



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 6 — April 16, 2025**

Published under the  
authority of  
The Hon. Todd Goudy  
Speaker



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Thirtieth Legislature**

*Hansard* and other documents of the  
Legislative Assembly are available  
online within hours after each sitting.  
<https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>

## **STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES**

Doug Steele, Chair  
Cypress Hills

Erika Ritchie, Deputy Chair  
Saskatoon Nutana

Chris Beaudry  
Kelvington-Wadena

Terri Bromm  
Carrot River Valley

Hon. Lori Carr  
Estevan-Big Muddy

Don McBean  
Saskatoon Chief Mistawasis

Jordan McPhail  
Cumberland



[The committee met at 15:58.]

**Chair Steele:** — Well welcome. We're a little ahead of time. I think if we have quorum we'll start. Okay, welcome to everyone. I'm Doug Steele, the Chair. Chris Beaudry to my right. Brad Crassweller, Terri Bromm. Sitting in for Don McBean is Hugh Gordon. Jordan McPhail, Trent Wotherspoon is sitting in for him. And Erika Ritchie.

Today the committee will be considering the 2025-26 estimates for 2024-25, supplementary estimates no. 2 for the Ministry of Finance before considering three bills and voting on the committee's resolutions.

**General Revenue Fund  
Finance  
Vote 18**

**Subvote (FI01)**

**Chair Steele:** — We will begin with consideration of vote 18, Finance, central management and services, subvote (FI01). Minister Reiter is here with his officials. As a reminder to the officials, please state your name for the record before speaking. Please do not touch the microphones. The Hansard operator will turn your microphone on when you're needed to speak.

Minister Reiter, please introduce your officials and make your opening remarks.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank you and the committee members for the opportunity to discuss the budget for the Ministry of Finance.

Officials joining me today include Deputy Minister Max Hendricks; Assistant Deputy Minister Brent Hebert; Assistant Deputy Minister Cullen Stewart; Provincial Comptroller Chris Bayda; my chief of staff, Brady Peter. And we have a number of other officials with us as well, Mr. Chair. And I'd just reiterate your comments, if any of them are called on to speak, if they'd introduce themselves at that time.

[16:00]

The Ministry of Finance's expense budget is \$463.88 million for the fiscal year '25-26. Our ministry's budget includes the following increases we would like to highlight: 7.3 million for the Saskatchewan secondary suite incentive grant program; 9.06 million for implementation of the government enterprise management, or GEM, system; 1.37 million for tax compliance initiatives; 1.05 million for the Saskatchewan class 1 truck driver training rebate program; 515,000 for consolidated investment management; 4.34 million for salary adjustments, primarily resulting from the settlement of the collective bargaining agreement and related out-of-scope increases; and 34.61 million for system-wide pension and benefit costs.

On the staffing side, FTEs [full-time equivalent] are increasing by 52 from last year, primarily due to the reallocation of existing resources within government for the centralization of accounting functions within the ministry. It's important to note that all 52 FTEs are offset by either increased revenue or reallocated

funding from other ministries. There's a net zero impact on executive government as a whole.

Mr. Chair, allow me to elaborate on some of the highlights of the budget. Overall the '25-26 budget delivers for the people of Saskatchewan. The priorities in the budget reflect the priorities Saskatchewan residents told us were most important to them. This year's budget delivers relief from cost-of-living pressures for everyone in Saskatchewan; improved access to care for patients and health care professionals; additional supports in the classroom for students, parents, and teachers; safer communities for residents in every part of Saskatchewan; and strong financial management.

In this year's budget, our government is following through on our promise to ensure the province remains the most affordable place in Canada to live, work, raise a family, and start a business. The budget includes affordability initiatives that were introduced in *The Saskatchewan Affordability Act* in December of 2024. Thirteen commitments from this Act are included in the budget and will reduce income taxes for every resident, family, and small business in our province.

This year's budget helps make life more affordable for seniors, families with children, persons with disabilities, caregivers, new graduates, first-time homebuyers, and people renovating their homes. The taxation changes introduced in the '25-26 budget provide more than 250 million in tax savings this year. This is in addition to the more than \$2 billion in affordability measures in every budget.

The budget delivers strong financial management for the people of Saskatchewan, prioritizing affordability and delivering necessary programs and services. This year's Ministry of Finance budget also supports strong financial management and accountability, helping ensure valued services, programs, and capital investments are sustainable today and into the future.

A few highlights. Ministry of Finance officials play a lead role in many of the affordability measures in this year's budget, often working with their counterparts in the federal government.

To help make life more affordable for Saskatchewan homeowners, this budget includes an increase of 7.3 million for the Saskatchewan secondary suite incentive grant program due to higher-than-expected demand. It's designed to increase housing availability across the province and generate supplemental income for homeowners. The program provides up to 35 per cent of the total price to construct a new secondary suite at an owner's primary, single-family residence to a maximum of \$35,000. In '25-26 the program will support the creation of approximately 320 new units with an estimated total cost of \$10 million.

The ministry's budget provides an increase of 1.05 million for the Saskatchewan class 1 truck driver training rebate program for individuals seeking their commercial driving licence. It also includes an increase of 1 million for the first-time homebuyers tax credit transition grant program. This helps make home ownership more affordable by increasing the maximum benefit of the tax credit by 50 per cent, from \$1,050 to \$1,575. These are important programs that will help make life more affordable for

Saskatchewan residents and support our growing province.

Mr. Chair, this is just a sample of the important work the employees of the Ministry of Finance undertake every year. And with that, Mr. Chair, we'd be happy to take questions.

**Chair Steele:** — Any questions?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to the minister. Thank you to all the officials that are with us here tonight and all those that are connected to this important work as well.

I'll get straight at it here with the minister. Now both you and the Premier stated that even though you're cancelling the provincial industrial carbon tax and losing over \$400 million of revenue from the budget, you're still going to balance the budget. Is that correct?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Well you know, I mentioned, including on budget day and the budget address, that I recognize that the issue that you're raising can have an impact. But we mentioned on budget day there's a number of things that could have an impact — for example, the tariffs right now. If tariffs go on and they're on for an extended period of time, it's, as I've said many times, it's quite possible that's going to push us into a deficit situation. But there's a number of other things that have an impact that change regularly. Prices of commodities, for example.

So you know, on budget day we delivered, I think — we've discussed this on the floor of the Assembly before — I think is likely to be the only balanced budget in the country. There's some dangers ahead. Hopefully calmer heads prevail on tariffs. Again, some things will be higher; some things will be lower, but we'll do our best to stay on track.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — You chose not to incorporate the cancellation of the provincial industrial carbon tax into this budget. Represents a loss of \$400 million of revenues if you'd incorporated it into the budget. Can you clarify, do you still think you'd have a balanced budget?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So I would just reiterate what we've discussed on the floor of the Assembly in the past is that, you know, it has a potential for revenue impact, but again it's paused right now. Consultations are going on with I believe it's environment officials and industry, so we don't know what the outcome of that's going to be. And again, as I mentioned earlier, there's a number of things that have an impact. As I mentioned, commodity prices going up or down. The exchange rate has a huge impact on the provincial treasury. You know, I've mentioned before, there's a settlement with tobacco companies, that discussions are under way right now. There's a potential for more revenue from them. And as the year unfolds, there'll be other revenues will be up and down as well.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Well I guess where folks are at on this is, you know, when you look at it, like things like the weather obviously or commodity prices or the choices of the US [United States] administration, those are a little bit outside of our control. We do our best obviously to influence those pieces with respect to the tariffs. But the choice to cancel the provincial carbon tax, the OBPS [output-based performance standards], was

your decision, so it's something entirely in your control. And of course, the only correct answer is that it's a significant reduction in revenues.

And we support the cancellation of your provincial carbon tax, but we expect and find it baffling that as a ministry you'd bring a budget forward to the Saskatchewan legislature in this institution that's inaccurate, a budget where the numbers simply, like, don't add up, literally, based on matters that we're discussing right here. And some of the revenue numbers are wrong as a result. Your expense numbers are wrong. Your debt numbers consequently are wrong. And I guess my question would be, does the cabinet approve plans and policies that they then advise the public are incorrect?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I would just simply disagree with how you position that. As I mentioned earlier, this is a pause. We don't know what the outcome of the discussion is going to be. And again we certainly we can agree to disagree, but I would disagree with your description of that.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Well the numbers don't add up. It's a choice of government and it has consequences on the budget, and they're not reflected in the budget that we have before us for votes as we speak. You know, people deserve better than a budget that's not a reflection of the facts, right?

I guess, a couple of things on that though then. Can you confirm the elimination of the OBPS will directly reduce the power rates by the same amount?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So that question would be better put to SaskPower, but I would repeat what I said earlier about, so this is a pause. So again, the outcome is still not known. But again, I should indicate, SaskPower as of April 1st has removed that from bills.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. So no confirmation if the elimination of the provincial carbon tax, the OBPS, will cause rates to be reduced by the same amount. I think those are things that the consumers are going to be interested in, or those that are paying the bills.

Question: what will happen to the money in the electricity fund from the past year OBPS?

[16:15]

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So in the small modular reactor fund, that money . . . There's been no decisions made on that. That money will still be used as originally intended for nuclear power down the road. And on the tech fund, that money will still be returned to industry by industry doing projects that qualify.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — What would the timeline be to deploy those dollars? Maybe state, just in the tech fund, what the current balance is? And what's the timeline to discharge those dollars back to industry to make the investments that they're looking to make?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So that's in Environment's budget, but I understand officials are telling me they believe that Environment has announced another round of applications.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Can you describe the impacts on net income for SaskPower, what they'll be for the year 2025-26 given the loss of the grant coming out of the electricity fund?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So all final decisions are pending the consultations. So no decision's been made.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No, sorry, the question was . . . Because if you're cancelling the OBPS or now pausing it as you're suggesting, but those revenues will no longer be provided then through that grant. So the net income is . . . The revenues are going to be reduced by the amount of that grant. So could you speak to the impact on the net income for SaskPower?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — No decision's been made. It's part of the review. And to your question, that would be SaskPower's budget, not the Ministry of Finance budget.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — The way summary financials work . . . You're the Minister of Finance, right. So you're responsible for the budget. And so I guess what's frustrating to anyone here is we've had these changes made on the fly, and they're not incorporated in this budget. And so again revenue numbers are out of whack. Net income numbers are out of whack. Expenses are out of line, and so are the debt numbers. So we just have this budget that, you know, we'd like to be able to kind of focus in on, but it's not an accurate budget, accurate portrayal of what's going on with our finances.

I'd be interested I guess in your take on, and your team's take on, how you would assess the risks and volatility to both your revenue projections and your expense projections at present, and both in terms of the potential impacts and the size of those impacts.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — On the risk side you were asking about, I would say, things that have happened before in the past. An example — none of this will surprise you — for crop insurance for example, they have a formula; they follow a rolling average. So we think that's a pretty good way to do it. Officials are comfortable with that.

But there'd always be the risk if there's a drought or a flood for that matter. There could be a risk in those regards. Also wildfires at times can cause a problem. You know, and I just mention floods in regards to crop insurance, but that could also be in regards to other damage as well. So those are just a couple kind of the incidents that have happened in other years, so they're sort of the risks that you try to factor in.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Why did you peg oil so high? \$3 higher than Alberta next door as an example.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So the ministry gets information from the different forecasters. And Cullen's an expert in that field, so I'm going to get him to kind of walk through the thought process that they use on that.

**Cullen Stewart:** — Okay, thanks. Cullen Stewart, assistant deputy minister of fiscal policy division. So the way that the oil forecast is developed is using a broad range of private-sector expert forecasters for what they are forecasting. The WTI [West Texas Intermediate] price to be for the year. So when the budget

was developed, there were forecasters with prices in the mid-70s, in the low 70s, in the high 60s. So looking at that, the average at the time was approximately \$71 WTI.

The Ministry of Energy and Resources also looks at, you know, very recent actuals. Some of the factors that they have in their forecast account for different credits, or when maybe certain enhanced oil recovery projects are moving up or down in terms of when they're in pre-payout or post-payout. So they have a view of the netback at the wellhead specific across the province.

With respect to WTI, the forecast that the Alberta budget had was \$68. Ours was \$71. And British Columbia, which came out around the same time as Alberta's budget, had just under \$71. So a \$3 difference. Or in the case of British Columbia, you know, about 20 cents difference. That's not typically what you'd think would be a large spread at all between different forecasts. That's quite common that they be clustered in an area of, you know, a difference of a few dollars.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — The oil price, obviously due to economic circumstances, oil price is down. Off a budget obviously we have a big year ahead of us still, so it has to be determined on what the oil price is at. But I guess, anyways, pegging it three bucks higher than Alberta's, knowing that the fiscal impact is about \$18 million, you know, a dollar there I believe, a barrel, you're already out of the so-called balance. Setting aside the much bigger matter that we've already discussed, the non-inclusion of the 400-and-some million dollar revenue loss and adjustments required with the OBPS that aren't there.

So I guess to the minister: this budget is already out of fiscal balance, and you haven't accounted for potential impacts of any US or Trump tariffs and Chinese tariffs that we're experiencing right now. Why did you choose not to include any sort of a contingency fund to deal with that situation or incorporate some of the revenue impacts or fiscal and economic impacts into the budget?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So as we've discussed on the floor of the Assembly before, there was a tariff analysis done in the budget as part of the budget document that showed a worst-case scenario. If the tariffs were put on and left on for the entire year, it would be a \$1.4 billion hit. So it certainly wasn't hiding anything. It's there as part of the budget document.

[16:30]

I would point out though that already that's not where the tariffs are at. But again it's, you know, it's frustrating for everyone dealing with this that the tariffs have been changing at times almost by the day. It's almost possible to predict. But again, you know, other provinces have chosen to put a contingency in place and then have an even larger deficit. I'm not sure what the benefit of doing that is. At the end, the result is going to end up the same.

We've been very clear, as I said. I said it earlier tonight. I said it in the budget speech. I said it to all the media I did on budget day. I've said it on the floor of the Assembly. The tariffs could potentially have a big impact. Not a secret, but didn't make any sense in my view to say, well we have this contingency fund. And then you're in a deficit situation — to what end?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — It's the matter of planning. I mean basic things like, you know, a boost to AgriStability. Right now, you know, we don't have the dollars in the budget to backstop producers at this time. So again people deserve a budget that reflects reality and that steps up.

It's not just the matter of a contingency fund. It's a matter that this budget doesn't incorporate any of the fiscal impacts based on some of the economic impacts of Chinese tariffs or the US tariffs, which again don't provide an accurate portrayal of the fiscal position.

If we look at the scenario that you were looking at with respect to tariff impacts, you described an impact on the loss of revenue. I'm sure there'd also be an increase in expense. Maybe you could speak to that. On the revenue side, I'm just interested in how you break down or what you were looking at in the scenario there. Which revenue lines are impacted to what proportion when you're looking at that scenario? And then what expenditure pressures would you expect as well?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So in the tariff analysis that I mentioned that's in the budget, it speaks to . . . I'll read this part to you. It says:

The US tariffs and Canadian response scenario could reduce the value of Saskatchewan exports to the US by 8.2 billion or 30.4 per cent, reduce real GDP by up to 4.9 billion or 5.8 per cent, and then reduce revenue to the province by up to 1.4 billion.

So that's sort of the macro view of it, but again, I just would say we're obviously still very concerned about the possibility of what tariffs could do. But so far — that was the worst-case scenario — so far the tariffs aren't in effect to that extent.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No, I've got all that, and I know nothing's incorporated back into the budget, and I have the page in front of me. My question more specifically was, so we have a loss in revenue in kind of this worst-case scenario, laid out at 1.4 billion. I'm just interested in the different revenue lines and what proportion we're seeing, so the various tax impacts. I'm sure that's part of your scenario there. And then as well, if you could speak to the expense pressures that you'd also have as part of that scenario.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So Cullen led that analysis. I'm going to get him to walk through that.

**Cullen Stewart:** — Thank you for the question. So in terms of the impact analysis, the decline in GDP [gross domestic product], there's a historic relationship between the province's total revenue and when you see GDP increase or decrease. So it's very consistent over the last 20-plus years. So when you look at our revenue sources, 50 per cent comes from taxes, for example, of total revenue.

So if you saw a significant decline in GDP to the degree of 5.8 per cent from the current budget forecast of 1.8, so negative 4 per cent growth, that would have broad impacts across many different sectors — your consumer base, retail, all of that, right. So you would see significant decline spread across lots of different tax types and both on the consumer side, consumption

side, as well as business taxes. So that would be the vast majority of the impacts we would anticipate. If we saw a decline in revenue, it would be in that category, which makes up 50 per cent of our total revenue.

There would be, you know, impacts in other own-source as well as in natural resources, depending on particularly what was happening in those sectors. That's potential. But the vast majority we'd expect to see spread across the different tax types.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Do you have a bit of a formula that you've assessed there as far as that correlation between the GDP and the tax revenues? In this scenario, you'd have a \$5 billion loss in real GDP, and then a corresponding revenue reduction of about 1.4. So what is it, about 225 mil or something like this per billion on the GDP as far as the tax impacts?

**Cullen Stewart:** — Yeah, there's an historic relationship between nominal GDP changes . . .

**Chair Steele:** — Please can we just . . . Please do not touch the mikes.

**Cullen Stewart:** — Sorry. My apologies. And total revenue. And so the point that I was trying to draw out was the vast majority of our revenue comes from taxation, so if we were to see that large drop, we would anticipate to see the largest drop coming from the taxation bucket, which makes up 50 per cent of our total revenue.

There would be some impacts in other areas as well, particularly other own-source. And in the case of those specific sectors like potash, uranium, oil, it would depend what was happening specifically in those sectors in any given year. So those would be different than looking at total revenue and that overall relationship.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Moving my microphone there, Mr. Chair. That Chair, he's fair but tough, eh?

Now with respect to vote no. 18, I have a couple of questions around this vote 18 here, a few detailed questions. They're pretty straightforward. I guess first, central management and services budget is increasing by 37 per cent. Can you please list for me all the various components and reasons for that large increase?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I'll just get our deputy minister, Max, to walk through that.

**Max Hendricks:** — So the increase is partially related to one-time increases. \$1.8 million will be a one-time increase for capital costs associated with moving the Public Service Commission out of our current building to accommodate staff moving in for EBMP [enterprise business modernization project].

There's a 1.015 million one-time increase for capital accommodations so that we can adjust base within Cooper Place, again to accommodate staff that are shifting into the ministry from other ministries, and then a \$294,000 increase for salary adjustments for collective bargaining, and then a 100,000 increase for one FTE reallocation from the Provincial Comptroller's to Finance's internal audit branch, and a \$9,000



increase for SaskBuilds recoveries.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Thanks so much. The two first items you mentioned, was the 1.8 million on the moving — this is associated with the EBMP — as well as the 1.05 million?

**Max Hendricks:** — No, they're capital amounts that are one time.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — One time. Okay. Capital . . . The next question's concerning the Provincial Comptroller's office and a \$9.4 million increase in their budget. Can you list for me what that increase is for? I see some of this is broken out. I see that they're paying 3.2 million in new salaries, 6.2 million in increased goods and services. So I'd just like more detail on that.

**Max Hendricks:** — So the biggest part of the increase is a \$9.063 million increase for the government enterprise management implementation system, GEM, or EBMP as it's known. \$2.667 million increase for sustainment contract, and that is frozen. That would be the amounts that we pay our share of it to the vendor for services that they provide going forward. 1.659 million for 26 FTEs for centralization of services, so that's a transferred amount. \$1.57 million increase for GEM licensing. \$1.145 million increase for GEM and 14 FTEs for GEM sustainment.

And then a \$920,000 increase for GEM accommodation costs. That was what I was talking about earlier, where we're taking on the Public Service Commission's accommodation costs because there will be staff moving in to the Ministry of Finance. 571,000 for centralization of operational costs, again related to GEM. All this is, sorry. And then \$260,000 for IT [information technology] additional services, and 175,000 for GEM training costs, and \$500,000 decrease for the ministry's contribution towards GEM.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Yeah, thanks for that. So that was what I was trying to get to was whether or not this EBMP enterprise system, or the GEM system, how much it's costing. Now you detailed a bunch of different increases there as a result of that system, and my question was about the comptroller's office. Were all the costs that you identified, all those increases, within the comptroller's office?

**Max Hendricks:** — The first set that I provided, the capital costs, were within corporate services, and then the remainder were in the Provincial Comptroller's office. As well there's allocations to other ministries.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — And so then out of the Provincial Comptroller's here, what was the total there associated with the increase or the costs for the GEM or EBMP system?

**Max Hendricks:** — It would be about \$11.5 million.

[16:45]

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — And are those sustaining costs, those costs? Are some of those one-time costs? Are some of them . . .

**Max Hendricks:** — Some of those are one time. Approximately 2.8 million are one-time costs. And then keep in mind, the majority of those costs related to the 26 FTEs and the 14 FTEs

are offset by moving money around in government. So we actually issued a bill to a ministry, another ministry, and transferred budget into our ministry.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Now who in government is responsible for operating the new EBMP or GEM system?

**Max Hendricks:** — That'll be Ministry of SaskBuilds and Procurement.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — What functions does this new software provide for the Ministry of Finance?

**Max Hendricks:** — Basically this program, you know, over time it will I guess deal with approximately 61 different functions that government currently provides. It will deal with the finance side. It will deal with PSC [Public Service Commission] side, payroll, all that sort of thing, human resources management, and then supply chain as well.

So it deals with a number of government functions for finance specifically. You know, it will be accounts receivable, payables, planning, budgeting, and forecasting. It will be responsible for putting out our estimates every quarter and for our budget. And then all the consolidation that we do in terms of all the accounts of government . . . with the financial statement, sorry, as well.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Now which ministry in government paid for the development of the new EBMP or GEM system? And was the system's cost capitalized?

**Max Hendricks:** — So as lead ministry, SaskBuilds holds the contract for the vendor and manages procurement, so they will capitalize the capital portions of the budget.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Now how much in total has the EBMP or GEM system cost to develop?

**Max Hendricks:** — I think that's a question for SaskBuilds. Right in front of me I don't have the numbers. I have what's in the Ministry of Finance's estimates.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Would that be something that you'd be able to get back to us in subsequent days if it's not with you here tonight?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So that would be in the builds budget, as we said. So you can get it from the minister there or a written question. Or you've got a number of avenues for that.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No. I've got the Finance minister here and in charge of the budget. If the number's not available just right here, a simple undertaking to provide us the information back reflected in the budget put together by you and your ministry.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I'll mention it to the Minister of SaskBuilds.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Because I think there's costs that are being borne in different ministries as well, right. So maybe I guess to make sure that we're getting the question properly captured: the cost to develop that system to date and all other associated costs across government that would be reflected in the

current budget and previous budgets. Now am I correct to understand that this system is the same as the new software system installed for the Saskatchewan Health Authority? Is that correct?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Can I just clarify — sorry — as your question, is this the same system that SHA [Saskatchewan Health Authority] is using? Is that . . .

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah. So I understand or it's been shared with me that this software system is the same as the new software system installed by the Saskatchewan Health Authority. Is that correct?

**Max Hendricks:** — Questions towards the AIMS [administrative information management system] project would have to be directed to the Ministry of Health. I've been out of Health for a few years, as you know. But it's the same vendor and the same I guess core product, but there are several modules that have different suppliers, that sort of thing. It's a much different system in that regard, with different functionality. They have more collective agreements, that sort of thing. So it's quite different.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thanks so much. Same vendor. And just remind me, who's the vendor on this?

**Max Hendricks:** — The lead vendor is Deloitte.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. My next question's concerning the treasury management division. And I think there's a 5 per cent increase in the budget with respect to salaries increasing by 338,000. Just some clarification as to whether you're adding staff or increasing individual salaries. If you're adding staff, if you can justify what the roles . . . You know, why.

**Max Hendricks:** — Yeah, we have 200,000 and two FTEs to expand our investment management capacity, and then we have an additional \$163,000 that was for the increase in salary adjustments for out-of-scope.

The increase in FTEs to increase our management capacity is related to the fact that we're functioning in a lot of different markets now. Last year we went into Euromarkets. A couple of years ago, a few years ago we went into the US markets to broaden our exposure. And so with that comes different filings and that sort of thing, and a heightened need for expertise in those areas.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thanks for that. In a similar fashion, the budget for the revenue division is increasing by 4.2 million, or 15.5 per cent. Could you please list the reasons for this increase with the costs associated with each reason? And is the increased budget associated with the new EBMP or GEM software system?

**Max Hendricks:** — The costs related to EBMP aren't within the revenue division. There's a \$2.55 million increase for salary adjustments for collective bargaining with the SGEU [Saskatchewan Government and General Employees' Union]. This is our largest shop in Finance, so thus the greatest increase.

And then we have 1.365 million for tax compliance initiatives

and \$350,000 increase for additional operating expenses to support division operations.

In terms of, you know, the tax compliance initiatives, over the last few years we've increased our enforcement in terms of both things like PST [provincial sales tax] and tobacco. And we found that those positions tend to pay off in terms of our revenue collections, and obviously we have tobacco flowing across our province into Alberta and stuff like that. So we've seen more activity on that front.

But also, you know, we want to be more active in making sure that people that are not paying their PST are paying it. And so we'll focus on that as well.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — The budget for the budget analysis division is increasing by 876,000 or 11.6 per cent. It says the increase is associated entirely with salaries.

My question is, how many new staff did you add? And what portion of the increase was associated with the increased salaries, or with increased salaries?

**Max Hendricks:** — Yeah. 676,000 was for increased salaries, and 200,000 and two FTEs was just an internal reallocation from the Provincial Comptroller's office to support budgeting and forecasting. So just a movement within the ministry.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — I see the personnel policy secretariat is increasing by 9 per cent, and as well there's a subvote called financial programs there as well. It's increasing by 346 per cent.

Could you explain the specific programs or expenditures that are included in these subvotes? And also please break out if there's any that are associated with that EBMP and GEM system.

**Max Hendricks:** — So the increase to the personnel policy secretariat was \$48,000. That was purely salary adjustments, nothing from EBMP obviously. And then in the financial programs, this is where we build in the increases for \$7.3 million for the Saskatchewan secondary suite incentive grant program, a million dollars for the Saskatchewan class 1 truck driver training rebate program, and a million dollars for the first-time homebuyers tax credit transition program.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Thanks for that information. So I guess if I look across those . . . Thanks for breaking down many of those costs in each of those areas. You know, it stands that the Finance minister, his own budget there is increasing government overhead on this front by 37 per cent.

I guess just a question to the minister: is he comfortable with that at the same time that it's been fairly tight budgets for areas like Health and Education, Social Services, who are certainly in many cases in a real challenged position?

[17:00]

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — To your question, so there's a number of factors that weigh into that. I'm just going to read through where that increase that you read came from. So part of that was the SGEU settlement. There was 40 FTEs.

We were talking about GEM, but those are reallocations. So those look like an increase in the Ministry of Finance, but they've actually been reallocated. They were transferred from other ministries, so the overall cost to government is nil.

When wage increases anywhere in government, with a wage increase, because it's a percentage, the pension increase goes up as well. And all the pension increase is allocated to the Ministry of Finance. So there's an impact there. There's also seven FTEs compliance, which ministry officials believe will be offset by increased revenue from that.

And then the affordability measures. The affordability measures we campaigned on, many of them are included in here. The secondary suite program is, the new homebuyers, the truck driver training — those are all included in there as well.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay, so while we have these increases that we're talking about in these divisions here, government is continuing down the path, I understand, of considering duplicating the federal corporate income tax system and creating this new Saskatchewan agency called the Saskatchewan revenue agency. Of course this has been a point that we've challenged, along with the business community, from the get-go, driving up admin costs and driving up compliance costs.

I guess my question to the minister, why would you want to further increase the administrative cost that Saskatchewan taxpayers have to pay for?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — It hasn't been ruled out, potentially some point down the road, but there's nothing imminent. There's nothing in this budget for it. Frankly, we've had other things we've been dealing with. I've really had no discussions on it in this file.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Well that's sort of been our point these last couple years. You know, it's going to drive up the costs for government, for taxpayers. It's going to become a more redundant system where businesses have to file twice, and it's going to cost them more for compliance.

So it's just, you know, I think that this is something that should have been dead on arrival. So it sort of is confusing why your government continues to carry this idea forward and not put it to rest and focus energy and priorities in the areas they need to be.

I know last year I canvassed this a little bit, and there was some discussion about the kind of work that your ministry, was up to on this front. Can you share with us at this point on the work that you've done, what the increased cost to administration would be for this program?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Any of those kind of numbers would require a detailed analysis that hasn't been done, that's not being done at this time.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Again, we're going on a few years now with this energy taking oxygen and some time of your officials and resources and revenues of government to analyze. It seems that it should be put to rest. But it also seems strange that there's not a better forecast around some of the costs of a program that you've been contemplating for a few years and spending

resources and time within your ministry on. So that's surprising, disappointing.

With respect to the compliance costs, the last thing businesses need right now is another hit on them, another increase to their costs. And certainly they don't need a more complex tax filing system. But could you share at this point what you've assessed as the increased costs for businesses for compliance on this front?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So, sorry, your question on compliance was?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — The question is, we've met with businesses. The business community has spoken out on this, the accounting community. Building this more complex system will place an onus, an extra onus on businesses when they file, and not only be more complex but drive up their costs for compliance, their costs to file their taxes.

We've had some numbers estimated out on the front as far as what this would mean for the businesses in our province. I'm just wondering what number you have as far as the costs, annual costs, the additional costs that this would impose upon businesses.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Well, you're going a long way down the road that we're not at. I just said that detailed sort of analysis hasn't been done, nor are we working on it. All that I said when you asked about it is that we haven't completely ruled that out at some point in the future, just like you don't rule out a lot of things. But there's no analysis being done. There's nothing imminent there. There is no work being done on that right now.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — I know you're new into the role here, but I know the ministry, year after year I've followed up on this front because there's been work being done by the ministry, and the minister's spoken to this initiative.

So I guess again it's just frustrating that some of these, I think, some of these clear reasons that we should, you know, toss this bad idea out before it costs us any more money. And again any initiative that you have some of your officials spending time on and working on or commissioning reports on is costing time and money that should be better focused when we know the outcomes of this are higher costs for taxpayers and then higher costs for businesses to file their taxes, the compliance costs.

I guess specific to some of the reports that you've engaged on this front as a ministry, would you be able to table the McGregor report, and also share its recommendations?

**Max Hendricks:** — So you're correct that we did commission what I would describe as some high-level policy analysis. It didn't get into system design or any of that stuff — what would be required, the costing that you've mentioned.

The report that Kirk McGregor assisted C.D. Howe with, the draft was submitted to me last June. And quite honestly, it just hasn't been a priority focus of the Ministry of Finance in the last several months. I've had no opportunity to brief the minister on it. And because it's a document that potentially, you know, that we would need to brief government on, we've held that document. And we haven't presented anything on it to them.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Would you be able to table that commissioned report and/or speak to the recommendations?

**Max Hendricks:** — No, not until cabinet and others and my minister has had an option to consider it.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Well again, I would just urge the minister's attention, because any time you have too many files and ones that are taking you down a wasteful path — drive up the cost for taxpayers, drive up the cost for businesses — it sort of takes the eye off the ball and the resources that could be deployed in more effective ways.

[17:15]

Now this as I understood, the government and the minister had always talked about this as taking a collection of the federal corporate taxes away from the federal government and setting it up here. Again I've identified all the problems with that. But is the minister or the ministry also contemplating the same for income taxes?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — There's been no discussion about personal.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay. Moving along a little bit, I'd like to touch on a file that's critically important to this province. It's a matter of equalization and fiscal fairness for the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly we face inequity as a province with respect to this program. Certainly over the years, year after year and throughout the year we've advocated for reform and change and for this to be addressed to make sure that non-renewable resources are treated in equitable fashion with renewable resource revenues.

We've laid out different improvements and advocated at this committee with the Finance minister in the past, and year to year as well. What I'm interested in is what actions have you undertaken as a minister on this front. And can you share with us the most recent communication and proposals that you would have taken up with the federal government on this front, or provincial counterparts?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So Newfoundland has filed a court case with the federal government challenging the constitutionality of the equalization formula, so Saskatchewan has applied for intervenor status. We support them on that. We agree with Newfoundland. My understanding I think is that's anticipated to go to court this fall.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — We've undertaken to communicate with the three federal leaders — Poilievre, Carney, and Singh — on this matter and be clear of the inequity that Saskatchewan faces and the need to address this matter of fiscal fairness. Have you had a chance to take this up directly with those that are running for prime minister?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So as part of having intervenor status, Saskatchewan's position I think is very clear. It's laid out in the court documents — those documents are public — and we look forward to that court case.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah. You know, we had filed a court case years ago and then that was scrapped by your government,

unfortunately. So now we're back at it with a court case. Could also be resolved obviously with leadership from a prime minister and a federal government. That's why we've chosen to advocate there and importantly to advocate with other provinces on this important matter.

I'd like to shift just a little bit to a matter related to concerns around tax fraud within the construction sector. Particularly it's been identified to be a concern in large public projects and also in larger industrial projects as well, and it goes right across the industry. And some of what's been identified . . . I know some of the carpenters have met with the Premier recently as well and had followed up, you know, followed up on this matter before.

But the way some projects are organized, as you go through the subs you can get into a situation where a worker is classifying themselves incorrectly, or sorry, the company's classifying those workers incorrectly, you know, paying them cash, or . . . And of course if you're undermining that system it leaves the workers in a vulnerable position.

I know provinces like Ontario were looking at this. They've assessed that construction tax fraud cost them about \$3 billion a year in revenues that don't get submitted. So I guess as Finance minister, that's why I bring it to you here today to see if you've assessed construction tax fraud as a concern, potential fiscal impacts, and as well if any measures to address it.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So the meeting you mentioned that the Carpenters' Regional Council had with the Premier, I also met with them later in the day. We had a great meeting actually and a very interesting discussion. So we're taking a look at what they had given to us.

And again we also work . . . It impacts a lot of players, right. It also impacts WCB [Workers' Compensation Board]. It impacts, as you mentioned, tax fraud, income tax, GST [goods and services tax], PST, all of those. So we had made some changes to the financial services Act not that long ago too.

So I'm just going to get either Max or Cullen, whoever wants to do that, to just kind of touch on how this impacts that as well.

**Max Hendricks:** — Yeah, so you'll recall that last October we introduced *The Revenue and Financial Services Act*, and what that really does is it gives government more teeth in terms of PST enforcement. And so it increases not only the fines, but it is part of the other discussion we had on our revenue enforcement activities. It increases, with that part, increases our ability to actually detect these non-compliance issues.

The impacts, obviously, if we were to find out somebody in the trades wasn't paying PST, there's a pretty good chance they're not paying income tax or WCB costs as well. And so obviously we have mechanisms to communicate that to those agencies.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah, thanks for that information. And I appreciate as well that the minister met with the carpenters. I want to thank them for their advocacy over the years on this front.

One of the solutions that they had, they had a couple ideas. One of the ones was to have . . . require a publication, or providing on a public project back to the government a declaration, a statutory

declaration, that would state all the subs throughout the project. This would be on the general contract, back to all the subs, as well as all the employees, and provide that back to the government.

That should be readily available information. It shouldn't be too onerous, you know, we always want to be careful to not be adding red tape that isn't of value. It seemed to be a solution that was maybe very efficient and would give the government the ability to investigate and address concerns where they find them.

Maybe shifting gears a little bit. I want to address a concern that's been brought to me around I guess a bit of a gendered thing, a bit of an inequity for maybe women or for parents as it relates to the graduate tax credit program.

Of course this program is valued by those that are utilizing it. What I've had identified is that it's quite common for a parent, for a mother, to . . . if they're into the workforce but then also into growing a family and raising children, not able to fully utilize their tax credits because of the way that impacts, the way raising that child and maternity leave impacts their incomes through that period of time.

[17:30]

I'm just wondering if this is something that's been brought to you as a minister, and if it is something that you're interested in looking at. I know one of the folks that reached out to me and was sharing kind of how common and widespread it is that there seems to be a real inequity for women on this front. I'm wondering if you're tracking the utilization of that full tax credit for men as opposed to women for those that enter into that program.

And then I'm wondering if, you know, maybe there might be a fix kind of along the lines of what you see for, you know, some of the federal programs where you kind of have a bit of a child-rearing carve-out, and then extend . . . carry forward and extend the ability for that credit to be claimed.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — So this hasn't been raised with me before, and officials tell me it hasn't been with them either. A very good question though, very interesting. So because of that we don't track it, but officials were also telling me that there's some rollover possibilities there they could use. So I'm just going to get Cullen to touch on that.

**Cullen Stewart:** — Thank you for the question. So with respect to the graduate retention program, the non-refundable tax credit, the issue that you raised, this is the first time I've heard of it as well.

But basically that program provides tax credits post-graduation from a degree program or a journey person certificate, etc. over a seven-year period. So you claim the credits over a seven-year period. If in any of those years you have unclaimed credit amounts, those roll forward. And then you have up to 10 years to claim the full credit amount with your certificate that you get issued from the post-secondary institution upon graduation.

So again, we haven't heard anything directly from any taxpayers or other groups about this issue that you raised. But there is that

extended claim period, and there is the rollover provisions each year for any unused credits.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No, thanks for the information. That's why I brought it here; it was brought to me. And certainly those that brought it to me are in a position of dealing with tax filing for a large number of individuals, and state that it's a fairly common situation that many younger women face as they come into those child . . . they grow their family and then they're not in a position, with all the provisions that you've described there, to fully utilize that tax credit.

Those that have brought it, presented it, it says that this is kind of an inequity and the kind of thing you don't want to be doing that impacts, you know, women in a different way or those that are raising a family. So something to consider, and I'd appreciate if you could look a little bit at a comparison of who's fully subscribed or utilized those tax credits by way of men or women and those with children.

And if this is a problem as has been identified to me, there's solutions that could be brought to bear, as I mentioned. The CPP [Canada Pension Plan], there's a child-rearing carve-out that's there. And then you might need to adjust some of the carryforward provisions. But I'll leave it with you for now and maybe follow back up in a few months or something to see if there's been any further consideration on this front.

I'd be interested in I guess a couple questions around . . . If the minister can advise me whether the operations of the numerous international trade offices that have been established around the world are governed by the same financial framework as ministries operating here in Saskatchewan.

**Max Hendricks:** — So the export offices, which is something that is operated out of the trade and economic development ministry, are required and that ministry is required to follow *The Financial Administration Act*, the Financial Administration Manual, and everything else that a ministry in executive government would be required to follow.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay, thanks so much. And so that probably answers the next question here then, but I'll still put it just to make sure. Do those offices submit payment requests and accompanying documentation to the Ministry of Finance for issuance of payments? And are there any petty cash accounts or chequing accounts managed in these offices?

**Max Hendricks:** — The trade offices tend to have agreements with the consulates. Oftentimes they operate out of consulates for efficiency, and they have arrangements with them so that they don't have to manage issues around currency and that sort of thing. But still their reporting requirements would exist.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — And that answered some of the questions around . . . Do they submit payment requests with accompanying documents to the Ministry of Finance? And do they have petty cash accounts or chequing accounts managed within these offices?

**Max Hendricks:** — So they do submit information to us on what has been paid, through Global Affairs Canada. And to our knowledge they don't have petty cash accounts.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Shifting gears just a little bit to debt within the province and some of the impacts of that. I'd like to focus a bit on what's really been on the rise in a big way in the last couple years, last few years. The debt's been on the rise for a good number of years, and we see that trajectory as a concern, but the debt servicing costs are really coming home to roost.

And this budget with over a \$100 million increase to the cost of just servicing that debt this year, I'd be interested if the minister can provide the forecast over the next four years for where that debt servicing costs go. Of course in this budget it increased by over \$100 million, surpassed a billion dollars in costs. If you can provide the forecast for the next four years?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I think officials had given this to you on budget day, but we'll give it to you again — the forecast. I would just say this though. This is a straight-line analysis. It doesn't take into account any change in direction from the government. We will be looking at capital. Obviously we want to make sure we keep this in check. But I'll get Max to read that in.

**Max Hendricks:** — Yeah. So as the minister said, assuming kind of a straight-line growth in the current capital plan, it would be \$1.2 billion in '26-27; 1.295 billion in '27-28; 1.437 billion in '28-29; and 1.651 billion in '29-30.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Okay, thanks for the information. I wanted make sure we had it on the public record. As the minister identified, we have had a briefing, but I know in those briefings I'm not able to reference the information that I receive there. So I appreciate it being shared here.

And I guess what's really concerning for folks is to look at a budget just, you know, a year ago that spent 800 million on debt servicing. And we had identified the trajectory at that point that was concerning as well as changing interest rates as a concern at the time. That had been largely brushed aside by the minister — not the current minister — but now we're looking at a doubling, right, over a course of, wow, just like six years or so from 800 million on that debt servicing cost to \$1.6 billion. And that starts to eat into the dollars that government has at its disposal. This year where it's surpassed a billion dollars or 1.1 billion it's almost 5 per cent of the total expenditure of government, I believe.

But anyways this is why, you know, solid fiscal management matters. It's why, you know, dollars can't be wasted and stuck on the debt or otherwise.

But I'm interested on of course the debt's increases in a real big way, you know, over \$38 billion now in this budget and climbing, but I'd like just a little bit more technical information with respect to the profile of the borrowings of government. So could you confirm for me the interest rate assumptions in your '25-26 financing program for 5-, 10-, and 25-year borrowings.

[17:45]

**Max Hendricks:** — I guess a few things. So we use assumptions. So most of our borrowing is done at kind of a 5- and 10-year, you know. We do have some 30-year. We've used a blended rate or an average of 4.25 per cent, which given the current trajectory is probably on the high end. We use 3 per cent for short-term debt

less than one year.

And you know, I think a couple of other factors. You know, we still have a debt-to-GDP ratio of 14 per cent or below 14 per cent, and we've tried to kind of keep it in that ballpark. And we have the highest credit rating in the country, which is an indication from credit rating agencies that, you know, as a province they have confidence in our ability to service that debt.

I think from a technical perspective, you know, just reflecting on the last question, when you have debt . . . Part of our debt number is debt refinancing, and this year we happen to have some debt that was older debt come due for refinancing. And you know, that was borrowed at a very, very low interest rate, unusually low. And we're, you know, having to refinance it at 4.25 per cent, so that's a danger. But it cuts both ways too. You know, we could have 30-year debt come due that was at a high interest rate, and we could be financing it lower now.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No, thanks so much. I think a lot of households across the province would be able to relate to the scenario you just described, who may have been in a mortgage where they're coming to the end of their term. And they may have had a fairly low rate or, you know, what had become a fairly consistent rate for them, and you know, a fairly significant adjustment that many have endured in the last couple years here and moving forward as well. All those rates are coming down a little bit. Still a significant impact for many, many households.

But more specifically, just looking at your debt — and you spoke to this a little bit here and I've asked this question in the past, in past years, so it's no sneak attack — could you provide a breakdown, a complete breakdown of the individual borrowings that comprise total government debt in '25-26.

And then please identify for each tranche of debt the source of the borrowing, the term of the debt, the due date, and who's responsible for the debt — whether that's executive government versus a self-supporting Crown — as well as the interest rate.

**Max Hendricks:** — So in the budget document our plan is, in the '25-26 fiscal year to a total of new borrowing and refinancing of roughly \$4 billion.

In terms of the breakdown of upcoming maturities, debt maturities, and interest rates, we have 1.7 billion from — I hope I get these right — 1.7 billion from SaskWater and 175 million for Sask Power. And then we're refinancing 1.2 billion. That's the GRF [General Revenue Fund]. And then \$50 million for Power and \$3 million for MFC [Municipal Finance Corporation of Saskatchewan].

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thanks for that. And it would be hard to convey the information in the few minutes we have left on the full question sort of that I had asked, but in the past I've received and have appreciated from the ministry kind of the full tranche, sort of the breakdown of all the government's debt, all the borrowings that comprise government debt in '25-26, and then identify each tranche of the debt; the source of the borrowing; the term of the debt; the due date; who's responsible for the debt, exec government or self-supporting Crown; and the interest rate.

I know this won't be information that . . . Or it's probably more

information than we can receive in the next few minutes here, but as I've received in the past, could the minister undertake to have that information provided back to us in the subsequent days?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Just to clarify, we can give you that up to this fiscal. But because we haven't borrowed yet this year, we'll endeavour to give you as much information as we . . .

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah. Thank you. Just a couple of final pieces. I see our time is ticking by here. With respect to something I've followed up with each year, I've had interest in and thought the ministry's done good work around addressing e-commerce platforms, or properly taxing e-commerce platforms outside of Saskatchewan.

There's a matter of fiscal fairness on this front, I'd say, for Saskatchewan companies, for local companies, where you have an online retailer that's not remitting taxes to the province of Saskatchewan but a local retailer or local business is on the hook for that. So this is something I've followed up with over the years.

Your ministry has done good work on this front in the last few years, and I just am looking for an update on two things. I think the last update I received is that they had registered over 323 businesses or organizations here to register taxes on this front now, of these out-of-province e-commerce platforms. I'd like an update on that number, because I know there's been continued work, and then what the amount of revenue collection has been on this front or is on this front for this current budget.

**Brent Hebert:** — Brent Hebert, assistant deputy minister, treasury board, personal policy secretariat. So thanks for the question; I remember you ask it each year. So over '24-25 we have identified 13 additional businesses that are selling into Saskatchewan with respect to online sales. We've got them registered. Year over year it's about a million dollars more in revenue. We've hit a lot of the big ones, so we're starting to reach maybe that point of diminishing returns, but total tax collections on the strategy have reached just under \$280 million of additional tax revenue on that program.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — That's great. Because as I say, this is a file that I've followed up over the years and urged action. And I've been very encouraged by the actions taken by you and your team, so credit to you. And it's not just a matter of having those revenues there, it's a matter of retailing or fiscal fairness for Saskatchewan businesses as well.

[18:00]

I'm interested with respect . . . Of course we've pushed for a long time for the needed pipeline capacity in this country and getting access to tidewater. The Trans Mountain project of course came online last year, last spring. And I'm just interested in a fiscal update from the ministry around what that's meant, how that's played out around the differential and the fiscal impact for the province.

**Cullen Stewart:** — Thank you for the question. With respect to Western Canada, it's an integrated production zone between Saskatchewan and Alberta, also a little bit in Manitoba, and obviously to a certain extent, even North Dakota.

When you talk about egress capacity from the region, the main pipeline system is the Mainline pipeline system, which effectively runs from the Edmonton area all the way down through to Chicago. And then from there it separates out: some pipes go east into the Great Lakes region, and some go south, and some oil stays in that main basin. So that's the vast majority of our Western Canadian egress capacity, is that Mainline pipeline system.

For many years, the Mainline system was oversubscribed. Essentially more barrels were wanting to get shipped on the system than the system had capacity to ship. So that leads to what is called apportionment, where basically barrels get pushed back from the different producers. And there's a formula that Enbridge implements to do that.

When barrels are getting apportioned, oftentimes you'll see, you know, crude by rail increase. Sometimes in the past it's increased significantly. That's worse for producers; obviously it's more expensive to ship product by rail. It's worse for the economy in Western Canada too because we use the rail system to move agricultural products — potash and those sorts of things — that can't move in a pipe.

The big gain from the Trans Mountain Expansion, about 600,000 barrels a day of additional egress capacity, was to get to tidewater a lot more oil from the Western Canadian sedimentary basin into the Pacific basin, which is the most lucrative market in the world. So you get a better price for that oil and you diversify, obviously, your buyers.

What also happened there is apportionment has fallen off, and we haven't seen apportionment in quite some time on the Mainline system. So that means that more barrels are moving on that system as well.

Broadly speaking, when we look back at some of the years when we had light-heavy differentials, say in '23-24, the light-heavy differential was nearly 17 per cent. So that's the differential between WTI and Western Canadian Select. You know, we're down now to 15 per cent, is their forecast in our budget. But the Q3 [third quarter] forecast is about 14.2 per cent. So that's the most recent actual data that we have is in that Q3 forecast.

That is a significant gain in terms of the value of the oil that's being shipped on the heavy side. Also when our oil on the light side is all moving by pipeline, that's a cheaper way to move the oil. Better netbacks to the wellhead means better price for producers, better royalties overall for government.

So increasing the egress capacity in Western Canada, getting more oil, whatever kind of oil it is, to tidewater out of our basin helps all oil producers across the entire basin in terms of transport options. And overall the pricing levels that we're seeing in Western Canada for all our heavy oil at the wellhead is improving.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Having reached our agreed-upon time for considerations of Finance today, we will adjourn considerations for these estimates. Minister, do you have any closing comments?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I'd just like to thank you, Mr. Chair, and

staff, committee members, and the critic and his colleagues for the questions and discussion today. And I'd like to thank all the Finance officials for their good work, not just for today but over the past year as well. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

**Chair Steele:** — Do you have any comments? Closing comments?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thanks so much. I'd like to thank the Chair as well. You know, firm but fair, I thought, Mr. Chair. And I want to thank all the officials that do this very important work day in, day out that joined us here today and that are involved in the work right across the province. I want to thank the minister for his time and many of his responses as well.

I mean I've stated my very clear concern with the choice to bring forward a budget that's not accurate and my very serious concerns about what that means for this legislature and those that are going to vote on it and the people of Saskatchewan, who I believe deserve better. But with that being said, thanks to the committee members and the Chair, and certainly all the officials and the minister for his time here tonight.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you so much. Do we need to recess to change officials, or do we just continue on, Minister? Okay. All right. Next item, consideration of Bill No. 13.

### Bill No. 13 — *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2025*

#### Clause 1

**Chair Steele:** — We will now consider Bill No. 13, *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2025*. We will begin on the considerations with Clause 1, short title. Minister Reiter is here with the officials. I would remind officials to identify themselves for the record for the first time they speak. And do not touch the microphones; Hansard has operators that will turn them on. Minister, please introduce your officials and opening comments.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Thank you. The same officials are present. These changes reflect our government's continued focus on making life more affordable for everyone in Saskatchewan. They also ensure that our tax system remains clear and aligned with the CRA [Canada Revenue Agency] requirements.

Amendments include the addition of the fertility treatment tax credit. We know that fertility treatments can be costly, and we believe that this will provide the opportunity for families who wish to have children. Saskatchewan families deserve this support, and we're delivering it. This credit will provide meaningful financial relief, covering 50 per cent of eligible fertility treatment costs and related prescription drugs up to a maximum benefit of \$10,000 per individual.

These amendments also include introduction of the small and medium enterprise investment tax credit, an important initiative for Saskatchewan businesses. Small and medium-sized businesses are essential to our province, and this three-year pilot program will help fuel investment in key industries, including food and beverage manufacturing, as well as machinery and transportation equipment manufacturing. Starting in July of 2025, investors who acquire an equity stake in these businesses will receive a 45 per cent non-refundable tax credit on eligible

investments. We continue to position Saskatchewan as the best place in Canada to start and grow a business, and this tax credit will help achieve that goal.

The legislation also includes some housekeeping amendments. For example, at the request of the CRA, we are making updates to tax credit formulas to ensure indexation adjustments are applied smoothly in the coming years. We're also extending the Saskatchewan commercial innovation incentive program's new application window for two more years, ensuring continued support for businesses bringing new technologies to market.

Mr. Chair, these amendments deliver affordability for Saskatchewan people, and I would be happy to take any questions.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you, Minister. Any questions?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thank you. I'd ask a couple questions with respect to the legislation. Could you just break out the fiscal impacts for the current fiscal year with respect to this legislation, the changes that have been brought forward, as well as for the years ahead?

**Max Hendricks:** — The fertility tax credit is estimated in the budget at \$3 million per year. And then the small and medium enterprise investment tax credit will be three and a half million dollars in '25-26, but that starts halfway through the year so it'll be 7 million on an annualized basis.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Thanks so much. And as far as some of the changes on income tax, how do those . . . What are the fiscal impacts on the income tax changes?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I just want to clarify to make sure we're addressing your question. So when you said income tax, the affordability income tax measures we made were actually in a previous bill. The income tax ones here are indexation. So we can get Cullen to speak to these or if that might clarify what you're thinking.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah, no, that's good. Maybe he could speak to the components that are within this bill, and I appreciate that as well.

**Cullen Stewart:** — With respect to the three elements I guess within this bill, as Deputy Minister Hendricks had said, the fertility treatment tax credit, the estimated fiscal impact of that annually will be \$3 million a year. With respect to the small and medium enterprise investment tax credit, the estimated impacts, once fully implemented on that program, will be \$7 million a year in tax credits awarded.

With respect to the housekeeping amendments, the extension of the two-year window for new applications to the Saskatchewan commercial innovation incentive, that will be dependent on what applications are ultimately received in that two-year period in terms of what the fiscal impacts would be from that. So it depends what specific projects that come in to that program during that two-year period. So we'll see what happens with that and adjust accordingly, but difficult to forecast at this time as it's very project specific.



And then there was some housekeeping amendments with respect to in out-years, how the formulas are quite complicated for the indexation that occurs with the \$500 increases to all the major credits in the '26, '27, and '28 tax years as well as the indexation.

So with respect to engagement with CRA, they had requested . . . They thought there was some ways to simplify, streamline those credits so that in their administration of the income tax system and with the tax agencies and software providers that they work with, that they would be able to more efficiently administer those increases as they stack on top of indexation.

Which we of course don't know the exact percentage of indexation right now in those out-tax years because that depends on what the national consumer price index is for those years. So typically we would estimate 2 per cent, but the actuals won't be known until that indexation is set. And then the incremental \$500 increases to the tax credits are applied on top of that amount.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — I think everything's fairly straightforward for me here, Mr. Chair. I know we've advocated for some other measurers around affordability, but that debate we've had in other forums. We've talked about the PST that's been put on so many goods, including things like children's clothes and groceries. But with respect to the actual bill itself, I don't have any further questions on that front.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, seeing no more questions we'll proceed to the vote on the clauses. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 21 inclusive agreed to.]

[18:15]

**Chair Steele:** — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2025*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 13, *The Income Tax Amendment Act, 2025*. MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] Bromm.

#### **Bill No. 16 — *The Provincial Sales Tax Amendment Act, 2025***

##### **Clause 1**

**Chair Steele:** — We will move on to consideration of Bill No. 16, *The Provincial Sales Tax Amendment Act, 2025* beginning with clause 1, short title. Minister Reiter is here with his officials. Minister, please introduce your officials and opening remarks please.

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — Thanks, Mr. Chair. It's the same officials that have been with us for the previous estimates and the previous bill. This bill expands the provincial sales tax base to include the

taxation of vapour products. PST currently applies to tobacco products but doesn't apply to vapour products. Expanding the PST base to include vapour products will provide equitable tax treatment to these products.

Vapour product use is becoming more prevalent in Saskatchewan, particularly among the youth population. The use of vapour products has the potential for long-term health impacts, such as harming healthy brain development and a higher risk of addiction to other substances. The increased cost will help discourage vaping, similar to the impact that increased tobacco taxes had on tobacco use. And with that, we'd be happy to take any questions.

**Chair Steele:** — Questions?

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — Yeah, thanks so much. We're supportive of the change on this front. I want to give a shout-out to some of the organizations that advocated on this front as well, some of the young people. I think of that group, the Youth4Change that came here and really used their voice in an effective way and have left an impact here.

How much revenue will this collect?

**Hon. Jim Reiter:** — I would just concur with you, first of all. Youth4Change, Lung association at the time did some advocacy work. And so I certainly appreciate your support for the bill.

It's estimated that this will generate about \$3 million a year in revenue. But again I would just sort of reiterate, it's a significant amount of money but in the big picture, the budget, it wasn't about the revenue generation. It was about the health issue. And then it was also about fairness, as I mentioned in the opening comments, compared to tobacco products.

**Trent Wotherspoon:** — No, we're supportive of this as a health measure. I want to give a shout-out again to Youth4Change and Lung association and some of the cancer advocates that spoke up on this front, and then to reiterate the point that there's an increase here on something that we support. But we would have been looking for the reductions of the PST in other areas, like children's clothes and groceries and more, just to address the affordability for families. With that being said, I don't have any further questions on this piece of legislation.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you. Seeing no more questions, we'll proceed to voting off the clauses.

Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.]

**Chair Steele:** — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Provincial Sales Tax Amendment Act, 2025*.

I would ask a member to move that we accept this report, Bill No. 16, *The Provincial Sales Tax Amendment Act, 2025* without amendment. Okay. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. We will now consider Bill No. 9, *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024*. We will begin on the consideration with clause 1, short title. Minister . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . We need a recess. This committee stands for recess for five minutes.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

### **Bill No. 9 — *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024***

#### **Clause 1**

**Chair Steele:** — We'll now consider Bill No. 9, *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024*. We will begin on considerations with Clause 1, short title.

Minister Harrison is here with officials. I would remind officials to identify themselves for the record the first time that they speak. And do not touch the microphones. The Hansard operator will turn your microphone on when you've been identified.

Minister, please make your opening comments and introduce your officials, please.

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Sure. Well thanks very much, Mr. Chair, and thanks to the committee for accommodating us moving a little more expeditiously on this than we had planned. This is a good thing though.

So not lengthy opening remarks, but I will introduce officials JP Cullen on my left, the chief operating officer of the Auto Fund, and Jamie Poletz, our senior legal counsel.

The bill under consideration this evening, *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024*, makes just one amendment, but it's an important one for SGI [Saskatchewan Government Insurance] and its customers. The proposed amendment will allow SGI to notify customers about important matters like driver's licence suspensions and required vehicle inspections by electronic means.

Currently, legislation only allows SGI to notify customers about these matters by mail or in person. In today's world, customers expect communication by email or text message. Not only is it the modern way to communicate with customers, it's also much timelier than mail service. This is especially important when notifying customers of requirements that are time sensitive.

To ensure customers' personal and private information is secure, SGI would text or email customers to advise them to visit their secure MySGI account to view an important notice. That way, sensitive information is not contained in any email. While many customers have been asking for this change and prefer communication by electronic means, any customer who would rather receive notices via mail will be able to continue to do so.

And with that, Mr. Chair, we are happy to take any questions

from the committee.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Minister and your team, thank you. I don't have a lot of questions on this one, just a couple. Little bit of insight into the background of the need to make this amendment perhaps. I just was wondering, were the changes proposed in the legislation something that the government initiated? Or was this something that was initiated by stakeholders from outside of government?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Yeah, I think it would be fair to say that this was really a number of requests that we had received from customers of SGI to receive notices in an electronic way.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Fair enough. So it wasn't like a group that came forward or a bunch of groups or some customer groups or advocates or anything like that. Were there any consultations involved with that, or was that just a decision that the ministry made based on that information you were receiving?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Yeah, I would say that my understanding was that there were a lot of organic requests from customers. You know, we had looked at different time frames for when to introduce amendments, but this really made a lot of sense to do it right now, given some of the IT work that's going on at the company. So it made sense for us to move forward just with this one amendment right now.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Fair enough. And I think you touched on what "prescribed means" is, beyond obviously in-person service or registered mail service. It will be using this text or email to direct people to, I guess, the SGI portal, their SGI secure . . . Okay, that's great. And then just curious, when do you anticipate making regulatory changes that go along with these legislative changes?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — The regulations I believe are prepared to go in the relatively near future, and we would be taking those through the approval process for regulations within government, then proclaiming after approved publicly through the normal, decided method.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Fair enough. And do you anticipate any costs, any new costs, associated to this change?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — No, in fact it will save significant amounts of money. I think we send out about nearly 300,000 notices right now through mail. You know, that's not to say that we wouldn't be sending out some notices by mail into the future. If customers so desire, they will continue to receive them that way. But really all of the effort, work, and you know, things like postage that go into 280,000 pieces of mail, a lot of that will be diverted.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Fair enough. Last question. When do you anticipate the bill coming into force?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Good question, actually. I think we have on this "by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council" and so I actually will defer to SGI.

**Jamie Poletz:** — I think that the bill will go into force once the regulations are ready.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Do you know when the regs . . . or is there a schedule for when those regs will be ready?

**Jamie Poletz:** — The goal is to have them ready as soon as possible.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Okay. Fair enough. Mr. Chair, I guess we'll keep an eye on that as to the development of those things. And with that, I have no other questions for the minister or staff. Thank you.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Seeing no more questions, we'll move into proceed to voting off the clauses. So clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.]

**Chair Steele:** — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 9, *The Traffic Safety Amendment Act, 2024* without amendment. MLA Carr moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — I think I just want to thank the committee for their time and thank the team at SGI for the good work on this.

**Chair Steele:** — MLA Gordon.

**Hugh Gordon:** — Thank you for that. I just echo the same sentiment. Thank you very much for this, and glad to see we were able to move this along.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you, Minister and your officials, for your time tonight. You may now leave while the committee members proceed to vote on the committee resolutions.

#### General Revenue Fund Finance Vote 18

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, this is the 2025-26 estimates. Vote 18, Finance. Central management and services, subvote (FI01) in the amount of 11,791,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. The Provincial Comptroller, subvote (FI03) in the amount of 19,631,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Treasury management, subvote (FI04) in the amount of 3,235,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Revenue, subvote (FI05) in the amount of 31,765,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Budget analysis, subvote (FI06) in the amount of 8,442,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Miscellaneous payments, subvote (FI08) in the amount of 22,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Pensions and benefits, subvote (FI09) in the amount of 250,716,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Personnel policy secretariat, subvote (FI10) in the amount of 580,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Research and development tax credit, subvote (FI12) in the amount of 5,000,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Financial programs, subvote (FI13) in the amount of 12,050,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 2,626,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted on.

[18:45]

Finance, vote 18 — 343,232,000. I will now ask a member to vote the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2026, the following sums for Finance in the amount of 343,232,000.

MLA Bromm. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay.

**General Revenue Fund  
Finance — Debt Servicing  
Vote 12**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 12, Finance, debt servicing. Debt servicing, subvote (FD01) in the amount of 771,000,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

Crown corporation debt servicing, subvote (FD02) in the amount of 44,200,000. No vote as this is statutory.

Finance, debt servicing, vote 12 — 815,200,000. There is no vote as this is a statutory vote.

**General Revenue Fund  
Public Service Commission  
Vote 33**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Vote 33, Public Service Commission. Central management and services, subvote (PS01) in the amount of 6,338,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Speak up there folks. Carried. Human resource consulting services, subvote (PS03) in the amount of 8,866,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Oh, that's better. Carried. Employee relations and strategic human resource services, subvote (PS04) in the amount of 13,037,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Oh, that's better. Carried. Human resource service centre, subvote (PS06) in the amount of 19,912,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 405,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purpose only. No amount is to be voted on.

Public Service Commission, vote 33 — 48,153,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2026, the following sums for the Public Service Commission in the amount of 48,153,000.

MLA Beaudry. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay.

**General Revenue Fund  
SaskBuilds and Procurement  
Vote 13**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 13, SaskBuilds and Procurement. Central management and services, subvote (SP01) in the amount of 16,648,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Property management, subvote (SP02) in the amount of 5,198,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Project management, subvote (SP03) in the amount of zero dollars, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Transportation and other services, subvote (SP05) in the amount of 474,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Major capital asset acquisitions, subvote (SP07) in the amount of 63,260,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Information technology, subvote (SP11) in the amount of 39,283,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan, subvote (SP13) in the amount of 5,109,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Okay. Infrastructure and procurement, subvote (SP14) in the amount of 25,367,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Okay. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 12,042,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted on.

SaskBuilds and Procurement, vote 13 — 155,339,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2026, the following sums for SaskBuilds and Procurement in the amount of 155,339,000.

**Hon. Lori Carr:** — I'll so move.

**Chair Steele:** — MLA Carr. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**General Revenue Fund  
SaskBuilds Corporation  
Vote 86**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 86, SaskBuilds Corporation. SaskBuilds Corporation, subvote (SB01) in the amount of 25,000,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. SaskBuilds Corporation, vote 86 — 25,000,000. I now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2026, the following sum for SaskBuilds Corporation in the amount of \$25,000,000.

Hon. Lori Carr: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — MLA Carr. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Agreed. Carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Lending and Investing Activities  
Municipal Finance Corporation of Saskatchewan  
Vote 151**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 151, Municipal Finance Corporation of Saskatchewan. Loans, subvote (MF01) in the amount of 33,000,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Lending and Investing Activities  
Saskatchewan Power Corporation  
Vote 152**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 152, Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Loans, subvote (PW01) in the amount of 687,000,000. There's no vote needed as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Lending and Investing Activities  
Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation  
Vote 153**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 153, Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation. Loans, subvote (ST01) in the amount of 200,000,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Lending and Investing Activities  
Saskatchewan Water Corporation  
Vote 140**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 140, Saskatchewan Water Corporation. Loans, subvote (SW01) in the amount of 1,500,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Lending and Investing Activities  
SaskEnergy Incorporated  
Vote 150**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 150, SaskEnergy Incorporated. Loans, subvote (SE01) in the amount of 272,610,000. There is no vote needed as it is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments  
Debt Redemption  
Vote 175**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 175, debt redemption. Debt redemption, vote 175 in the amount of 1,529,420,000. There is no vote as it is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments  
Sinking Fund Payments — Government Share  
Vote 176**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 176, sinking fund payments, government share. Sinking fund payments, government share, vote 176 in the amount of 268,265,000. There is no vote needed for that either as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments  
Interest on Gross Debt — Crown Enterprise Share  
Vote 177**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, vote 177, interest on gross debt, Crown enterprise share. Interest on gross debt, Crown enterprise share, vote 177 in the amount of \$0. There is no vote needed on because it's statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
Finance  
Vote 18**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. 2024-25 supplementary estimates no. 2. Vote 18, Finance. Central management services, subvote (FI01) in the amount of 1,116,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Revenue, subvote (FI05) in the amount of 814,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Pension and benefits, subvote (FI09) in the amount of 11,566,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Financial programs, subvote (FI13) in the amount of 6,800,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

[19:00]

Finance, vote 18 — 19,221,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2025, the following sums for Finance in the amount of 19,221,000.

MLA Bromm. Carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
Finance — Debt Servicing  
Vote 12**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 12, Finance, debt servicing. Debt servicing, subvote (FD01) in the amount of 45,600,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

Crown corporation debt servicing, subvote (FD02) in the amount of 1,000,000. There is no vote needed as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
SaskBuilds and Procurement  
Vote 13**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, vote 13, SaskBuilds and Procurement. Major capital assessment acquisitions, subvote (SP07) in the amount of 3,731,000, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

SaskBuilds and Procurement, vote 13 — 3,731,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolution that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2025, the following sum for SaskBuilds and Procurement in the amount of 3,731,000.

Mr. Beaudry. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
Municipal Finance Corporation of Saskatchewan  
Vote 151**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Vote 151, Municipal Finance Corporation of Saskatchewan. Loans, subvote (MF01) in the amount of \$6,000,000. There is no vote needed, statutory.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
Saskatchewan Power Corporation  
Vote 152**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Vote 152, Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Loans, subvote (PW01) in the amount 157,800,000. There is no vote needed. This is statutory also.

**General Revenue Fund  
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2  
Debt Redemption  
Vote 175**

**Chair Steele:** — Vote 175, Debt Redemption. Crown corporation general debt in the amount of 15,000. This is statutory; we don't need a vote.

Committee members, you have before you a draft of the second report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies for the thirtieth legislature. We require a member to move the following motion:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies for the thirtieth legislature be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

MLA Beaudry. Oh, you're going to read it? You got it? You need your glasses?

**Chris Beaudry:** — No, I don't need glasses. Not yet. I move:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies for the thirtieth legislature be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

**Chair Steele:** — Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Carried.

That concludes our business for today, and I'd ask all the members to move a motion to adjournment . . . I'd ask a member. All of you can do it as well. MLA Beaudry.

Committee stands adjourned to the call of the Chair. Thanks, everybody.

[The committee adjourned at 19:07.]