



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

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 7 — May 6, 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 15:29.]

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Welcome, everyone. Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies. I'm Doug Steele; I'm the Chair; Chris Beaudry to my right; Terri Bromm to my right. Hon. Lori Carr is to the right. Don McBean. Okay. Jordan McPhail, and Keith Jorgenson substituting for Erika Ritchie.

[15:30]

Consideration of Bill No. 15. Today the committee will be considering two bills, one with the Minister Responsible for the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority and one with the Minister Responsible for SaskPower.

**Bill No. 15 — *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act, 2025/Loi modificative de 2025 sur la réglementation des boissons alcoolisées et des jeux de hasard***

**Clause 1**

**Chair Steele:** — We will begin with the consideration of Bill 15, *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act, 2025*, a bilingual bill. Minister Ross is here with her officials. As a reminder to the officials, please state your name for the record before you speak. Please do not touch the microphones. The Hansard operator will turn them on for you when it's your turn to speak. Minister Ross, please introduce your officials and make your opening comments, please.

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. The officials joining me here today are, on my right, Susan Ross, SLGA [Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority] president and CEO [chief executive officer]; to my left is Lynnette Skaalrud, director of policy and legislation; and behind me I have my ministerial assistant of comms, Josh Fryklund.

As the regulator of liquor, gaming, and cannabis, as well as the wholesale distributor of liquor in the province, Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, SLGA, is committed to ensuring accountability and fairness across these sectors. To reinforce these principles, Bill No. 15 proposes the following: increase the maximum administrative penalties from \$10,000 to \$25,000 to ensure greater deterrence against non-compliance; authorize SLGA to charge interest on overdue accounts and encourage timely payments and responsible fiscal practices.

Under *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Act, 1997*, SLGA has the authority to impose administrative penalties on liquor permit holders and gaming registrants who fail to comply with the Act, its regulations, and specified terms and conditions. The regulatory framework helps to ensure that businesses operate responsibly and in accordance with SLGA's rules that promote public health and safety.

The maximum administrative penalty has not been updated in over 20 years and no longer serves as an effective deterrent. The existing maximum administrative penalty of \$10,000 does not align with the penalties established in *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Act*, which is currently set at \$25,000, nor is it in line with maximum administrative penalties in Western Canada. Updating the maximum penalty will align Saskatchewan with

other jurisdictions and promote consistency across cannabis and liquor regulations.

At the same time amendments contained in Bill 15 will increase the maximum administrative penalties that the First Nation charitable gaming regulators, like Indigenous Gaming Regulators, can assess on gaming registrations. This approach will maintain parity between SLGA and IGR's [Indigenous Gaming Regulators] maximum administrative penalties.

Administrative penalties play an important role in SLGA's progressive sanctioning process. The process typically begins with educational guidance or warnings, and administrative penalties are generally used as a last resort for repeat or particularly egregious offenders. While these penalties are used infrequently, they can serve as an effective deterrent to liquor permittees and gaming registrants not complying with the Act, regulations, or terms and conditions of their licence or registration.

Additionally SLGA will introduce interest charges on all overdue accounts within SLGA's liquor distribution system. While this is not a significant issue for SLGA, adopting a collection policy is anticipated to improve SLGA's management of overdue accounts while encouraging timely payments.

The collection policy includes a rate increase of 1.5 per cent compounded monthly, totalling an annual rate of 19.56 per cent. Other Crown corporations in Saskatchewan have similar policies. By aligning with these entities SLGA can strengthen its financial position and follow the industry's best practices.

The advantages are clear: efficient debt collection, increased revenue from interest, and consistency with other Crown corporations. While some businesses may raise concerns about higher operating costs, the interest charges will only apply to those businesses that do not pay their bills in a timely manner.

With that, I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you, Minister. Now I'll open the floor for questions. I recognize Mr. McBean.

**Don McBean:** — Thank you very much, Minister Ross. Yeah, when I saw there was a bill coming down that was about SLGA, I thought, oh good. As the shadow cabinet person responsible for SLGA, this was going to be an opportunity for me to learn a bit more, some of the dynamics that go on.

And then when I saw the bill, I guess I thought, well it's a fairly straightforward thing. Probably not really getting into the meat of the operation of SLGA, but still it's given me a chance to study some of this a little more, understand the process of bills, adjourned debates, and now actual committee.

If anyone was listening or went back and read *Hansard* after I moved this moving forward . . . I'm getting Mr. Chair to laugh; that's a good sign. You know, sort of as I moved it into the committee stage, a good deal of my questioning sort of centred around the need at this time for the amendment. And I think that actually you covered off some of that at least in your introduction.

Maybe I'd start with, you said it's used infrequently. Could you give some sort of number to, I don't know, the last year? Maybe the last five years? How often does the penalty — and then as the follow-up will be — how often is that penalty the maximum?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — Thank you for your question. I don't have the last five years, but I can go over since 2003. I have those figures to share with you. So in 2003 there were — 2023, sorry — there were eight suspensions and 30 fines imposed. In 2024 there were 13 suspensions and 65 fines, along with one cancellation. And in 2025 to date, one suspension and 21 fines issued.

**Don McBean:** — And those fines, would they be the maximum fine? Is that sort of the place we start at or is there some escalation?

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. The SLGA has a progressive penalty system, so we start with educational components. The inspectors will speak with the permittees and let them know what they've noticed, how they can correct that.

We may elevate that to a written letter acknowledging that there were some oversights in the compliance but nothing serious, and just educating them on how to correct that action. The penalties are really a last resort. And within that progressive penalty structure we also have progressive fines. So they start around 500, \$1,000 and increase to the maximum of 10,000 as offences occur.

So I did check in right before I came, but I asked too late I'm afraid. It's pretty rare to issue that maximum \$10,000 fine. We do find that the educational component is our most effective tool to compliance. Most of our permittees do want to comply, so when we give them that corrective information they typically follow it. So it's pretty rare that we use that maximum \$10,000 penalty.

**Don McBean:** — Okay. I wasn't scrolling down things quickly enough. 2023, eight suspensions and how many . . .

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — 30 fines.

**Don McBean:** — 30 fines. 13 suspensions and . . .

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — 65.

**Don McBean:** — 65.

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — Fines.

**Don McBean:** — And so far . . .

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — With one cancellation.

**Don McBean:** — And one cancellation, yeah.

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — And to date in 2025 one suspension and 21 fines.

**Don McBean:** — Twenty-one fines in the first four months. So is it fair to think that we perceive that this is an increasing problem? I mean, it's gone up — 30 fines, 65 fines, 21 already in

the first third of the year.

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. So we don't see this as an escalating issue at this stage. It ebbs and flows a little bit over the years. It has to do with things around timing of enforcement actions and when the inspectors are going out into the field. And even though the 21 fines were issued in the first quarter of this year, or first one-third of this year, some of those offences may have occurred in the later stages of 2024. So it's a bit cyclical, but at this stage we don't see a growing concern with non-compliance.

**Don McBean:** — Okay. Some of this is kind of leading toward what I said last week and what I said just now is sort of like, why now? And I get — and it's well stated — that I get the sort of alignment with other Crown corporations, other degree of penalty. But I was curious, I guess, if there was such a need as to be able to raise it from 10 to \$25,000. And what do we expect the effect of the raise of that maximum penalty to be?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — Thank you for the question. This is actually quite late in coming because it's been a number of years since there has been any type of changes to the regulations, and we do want this to be a deterrent. And it's also a significant cost of doing business. And with the current fine structure that we have, it actually costs more to do the inspections than it does to . . . The fines don't cover the cost of doing that, the investigations.

**Don McBean:** — But that would be a sign of compliance. I mean there's not very many fines because people are complying, or the various agencies are complying.

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — So I maybe didn't explain that. When there is a fine and we go out and do an investigation, the current fine structure does not cover the cost of doing that business, so it comes at an expense to SLGA.

[15:45]

**Don McBean:** — Yeah. Sorry, I heard that as sort of the general investigation and monitoring of all that.

So you did say it's been 20 years. You talked about the cannabis control Act, alignment with the cannabis control Act. Is it just been an oversight that it stayed at 10,000 for so long, that it has been so far out of line with the others? Or has there been something within the SLGA legislation that exempted something, or allowed . . .

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. It was a combination of a couple of things, the first being that in 2018 the provincial government passed the cannabis control legislation, and the maximum administrative penalty in that legislation is \$25,000. So SLGA also acts as the cannabis regulator. So as much as possible we try to align the regulatory structures for both of them. With liquor at 10,000 and cannabis at 25,000, there wasn't alignment there.

And the other piece is that our neighbours across Western Canada have significantly increased their fines over the last few years, and so we just didn't want to get too far out of step with them.

**Don McBean:** — It makes sense. I mean as I first looked at it I

thought, well that makes sense. You want some consistency; you want some alignment, etc. But I was just curious if there was something within SLGA. But if it's seven years to get around to doing what you know you should do, that's about how I operate sometimes too. You know, good intentions.

We often think about, you know, the stakeholders involved. I kind of can't imagine that the stakeholders came to you and said, you should raise the fine on this. But was there . . . Sort of what level of communication has there been with stakeholders other than what I might have done from my side? Was there consultation going on with various organizations? Hospitality I'm thinking of, or something like that.

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. We haven't done formal consultation around this. Typically we don't. SLGA does not conduct formal consultations around our regulatory enforcement measures.

We can assure you that, you know, out of more than 2,500 liquor permittees in the province, this will only impact a very small handful of the very worst actors out there.

**Don McBean:** — Good. I'm glad that it's not . . . So the various associations I'm thinking of, Hospitality Saskatchewan, I met with them. They didn't have a lot of feedback to me, but they're aware that this is coming? And this is maybe just educating me as to when regulatory changes, amendments are made, what level of communication . . . Or does it wait for the bill to pass and then we tell everyone?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — So this was announced in this year's budget, so this shouldn't be a surprise. And then once everything is passed, we will be sending out formal communication to the stakeholders involved.

**Don McBean:** — And then now I'm asking you to look into the crystal ball. Do you think people will just say, oh, about time. You know, it's been cannabis for eight years. Or do you expect any sort of repercussion to it? Yeah.

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. We're not anticipating a significant reaction to this. It is consistent with what's in place for cannabis. It's consistent with what's in place in Western Canada. And again it's only the very few permittees that will be negatively affected by this.

**Don McBean:** — The other little part was the charging of interest. Was that something that was part of cannabis — I guess I could have looked that up myself — the charge on interest? Or that interest was not charged and sort of what consistency that brings in?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — So this is part of the wholesale side of this file. It's not part of the regulatory system. And what it is, it's customers of the wholesale department who have overdue accounts. So it would be really no different than if you purchased something from any other business, and most businesses typically charge interest to encourage payment of accounts on time. And if you look at other provinces — Alberta, for example — they don't sell to anyone who doesn't prepay.

**Don McBean:** — There you go. So then again, it's just kind of

been a historical thing that SLGA didn't get to charge an interest on late payments? And then it kind of makes me wonder because it is pretty standard. Yeah, you don't pay your bill, you start getting charged interest. Just historically it's been that way.

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — That's what I understand. And it also puts us and aligned now with the other Crown corporations.

**Don McBean:** — Good. As I said, you know, when I first looked at it I thought, well consistency is an important thing. I get that we're . . . I'm not sure how far I can go with this but because we're talking about on-reserve, a lot of that, and if I'm understanding correctly . . . Perhaps I'll ask it as a question.

Am I understanding correctly that the mention of — how do we word it? — on-reserve, it's just aligning their abilities to charge the 25 K and the interest just so that SLGA is not getting away with something that SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.] can't? Am I understanding that correctly?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — So the interest has nothing to do with IGR. It's the regulatory penalties.

**Don McBean:** — You said that. I didn't connect that dot quickly enough. Well so I guess when I saw this I thought, oh, there's something about IGR; there's something about SIGA. I don't know that I understand completely. Well I've studied a bit the history. I've studied a bit the difference of what SIGA and SLGA are able to do and not do. We're kind of drifting into casinos and such here.

But I'm curious, just because it's been brought to my attention lately, about people saying things in the press that, you know, certain First Nations hope to be able to purchase the SLGA casinos. Is that fair to ask for some feedback on this or some understanding of the relation there?

**Susan Ross:** — Susan Ross, president and CEO of SLGA. It was in 2023 that all of Gaming, the relationships in Gaming, moved to LGS [Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan], a newly formed Crown corporation. So the government created an umbrella Crown corporation called LGS, and the relationship that was between SLGA and SIGA is now between LGS and SIGA. And so LGS and/or SIGA would really have to be the people that answer that question. That was in 2023, about March.

**Don McBean:** — Okay. Well then I apologize in the sense that I'm not quite up to speed on that relation. I just know that as SLGA became part of my world, I had different people speaking to me about these things from both sides. And I thought maybe this would be an opportunity. And indeed I've learned something more interesting. Good, I have homework. I have homework every day.

Unless one of my colleagues has a question, I don't know that I have more to try to illuminate around this bill. The amendments, it strikes me — as I said at the beginning and as you said — fairly straightforward, a little bit technical. If anyone . . .

**Chair Steele:** — Mr. Jorgenson.

**Keith Jorgenson:** — Thank you very much. I was wondering if you'd be able to provide us with a breakdown in terms of the

enforcement actions that occur in a typical year. Is there a breakdown that you can provide us in terms of whether or not those are permittees that are selling liquor — like what type of licence those people are holding, whether it be like a craft-production licence; whether it be, you know, a restaurant or tavern licence; and whether or not it'd be like an off-sale permit; if there's any information about how those break down by class or category of licence?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — So we can undertake to get you that information. It will take some time, but we will provide you with what we're able to.

**Keith Jorgenson:** — Fair enough. And just in a quick follow-up to that, in terms of the people who hold craft-production licences, has the number of people who have had to be fined, has that changed over time as kind of the enforcement protocols have changed? Or has it been fairly consistent?

**Lynnette Skaalrud:** — Lynnette Skaalrud. We don't have that information with us. It'll be broken out in the information that the minister's undertaking to provide it with you when we divide it out by liquor permit type.

**Keith Jorgenson:** — Much obliged. Much obliged. Are we concluded now? Okay, I wasn't sure if we just kept going until the other people got here.

[16:00]

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, thank you. Seeing no more questions, we'll proceed in to the voting on the clauses.

Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.]

**Chair Steele:** — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act*, a bilingual bill.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 15, *The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act, 2025*, a bilingual bill, without amendment.

**Terri Bromm:** — I so move.

**Chair Steele:** — MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] Bromm. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Any closing comments?

**Hon. Alana Ross:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to thank yourself, all the committee members, the staff who have joined

me here today, and Hansard, the officials from the Legislative Assembly that are here, very much for taking the time to conduct this important business today. Thank you.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you, Minister. I'd like to thank all the members for their attendance here this evening. So we'll take a brief recess. Closing remarks? I'm sorry, guys. Mr. McBean? Mr. Jorgenson? No?

**Don McBean:** — Thank you very much for this opportunity, and I will echo . . .

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. We'll take a brief recess to change out the officials. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

## **Bill No. 14 — *The Power Corporation Amendment Act, 2025***

### **Clause 1**

**Chair Steele:** — Okay, we'll get under way. We will now consider Bill No. 14, *The Power Corporation Amendment Act, 2025*. We will begin with our consideration with clause 1, short title. Minister Harrison is here with his officials. I remind officials to identify themselves for the record the first time you speak at the microphone, and not to touch the microphones. The Hansard operator will turn them on for you when you're speaking. Mr. Harrison, please make your opening comments and introduce your officials.

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Sure, well thanks very much, Mr. Chair, and thanks to the committee for all being here today as well. With me today, Rupen Pandya, president and CEO of SaskPower; Troy King, executive vice-president and chief strategy, technology and financial officer; and Rachelle Verret Morphy, executive vice-president of legal and corporate services and general counsel.

This legislative amendment will do three things: (1) increase SaskPower's borrowing limit; (2) include in legislation SaskPower's ability to advance loans and guarantee indebtedness of its subsidiaries; and (3) ensure consistency with other Crown legislation to make it explicit that SaskPower subsidiaries are agents of the Crown.

SaskPower forecasted borrowing to increase above its currently legislated limit of \$10 billion by approximately 2026, as the corporation continues its considerable investment in infrastructure including new and sustainment activities. This bill will amend subsection 43(1) of *The Power Corporation Act* to increase SaskPower's borrowing limit from 10 billion to 14 billion. Without this amendment, SaskPower will not be able to meet its financial commitments, affecting its ability to maintain and expand infrastructure, impacting reliability of the electricity grid.

This bill will also add a new section to the Act to provide SaskPower with the express authority to make loans and advances to and guarantee the indebtedness of its subsidiaries. This change is necessary to eliminate any legal uncertainties and to gain confidence from third parties such as regulators, lenders, and investors who may otherwise be hesitant to approve or



participate in a project.

This amendment is required to remove all interpretational risk and provide SaskPower with the authority to make loans and advances to its subsidiaries and guarantee the obligations of its subsidiaries. And given the scope and magnitude, particularly of the SMR [small modular reactor] project, this change is crucial for the success of SaskNuclear.

Finally, this bill looks to amend parts of the Act to make it explicit and clear that SaskPower's subsidiaries are agents of the Crown. This aligns the Act with *The SaskEnergy Act*. This legislative amendment will ensure that Saskatchewan continues to have reliable and cost-effective electricity for years to come. And with that, Mr. Chair, I'm happy to take any questions that the committee may have.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you, Minister. I'll now open the floor to questions. MLA McPhail.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and — sorry, that was a lot louder on the microphone I'm sure — and to the ministry officials for joining us here today. You know, on quick review of the bill, I think it's important in where we're at as a province with the potential tariff war. Electricity is going to be a major issue here in Saskatchewan. And I think that the calls that we've had for expansion of power lines and, you know, tariff-proofing our infrastructure here in Saskatchewan will be a very important discussion that can be had.

And just to go into the questions here, I'm just wondering, the figure to go from 10 billion to 14 billion, what were the key factors in determining the number of that additional \$4 billion to the debt?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Yeah, it's a valid question and I thank the member for that. So the last time the debt limit was adjusted was in 2016-17, and we moved it up to that \$10 billion mark. And you know, we'd been able to function comfortably up until probably end of next calendar, middle of next calendar, something around there. That's why we're here today.

So as far as the actual number that will enable SaskPower to have borrowing ability for the next number of years, I mean there are a whole bunch of discussions and decisions that are going to go into exactly how long that is going to be for. And we were able to talk about that at committee, I think, in estimates to a degree. There is a pretty rapidly changing landscape right now in electricity generation, production, capital expenditure that's going to have a significant impact on what our borrowing needs are going to be as we go forward.

You know, one of the projects we actually talked about at estimates — and I'll maybe reiterate it — was around the north-south interconnect between the two grids. You know, my view is that it's probably been far, far too long that the grids have really been separate grids, I mean aside from the interconnect through Manitoba. But that means a \$700 million investment if we're to move forward with connecting the northern and southern grid in Saskatchewan.

Yeah, so those are . . . The decisions have not been made yet but would have, you know, a significant impact on the capital needs

the company would have.

**Jordan McPhail:** — And I guess just on the amounts there, you had said that it was last readjusted in 2016 by roughly the same amount? Sorry, I . . .

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Yeah. That was a \$2 billion increase in 2016.

**Jordan McPhail:** — So from 8 billion to 10 billion.

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — From 8 to 10.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Understood. And so from just I guess a high level, this is mainly so to free up some dollars for capital investment into the power grid. And so I guess one of the questions I have is, have you factored into consideration, you know, the potential cost of the tariff on some of the things that would be needed to build those capital projects to adjust it into the \$14 billion that we're seeing in the adjusted amount in this bill?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Well it's an interesting question because I mean that really I think any tariff issue as far as SaskPower procurement, we do the vast majority of procurement from outside the United States. I mean 97 per cent or thereabouts in the aggregate is non-US [United States] procurement for the Crown. So we'd have to delve into maybe a bit more detail but it's a very, very high proportion that is procured from within the country.

You know, as much as we can, we do from within the province. And you know, there's procurement from other parts of the world for items that we can't get from within the country. So the tariffs are not really applicable in that we're going to . . . If there are tariffs, and there really aren't in a lot of these spaces other than steel, if we're procuring from Canada though, we're obviously not subject to any of those activities.

I think there have been some concerns from companies. And it's not as big of an issue given the fact that the vast majority of procurement is from within the country. But for companies that are having to procure from the United States on counter-tariffed items, that's actually been, you know, a concern that has existed out there as well.

So you know, I would just say to the overall aggregate question, really it's going to be a pretty minor issue, simply because we procure as much as we do from within the country.

[16:15]

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thanks for the response. And the \$14 billion that has been established in the bill here to go from 10 billion to 14, was that established before or after the government's decision to pause the OBPS [output-based performance standards]?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — We made this decision months and months ago. So I think it probably would have been one of the first things we actually talked about after I was appointed as CIC [Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan] minister. And officials may have had that discussion with the previous

minister as well because, you know, there's obviously pretty significant lead time to preparing legislation, having it prepared to go, all of these questions.

So I can't speak for Minister Duncan from before, but I know we had that discussion very, very shortly after I became minister. And then we went through the internal process for approval of the bill and moving it through the budget process as well.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thanks for the response. Was there . . . Sorry. And very similar question in the same vein, was the \$14 billion established before or after the government's announcement on the coal refurbishment project?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Coal, we haven't made any formal announcement. I think I've been pretty clear in telegraphing where we're going on that, but we haven't made the final announcement yet on where we are going on coal life extension. So the fact that, you know, we haven't yet done that means that this decision was obviously made prior to any formal announcement of a decision on the other item.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thanks. After this takes effect, what will the SaskPower's debt/equity ratio be?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — I'll leave that to officials. But I would say, as far as comparators across North America, we would be very much in industry standard position on debt/equity. But I will turn it to Rupen, Troy for that.

**Troy King:** — Troy King, executive vice-president, strategy, technology, finance with SaskPower. So our debt ratio we expect to float between that 76.5 per cent and about 75 per cent over the next five years.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thank you for that. What impact will this borrowing have on SaskPower's operations and capital spending program?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Well I can maybe just speak to elements of that anyway. I mean really the quantum at which we are looking at making investment over the next number of years really is dependent on having the authority to borrow, which is not a new thing. So this is really essential, the bill to have go forward and pass and be recommended by the committee and voted on by the Assembly for our future needs.

Although I would say with regard to, you know, specific projects, those are determined on an annualized basis through the budget process, approved by the board, recommended by the CIC board, and ultimately approved by the cabinet. So that is done kind of on an annualized basis. So you know, how specifically resources would be allocated out into 2028-29, I mean there is no answer to that because we haven't made those formal decisions yet.

**Jordan McPhail:** — And so when you've put it into I guess the budgetary considerations of future capital projects, in the increase in the borrowing limit going from 10 billion to 4 billion, have you put it into kind of the capital spending plans? And do you know whether that 4 billion will be spent on SMRs, the coal refurb project, or gas plants?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — I think the short answer is that it

could be all of the above. But really that will be dependent on annual budgetary decisions on the capital front that government will consider. But you know, which is kind of going back to the previous response I gave, it's hard to give a specific answer on a lot of those simply because we haven't made the individualized decisions yet. But it would be fair to say that all of those items — SMR, gas, coal life extensions — could very well be recipients of some of the resources for capital.

**Jordan McPhail:** — Thank you.

**Chair Steele:** — Okay. Seeing no more questions we will 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 to 7 inclusive agreed to.]

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

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 14, *The Power Corporation Amendment Act, 2025*.

**Chris Beaudry:** — I so move.

**Chair Steele:** — MLA Beaudry moves. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**Chair Steele:** — Carried. Okay. Any closing comments by the minister?

**Hon. Jeremy Harrison:** — Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to thank our team at SaskPower for the work they do every day in providing reliable power — affordable, reliable power — for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Chair Steele:** — Mr. McPhail, do you have any closing comments?

**Jordan McPhail:** — I do. I just wanted to quickly say thanks to the Chair, the legislative staff, SaskPower, the officials, the minister, and Hansard and the production team for taking the time here today to do the good work on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. So thank you.

**Chair Steele:** — Thank you so much. That concludes our business for today. I would ask a member to move a motion for adjournment. MLA Bromm has moved. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

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

[The committee adjourned at 16:22.]