that they need to do it. So anyway, that's the logic.

Ms. Sarauer: — How does this process compare with processes available to other professions?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Are you referring to like a self-governing profession?

Ms. Sarauer: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think in the case of a self-governing profession, there would be a professional body that could deal

with it where, you know, the logical first place in most instances would be an individual would go to the employer with a complaint. If the complaint isn't dealt with satisfactorily, they would be able to go to whoever the professional entity is and say, would you conduct a review? Would you deal with it otherwise?

Ms. Sarauer: — So let's use lawyers as a self-regulating profession that we both know well. What would be the similar process for them to be able to follow if they were experiencing workplace harassment from other lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think they would have the option to say they would treat this as a conduct unbecoming complaint and deal with it through the internal discipline process within the law society.

Mr. McGovern: — In terms of the self-governing profession, which of course as the member knows, the police are not . . . sorry, Darcy McGovern. One of the issues with this is that it does bridge some . . . You have a professional responsibility, as the minister said, as we all do, in conducting ourselves. Whether we're a lawyer, we're also employees in some circumstances of the particular organization; we might be in-house counsel or we might be a government employee. And so it's a little bit like this circumstance for the police. You may have more than one master.

Now the police have always been an interesting hybrid because it's an organization that has very much a command structure, but it's also an employer. And so unlike myself or yourself, they have a public complaint process as well as a discipline process that's set out in statute through which there is independent hearings to move forward, in addition to a grievance process that they already have a compliance with.

And so I think the difference here and what was identified, as the minister had indicated, was that police, which have historically skewed heavily to one gender, that Minister Tell had identified a concern with respect to harassment in this context. That made it appropriate that not only would you be able to internally of course identify this with your manager within that process, but if you felt that it was important to do so, this would provide a mechanism by which you could go to a third party entity and make a complaint in that regard and indicate that outside of that command structure, I would prefer that.

Whereas in my office, for example, if Neil and I are working together and there's a complaint with respect to one of the people in my shop, we also have that process within our employment structure to deal with it where it might be a matter of dealing with it within that employment structure. But we're also within a profession.

But policing, because it isn't a self-governing profession, this is a mechanism by which you can assist an individual who's within a police service to identify a harassment concern and ensure that it's dealt with outside of that command structure.

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm trying to figure out if there's a comparator outside of policing, outside of this instance where there is the ability to access a third party for harassment issues that are occurring inside — well the office, so to speak — regulated professions or unregulated professions.

Mr. McGovern: — Well the example I think that we'd all be most familiar with of course is the Human Rights Commission, in which you may have an employee of an individual who makes a complaint through that structure. That's a very different process though. And of course, you know, it can occur in different circumstances. But what this would do is to provide something within that policing framework where a report can come back and it can be dealt with directly by the individuals within that structure, as opposed to a completely divorced process in that regard.

Ms. Sarauer: — And just to clarify, the Human Rights Commission is a process that police can access for them if they are experiencing any workplace harassment, correct?

Mr. McGovern: — Police are certainly not prevented from making a complaint with respect to the Human Rights Commission.

Ms. Sarauer: — Has the ministry considered including other professions where it's a majority one gender — as you had mentioned, Minister, firefighting is one example of that — into this process?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It may be an option to look at at some point in the future. Right now these were . . . This bill is part of *The Police Act*, so it made sense to do it here, and we weren't looking at a broader role for them at this point in time. But you know, if it works well, it may be something that would be set aside as a stand-alone or something. And I don't have an answer for that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now the Chair of the PCC has expressed some concern about the expertise which you had mentioned of the PCC to be able to do this work because it does take a level of expertise to be able to investigate and make findings in this sort of area, and that they would likely be contracting this out to a third party. And I understand that cost of that, pursuant to the legislation, will be borne by the ministry. Could you provide an estimate as to what the ministry's anticipating the cost of that will be?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The budget has increased in this budget from about 650,000 to just slightly in excess of a million dollars, so there's been a 50 per cent increase. And I don't think we're able to say at this point in time how much we think the additional investigations are. There's two areas where there's an increase in cost. There was the complaints that were received in the ordinary course by the existing PCC. There was concern that there was not sufficient resources to deal with those complaints, either adequately or in a robust enough manner, and a number of the complaints were sent back to the police forces that they originated from. So we would want to have greater strength and some greater expertise in that area with regard to the staff that would work in there. And that's a process that's under way right now.

And then the work that's done on the investigator side, on the IO [investigation observer] side, there would be an investigator, an IO, appointed by the PCC, and the expectation is that they would work with other police forces to identify what resources they need. And right now under the current model, those resources are provided at no charge by other police forces. They're sort of a reciprocating thing.

So we would expect, in the short run at least, that those services would continue to be offered by other police services. It wouldn't make a lot of difference to them whether the services are requested by an investigation observer appointed by the PCC or at the request of another police chief.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now, Minister, the second major change in this legislation is expanding who can be the subject of a complaint. Can you provide some information as to who would now be covered under this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes. We've added a number of specific entities because we now have a higher expectation and different roles for highway traffic officers, conservation officers. So I'm going to let one of the officials speak to it specifically.

Mr. Larsen: — Dale Larsen, deputy minister, Corrections and Policing. I'm sorry, Ms. Sarauer, what was that question?

Ms. Sarauer: — I was asking who will now be covered under this legislation. It's been expanded now to not just include police officers and former police officers, but it has included, as the minister mentioned, conservation officers and commercial vehicle inspectors.

Mr. Larsen: — Highway patrol.

Ms. Sarauer: — Highway patrol officers. Not commercial vehicle inspectors?

Mr. Larsen: — I believe that name transitioned to highway patrol officers.

Ms. Sarauer: — Oh, they're just changing names.

Mr. Larsen: — That's right.

Ms. Sarauer: — Oh, I see. Okay.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The rationale was that if you were sworn in as a peace officer and carrying a side arm you're, for all practical purposes, a police officer. And the process for oversight or discipline should apply to you the same way it does to a serving member of RPS [Regina Police Service] or similar.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now as we all know that the expansion of their mandate occurred as a result of the creation of the provincial response team. Could you provide when that occurred?

Mr. Larsen: — That initiative was brought forward in September or August of 2017 and became active by the time some training was completed in April and May of 2018.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why did it take so long to include them into this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The expectation had been on an informal basis by the ministry that even though the legislation didn't specifically do it, that had there been a complaint they would deal with it. I don't think complaints ensued from that period of time, but . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — That's probably a public awareness issue,

though.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That could well be. I don't know what incidents arose. But my expectation was — and I think I'd said publicly on it — our expectation is that they will be covered. And so the legislation is at this point catching up to what's taken place, but your point's valid.

Ms. Sarauer: — Just to be clear though, there were not any complaints investigated by the PCC with respect to these individuals prior to this legislation?

Ms. Turner: — Hello. Jan Turner, courts and tribunals. Not to my knowledge for these particular individuals, no. Not during this time since they've been in force.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is the process for making a complaint against any of these individuals any different than it is for a complaint against a member or a former member?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — There may be. As you're aware, the PCC, the Chair has expired, and so there may be a need to make some regulatory change.

Ms. Sarauer: — His term has expired, not him.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes, he has not expired. I think he's healthy and well. But yes, his term has expired, so as new people come in there may be a desire or need to make a change.

Ms. Sarauer: — But the processes outlined in the legislation . . .

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Would be the same.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. So if an individual wants to . . . As of right now, if an individual is making a complaint against a conservation officer for example, the process for making the complaint and the way that complaint moves through the Public Complaints Commission system is exactly the same as a complaint against a police officer. Is that correct?

Ms. Turner: — So I'll start the answer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you.

[18:15]

Ms. Turner: — So right now the vast majority of the complaints that come forward come through the website that the Public Complaints Commission have, and on the website there is some detailed information about what the complainant can expect, what the Act says, what the process will be.

Once this legislation is passed, then of course one of the first activities is to update that website so that the public and everyone has accurate and good information about now what can come forward and who could bring complaints. So I expect their intake on that is going to be very similar.

However there are other aspects more consistent with the legislation and I'll let my colleague Neil Karkut respond to that.

Mr. Karkut: — Neil Karkut, Ministry of Justice. Just to speak a

little bit about the process and how it proceeds. A lot of the legislation for the special constables is based directly on what already exists in part IV of the Act.

Where you see the main difference is following the investigation process. Under the public complaint process right now, there is a whole process set up whereby it's intended typically that the chief would prosecute the matter. There's a hearing process set up for that. There is an appeal process, if necessary.

The special constable process for how you deal with the findings is a little bit different, in that right now what happens is if there's a complaint about a special constable, that goes to the minister and the minister's internally responsible to deal ultimately with the discipline. Through this process, we're creating a more transparent review and investigation process.

Following that process, the minister would still be provided with findings and recommendations from the review process, but it would be the minister and the special constable's permanent head that are ultimately responsible for carrying out the appropriate disciplinary actions, for example. And part of that difference is that with special constables, you're dealing with a variety of different employers. They're not in that police structure. They're working, in this case, with the ministries.

So this achieves a balance between having that transparency with the review and investigation process while allowing the discipline process to proceed through their respective employers.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, the minister then determines what discipline will occur after the investigation is complete?

Mr. Karkut: — Yes, correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — How is this an independent civilian-led process for special constables?

Mr. Karkut: — As I noted, it would be from the review and investigation process, that you're having an independent third party conducting the investigation, making findings, providing that report. And so that's really where the independence and neutrality comes from, is in that process.

Ms. Sarauer: — What involvement does the complainant have after the investigation has concluded?

Mr. Karkut: — They're provided a copy of the report and they're, I guess, maintained . . . They're forwarded a copy of the report, so they are provided all the information, including the recommendations of the Public Complaints Commission following their investigation of the matter.

Ms. Sarauer: — Does the ministry see a copy of the report prior to the complainant?

Mr. Karkut: — They're provided the complaint, or they're provided the . . . Sorry, did you say the complaint or the recommendations?

Ms. Sarauer: — I said the report, which I meant the recommendations. Whatever the completion document is.

Mr. Karkut: — The completion document. So that's in subsection (17) and it's:

The PCC shall forward the report . . . [to]

the minister;

the complainant;

the special constable who is the subject of the complaint;

and the special constable's permanent head.

And that would occur at the same time.

Ms. Sarauer: — So the ministry doesn't see and approve the report prior to it going out to the complainant. Does the complainant have the ability for an appeal or any sort of mechanism after the investigation has occurred?

Ms. Turner: — In the current process there is not an appeal process to that as you can see in the legislation. But on occasion a complainant will dispute something that is in the investigation report that's been shared with them, and they will approach the Chair of the commission and ask if there is further evidence. And the Chair can rule whether there is next steps available or not.

Ms. Sarauer: — Is there any requirement on the ministry to provide an update to the complainant subsequent to receipt of the report as to what occurred within the ministry about this individual?

Mr. Karkut: — When the complaint is first filed, the PCC is responsible — and this is in subsection (5) — to log the complaint and then inform the complainant of the procedures that are to be followed and all of the rights of the complainant under this section, so that they do receive information following their initial complaint on those matters.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. So once the investigation is concluded and the report with its recommendations are sent to the ministry to make that determination, what reporting requirements are placed on the ministry to subsequently follow up with the complainant on the steps the ministry took as a result of the recommendations and the investigation?

Mr. Karkut: — My apologies. I misunderstood the question there. We don't have those types of requirements built into the legislation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I barely understand my questions sometimes. So it's fine.

Mr. Karkut: — It could be a best practice, but it's not mandated within the legislation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why wasn't that included in the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think the idea was the PCC would conduct the review and make a determination and would make a recommendation. They would involve the complainant throughout that process, would provide them with a copy of it. After that point in time their work is largely finished. It goes to

the permanent head or minister, whoever the permanent head is, and then it becomes an HR [human resources] issue whether the person is terminated, given, you know, whatever else.

I think as a general rule, my understanding is that virtually all of the complaints that have come forward, almost invariably the recommendation is followed. At least I'm not aware of any situations where it hasn't been. So I don't think it's something that was focused on as being oh, what happens if it's not done or it's not done adequately.

But that may be something we want to have some further discussion about as to whether at the end of the work done by the PCC, whether it go back to a police service or someone else, whether the complainant should know what the ultimate outcome was, that the person was fired, disciplined, or whatever. And the point you take is a valid one. And I think that's one we'd want to give some careful consideration to, and I'm glad you raised it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I do appreciate that. As you mentioned, Minister, there is a desire to make this process more transparent and accountable and independent. And this would be a piece of that, is ensuring that the complainant is able to participate in every step, even if that means simply being provided information as to how the recommendations were followed through with. It would at least provide that complainant with the assurance that if the recommendations were followed through, that they had been.

Will the ministry commit to monitoring the changes with respect to these specific categories of professions and potentially making changes to this process in the future to ensure more transparency and accountability and hopefully more independence away from the Ministry of Justice if possible?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes, absolutely. I think that's a commitment that we would be prepared to make. Ever since we started adding the special constables, I wanted to make sure that we had them subject to the same discipline processes that police officers were subject to and whatever changes that we might need to make.

The challenge that came back when we were looking at it internally was you didn't have a chief or somebody else that was sort of one step removed from the employer. These were direct government employees. And that said, it doesn't mean they shouldn't be subject to any less scrutiny or any less accountability than anywhere else. So yes, I would agree with you.

Ms. Sarauer: — I appreciate that. It's unfortunate when the government created the provincial response team that they didn't think about the extra pieces that would occur as a result of giving these categories of employees a much larger mandate than they had before.

The third main change in this legislation is with respect to serious . . . we'll call them serious incidents. You know the provision that I'm speaking about. You mentioned in your opening remarks that you had consulted with First Nations communities on these changes. When did you do those consultations?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I actually had some discussions with

FSIN, with Vice-Chief Lerat, and then I've had some discussions with some other chiefs over the last year or so as to how that process might come out. The discussions were informal, and I think we would want to look to them now for further guidance and direction as to how we would want to do that.

The immediate concern that they have, that Vice-Chief Lerat had, is that we would have a good representative on the PCC who would be somebody that they were comfortable with, as being either a Chair, Vice-Chair, or a commission member. So that's sort of the nature of the direction of the discussions that we've . . . We think we have a good plan forward on that.

Ms. Sarauer: — What other consultations have you made with respect to this?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — As over the last year, so I meet periodically with the Sask federation, and I've had discussion with individual chiefs as to how it might play out. And I'm not sure whether there's been anything that the officials want to add at this time. I don't think so.

Ms. Sarauer: — What feedback have you received since this bill was introduced?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think there's a . . . People want it to be as strong as it can. People want it to ensure that it be truly independent, and where there has been a serious incident, that they know the process that takes place is open, transparent, and that the public will know that there's accountability when those things take place.

I'm responding by saying that this is a significant first step. It adds the additional powers to the PCC that didn't exist before. What took place was an informal process between police services where, if a death in custody or a serious incident happened, they would make their own determination how serious it was. And if they felt it was serious enough, they would contact another police force or the RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] and ask them to appoint an observer to come and watch the process. And the observer would come and sort of be tasked with doing it.

We feel the observer must be appointed at the earliest stage. The observer must be appointed by the PCC, must not be a serving officer, and must direct and control a significant portion of the process as it goes forward.

Ms. Sarauer: — Minister, you mentioned that those who have reached out to you have expressed a desire that this process be, I believe you said, as robust and transparent as possible. How do those who have reached out to you say they feel that this bill has met that need?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — You know, my expectation is that as we go forward and the bill comes operational, we'll look to those individuals and say, is it meeting your expectations? How much more things do we need to do? I've indicated publicly that this is a first step towards going to a stronger and more independent model. So we now have the entity that does it. We've given them a number of the tools. We've given them an increased budget. So I would regard this as a step forward.

And then the next steps would include appointment of the new

commission members and asking them to do some more formal consultation with police services, First Nations, Métis Nation, members of the public, to determine what other changes and what other additional services need to be provided.

Ms. Sarauer: — What about consultation with those who are involved in Saskatchewan's Black Lives Matter movement?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The issue with what happened in Minneapolis and the Black Lives Matter, I think all of us have got enormous sympathy and a great deal of concern. That happened in the recent past, so we have not had any specific consultation with any of the organizers or people that would speak on behalf of that particular movement.

[18:30]

The focus that we have had is our obligations under Truth and Reconciliation and our relationship with Métis Nation and wanting to ensure that the concerns that have been addressed there have been dealt with. And I think to the point that you raise that Black Lives Matter is an area that we would want to have some additional consultation or consideration as to how we might appropriately respond.

Ms. Sarauer: — What changes does this bill make to the regular complaints process?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It adds the additional group of people that are covered by the Act. And our expectation is that the resources that are made available will allow them to handle and process more of the complaints. But I'm not sure whether Jan or somebody else wants to provide some additional information on that.

Ms. Turner: — Thank you, Minister. Yes, that's exactly the expectation that we have with this bill and with the additional budget. As the minister has stated, the commission has not been able to fully investigate all of the complaints that come to their attention because their resources have fallen behind. So having these additional resources will certainly have them back investigating all of the cases that will come forward.

Ms. Sarauer: — Well with respect, the increase in funding I think is welcome by the complaints commission; however, as you have noted, their scope has increased with this legislation, as well as it's been quite publicly discussed in the media that the number of complaints that they're receiving is on the rise. So can the ministry say with confidence that all of the complaints received by the Public Complaints Commission will be investigated by non-police?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think we can say where the investigations are done, they will be done by non-police. In all the cases, the complaints that have been received — and I think we have to do a better job or a different job — were initially, they use the term, they were triaged. They determined what the issue was and then made a determination whether it would be a PCC investigation or one that would be referred elsewhere.

So I think they would want to make a shift in what was being investigated so that a greater number of them were being done, and where there was a significant public interest in the complaint,

then it would proceed.

You know, I don't think I'd want to give examples of the ones that might not proceed, but there would certainly be situations where they would say, oh yes, this is a family matter or something else, this should be dealt with in another forum. But they should all be looked at in the context of, does it fit within the scope of the legislation, and need they proceed further with it. And where appropriate, we'll want to make sure that they have sufficient resources to do it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Going back to the consultation piece, what consultation has occurred? And if it hasn't, will the ministry commit to doing consultation with respect to the changes in this bill and changes going forward with families who've been affected by incidents in the past, some of which you are well aware of, Minister. The families of Haven Dubois and Nadine Machiskinic are two that are quite prominent that I know you are well aware, who I'm sure would have feedback for you with respect to this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes, the new commission members, I'm not sure how long it will take them to get up to speed. We would want to work with the commission to make sure that appropriate wide-reaching consultations are done, and certainly we would want to include family members where there was a situation where it was high profile. We would know those ones and would hope that other people would reach out to us as well. So yes.

Ms. Sarauer: — Does the Public Complaints Commission still operate under the purview of the Ministry of Justice?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes it does. It's part of *The Police Act*, which is an Act assigned to Corrections and Policing. But that aspect of the Act is directly controlled and funded through the Ministry of Justice.

Ms. Sarauer: — Who appoints the members of the board?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The Act indicates that they are Lieutenant Governor in Council appointments. The appointees must have one that is First Nations appointed in consultation with FSIN, and another one that would be done in consultation with MNS [Métis Nation of Saskatchewan].

Ms. Sarauer: — Just for clarification, that is a decision made by Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — By Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Ms. Sarauer: — How does the Lieutenant Governor in Council decide who is appointed?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Well I think they would look to the ministry for some advice as to what was there. In this case, I've had discussions with both MNS and with FSIN, and I think as we finalize things we'll want to make sure that the choices are acceptable choices. And as I indicated to you the other night, I would be pleased to have an informal discussion off record with you sometime as to where we're at on it.

Ms. Sarauer: — I look forward to that, Minister.

Ms. Turner: — If I could just add a comment that section 16 of *The Police Act* actually sets out a number of bodies that the minister shall consult with in terms of the appointments. So that includes FSIN, the Métis Nation. It includes the chiefs of police, all of the boards of police commission for all of the municipal services, as well as the federation of Saskatchewan association. So that's a process that we follow in terms of seeking candidates and nominations from this very wide group of stakeholders for this commission.

Ms. Sarauer: — I appreciate that. Just to clarify though, it is still the Ministry of Justice who does that work and ultimately makes those recommendations to the LG [Lieutenant Governor]?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's right.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why is this process still under *The Police Act*?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Right now it's been under *The Police Act*. You know, the automobile insurance Act, you know, there's different things that exist. I think at some point in time it would be worthwhile, and I'll look to the new members of the PCC as to whether it should be a stand-alone piece of legislation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Has the process for the complainant changed at all as a result of the changes in this legislation?

Ms. Turner: — I think it's slightly premature to ask that. With respect to most complaints, we believe that the process that's currently in place for taking the complaints, reaching out to the complainant, moving it into investigation, preparing the reports is certainly the one that would be recommended for the new commission to use.

But again, we have all of the detail yet to assess of how all of these new parts of the legislation will come to play, all of this implementation. And of course as the minister's indicated, with new commission members they may want to review some of the process and make their own suggestions about that.

Ms. Sarauer: — But just to clarify, as the process is outlined in the legislation, that process has not changed? How about who will conduct the investigations? We've spoken about this a little bit already. But could you provide some information as to how that will change?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes. Right now under the existing practice, the police force where the serious incident happened contacts another police force to provide an oversight. And the oversight may or may not give some directions if they should bring in external people. But it's largely done by the police force where the incident happened, with oversight from somewhere else, and they may or may not involve them. The goal, we think, should be that it removes it, that the oversight and the direction comes from the PCC, but that the resources and the actual investigation be done by people that have been seconded or borrowed from another force.

I think it's impossible not to have serving officers from elsewhere. I'm trying to avoid the necessity of creating a stand-alone police force that will run around the province and investigate when something has happened. I think we have enough resources internally and enough separation between the

police forces, if the direction is given from someone else from the PCC, that we can maintain a good degree of accountability and transparency.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, the goal is to remove police from that investigation piece. However, this legislation still allows for police to investigate police. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It would be police officers from somewhere else. I mean you could say, yes we want to have retired police officers or civilians. But there would have to be police officers investigating it, yes.

There may come a point in the future where we decide we want to contract with somebody, whether we want to create more and more investigators within the PCC. But right now we think by having the control and the direction coming from an independent person assigned by the PCC or a commission member, that we can utilize other forces to give us the necessary boots on the ground.

Ms. Sarauer: — What about the role of the investigation observer? Now you've mentioned of course the requirement that the investigation observer be a member is removed in this bill. The bill also states that the ministry will create a list of investigation observers, but that list is not provided in this legislation. So could you provide some information as to where this list will be housed and who will be in, who will comprise this list?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It would at the direction of the PCC, and it would be people that would have some investigation or some ability to deal with it. There was media recently about the different provinces and the people that were doing the investigations and that most of them were retired police officers, which I don't have a problem with. But to be blunt and to use a term that I can get away with, most of them are old white guys and there was not nearly enough diversity on it. So I think that's a discussion point that needs to happen as to how you have the investigators or the oversight people that were there.

I recently had a situation that I discussed with FSIN where there had been a serious incident. And I spoke with them about appointing somebody and they said, well it involves a First Nation but we think it should be another individual. We made the decision in that case to ask that there be two people appointed and it worked out remarkably well. The appointee that came from FSIN was somebody that was a competent, professional First Nations person. As well the one we had appointed worked together and we think produced a really superb result. So I think that may be the direction they might choose to go to.

Ms. Sarauer: — And that was, they were investigation observers that were appointed?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — So that conversation about more diversity, does that apply to both the investigation observers and the investigators as well?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think it should apply to both.

Ms. Sarauer: — What is the role of the investigation observer?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Under the old legislation they were there to serve as a watchdog role to make sure that things were happening and they may be chosen to consult with. And they were there to view the process that took place so that they were able to say at the end of it, we watched, we think the process was completed adequately, we were consulted with on two or three things.

We think they need to take a more direct, more active role where they're the ones that are in fact writing the report, signing off on the report, and ultimately become responsible for it.

Ms. Sarauer: — That's not included in this legislation though, correct?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It's not. It'll be the practice. There'll be some more in the regulations that come forward, but I think that's where it needs to go to, is it that individual that's appointed as, and you can use the term "observer" or . . . [inaudible] . . . that person ultimately has to become the one that is responsible for the investigation. They're the ones that write the report. They're the ones that are accountable to the public for what's taken place, for the recommendations that are made, for the quality of the review, that at the end of the process it's not an acceptable answer for them to stand back and say, well I didn't really have a role in there or I chose not to. They're the ones that are either directing the investigation or are involved in it far enough that they're responsible for it.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just to clarify, the ministry's intention is to in the future amend the legislation again to ensure that investigation observers have a more robust role in this process.

[18:45]

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Through legislation or regulation. Right now it's a matter of building capacity because we don't know where we have the capacity right now. We're reliant on other police forces, and we want to be able to take it one step removed. So yes, the answer is we want to move in that direction.

Ms. Sarauer: — But just to clarify for those who are paying attention, as of right now per the legislation, investigation observers are not doing the investigation or writing the report at the end.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's correct.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now the amendment provides that the investigator who does the investigation and then does the report, provides a confidential report to the PCC and the ministry. Could you provide some information as to why that hasn't changed in this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Well the investigator's role is to complete the process, and I think that's where it would normally go to, would be back to the PCC which is effectively the governing body, and they would make the determination, as they have in the past, that a copy of it go to whatever else. And Ms. Turner indicated that the reports right now are disseminated to the complainant, the police service, and everybody else

simultaneously. And that's been the practice, and I don't think there's any expectation that that will change.

Ms. Sarauer: — So the complainant receives the report, not the summary of the report that the PCC will be in the future determine . . . or that will now have . . . Okay, maybe you can clarify what's going on.

Mr. McGovern: — We just have to make sure that we're dealing with apples and apples on this, because there is two procedures here. We have a complaint process, which the minister has previously set out, in which the complainant makes a complaint at any location they want to. It's brought forward there as Jan and the minister had mentioned. They're kept apprised of how that complaint moves forward. There's a whole process there. And that complaint can either be with respect to the conduct of the member or services. And that's how it works in the Act right now.

So for example, if I make a complaint with respect to services — that people are trampling my front lawn during the Santa Claus parade, and that there should be police to make sure that that doesn't happen — that's a service complaint. That's a separate process. Your question, I believe, member, was that with respect to the investigation observer . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — The serious incident. Yes.

Mr. McGovern: — That's right. And under this process it provides that the investigation observer who's appointed provides a report under (6)(b) and that report's provided to the chairperson of the PCC, deputy minister of Justice, deputy minister of the ministry, being Corrections in that case.

Within 30 days after that report is received in (8), the PCC is going to now make public a summary of the results of the report. So that is a new transparency method there, so that the report comes back to the PCC as the Chair, rather than to the ministry or to the deputy minister directly as it is now. So that level is new in terms of the PCC, the civilian agency, as well as the ministry. And then there's a public summary of the report made.

Ms. Sarauer: — So what does the complainant receive?

Mr. McGovern: — Well in that scenario as we described, there is no complainant, right? If there's a complaint as to a serious incident, then that process, the complainant's involved from the start and does receive the report. This occurs automatically without a complaint, depending on what the nature of the incident is.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay, say for example, I was thinking more of serious injury where there many still be an individual alive. Also sexual assault falls under this, so it's possible that that would be a complainant. That probably wouldn't be a process that would happen automatically. But say this is in relation to a death and there is a family who is involved. They may not have made the complaint because the provision was triggered automatically. What's shared with them?

Mr. McGovern: — The PCC in that circumstance, because it's a public report process at the end, would certainly be part of that. If however it becomes a complaint . . . or the PCC can commence

its own complaint if it feels that it's appropriate in a circumstance where there isn't a complaint. That occurs in the existing Act.

And so that's why it can be a little bit of a confusion in terms of saying . . . There's two circumstances that this contemplates and they can overlap each other. One is where a complaint is made and that complaint process — and it's driven by the complaint — there's timelines; there's reporting back to the individual; there can be the hearing process. So that complaint process is complaint-driven.

At the same time, regardless if whether there's a complaint, depending on the nature of the incident, this says automatically we want two things to happen. One is that the police service that was involved in the incident won't be the police service that's doing the investigation going forward. And that's what we see in 91.3, that we mandate in that serious circumstance a third party police service.

What we're talking about with respect to the investigation observer is, say again, automatically if there's this category of a serious incident that we describe in (2), and then in addition in (3), an investigation observer shall be appointed by the chairperson of the PCC. And so that process now is done by the independent PCC to ensure that an investigation observer is always appointed.

As the minister mentioned, there's a provision that says, depending on the ancestry of the individual who was injured in that context, we could end up with two investigation observers. They are part of that process. They provide that report. If at the same time a complaint has been generated, then those two operate at the same time. And that's where it gets, I think, a little bit conflated in terms of saying, how does that work. But here what we're saying is that regardless of whether there's been a formal complaint made, we need that independence in terms of the review from the outside.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sorry, I was following you. But again to my example, if there's a death and obviously interested family members, maybe they didn't make a complaint, but this serious incident process is ongoing with the investigation observer. What is released to them in terms of documentation? They obviously receive, as the public does, the summary of the report that the PCC is now required to provide within 30 days of their receipt of the investigation report.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think you're making a distinction between where the process was initiated by a specific complaint. So where that happens then, I think, what the officials have indicated, the information flows back to them.

And then there's the other situation where it wasn't initiated by a complaint, a death in custody where there's family members. And I think the process is not started by a complainant. So to the extent that those people are more than members of the public, I think it's up to the process or the people involved in the process to identify who the potential people would be that would be given the status as a complainant, or would be offered a meeting or whatever else.

So if, for example, a death in custody happened, the spouse of the person that died may not lodge a complaint, may not have

anything else. But I think in fairness to that individual, that individual should be treated as if they had made a complaint. And I think that's something that the officials and the processes that would take place, that the PCC would want to identify who those individuals are and how you would treat them even though it wasn't a process that was initiated by them. So does that make the distinction?

Ms. Sarauer: — Yes, that's what I was trying to get at is that they obviously have an interest in this process and want the information. But just to clarify, the legislation doesn't obligate that level of transparency.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think it would be difficult in the legislation to identify who those individuals might be that might have an interest in it. So I think we should probably look at some method of imposing a duty on the process or on the people involved in the process to identify who should receive that information.

Ms. Sarauer: — Other than the obligation to make the summary of the report public in 30 days, what other timelines for the investigation process, be it serious incident or the traditional complaints process, are included in this bill?

Mr. Karkut: — Yes. With respect to timelines in this bill, as you noted, there's the timeline to provide a report. And that's the only timeline that's been added in with the investigation observer process. And there's been no amendments in this bill that impact the current timelines under the public complaints process.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Why did the ministry determine that no further timelines were needed at this time?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Well there is the existing process and it wasn't identified as being an issue. So we added the one timeline, and maybe at some point in the future we want to add timelines. But the issue we're trying to address right now is the issue of independence and transparency and would like to be there. So I don't know what those timelines might look like, but that may be something that we would want to have some further discussion on. So your point's taken.

Mr. McGovern: — As Neil had mentioned, the complaint process, as the member will recall, that does exist has very specific timelines for reporting back to the complainant. And those absolutely continue where there is a complaint.

Ms. Sarauer: — Minister, why won't serious . . . we'll call them serious incidents, that process. Why aren't they being handled by a separate body similar to what we're seeing in other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We're not actually. A number of the other provinces use a secondment process. I'm not sure which ones, but I know a number of the other provinces will use seconded officers or contract out. So it's certainly an issue of can it be handled effectively and independently by another police force or do you have to hire a separate police force.

So the idea of creating a separate police force with all of the attendant things that you might have in a . . . You know, an accident reconstructionist, a forensic pathologist, all of the things that you might want to have in a large city police service. Do you

need to create that separately for part of a serious incident model, or are you able to second those from elsewhere in the province? It's certainly our view at this point in time that we've got good opportunities to second within the province and that makes us consistent with most other provinces.

Mr. Larsen: — Just to add some further clarification to the minister's comments there, Alberta is the only one that I'm aware of that has a hybrid of seconding current police officers to their ASIRT [Alberta Serious Incident Response Team] unit. So they have a combination of investigators and RCMP and municipal police officers that are seconded for a period of time to work within that unit.

Ms. Sarauer: — Minister, you had mentioned in some media when asked about creating a serious incident response team that finances were a factor in your decision. Minister, I suppose the question is, at what stage do you feel that ensuring that civilian confidence in the investigation process supersedes those concerns?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think that's the role of everybody that's in government, is to try and strike a balance to what money you need to expend to get the results that you need to have.

[19:00]

I think the officers, the women and men that work as police officers in our province, are generally by and large good, honest, well-intentioned, caring individuals that want to do the right thing. Occasionally things will happen that need to be dealt with in a different manner and that's the reason we have these processes. But I think it's reasonable to assume that if an incident happens in Saskatoon, if it's directed by somebody independent, somebody else, that if you need to have either an ident squad or an accident reconstruction or whatever else you need, that you could ask for those resources from another ministry.

If it appears over time that we can't do that, you might have to look at contracting them from out of the province or elsewhere — which I don't prefer to do — or you may have to have additional resources brought in. But at the time being, we're addressing the issue right now that the whole process is given to another neighbouring police force to do, which I think, in spite of the fact that it may have been done well intentioned, is certainly not done in an acceptable manner. So I think by the direction we're going, manages funds and also accomplishes the needs that we've got for arm's-length and independence.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now, Minister, I have had the opportunity to reach out to and speak with several stakeholders. As you know, the time between the introduction of the bill and where we're at in committee was very truncated, but still was able to speak with several folks. And it's fair to say that all across the spectrum, from those who are in the world of policing and police chiefs, as well as those who are in the more activist movements such as Black Lives Matter and those who are within the Indigenous community and those who have been working with families to improve policing oversight for several years, all see this bill as a bit of a disappointment.

You have mentioned in your opening remarks that this is the first phase of this work. Can you provide some concrete timelines as

to what the next steps will be?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm expecting over the next few weeks to be able to have the new commission members in place. I'm hoping that in the weeks and months following that, that they will be able to use the new resources to try and improve the things on a virtually immediate basis, as far as the complaints process goes, that they'll be able to staff up.

It may take them slightly longer to get the protocols in place for the serious incident response. I'm expecting that to happen. I'm optimistic it will happen fairly . . . [inaudible] . . . but I can't give you a specific timeline. I'm hoping sooner rather than later.

I would emphasize that, you know, what I'd mentioned earlier and what I mentioned in the media is that this is a first step. We want to do the consultation, make sure that we do this in a manner that's fair and reasonable. I don't want to rush the process, but I do want to have it in place as quickly as I can. I think it's something that we've wanted to do for a while. We have money in the budget to do it and a clear direction that we want to do it, so I'd invite people to consider this as a small step. Contact us and have discussions with us as we go forward.

Ms. Sarauer: — Now as I indicated, Minister, there are many who feel that this bill fails to deliver on any of the calls for changes, both recent and long standing. There have been many pieces of both feedback by letters as well as motions from relevant organizations that I think it's incumbent that get read into the record, both for those who look at this legislation in the future as well as for your benefit, Minister, that I'd like to do so at this point.

First is a motion passed by the Regina Board of Police Commissioners on June 25th of 2020 regarding Public Complaints Commission civilian oversight. And now I'm quoting:

Whereas some residents of Regina, in particular Black, Indigenous and Racialized people have expressed a lack of confidence in the current system dealing with complaints against Police Officers in the course of police investigations and actions;

Whereas residents of Regina have expressed a desire to ensure that civilian oversight take the place of police investigating police;

Whereas the Saskatchewan Association of Chiefs of Police has acknowledged that providing more transparent, independent, civilian-led oversight is vital to improving the public's confidence in police services;

Whereas the Provincial Government's proposed amendment to *The Police Act, 1990*, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020*, expands the role of the Public Complaints Commission but does not make a fundamental shift away from having members of other police services investigating police services when complaints are made;

Whereas seven other provinces have replaced the practice of having police officers investigating complaints against other police officers with Independent Serious Incident Response

Teams;

Therefore, be it resolved that:

1. The Regina Board of Police Commissioners request the Minister of Justice/Attorney General and the Government of Saskatchewan to commit to further reform of the PCC by:

Transitioning to civilian-only oversight,

Expanding the membership of the PCC to ensure adequate, timely and thorough investigations, and

Providing the expanded PCC with adequate resources and investigative tools.

2. The Regina Board of Police Commissioners request the Minister of Justice/Attorney General to expedite the creation of a civilian-only Independent Serious Incident Response Team to deal with incidents involving injury or death sustained by members of the public who are placed in police custody or subject to police investigation.

3. The Board of Police Commissioners provide a report to City Council and members of the public regarding Regina's Police Service's Use of Force guidelines and the concept of Use of Force as described and defined by the Saskatchewan Police Commission.

That's submitted by Commissioner Jada Yee. And I apologize, that meeting has not happened yet — June 25 is in the future — but that is a motion that will be before the police commission board. And I anticipate, since a similar motion was passed by the Saskatoon police commission board, that that one will be passed as well, based on my conversations with those who are on the commission.

I also want to read into the record, as I had mentioned, a motion that was moved and passed by the Saskatoon police commission board. And now I'm quoting:

Whereas the Province of Saskatchewan has recently introduced *The Police Amendment Act, 2020* to make changes to grant additional responsibilities of the Public Complaints Commission along with an additional \$350,000 in operational funding, helping to reduce the backlog in cases;

Whereas these legislative amendments will, among other changes, allow the Public Complaints Commission to appoint an Independent Observer in situations where someone has suffered a serious injury or death in the custody of or as a result of the actions of a police officer and that online summaries of these investigations will be posted online, helping to create greater transparency of this process;

Whereas the Province of Saskatchewan has indicated that these changes are the first in a series of ongoing efforts to improve police oversight in Saskatchewan and has also indicated a willingness to work with partners on this matter;

Whereas the currently proposed changes only add an Independent Observer appointed by the Public Complaints Commission and do not address the fact that police services are still investigating police services in matters of serious injury or death;

Whereas at least seven other provinces have replaced the practice of police investigating police with "Independent Serious Incident Response Teams";

Whereas it is imperative for the confidence of both the public and police services that investigations into police actions are done as professionally and independently as possible;

Whereas members of the public, and in particular those from Indigenous, Black and other racialized communities, have expressed a lack of confidence and/or comfort with the current system of complaints and/or with the serious incident investigation process;

Whereas the Saskatchewan Association of Chiefs of Police has recognized that improving and creating more independent oversight in the system is important for building public and police service confidence;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Saskatoon Board of Police Commissioners advocate to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General and the Provincial Government for the continued reform and modernization of the Saskatchewan Public Complaints Commission process such that:

There is further consideration of the development of an Independent Serious Incident Response Team model to eliminate the possibility of a police service investigating another police service or police officer,

There is due consideration for well-trained, qualified independent investigators with serious attention paid to racial diversity,

Indigenous leaders, racialized persons, community stakeholders, subject matter experts, police services, and police commissions be engaged to ensure the accessibility and inclusivity of the complaint process, and

There are sufficient resources provided to the Public Complaints Commission to undertake their work in a timely fashion, especially in light of any additional powers it may be granted

I also want to read into the record a letter provided to your office, Minister, as well as cc'd to me, dated June 23rd, 2020. This letter was signed by those involved in several non-profit organizations that are related to this issue, including Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan; John Howard Society of Saskatchewan; Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan; CLASSIC [Community Legal Assistance Services for Saskatoon Inner City Inc.]; as well as lawyers Debra Hopkins, Gillian Gough; and professors — of which you're well aware, Minister — Glen Luther and former professor, Tim Quigley.

And that letter states, and I'm quoting:

I am writing to you on behalf of several organizations to register our concern about your proposed changes to charge the Public Complaints Commission with the oversight of complaints against police misconduct. As you will know, Saskatchewan is the only province without some independent process for investigating allegations of police misconduct. (We are aware that New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador do not have their own processes for this purpose but they use Nova Scotia's independent body; Newfoundland and Labrador is in the process of establishing its own investigative body.) Your proposals will not move Saskatchewan from last place in this regard.

This is a moment in North America and around the world where attention is directed to police misconduct, particularly against minority communities. Saskatchewan is far from immune from this issue, given the number of incidents of alleged police assaults in this province and the fact that many such incidents have involved Indigenous citizens. Unfortunately, the world is aware of the names Neil Stonechild, Jordan Lafond, and Darrel Knight. There are many others. This is an opportunity for this government to send a strong message that it understands the importance of an independent oversight body as a core need in ensuring the integrity of the criminal justice system. As an adjunct issue, we are concerned that the government has not funded the Safe Injection Site in Saskatoon and has, instead, elected to fund an expensive and unnecessary expansion to the Saskatoon Correctional Centre.

We are suggesting that you step back from passing this legislation in order to give some time for meaningful input from community based, justice seeking organizations. We would hope that you would be in a better position to introduce legislation that establishes an independent body to investigate and take action when allegations of police misconduct are made. In our respectful opinion, the legislation should include the following elements:

- (1) Establishment of a truly independent agency with the sole and clear mandate to investigate and take action against police misconduct;
- (2) Proper funding of the agency so that it has sufficient resources to thoroughly investigate alleged misconduct and the ability to analyze trends to prevent incidents;
- (3) The explicit inclusion of the power to investigate officers accused of domestic violence and for the definition of misconduct to include all sexual offences as opposed to sexual assault;

As an aside, Minister, we didn't really speak about that one, but that seems like a reasonable thing to consider in the future.

- (4) Ensuring that underrepresented communities are included in the composition of the agency and, specifically, that there be representation from Indigenous girls and women and 2SLGBTQQIA communities. The MMIWG Calls for Justice includes an observation and oversight function in relation to police negligence or misconduct, including rape and other sexual offences and

investigations involving Indigenous Peoples. The Call to Justice also emphasizes the importance of a reporting function;

- (5) Ensuring that police are no longer investigating themselves. This means that the governing body must have a strong civilian presence with appropriate training resources for the investigators and those reviewing the complaints.

This list is not exhaustive of the principles that would ensure a transparent and fair process that could be put in place to provide assurances to the citizens of Saskatchewan but form the basis for a meaningful discussion.

Similarly, Minister, I would like to read into the record a portion of a letter sent to your office, cc'd to me, by Dr. Michelle Stewart — who has been quite active on this issue for a number of years — dated June 23rd, 2020 in providing some criticisms for it as well as some feedback on future changes for the bill. She says:

(1) The proposed amendment does not address the many families and community members that have come forward asking for independent police oversight. Independent, civilian oversight should be a welcomed form of accountability. The Public Complaints Commission is not independent. It is nestled within the Ministry of Justice. Saskatchewan needs to keep pace with other provinces and territories in the area of accountability and oversight. Of note, the Board of Police Commissioners . . . is currently considering a motion calling for the Ministry of Justice to undertake reforms [to] the PCC . . . [which I've read into the record].

(2) There have been many high-profile cases that placed a spotlight on the need for independent oversight. One can think here of the case of Haven Dubois and Nadine Machiskinic. Given the fact that the Minister of Justice has met with families who have called for independent oversight, it would seem important to reach out to these families and consult on the proposed changes. There is demonstrated unequal access to the justice system in Saskatchewan. We need an oversight arm that is independent of the police and has the ability to understand the challenging work of bringing about a more just and fair justice system.

[19:15]

(3) *The Police Act* of 1990 allows officers who have been involved in a serious, criminal matter, to potentially retain their positions. This is not acceptable. *The Police Act* and procedures of the Saskatchewan Police Commission need to be reviewed and updated to reflect a society that does not want officers convicted of assault to retain their positions working with the community and specifically vulnerable . . . [persons].

And if you bear with me, Minister, I'm almost finished. I would like to read into the record a few of the quotes that have been in the media recently attributed to the current Chair of the Public Complaints Commission, Brent Cotter.

This first one is a quote from an article dated June 19th, 2020 which is entitled, “‘It’s still police investigating police,’ Cree lawyer says of Sask. oversight changes.” And it’s a CBC [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation] article. And his quote says:

I think we would be better off with an independent agency conducting those investigations: a non-police agency that has the same kind of authority and resources as a police agency and that is completely independent.

He also says:

Our investigators are very good. But sexual harassment isn’t their area of expertise. So we will have to have independent people that can do that and that will cost us money. How much it will be is kind of anybody’s guess. How few of those kinds of complaints will come our way is a complete unknown to us.

Another article in which the Chair is quoted is an article entitled “Chair of body tasked with overseeing police says reforms fall short.” It’s a *Leader-Post* article dated four days ago. And his quote is:

The minister is not establishing a serious incident review team that is an independent agency to conduct and essentially direct investigations of serious incidents involving police behaviour. That, I think, continues to be a concern.

And another quote from this article:

At this particular moment in time, when public confidence in the police is strained, I think, and the quality and depth of accountability is being called into question . . . probably a million-dollar-a-year project would go a long way in building that confidence.

I think that concludes the list of feedback that I wanted to ensure was in the record. As you see, Minister, it was a wide spectrum, ranging from police commissioners to those who have been active in supporting families through this process. I do appreciate the indulgence of the committee in allowing me to read these important words into the record. With that, unless there’s further comment on this legislation by the minister, I have no further questions.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Chair, I would like to acknowledge I appreciate the input that the member opposite has received. And certainly those are things that we’d want to consider and take into consideration as we go forward. The goal, as I indicated earlier, is to have new members of the PCC in place and invite them to do some fairly in-depth consultation. We chose to go ahead and do the legislation now so that we can increase the funding, and we can have some fairly immediate results on some of the things that are there. The easier thing to do would’ve been to appoint the people and go through a two- or three-year process to try and do the consultation, get up to speed.

So I want to acknowledge that this is a first step and would like to conclude by just reading a short comment from FSIN chief, Bobby Cameron. He said he was happy to hear the acknowledgement of systemic racism:

He said the government’s expansion of police oversight on Wednesday is a good building block for the future.

“It’s a great start, it’s a good start. We want to thank our [own] Indian Justice Commission for the support of having those type of . . . [things] happen,” Cameron said.

“It’s part of the items that we have been lobbying for and it’s a good start. Now we can build on it.”

In this instance, I would very much agree with Chief Cameron, whom I regard as an old friend from when we both had Education portfolios. And I look forward to working with him, with MNS, and with any other parties that may have an interest to try and make this the most effective and practical process that we possibly can. So we will certainly want to continue the consultation.

I want to thank the member opposite for the work that she did in getting us to this point. I know that it’s something that’s important to her and wanted to do that.

Mr. Chair, after you vote it all, I have a couple of closing comments. But I’m ready for you to proceed.

The Chair: — Excellent. 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 Police Amendment Act, 2020*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 212, *The Police Amendment Act, 2020* without amendment.

Mr. D’Autremont: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. D’Autremont so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. That concludes our business with the minister and his officials this evening. Minister, do you have some closing remarks?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Chair, I would like to thank you and the members that are here tonight on both sides of the House. I want to take this opportunity to thank the officials from Hansard, broadcast services, Legislative Assembly Services, the building staff, security staff, all whom provide continuing great service year-round.

But with regard to the bills we had tonight, I want to thank the officials that worked within both ministries. These are people that are committed, hard-working individuals, and through the pandemic have been producing pieces of legislation, bills, orders,

on virtually no notice whatsoever. So I want to thank them for the work that they've done on those items as well as the specific items that were before the House tonight, some of which had to be done in a rather compressed time frame to try and fit the abbreviated, or as the member refers to it, the truncated schedules.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sure. I'd like to join with the minister in thanking all those who work in this building for helping us today, as well as the members of the committee, as well as yourself, Chair, this evening. In particular, I'd like to thank the minister for having this discussion this evening. I think it was productive. As well as the officials for all of the work they do, but in particular for their work in assisting us this evening.

The Chair: — Well I'd like to also thank all the officials for being here. Minister, you and your officials are excused from the committee. We will consider the remaining resolutions for the '20-21 estimates and the 2019-20 supplementary estimates.

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

The Chair: — Vote 73, Corrections and Policing, central management and services, subvote (CP01) in the amount of 867,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Police Commission, subvote (CP12) in the amount of 1,749,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody, supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of 186,576,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of 229,707,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections and Policing, vote 73, 418,899,000. I will ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2021, the following sums for Corrections and Policing in the amount of 418,899,000.

Mr. Kirsch: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Kirsch has moved. 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, central management and services, subvote (IJ01) in the amount of 48,651,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Integrated services, subvote (IJ02) in the amount of 54,030,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Capital and improvements, subvote (IJ03) in the amount of 26,728,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 8,023,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Integrated Justice Services, vote 91, 129,409,000. 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, 2021, the following sums for Integrated Justice Services in the amount of 129,409,000.

Mr. Francis: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Francis moves. 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, central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of 969,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of 49,696,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Innovation and legal services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 39,995,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards, commissions and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of 43,859,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3, 134,519,000. 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, 2021, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of 134,519,000.

Mr. Francis. 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, central management and services, subvote (PC01) in the amount of 9,217,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, subvote (PC12) in the amount of 28,562,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Resource stewardship, subvote (PC18) in the amount of 7,553,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community engagement, subvote (PC19) in the amount of 24,639,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Non-appropriated expense adjustments in the amount of 5,126,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

So Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27, 69,971,000. 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, 2021, the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of 69,971,000.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So moved.

The Chair: — Mr. D'Autremont so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Tourism Saskatchewan
Vote 88**

The Chair: — Vote 88, Tourism Saskatchewan, Tourism Saskatchewan subvote (TR01) in the amount of 14,456,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Tourism Saskatchewan, vote 88, 14,456,000. 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, 2021, the following sums for Tourism Saskatchewan in the amount of 14,456,000.

Ms. Wilson: — I so move.

The Chair: — Ms. Wilson. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

Subvote (CP13)

The Chair: — Vote 73, Corrections and Policing, custody, supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of 6 million, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections and Policing, vote 73, 6 million. 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, 2020, the following sums for Corrections and Policing in the amount of \$6 million.

Mr. D'Autremont: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. D'Autremont moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

Subvotes (JU04) and (JU08)

The Chair: — Vote 3, Justice and Attorney General, innovation

and legal services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 700,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards, commissions and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of 1,500,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Justice and Attorney General, vote 3, 2,200,000. 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, 2020, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of 2,200,000.

Mr. Kirsch: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Kirsch moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

Subvotes (PC12) and (PC19)

The Chair: — Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, Parks subvote (PC12) in the amount of 150,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community engagement subvote (PC19) in the amount of \$200,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27, 350,000. 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, 2020 the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of 350,000.

Mr. Francis: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Francis. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

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

Mr. Francis.

Mr. Francis: — Yes, Mr. Chair, I'd like to make the motion:

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

The Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. That concludes our business for this evening. I will ask a member to move a motion of adjournment.

Mr. Kirsch: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Kirsch has moved to adjourn. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

[The committee adjourned at 19:35.]