



STANDING COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 8 — May 10, 2021

Published under the
authority of
The Hon. Randy Weekes
Speaker



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the
Legislative Assembly are available
within hours after each sitting.

<https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/Calendar>

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

Mr. Ken Cheveldayoff, Chair
Saskatoon Willowgrove

Ms. Meara Conway, Deputy Chair
Regina Elphinstone-Centre

Mr. Ryan Domotor
Cut Knife-Turtleford

Mr. Muhammad Fiaz
Regina Pasqua

Mr. Derek Meyers
Regina Walsh Acres

Mr. Hugh Nerlien
Kelvington-Wadena

Ms. Alana Ross
Prince Albert Northcote

[The committee met at 14:58.]

The Chair: — All right. Good afternoon, committee members. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Human Services. I'm Ken Cheveldayoff, the MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] for Saskatoon Willowgrove, and I will be your Chair this afternoon. Members of the committee are Ms. Meara Conway, the Deputy Chair; Mr. Muhammad Fiaz; Mr. Ryan Domotor; Mr. Derek Meyers; Mr. Hugh Nerlien; and Ms. Alana Ross. Substituting for Ms. Meara Conway will be Ms. Vicki Mowat. I recognize Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to move an amendment:

That the agenda be amended by adding the following as the first item of business and rescheduling the remaining items accordingly:

3 p.m. to 6 p.m. — Questioning the Minister of Health regarding the provincial government's response to COVID-19 and management of long-term care.

Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you, Ms. Mowat. Committee members, Ms. Mowat has moved the following motion:

That the agenda be amended by adding the following as the first item of business and rescheduling the remaining items accordingly:

3 p.m. to 6 p.m. — Questioning of the Minister of Health regarding the provincial government's response to COVID-19 and management of long-term care.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — I believe the nos have it. The motion is defeated. Thank you very much.

Today we will be considering three bills. We will first consider Bill No. 19, and then we will recess briefly to change ministers and officials before considering Bill 3 and Bill 20.

Bill No. 19 — *The Human Resources Profession Act*

Clause 1

The Chair: — First bill of consideration is Bill 19. I ask the minister and his officials to take their place.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. As always, I appreciate the prompt start. We will continue to be like that throughout.

I'm pleased to join the members today to discuss Bill 19, *The Human Resources Profession Act*. Our government is on the path for growth to ensure that every citizen can experience the benefits of a strong economy. To be successful we need to support a wide variety of industries, organizations, and professions.

Today with Bill 19 we are looking to ensure that we are giving our human resource professionals every advantage necessary to compete in today's market. The Act establishes two levels of regulation: firstly, registration for members; and secondly, certification for those who wish to pursue the Chartered Professional in Human Resources, CPHR, designation. While this legislation does not provide for licensure, it does offer the ability to protect the public interest by ensuring professional competence and ethical conduct of human resources, HR, professionals.

Our human resource professionals already hold themselves to a high standard, but now with the ability to self-regulate they will be able to hold their members accountable for their actions. Additionally it increases the status and recognizes the skills and proficiency of individuals in the human resources profession. The move to self-regulation will only work to improve the level of services that employers, workers, and their families can expect when dealing with a human resource professional.

Mr. Chair, our work in setting out the right legislation is an ongoing process, and we're always open to hearing from stakeholders on legislation. And we'll be proposing the following House amendments to the Act: first, we will be amending the name of the Act to *An Act respecting the Human Resource Professionals of the Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Saskatchewan*; second, the short title will be amended to *The Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Act*; finally, section 21 will be amended to make it clear that this Act only applies to the certification of chartered professionals in human resources.

Both the Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Saskatchewan and the International Personnel Management Association Canada have jointly proposed and endorsed these amendments. I understand that the critic has been working with CPHR and IPMA-Canada [International Personnel Management Association Canada]. I want to extend my thanks to her for her collaboration and consultation in this respect. I have said before that working together with stakeholders helps us to develop legislation that truly addresses the needs of individuals and groups. And we continue to listen and talk with stakeholders to ensure the Act is not going to impede the good work of the human resource professionals in this province.

With that, Mr. Chair, I close, and I am happy to take questions to help us move forward in this legislation.

The Chair: — All right. I recognize Ms. Beck.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you, Minister. And thank you to Mr. Tuer as well. I got your name right today. Thank you to the committee members.

I want to echo some of what you said, Minister, or perhaps enter into the record my appreciation for the willingness of the ministry to work through some of the considerations brought to us, particularly through the members of the IPMA, and for facilitating that discussion. Very much appreciated.

And I do have a copy of the letter that was sent to your ministry and I was cc'd on. So the first two changes, in fact the first three

changes are pretty straightforward, and they are in fact the changes that were jointly agreed to by the members of these two professional bodies.

The last two amendments, I just wondered if, Minister, yourself or your officials could speak to the reasons for these last two amendments. So the first one being clause 10, and my apologies, my numbers don't line up with the amended numbers in the new bill. So the first being the change to clause 9. If you could describe the changes that are proposed there.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm not sure of where in the bill you're asking. Clause 1 of the proposed amendment deals with the name change. And then clause 21 may be what you're referring to, where it renumbers section 21(1), and then it changes the abbreviation CPHR, or any word, title, or designation. So it's a definitional thing.

And then it adds the following after subsection (1):

Notwithstanding subsection (1), this Act does not affect or interfere with the right of any person who is not a member of the association to practise in the field of Human Resources or to become a certified professional with a human resources association other than the Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Saskatchewan.

So if that's the section that you're inquiring about, the purpose of it would be that this is not an exclusive designation. You're still entitled to practise in that profession. You're just not entitled to use the name "chartered human resources professional."

So I would use the analogy of a person that works in a hairdressing salon. The person may have started there, worked there, but does not have a professional designation. Or they may have a professional designation, but it doesn't limit them from doing it, or they may have a designation from any one of several different accreditation bodies for it.

The request that we originally received from human resources professionals in our province was based on the fact that there was a similar piece of legislation in Ontario. The Ontario human resource professionals were holding themselves out as chartered or licensed under . . . Maybe not use the word "licensed," but were subject to the legislation in Ontario. And the inference that was made was that they were somehow superior or that somehow people here were of a lesser standard, which certainly wasn't the case or intended to be the case.

So by providing this legislation, we put the human resource professionals in our province on the same footing as they did in Ontario. It gave them the right to use that particular title that's specified in the legislation but did not prohibit somebody else from working in the profession or from obtaining an accreditation from another entity. I don't know whether Mr. Tuer wants to add something to that or whether that's . . .

Mr. Tuer: — Well I mean, you mentioned working with IPMA and CPHR. IPMA also has a certified member category, and I think part of the concern they were putting forward is they wanted to make it clear that their certified members were still allowed to use their title, just not chartered professional in human resources, which is the CPHR.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you. And thank you both for that description. I'm going to admit, somewhat embarrassingly, on record that I was looking at amendments not to this bill. So the three that were there are the ones that were outlined in the letter, and I thank you for that. And I also was remiss in not thanking you for the technical briefing this morning with Ms. Parenteau and Mr. Siebert . . . or with Anastasiia, rather. So thank you for that.

So I think in terms of the concerns that we had — and I will note on record that it was heartening to see the level of engagement from the professionals with this bill — I think that's always a good thing when we've got a high level of interest. We had a number of emails to our office, and I've had opportunity to speak with both organizations. And they were both very happy with the amendments as we see in front of us. So thank you for that and sorry to give you a bit of a scare.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I acknowledge the work that was done with the different people of the ministry. Initially when we started, both of the groups were working together and were sharing professional development, a variety of things. For whatever reason there was a breakdown in communication, whatever, and then the bill was no longer supported by both sides.

So I'm glad that they reached out. I'm glad that the parties stayed engaged and were able to find a path forward. This bill, as I think I'd indicated to you on the phone, is not a government initiative, it's requested by the profession. So I think it's our role to try and be a coach where it's appropriate, a referee where there's two competing views, but never a goalie.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you for the analogy, and certainly I recognize that. And as I've mentioned in comments, this is something I do recall from lobby days; for example, this was something that was being asked for. So I'm glad to see the bill in front of us and that those proposed amendments have been made. And I do expect that both organizations will be happy with that.

I do also have a letter dated from January the 4th of this year from the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. And I did have some opportunity to ask questions this morning in the technical briefing, but I did just want to get on the record and just ask what the status is in terms of the actions that were proposed, and some of the amendments proposed, by the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner?

Now it is my understanding that some of the proposed changes would require a change to the template legislation, so that is understood.

I just want to go through the proposed amendments and ask if there is future action that will be undertaken with regard to the concerns that have been brought forward. So the first is around subsection 18(1) and the register. And I think that this is also canvassed in a later proposed amendment, and that's around the publishing of both business addresses and potentially home addresses as well.

Now I believe that the legislation is neutral except for in one spot where it mentions both home addresses and business addresses. The proposal is to make it clear that it is a business address that

would be provided to the register, given that this is something that would be published. So I'm just, I guess, looking for comment, Minister, with regard to those concerns and any future action that we might see.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The Privacy Commissioner raises two issues. One is the right of the public to know who the registrants are, what their address is, and the particulars about them, and I think that's the same with the Law Society and a variety of other entities.

The template that's being used does not give a lot of particulars, a lot of direction on them. So it's something that in my discussions with the Ministry of Justice, they may choose at some time to do a broader consultation with the different 40-odd groups or whatever that are governed by self-governing pieces of legislation. With this particular one . . . And I think it was a response back to the Privacy Commissioner or that was the nature of the discussion was, this is something that should be determined by the governing body. They should make the determination whether they want to include a business at a residential address. And the balance to the Privacy Commissioner was the individual's, the registrant's right to privacy and right of the public to know.

So his view was that it was appropriate to have the business address, and we feel that's something that's best left with the governing body to try and outline this in their bylaws. So we will raise the issue with them as they're preparing bylaws, which they'll have to do to complete the process, and say, how do you propose to deal with this?

[15:15]

It's part of a broader discussion about which things should be done by way of online registries, whether records are kept at a physical location, or how much is done online. And I understand that there's some contemplation being given as to when that might be done by the Ministry of Justice. I made inquiries and they referenced that maybe this was something that should have been looked after by a previous Justice minister. I can't comment on that.

Ms. Beck: — Okay, thank you. And just to put a fine point on it and perhaps sort of . . . Not directly in this discussion, but this is certainly a lens that I bring to it, having worked for 15 years in domestic violence, having access, especially if records are going to be online, it's difficult to pull them back once they're online. So if home addresses are made available, that certainly for a number of reasons . . . I suppose some that were outlined by the Privacy Commissioner, but I would just ask that that be a consideration as well.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think that's a point that's well taken. And I think the Privacy Commissioner was more than comfortable in his recommendation that we include business addresses. We don't want to do it by legislation, but we sort of want to make them aware that that's an option that should be considered.

Ms. Beck: — The second subsection of note in this letter is with regard to, as we were just speaking about, the electronic format. Now the bill in its current form uses the word "may," I believe,

"may be made available . . . including an electronic format." And perhaps this is going back to the updating of the template legislation or bylaws that flow from that legislation. Just noting that it's becoming increasingly the expectation that these registrars would be made available online, so not as an option but as a matter of course.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think the point you make is a good one, and it certainly would be, I think, the preference of most people to be able to find it online. There are a number of the groups that are very small in members and not having websites set up, so we would want to do a consultation and then consider whether a change . . . There would be a bill that would make all of those entities change at once. So I think we'd want to go through the process, but your point's valid.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you. And just moving through systematically here, subsection 29(3), rules of the discipline committee. It talks about "the discipline committee may make rules regulating its business and proceedings." There is a proposal here that those rules include information around how private health information or private information is disclosed between parties. Is this something that would be dealt with in the bylaws, then?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It would.

Ms. Beck: — Okay.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think it goes back to that fundamental expectation of privacy on those matters. And it would certainly be the expectation that the bylaws would deal with what information must, to ensure public transparency, be made public and what could reasonably be redacted or kept quiet.

Ms. Beck: — There is an expectation, though, that private health information and private information would be redacted to some degree?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Absolutely.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Hearings in public, subsection 29(14), it deals with, as you might expect, a discipline committee conducting hearings in public. This is sort of adjacent to the question before. If the public is able to attend committee hearings, are they also entitled to view the documents that are tabled in that committee?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The opinion that we have or that Justice has expressed to us is that this section should be interpreted so that access to the documents would be not included as such that the public wouldn't have direct information, and that adding an additional section wouldn't be appropriate, that the committee or the discipline committee would determine what things could be included, what things wouldn't, and where documents would need to be redacted or otherwise kept privileged.

I think it's similar in some ways to health information. So the information of a client of a professional may have information regarding other people's personnel files, which could be incredibly personal or, you know, it may not be health information but it would certainly be information that would be totally inappropriate to have released. But I think the balancing

part that has to be there is the public's right to know and view and become part of the hearing. So I think that would be why we would look to them to have appropriate bylaws, and look to the various other self-regulating professions to see how their bylaws are crafted, and ensure that the appropriate balance is struck.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you for that explanation. So if I'm reading the letter correctly, it would seem, yes, that the proposed amendment is about balance, that all documents in the interest of public disclosure and oversight would be public except in instances where there is reason, specifically public health information or private information that would be disclosed.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Health information or information belonging to third parties which might be clients of the professional or other things that are there, these are the people that would have access to an individual's personnel files which may include performance assessments of a client's employee or health information, disciplinary proceedings, or a variety of other such things that would certainly be inappropriate to be released. So I think that's why you have both a disciplinary panel that would be conducting . . . doing their work, as well as the bylaws which would hopefully be crafted to protect the private information in the same way that it is with the Law Society or teachers regulatory board or any of the other entities.

Ms. Beck: — So I guess the question that I have then is if this is sort of a common expectation in bylaws across those professional organizations that are subject to this template legislation, if that is the basic expectation, is there a reason that it's kept out of legislation and in bylaws?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's probably something that might be looked at at some point by the Justice officials to determine whether there is a more direct way of doing it. I think doing it by way of the bylaws, the bylaws have to be filed and would have to certainly be appropriate for it, and I think at the present time, for the most part, these self-governing bodies — and there's literally dozens of them — do a pretty good job of protecting and balancing the interests of their members and the members of the public. They're all subject to our various pieces of privacy legislation both at a federal and a provincial level, and I think for the most part they're doing it.

But having said that, I think it's always worthwhile for us as a government and the legislatures to look at, are we doing the best job? Are they following best practices? What's taking place in other jurisdictions? I don't think it's right for us to sit back and say, well we'll wait until there's a breach or there's a significant issue that takes place. So I think we're aware of it, and we'll want to work with the Justice minister to determine when or if they are going to do a legislative change or perhaps provide some more guidance or direction with regard to how bylaws are drafted.

I don't think, with the number of groups that are there, we could come up with all of the different scenarios that would take place that would have to be regulated: where information would come from, and you know, what things they would have to worry . . . whether evidence is heard only in a verbal manner. Are they able to take sworn statements? Are they able to do things different than what hearsay rules would be?

I mean that's the reason why you have tribunals that are

appointed by the government. And I think that's why self-governing entities would work with the legislation. And if there's something that becomes apparent that it doesn't work, they would have to come back to either look to the government to create a regulation or alternatively a change to the legislation. But I think the point you raise is one should always be alive to, is the fact that there's potential for changes, and that this is one of the things that's an evolving area of the law.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you. So I think that I'm hearing that there perhaps is some willingness to look at the template legislation with regard to these. I assume that none of these are . . .

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I can't make a commitment on behalf of the current Justice minister.

Ms. Beck: — No, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I know his predecessor would have been very amenable. But no, seriously, we've asked them some of the questions, and I think they're always willing to decide, okay, is this something we wait till it comes up instead of in its cycle or is there some need to do it earlier?

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Okay, thank you. Subsection 31(3) around decisions or orders deals with whether once a ruling has been made or a decision has been made with regard to the disciplinary process, whether that would be made public. For some of the reasons I think that we talked about or you talked about, Minister, in your preamble in terms of the role of this legislation in furthering and protecting the public, just wondering how decisions either under this . . . well specifically under this legislation — I understand the scope — would be disseminated.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The Privacy Commissioner makes a recommendation that may find its way into further pieces of . . . into an update to the template, but it would be something we would leave to the association to include in their bylaws as well. We think — not disagreeing with the Privacy Commissioner — that there needs to be a path for it, but it should be included in the bylaws. We haven't seen draft bylaws from them yet. You know, as with the Law Society, they're usually posted online, but it takes a period of time for somebody at the Law Society to go through and decide what needs to be redacted to protect the names of clients, etc. So I'm guessing that this may require the same type of process that would take place within the human resources professionals.

Ms. Beck: — And I guess the next amendment that is . . . These are sort of re-canvassing some of the same issues but I'll just go through them. Subsection 36(4) talks about the solicitor or agent being able to obtain from the registrar a copy of documents filed and anticipate some cost of payment in producing them. And just is again talking about that personal health information, I think we've gone through that.

The subsection 36(5) talks about the hearing, the appeal hearing, the same issue with the initial decision whether that appeal would be made public. And then there's some, there's a proposed amendment around conducting appeal hearings in public, and subsection 9:

[the board] may exclude members of the public and the

person who made the complaint from any part of the hearing if the . . . [committee] is of the opinion that evidence brought in the presence of the person or persons to be excluded will unduly violate the privacy of a person.

[15:30]

So again striking that balance between the right to know and the right to protect personal health information, and moreover some additional proposed amendments dealing with documents. Am I to understand then that these issues brought up by the Privacy Commissioner, the expectation would be that they would be dealt with in the bylaws?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — They would. It would be our intention to have the ministry give the professional body the Privacy Commissioner's correspondence. Our recommendations or our response to those, which is these things properly belong within the purview of the professional body and that the bylaws should reflect those issues, strike the balance between the privacy of third parties that may be affected, privacy of the registrant, and that balanced against the need of the public to know and to have the information available to them.

I usually, when I meet with those groups, suggest to them that they look at the Law Society or the engineering body which includes the various disciplinary decisions online. There's redacted portions that would affect a person's private information or health information enough that it would de-identify the individual. And that's the advice I think we would look to all of those bodies, is that they would look to finding methods of dealing with de-identifying and appropriate redactions. And that would apply not just to the evidence that's submitted, but as well to the decisions that would be rendered, or whatever is included of the appeal process.

Ms. Beck: — The remaining two — and just since I've gone through all of the prior suggestions, I'm going to just read these two into the record as well — but they both deal with that issue that we've already canvassed around whether best appropriate to publish the home address or business address.

So I appreciate the answers, Minister, and I appreciate the answers that were provided to me in the technical briefing. And I understand that in terms of the changes, they will either be dealt with through bylaws, or perhaps if we speak with the Justice minister, an update of the template legislation.

I think I've fully canvassed my questions on this bill. I do sincerely thank you for your time today on this bill. And I do hope that the human resource professionals in the province are happy with this legislation. I know that they've worked hard and spent a lot of time both prior to this and in negotiations for some of these amendments. So I do expect that they will be happy. All that's left are my thanks. And I'm prepared to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we'd be in a position that if there is an amendment being made, now would be an appropriate time.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Ms. Beck, Mr. Minister. Are there any more questions or comments from any other

committee members? Seeing none, we will proceed.

Before we proceed to clause-by-clause consideration, I have been provided with a list of amendments. And the first two amendments are to the long title of the printed bill and to clause 1, the short title. I want to refer members to Bosc and Gagnon, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 3rd Edition, which states, "Titles, whether it be the long, short, or alternative title, may be amended only if the bill has been so altered as to necessitate such an amendment."

Therefore the proper order for consideration of the clauses will begin at clause 2, proceed through the bill, then come back to clause 1, short title, and finally dispense with the amendment to the long title and the printed bill.

Clause 2, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Okay, let's see how many times I remember to say carried.

[Clauses 2 to 20 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 21

The Chair: — Clause 21.

Mr. Meyers: — I would like to make an amendment.

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers: — I'd like to:

Amend Clause 21 of the printed Bill:

(a) **by renumbering it as** subsection 21(1);

(b) **in subsection (1) by striking out** "the abbreviation 'CPHR', or any word, title or designation, abbreviated or otherwise, to imply that the person is a human resources professional member" **and substituting** "or the abbreviation 'CPHR' "; **and**

(c) **by adding the following subsection after subsection (1):**

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), this Act does not affect or interfere with the right of any person who is not a member of the association to practise in the field of Human Resources or to become a certified professional with a human resources association other than the Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Saskatchewan".

The Chair: — All right. Thank you, Mr. Meyers. Mr. Meyers has moved an amendment to clause 21. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 21 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 22 to 51 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 1

The Chair: — Clause 1, short title. I recognize Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to move an amendment to:

Clause 1 of the printed Bill

Amend Clause 1 of the printed Bill by striking out “The Human Resources Profession Act” and substituting “The Chartered Professionals in Human Resources Act”.

The Chair: — All right. Thank you. Mr. Meyers has moved an amendment to clause 1. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried. Is clause 1 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 as amended agreed to.]

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to move an amendment to:

Long title of the printed Bill

The long title of the printed Bill is amended by striking out “Profession and the Chartered Professionals” and substituting “Professionals of the Chartered Professionals”.

The Chair: — Thank you. Mr. Meyers has moved an amendment to the long title. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is the amendment to the long title agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Human Resources Profession Act*.

I would ask a member now to move that we report Bill No. 19, *The Human Resources Profession Act* with amendment. Mr. Nerlien moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

[15:45]

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank you. I would like to thank the committee members on both sides for their time and attention to this. I would like to thank the two professional entities that worked together to make this come together: the IPMA and the CPHR. They’ve both done a lot of work and worked together to resolve issues.

I want to thank the members that were . . . people that work in this building, the security staff, Legislative Assembly Services, broadcast, Hansard. And I’m joined as well today by great folks from my office: my chief of staff Jared Dunlop, administrative assistant Charles Reid, and we have a summer student, Luke Lumbard, who . . . People will know his brother probably better than Luke, but I think we got a good deal out of the family anyway. These people that are working well to try and make government flow smoothly.

I want to thank the folks at the ministry who work hard, not just today but every day throughout the year to try and make our province grow and try and make it the great place that it is. And we can’t thank them enough, and we’re not aware of all the work that they do. So to them I thank them.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Ms. Beck.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thanks again, Minister, and to your officials, to Mr. Tuer. I do appreciate how this problem was approached and happy to come to a resolution here today in service of these members of this professional association and towards the common good in this province.

So with that, thank you for your time and thanks to all the committee members for their time as well.

The Chair: — Thank you, Ms. Beck. Committee members, we’ll adjourn very, very briefly so . . . Recess, I’m sorry. Well maybe adjourn. I could probably get that through, right? We’ll recess for a very short break for cleaning purposes. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Bill No. 3 — *The Massage Therapy Act*

Clause 1

The Chair: — All right, committee members, we’ll be able to get back into committee now. We’d like to begin our consideration of Bill 3. We welcome Minister Merriman and his official, and we will be looking at *The Massage Therapy Act*, clause 1, short title. Mr. Merriman is here with an official. Minister, please introduce your official and make your opening comments.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I have Max Hendricks, my deputy minister. And I think we’ve discussed most of it in my second reading, so I don’t have any

initial comments right now. Oh, and I have my chief of staff, Morgan Bradshaw, here.

The Chair: — All right. Thank you, Mr. Minister. Ms. Mowat, you'll be asking questions. The floor is yours.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you, Mr. Chair and Mr. Minister, and we will get into some questions here. I know that this massage therapy Act has been years in the making. I've heard from several folks in the sector. I've heard up to 17 years is how long some folks have been looking for regulation in massage therapy, and I do think there are quite a few people across the province who don't know that massage therapy in the province isn't regulated yet.

And so to be able to bring this in feels monumental, I would say. And I think there is a great desire, folks around the province, to get massage therapy regulated and get it in line with a number of the other professions, the health professions, but also an importance that I think we really need to make sure that we're getting this right as well. So that's sort of informing the spirit of my questions today, and appreciate that this bill is before us today because I do think there are a number of folks that are counting on it here.

So my first question is around the timing of the bill. So like I mentioned, I have heard concerns about how long it has taken the bill to come about. And I wonder if the minister can speak to that and, you know, any perceptions of why it took so long for us to get to this space.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I guess there was three bodies that were made up of kind of the massage, different associations. It was a matter of getting them together and getting them all on the same page. As you had pointed out, it wasn't regulated. So when we brought these three together, there was a lot of discussions that had to go back and forth between them to make sure that we were meeting all of their individual needs, but also meeting the collective needs and the safety of the general public. So that's why we brought the three together and had lots of discussions. We were very close a while ago from what I understand, and then there was some extenuating circumstances, some things that needed to be worked out.

So we're happy to finally bring this forward to be able to . . . brought in to make sure that, one, that the safety of the public which is first and foremost; and two, that there is some regulatory measures to make sure that they are adhering to what the general public understands as being safe for . . . and that they are registered massage and somebody is just not hanging a shingle claiming that they are a massage therapist. Because there could be lots of side issues with that, not only physically hurting somebody — it could be causing more damage — but the safety side of things too.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. In terms of . . . You mentioned that things were close a couple of years ago. At least I think that's what you're referring to. That was also a question I had because, you know, I've had folks in the industry approaching me for quite some time. And you know, I would have to go back and check the actual schedule, but I want to say it was a year and a half or two years ago that I was meeting with folks who were saying, you know, when this bill comes forward we're very interested in

having the opposition support it. And you know, there's even been some public, you know, news articles urging the government to come forward.

You know, I wonder if you can speak to some of those delays, specifically, you know, people being told to go back and consult the folks who didn't respond to their survey and that sort of thing. What was the ministry's impression of all of this?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — The main reason was, is you have three organizations that were running themselves. And when you try to bring those organizations together under one umbrella, they all have separate mandates and separate objectives.

So just looking back here, and there was consultation started in 2015 and then again in 2019 on draft legislation for this, and in between those two points in time where the discussions happened and where the . . . Well from my understanding, there was two out of the three organizations that were very keen on doing this and the third one wasn't.

So we wanted to make sure that we had done it properly, that we did it again with safety in mind, and making sure that all three of those three organizations that brought up into the Saskatchewan massage therapy Act were all satisfied with the process and made sure that it was inclusive of all of them.

Ms. Mowat: — In terms of getting into some details here, my colleague Ms. Beck and I wrote to you before session started, looking for some answers to some questions and looking for a meeting. So I guess we'll go through some of the substance of that letter to be able to get some answers from you on it.

The first is that the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner has written to you regarding this bill and provided some comments around access and privacy. And he presents a detailed list of recommendations for amendments to ensure that the Act complies with the health information privacy Act. And these amendments contemplate things like the use of personal information, what information will be provided to the public, the use of websites to acknowledge that we're in the year 2021 and can publish lists on websites now, and the fact that the bill refers to home addresses being published and the concern about personal privacy on that front.

These, you know, on review seem certainly like reasonable amendments to bring forward in the spirit of protecting the privacy and access to information, and so I am prepared to bring forward some amendments on this front when the appropriate time comes. But I wanted to get your thoughts on this letter. I was copied on the letter and it was from January 4th, and a number of other folks were copied on it as well. Just wondering if you can provide some comment on these proposed changes.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — We're just going to track down a copy of the letter just to make sure that we're consistent with all of the . . . I remember seeing the letter a while ago. I guess it was back in January; seems like a lifetime ago now on some of the things. That's why we wanted to make sure that we brought all of these together and that they would be able to regulate themselves, to be able to make sure that they're adhering to all of, like, the HIPA [Health Information Protection Act] Act and anything else that the Privacy Commissioner had outlined in there.

This is the first step because right now it wasn't regulated at all, as you'll be aware. So we wanted to make sure that this is a step, something that we can make sure that the general public feels safe about what's going on in theirs. And we have a regulatory body that will be able to look at that and enforce, if necessary, with anybody that's not adhering to the legislation.

[16:00]

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. So to clarify, there's no interest in going forward with any of these amendments today? Like am I expecting that the committee will vote against these amendments today? Is that what you're getting at? I didn't hear a clear answer, yes or no, if are we going to bring in some of the spirit of what the Privacy Commissioner has called for.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I can't comment on what the committee's going to vote on.

Ms. Mowat: — Sure. In terms of the spirit of the recommendations, though, what are your thoughts in terms of the merit of the recommendations that are being put forward?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Well I think I identified that in my last answer that we understand that the Privacy Commissioner had some recommendations to bring forward. We're not bringing them in at this point in time. This is step one of the piece of legislation. If there's something that needs to be brought in at a later point in time, we can certainly look at that.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. I would just submit that, you know, this letter was provided in January, that we've had ample time to review these considerations and that part of the process is also going through this committee process where it's entirely appropriate to bring forward amendments. I think evidenced by the last bill that we went through on this committee where there were several amendments that were passed, I do think that it, while the Act is open and here and the recommendations are being made, that we've had ample time to consider these issues.

You look at things like personal addresses being required on lists. Ms. Beck identified in the last . . . While we were considering Bill 19, that there are significant concerns when you think about domestic abuse situations with personal addresses being listed. So I don't think that these recommendations should be passed over. And I don't know what the intent is behind not approving them.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Yes, I'll just start. First of all, there's no intent in behind this. We're bringing forward a piece of legislation that is needed and been asked for by the industry that we had been working on for a long period of time. I've been very transparent about the consultation, the process, and how we got to this point in time. So there's no intent here to dismiss what the commissioner had said. And nothing is being passed over. This is the foundational piece of legislation.

Some of the stuff that the, from what I've been told, that the commissioner outlined can be addressed in policy and regulations and doesn't necessarily have to be enshrined in legislation. So this is the bedrock of *The Massage Therapy Act* going forward, bringing three entities into one, under legislation. And then some of those things that were addressed can be done

in regulations or in policy. So it's not like they're being dismissed; it's just not part of the legislation process.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. I think we will disagree on this piece. But I do have some more questions, so I will move to a different topic and we can go from there. In the letter that Ms. Beck and I wrote to you we also identified a number of questions that arose while we were having stakeholder consultations to chat with them about what they wanted to see in the bill and whether they were satisfied with it. We understand that there is a template that's being used for regulation, perhaps through NIRO [network of interprofessional regulatory organizations]. And so I'm wondering if this is in place and if Bill 3 follows the current template.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I guess my question would be now that you've seen the legislation and did your consultations back in January, did the stuff meet the needs that you had talked about, that these were done? Because we did consultation with all three organizations to be able to get here, so I'm not understanding what consultations that you and your colleague did that, without even seeing the . . . without getting all of that information now that you've seen everything and we're moving on it.

Ms. Mowat: — So this was just us engaging in regular conversations with stakeholders. As critics it's very much a part of our duties, once the bills had been tabled, us chatting with stakeholders and getting some of their concerns. So the spirit of that is what we are bringing forward. One of the questions that we received was, does this follow the template for other regulatory bodies? Is it in step with the legislation that exists for other regulatory bodies?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Yes, we follow the same template when we're dealing with other regulatory bodies as we want to keep consistent.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay, thank you. There were some concerns raised with the discipline process as it's identified in the bill. Can you speak to whether the disciplinary process is standardized between different professions, different regulatory bodies?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I'm just confused on the disciplinary and just in general here, and maybe I could ask for clarification from the member. We did consultation with the three bodies that made up, that we're now bringing into one. I'm not sure what consultation was done. Were you discussing with these organizations or was it individuals or was it people that are even within these organizations? We discussed with the three bodies and I'm just trying to . . . They all understand the process of the regulations and what needs to be in there. And I'm just confused as to who the members were consulting with to be able to . . . that weren't in those associations or in those initial discussions.

Ms. Mowat: — Well respectfully, like I don't think that the spotlight is on myself today. I haven't gotten approval to name names here so I'm not going to do that. I will identify that, you know, there are folks within these professions, within these organizations, that we have formally met with, and that there are also folks in related health professions that are the members of regulated bodies that have an interest in massage therapy being regulated across the province that we've spoken with.

Normally when the critic comes to these committees we ask the minister who have you consulted with, so I guess I will bring the question back to yourself, Mr. Minister. You've mentioned these three bodies but is there anyone else that you have had an opportunity to consult with, including individuals that are practising privately?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — To the member, I'm not trying to shift the spotlight on you, but if there was somebody that was missed in our consultation process, that's a concern. And here's the groups that we consulted with for the record, and I hope this maybe includes the people that you'd talked to: the Massage Therapist Association of Saskatchewan, Natural Health Practitioners of Canada, the Canada massage and manual therapists association, Western College of Remedial Massage Therapies, McKay school of massage therapy and hydrotherapy, Professional Institute of Massage Therapy, Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, Saskatchewan Health Authority, Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan Dental Assistants' Association, Saskatchewan Dental Hygienists Association, College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan Dental Therapists Association, Denturist Society of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan Dietitians Association, Saskatchewan Association of Licensed Practical Nurses, Saskatchewan Society of Medical Laboratory Technologists, Saskatchewan Association of Medical Radiation Technologists, Saskatchewan College of Midwives, Saskatchewan Association of Naturopathic Practitioners, Saskatchewan Society of Occupational Therapists, Saskatchewan college of optometrists, Saskatchewan Association of Optometrists, Saskatchewan College of Paramedics, Saskatchewan College of Pharmacy Professionals, Saskatchewan College of Physical Therapists . . . There's about 15 more if you'd like me to keep going.

Ms. Mowat: — Just to clarify, Mr. Minister, those are all organizations that you consulted with on Bill 3, *The Massage Therapy Act*?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Yes, and I can keep going if you prefer. I think this is a pretty extensive list, so that's why I'm concerned that you're bringing something forward that one of these groups either didn't bring to our attention or the individual or the business that you were talking to isn't part of one of these.

Ms. Mowat: — No need to continue on with the list. Is the disciplinary process standardized with other professions? That's the spirit of my question.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — The process would be very similar to the agencies and the associations that I just listed.

Ms. Mowat: — In terms of the definitions in the bill, I understand that other professions have a definition of their profession in the actual Act. So in the definitions section, can you speak to why there isn't a definition provided of what therapeutic massage is?

Mr. Hendricks: — A "member" is defined under the proposed legislation. A "member" means, except where otherwise provided, a member in good standing who is in good standing with the college or who is in good standing, sorry. And further on, in terms of the member, it defines the members as a member of one of those three organizations, associations that currently

exist.

Ms. Mowat: — Yes, I do note that. I'm just talking about the profession itself being defined in here and whether that's in line with other regulated professions.

Mr. Hendricks: — It's fair to say that we followed, and have followed throughout the course of this, pretty standardized approaches to developing regulatory legislation. And so when you establish regulatory legislation, you have your Act and then you have, as you know, your regulations. But there's also a series of bylaws that this organization will make over time that will govern the practice of that organization and further define what that membership will include.

[16:15]

So we're kind of in an evolutionary stage. You'll remember when we set up the midwives as a transitional council. We're following a very similar template in this case to that organization. And so over a few years we expect it to develop its bylaws, which will put a lot of meat around the bones in terms of how the profession looks going forward. And that in itself is self-regulated. We want the profession to help define how it looks.

Ms. Mowat: — Moving on to additional questions that we asked in our letter, will the public have access to information about the professional standing of a massage therapist?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Sorry, just for clarification, is that like a public reporting of anything that goes on in the association, like minutes of meetings? Or is it more on, like, the enforcement of regulation side?

Ms. Mowat: — So for example, would there be something like a website in the works? You know, if the goal is to protect the public, and I want to see that my massage therapist is registered and a member in good standing within an organization, how could I access that information?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — There is obviously posting of the minutes, which I discussed, but any of that information would be publicly disclosed just like any other organization. Whether it's a medical association or one of the other 25 that I had listed off, they have to publicly disclose that information.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. Where would that information be available? Like, if I was someone who was interested in that, how would I get that information?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I assume that once the legislation passed, assuming that the legislation passed and the governing body can be set up, that they would set up some type of website or some type of public access, very similar to the other ones. It's kind of standard practice these days.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. On the question of membership eligibility, how was it determined that the three organizations should be eligible for grandfathering? We'll start with that.

Mr. Hendricks: — So in your earlier line of questioning, the biggest delay in bringing this legislation forward was achieving consensus amongst the three organizations about what

grandfathering would look like. So what has been decided upon — and I think they've achieved consensus on this — is that as a go-forward, existing members will be grandfathered in. They will not be required to challenge an exam. They will go through a process where they will demonstrate that they have the abilities and skills needed, but won't be required to sit an exam. Future members, new members will be required to sit an exam. And so this was kind of how they were able to coalesce around this legislation going forward.

Ms. Mowat: — What about the decision of holding equal representation on the council? What are the relative membership numbers of the three organizations?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — The council consists of the number of members prescribed in the bylaws and is to be no less than five members elected by the members in accordance with this Act and the bylaws. Does that answer your question? The bylaws still have to be created, because we have to wait for the legislation to pass before the bylaws can be created.

Ms. Mowat: — Yes. I do understand the process with the bylaws and the transitional council. I think there is a lot riding on that council and the decisions that those individuals make, so that's why I'm asking about the composition of the council and what consideration was given to who has a seat at that table.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — To the best of my knowledge, it's people from the other three associations that would make up that, because they were the ones that we consulted with in drafting the legislation, and they're under *The Massage Therapy Act*. So that would be, the interim would be made up of those individuals.

Ms. Mowat: — Yes. I'm asking specifically about the membership numbers of those three organizations within Saskatchewan.

Mr. Hendricks: — So the legislation does not . . . it says basically there's not to be less than five members from those organizations. We don't say that it has to be a certain number of each. Plus there are three appointees, public appointees to that that are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. So does that answer your question?

Ms. Mowat: — It does but it's different than what I believe I read, so can you point me to which clause specifically talks about . . .

Mr. Hendricks: — Part 3, "Council of the College."

Ms. Mowat: — What page is that on? Sorry. So maybe I can just . . . I found the part that I was referring to here on page 21, 52, "Transitional — council." So it says, "The transitional council is to consist of equal representation from each of the following . . . massage therapy associations . . ."

Mr. Hendricks: — For the interim council, they've agreed . . . Sorry, for the interim council, they've all agreed to make up the interim council. So yes.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And do you have their numbers?

Mr. Hendricks: — We're establishing a council of the college

here and then there's a transitional council right? So yes, equal numbers.

Ms. Mowat: — Yes. I'm just asking . . . I think this is my fourth time. I feel like a broken record. I'm not trying to be overly political here. I am just doing my job and asking the questions that need to be asked. How many members are on these . . . are members of these organizations? Yes.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Are you asking about the transition? Are you asking about the original three groups or are you asking about the new entity that we're creating?

Ms. Mowat: — I'm asking about the original three groups that are coming to the table.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Okay. Just so I'm clear, you're asking what was the makeup of each one of those individuals? Like how many people are each one of their boards? Is that like . . . I'm still not understanding this.

Ms. Mowat: — How many members do each of those organizations represent?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — So there was a total of the three organizations of 805 members total. Is that . . .

Ms. Mowat: — And what is the breakdown amongst three organizations?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Sorry, I misspoke earlier. It wasn't 805 total. MTAS [Massage Therapist Association of Saskatchewan] had 805. NHPC [Natural Health Practitioners of Canada] had 661, and CMMOTA [Canadian Massage & Manual Osteopathic Therapists Association] had 150.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And just to clarify, these are all Saskatchewan members?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — To the best of the my knowledge, yes.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. I was just waiting for you to check, but okay. If those are all Saskatchewan members, it bears questioning why all three of them have equal representation on the council. So I was just wondering how that was determined.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Well, I guess it was determined through the process. We had three independent groups coming together. So I mean, obviously MTAS has the largest membership with 805, but when we're bringing three groups together, it was decided that they would have equal representation on this.

I mean I'm not sure what the question is on this. Are you saying that we should've prorated this transitional for MTAS to have more and for the others to have less? Like, we're bringing together three groups. We wanted them to all feel that this was . . . they had equal share in this. I think if we got into percentages of memberships it would just slow down the process, and we needed this done in a timely manner.

Ms. Mowat: — Fair enough. And I'm not making that argument, I'm just asking the questions. Because I think that they are logical

questions when you look at the importance of the council and the bylaws that they're going to be charged with, with drafting.

In terms of the council, there's a clause on page 4, section 8(3) that no member is eligible to be elected as a member of the council unless the member resides in Saskatchewan. I understand that there's overlap with other provinces with a couple of the organizations. This might preclude some of the representatives from Alberta, and so I wonder why the clause was introduced.

[16:30]

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — From my understanding that if there was . . . Like let's take Lloydminster for example. If there was somebody that was operating on the Alberta side, they'd still have to be licensed in Saskatchewan. So if anybody was, a company was in Alberta or Manitoba or somewhere else and they were operating in Saskatchewan, they'd still have to be licensed.

Ms. Mowat: — I understand. I mean in terms of the representatives that sit on the council. So you can imagine there could be a representative who, because the organization spans larger than the Saskatchewan border, could be in a leadership position and it would be a logical fit. But just in terms of why this clause was included.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Well as I've been told by my deputy minister, anybody that is on the board has to reside in the province.

Ms. Mowat: — Yes, I do see that in the bill. I was just asking about why but it's fine.

Okay, in terms of the membership eligibility, I wonder if there are individuals that are practising therapists that are not included in the membership eligibility because they don't belong to one of these associations. And what might this look like for a practising therapist who doesn't belong to one of these organizations?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — My assumption would be that if they're not part of one of these three organizations that made up this and they wish to become, that they would apply to the organization to be able to become and meet the criteria of the legislation and what those organizations lay out. So if there's somebody new to the table or not operating within these three organizations and they wanted to become this, they would have to go through the process of meeting the standards of this new organization.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay, so those individuals are likely in a position of having to wait until the bylaws are written or the prior learning assessment or test is determined, and then challenging the test.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Yes, I would say if they're individuals that operate outside of these and wanted to be included as part of the process as soon, they could certainly contact either the ministry to be able to guide them in the right direction . . .

Ms. Mowat: — Just to clarify, there is not a process to grandfather those individuals in.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — You mean individuals that aren't in these three associations? No.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay, no. Okay.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — If you're referring to like an unlicensed and unregistered thing that would just be grandfathered into this association, no. That's not the intent of this at all. We want to make sure that it is regulated. That's why we're doing it.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. In terms of this regulation, is the intent that there will be portability with other provinces, that practitioners would be able to move between provinces based on being regulated in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — My understanding is that Alberta doesn't have any legislation on this, or it's not the same legislation that's similar legislation to what we're proposing. So no, we would assume that if anybody is part of this new body, that they would be operating within Saskatchewan and not outside our provincial borders.

Ms. Mowat: — I'm not sure what the state of Alberta was because last I heard they were also developing something to regulate massage therapy. Do we know if what's being proposed here, how it lines up with other jurisdictions as well?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Here's the ones that are regulated right now: Ontario, BC [British Columbia], New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Prince Edward Island. And we did consult with all of these as part of our consultation process.

Ms. Mowat: — And so do we know if there's portability within any of these jurisdictions?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Yes, it's similar to other organizations that if they were operating in two provinces or multiple provinces, they would have to register in each one of those. So there is a general recognition of . . . Like a massage therapist in Saskatchewan would be very similar credentials to a massage therapist in Ontario or Prince Edward Island, but they would have to register in each one of those provinces with their governing body and be licensed under that as well.

Ms. Mowat: — Certainly. I think I'm nearing the end here of my questions. In terms of implementation, assuming the bill passes here, what can folks expect in terms of when there will be an existing college? Like what kind of a timeline are we looking at here? Because I do get a lot of questions about how quickly can we make this happen.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Under the assumption that the legislation passes, it would take about two to three years, just because there's over 1,500 members, just to transition them all into this. And that would be the job of that transitioning council to be able to oversee that. It can't be done overnight, but it would be done as soon as possible.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And just for clarification, I don't know whether you can answer this question right now or whether it has to be determined in the bylaws, but previously we had talked about grandfathering in members and you had mentioned the fact that they wouldn't be subject to the prior learning assessment, whatever the test ends up looking like. And then just now you've talked about how all the members need to sort of go through the process. So I'm just wondering if you can clarify

whether existing members of those organizations will be required to do the test?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Just for clarification, they will have to do like an assessment. They'll have to go through that process but they won't have to challenge a test, so to speak.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. I think that has left things muddier for me.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — They have to meet the criteria but they don't have to be like recertified. They wouldn't have to recertify and take the same test that they took coming out of school.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay, thank you. That concludes my comments, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Ms. Mowat, committee members. Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we'll begin going through it clause by clause.

Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 30 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 31

The Chair: — Clause 31. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I move that we:

Amend Clause 31 of the printed Bill by adding the following:

“(17) All documents filed with the discipline committee are public except for those where the discipline committee determines that certain documents or portions will not be made public because they contain personal information of others defined by *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*”.

The Chair: — All right. Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause 31. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — The amendment is defeated. Thank you, members. We will continue with the original clause 31. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 31 agreed to.]

Clause 32

The Chair: — Clause 32. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I move that we:

Amend Clause 32 of the printed Bill by adding the following after subsection 32(5):

“(6) Any discipline committee decision or order shall be available to the public and shall be published in any manner that the college considers necessary to protect the public, and post the decision or order on the college's website after severing third party identifying information”.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause 32. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — That's defeated. We will continue with the original clause, clause 32. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 32 agreed to.]

[Clauses 33 to 36 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 37

The Chair: — Clause 37. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I move that we:

Amend Clause 37 of the printed Bill by adding the following after subsection 37(7):

“(8) Subject to subsection (9), the council shall conduct all hearings in public.

(9) The council may exclude members of the public and the person who made the complaint from any part of the hearing if the council is of the opinion that evidence brought in the presence of the person or person to be excluded, will unduly violate the privacy of a person other than the member whose conduct is the subject of the hearing.

(10) All documents filed with the council are public, except for those where the registrar determines that certain documents or portions will not be made public because they contain personal information of others as defined in *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*”.

[16:45]

The Chair: — Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause 37. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — The amendment is defeated. We will continue with the original clause, clause 37. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 37 agreed to.]

[Clauses 38 to 47 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 48

The Chair: — Clause 48.

Ms. Mowat: — Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I move that we amend clause 48 of the printed bill to say . . . by striking out . . . Sorry. I'll start over:

Amend Clause 48(b) of the printed Bill by **striking out** “addresses” and **substituting** “business addresses”.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause no. 48. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — The amendment is defeated. We will continue with the original clause 48. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried.

[Clause 48 agreed to.]

[Clauses 49 and 50 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 51

The Chair: — Clause 51.

Ms. Mowat: — Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I move that we amend clause 51 of the printed bill:

Amend Clause 51(b) of the printed Bill by **striking out**

“residential”.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause no. 51. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — Amendment is defeated. We will continue with the original clause. Clause 51, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 51 agreed to.]

[Clauses 52 and 53 agreed to.]

The Chair: — Committee members, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Massage Therapy Act*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 3, *The Massage Therapy Act* without amendment. Mr. Meyers moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — No, just thank my deputy minister and my chief of staff. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members opposite, and the committee members. I appreciate their time today.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — Thanks so much for everyone's time today, and looking forward to getting massage therapy regulated. So I'm glad we're taking this step. Thanks to the committee members as well.

Bill No. 20 — *The Publicly-funded Health Entity Public Interest Disclosure Act*

Clause 1

The Chair: — Thanks very much committee members. We will now move on to consideration of Bill No. 20, *The Publicly-funded Health Entity Public Interest Disclosure Act*, clause 1, short title. Minister Merriman, the floor is yours.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. This was something that was committed to by the previous Health minister, something that was requested by this House. So I don't have any specific comments other than looking forward to this getting implemented so everybody in the public health sector feels that they can bring any issues forward that are concerning them and their work environment.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the minister as well. Certainly agree and enthusiastically accept this legislation coming forward. It is my responsibility to ask a few questions so I will do that.

You know, we have I think been on the record for quite some time identifying a gap in whistle-blower rules that has left out health sector workers in existing legislative protections. We've raised issues about what has been described as a culture of fear in terms of coming forward, and so certainly want to ensure that employees feel safe to identify wrongdoing as it comes forward.

And I will note as well, I put forward a private member's bill last year to this effect as well. And I'm sort of interested in the structure of this bill in terms of being a stand-alone item rather than an amendment to *The Public Interest Disclosure Act*. So I wonder if the minister can speak to what that process looked like in determining that a stand-alone Act was required for health sector.

Mr. Hendricks: — So we actually did explore using the existing public interest disclosure Act. It includes a certain amount of language that relates to executive government and, you know, in our consultations with the Public Service Commission it was their belief that it would require more amending within that legislation than creating our own Act that was focused on publicly funded health entities.

And so we do realize that through our consultations, that the public disclosure commissioner had a different point of view, which we followed up with her and spoke with her about our views about creating a different free-standing piece of legislation. And so we felt that this was the most expeditious way and allowed us to focus specifically on the issues of the health sector.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. In terms of preparing to bring forward this legislation, I understand that the . . . I think the initial position of the previous Health minister was that this could be solved through regulation. I think that was the initial conversation we had around this about . . . oh, time is escaping me now but it was about a year and a half ago, fall of last year. And I believe at that time the regulations were changed to include the Saskatchewan Health Authority. So I wonder if you can speak to how the determination came about to bring in legislation.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Sorry, I want to just comment. I think it was a call of the opposition to ask for legislation. The Leader of the Opposition had called for legislation specifically on this, and the minister, my predecessor, agreed. He thought that there could be some of it done through regulations, but there was calls and an agreement from the Health minister. And I support that and completely agree with it, that this should be enshrined in legislation so people understand the importance and the significance, that if they feel like there's something that they want to be able to speak out, that they have the ability to do that. And this is a stand-alone Act, something that we could point to.

And I would also disagree with your opening comments that there's a culture of fear within our health. We've had many doctors that have talked. We've seen recently, in over the last 15

months of COVID, many doctors, many health care people speaking out on their opinions on things. And to my knowledge none of them have been reprimanded or anything for them speaking out. So I think that that goes to show that the doctors do feel comfortable in speaking out, whether that is publicly or whether that is directly to the minister's office. There is that opportunity there, so I disagree with the "culture of fear" comment.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. I know we won't agree on this. The folks who come forward to my office, that send me messages, that . . . You know, I am inundated with calls from health care workers of all stripes, not just doctors, who feel like something needs to be done, feel an obligation to report a concern but don't feel that they will be supported because of the structure that is in place. So I appreciate, as the minister, that that's not what you want to hear. It is certainly what we hear on a daily basis.

And you know, I think we agree that folks should feel comfortable coming forward, that this legislation, the intent of it should be to encourage people to come forward when they have a serious case of wrongdoing to report. So I think we will agree on that front.

The piece around us requesting legislation, we absolutely did. I mentioned that I brought forward a private member's bill. That's an enthusiastic support of legislating this issue. I'm wondering what changed from the perspective of "regulation will be good enough" to deciding to bring in legislation.

Mr. Hendricks: — So as you mentioned initially, we introduced amendments to *The Public Interest Disclosure Regulations* prescribing the provincial health authority, the SHA [Saskatchewan Health Authority], and the Saskatchewan Cancer Agency as government institutions.

But in creating this legislation, there are other organizations that are working as part of the health sector, including affiliates and physicians who we just spoke about, and so this Act brings all of these groups in. And unlike *The Public Interest Disclosure Act*, which only applies to employees of executive government or government institutions, this is broader and allows us to include more groups.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. An important question that I have is, and I don't think it's terribly clear in the draft legislation as it stands right now, is who is going to be covered? So I see the definition of employee that is listed here as:

a physician;

any other prescribed person who performs services under contract for a publicly-funded health entity; and

any other prescribed person.

So we're talking about folks who are identified in regulations.

It seems unclear whether this will apply to employees of affiliates. You just mentioned affiliates, so I'm quite interested there. You know, health care workers that work for school divisions, pharmacy professionals, community pharmacy, like these are the types of health professions that I think about, and I

wonder if there's contemplation for including them in these protections.

The Chair: — Mr. Minister, before you answer, we're going to take a very short break here to allow Hansard to exchange individuals. So if we could do that, thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[17:00]

The Chair: — All right. Thank you, committee members. We'll resume our committee's proceedings. Mr. Minister.

Mr. Hendricks: — So the Act describes an employee under the meaning of Part II of the employment Act and we include:

a physician;

any . . . prescribed person who performs services under contract for a publicly-funded health entity; and

any other prescribed person.

So within that, a health care organization such as an affiliate, which we do define in our . . . which we can define in regulation, so affiliates would be defined specifically in regulation, or potentially other organizations. It doesn't include private pharmacy because we don't have any formal relationship with them, and so that would be one.

Physicians are appointed by health authorities. They have appointments generally to provide services within the authority, so there's a relationship there.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. So it seems to me this is quite an important piece of the legislation and will be important in terms of what the regulations end up spelling out. And I know part of this is also a little bit of wait and see what the regulations say. But in terms of the plan going forward from the ministry, is there a sense of which . . . if there is another large group of professionals that might be excluded, you know, who those individuals might be? What percentage of folks working within health care professions are we talking about here? You know, what is the scope of the legislation? How is it actually going to carry forward within, throughout the province?

Mr. Hendricks: — This won't be about defining professions as much as it will be about defining publicly funded health entities. And so when, you know, right now the only two that are prescribed in the legislation are the SHA and the Cancer Agency, but through regulation we will define affiliates. And so if I'm a nurse or an LPN [licensed practical nurse] or an RN [registered nurse] or an LPN that works in an affiliate, I will have protection under this Act and its regulations. Similarly a physician working in an organization that we define as a health care organization would have protection under this.

But it's only publicly funded health entities. We're not going to say a class of professions or a profession like pharmacists for example. All pharmacists are afforded protection under this Act — we have no jurisdiction to do that.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. So it's tied to the flow of money coming from the SHA or the Ministry of Health. That's how the Act will impact folks?

Mr. Hendricks: — Yes, and whether they're defined in the regulations specifically. A transaction of money to a third-party contractor doesn't necessarily mean they'll be covered under this unless they're defined as a health care organization in the regulations.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. What about a situation of a non-profit? Or you know, I understand there's going to be a line drawn somewhere, so I'm trying to get a distinction of where that line is going to be drawn.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Like, a non-profit health care provider?

Ms. Mowat: — Yes, like a non-profit long-term care facility.

Mr. Hendricks: — In the case that you mentioned, not-for-profit long-term care that are funded by government, they would likely be included under the Act and, as I said, follow kind of . . . You know, if it's a public health entity that's receiving public health funding, we would look at including them in the regs, but it's too early to tell or to say for sure exactly which organization. The intent, though, is that those affiliates and those organizations that provide a large amount of service for the Ministry of Health would be covered under this Act.

Ms. Mowat: — Okay. I had also talked about, like health care workers that would work for a school division. Would that be the type of person that would be included here?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Those would be employees of the school division and they would fall under their own disclosure, that if they had some issue within the school system, just like any other teacher, that would come under them because they're paid by Education or whoever the organization is. Other like CBOs [community-based organization], they would have something similar that, I would understand, that Education would. Or I think something like Education would have that, or it would fall under.

Ms. Beck: — Mr. Chair, now this maybe is getting into minutiae but, for example, you have mental health pilots in schools, and my understanding from committee is that those folks are paid through the Ministry of Health. So I guess what I'm . . . Further to that question, and less of a specific question would be, are you looking at a percentage of funding from the SHA in order to meet the threshold to be included in the regulations? Or how will that line be determined?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — My understanding is that if they're paid for by the SHA or the Ministry of Health or an affiliate, then they fall under this. If they're not paid by us, then they don't fall under this unless it's prescribed in regulations or somewhere else.

Ms. Mowat: — Since we got the list last time, I wonder if we can hear about which organizations were consulted in the drafting of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — We have the SHA obviously, the Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, health care organizations that are identified in *The Provincial Health Authority Administration*

Regulations, PHA [provincial health authority] regulations, example, Extendicare Canada, etc., and affiliates.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Everybody that would be covered by this legislation.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Any public sector unions that were consulted in this process? I know that they are often quite involved when members have concerns about their workplaces that they're bringing forward.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — And I may be wrong on this, but if there's an issue wouldn't that come up through the union process, of an issue that is brought forward through a unionized member to be brought forward to management?

Ms. Mowat: — Sure. Did you consult with any public sector unions in the drafting of the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — No we did not.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. I would submit that in developing regulations it might be a good practice to go back to these folks. I know that whenever it was brought up in the circles we were in, there was a lot of surprise that they didn't know this was coming forward. I think generally folks were quite supportive, but as you identified there are a lot of concerns that are brought up through the union process.

And for this to work I think that there would need to be a broad education amongst organizations, but also those unions, in terms of being able to help educate their members on what their rights and responsibilities are and how they can safely report wrongdoing and how they're being protected. So I would submit that they should be considered as part of the process.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Not a problem. It's something that we would cover off in the regulations, but if the member had any of the consultation process that you were able to do for your private member's bill that you wanted to pass on to us, we would certainly have a look at it.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. We will take that into consideration and perhaps correspond with you in the future by letter on this.

An additional issue that I wanted to bring forward was the definition of "wrongdoing" that's on page 3 of the Act, or bill I suppose at this point. So there's, I think, four different sections that are identified in part 2 as wrongdoings. It certainly sounded comprehensive to me until we started consulting and heard from a couple of different organizations that they thought that there could be a more fulsome definition here. And I think the definition of "wrongdoing" is of critical importance to the use of the bill and the uptake.

And what was identified to us by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and I see that they have also written to you in response to our request for feedback from them on March 24th, and what they had identified largely is that they had had an opportunity to review the bill. They'd concluded that . . . So this is the council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. They had concluded

that the legislation would benefit from an expanded definition of "wrongdoing" and that's because, like, any individual who reports concerns that are related to the operation of a health entity is only protected if that report relates to wrongdoing. So it's at the centre, really, at the core of the Act.

And so they had based this recommendation on the Alberta legislation that relates to the public service and that contains two additional circumstances that may constitute wrongdoing that this bill doesn't contain. And that's harassment or abuse of employees or conduct that is defined as wrongdoing in regulation — so there's an opportunity for regulation — and indicated that they thought it would benefit from expanding this definition. So they have identified what they think that that amendment should look like.

I'm prepared to bring forward the amendment at the conclusion of questioning today, but I wanted to get your sense of whether this definition of "wrongdoing" as it's presented in the bill is fulsome enough to capture those concerns.

[17:15]

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Just so I understand, you're looking for what is the . . . that the SMA [Saskatchewan Medical Association], is that correct?

A Member: — The college.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Sorry, the college, the college is looking at just on the wrongdoing side of things, and what is the definition of that. Is that correct?

Ms. Mowat: — Yes. And like, if the minister would like, I can table this letter so that he can see it.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Sure.

Ms. Mowat: — It was addressed to both you and myself on March 24th. So I will table my letter — it has a little bit of writing on it — so that he can have a look.

The Chair: — All right. Just for clarification to the members, Minister, would you like to see the letter immediately?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — I think I'm okay, Mr. Chair, but I wouldn't mind a copy of it.

The Chair: — Any other committee members that would like a copy of the letter immediately? Okay. Or can it be posted electronically? Okay. Agreement to post it electronically. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Like, what I have here in some of my notes is kind of the definition of what wrongdoings include. Would that maybe suffice with what your question is? The answer . . . If I gave you what we have as a difference of what wrongdoings is, difference between this and the PIDA [*The Public Interest Disclosure Act*]?

Ms. Mowat: — Well I know what's in the substance of the bill. Like I've already seen what has been provided there. And just identifying the fact that I think there's a strong case for adding

additional provisions in line with what the Alberta legislation looks like. So just wondering if you have taken a look at those additional provisions.

Mr. Hendricks: — So in considering what would define a wrongdoing under this Act, we looked at the existing collective bargaining agreements that we have with various unions. And we felt that a number of things, in terms of an employee's recourse through those avenues, were sufficient and didn't need to be replicated necessarily in this Act. This refers to very specific things that they actually, you know, don't have a formal mechanism under the context of a CBA [collective bargaining agreement] to raise.

And so similarly, you know, doctors in this province are members of a professional association who has the ability to raise issues with government if there's a feature or an issue with their relationship with the Health Authority. There are various tribunals and that sort of thing that exist under *The Medical Profession Act* and bylaws which govern the relationship between the Health Authority and physicians. And so it was felt like, honestly, including those would be redundant in this Act and might actually create some confusion.

Ms. Mowat: — Certainly in terms of . . . It makes sense for several health sector employees, but if we talk about folks who are coming under contract work, like I think that there would be some gaps here in terms of folks that are not represented by CBAs. And I wonder, because it hasn't even been spelled out, exactly who the Act protects. Would it not be more prudent to be more inclusive and to foster the environment of willingness to come forward in light of these situations if we, you know, have any amount of uncertainty about coverage of a CBA?

Mr. Hendricks: — The thing, you know . . . Every worker in this province, even outside of a CBA, is afforded a certain number of protections under the employment Act. And so, you know, you can try . . . You can't build every feature into every Act. And so we feel that, you know, obviously if a contractor did have an issue, there are other mechanisms that they could choose to exercise if it was related to something else like harassment or something like that. And so that was the basis under which we made the decision to include these particular wrongdoings.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. So my understanding of this is, despite the initial question of whether the minister had seen the letter, that you're saying that you've had a look at these recommendations and you think that your definition is complete enough that these additional provisions that are being recommended by the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons are not required.

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Well I would say that they're . . . Again back to what we talked about earlier was anybody that's under this that is an employee of the SHA or any affiliate agencies is covered under this.

There are other Acts out there, the employment Act, there's the union grievance issues that they could go through, there's association mechanisms, there's lots. This was brought forward to have an overarching . . . that there was some legislation out there that could be pointed to that was going to be able to create a comfort level within health, within the SHA, the cancer

agencies, that they could come forward if they had an issue.

This doesn't mean that this is just exclusive. This is in addition to everything else that is already pre-existing. We did have the public information disclosure Act. There was a request for there to be a separate piece of legislation. We've brought that separate piece of legislation forward. That doesn't mean that it stands alone. It stands in conjunction with all of the other pieces of legislation that were there. This one was identified as a potential gap. We've done our consultation to be able to fill that gap, and we've presented the legislation here.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you, Minister. Just for clarification, would it be within . . . Would there be a possibility that independent contractors would be included in the regulations, who would be under contract with SHA?

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — We're going to go back after — you know, under the assumption that this gets passed — we'll go back and do some consultations to develop the regulations on who is exactly going to be . . . If there's going to be an extension past the SHA employee, such as many organizations that are out there that are contracted. But just extensions of the ministry, we can certainly look at that in the regulation process.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you, Minister. And the reason I bring up that particular example is because in the answer about why some of these groups didn't need to be included potentially, or other provisions that there might be, those independent contractors don't enjoy the protections of *The Saskatchewan Employment Act*. So thank you for taking that under consideration.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. I conclude my questions as well, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — All right. Thank you, Ms. Mowat. Any other committee members have any questions? Seeing none, I'd like to table the document that Ms. Mowat introduced. HUS 9-29, Ms. Mowat: Correspondence to Minister Merriman dated March 24th, 2021. The document will be posted to the website shortly. Thank you.

We will now move on to consideration of Bill No. 20, *The Publicly-funded Health Entity Public Interest Disclosure Act*. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clause 2 agreed to.]

Clause 3

The Chair: — Clause 3, is that agreed?

Ms. Mowat: — Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — I would like to move that we:

Amend Clause 3 of the printed Bill by adding the following clauses after Clause 3(c) of the printed Bill:

“(d) an act or omission that is deliberate and that shows a reckless or willful disregard for the proper management of employees, by a pattern of behaviour or conduct of a systemic nature that indicates a problem in the culture of the organization relating to bullying, harassment or intimidation;

(e) a wrongdoing prescribed in the regulations;

(f) knowingly directing or counselling a person to commit a wrongdoing mentioned in clauses (a) to (c).”

The Chair: — All right. Ms. Mowat has moved an amendment to clause 3. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

An Hon. Member: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — The amendment is defeated. We will continue with the original clause. Clause 3, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 3 agreed to.]

[Clauses 4 to 10 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 11

The Chair: — Clause 11. I recognize Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I’d like to move an amendment to:

Clause 11 of the printed Bill

Amend Clause 11 of the printed Bill in subsection (1) by striking out “be in the prescribed form” and substituting “, if made to the Commissioner, must be in a form that is acceptable to the Commissioner”.

[17:30]

The Chair: — All right. Mr. Meyers has moved an amendment to clause no. 11. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried. Is clause 11 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 11 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 12 to 35 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 36

The Chair: — Clause 36. I recognize Mr. Meyers.

Mr. Meyers: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I’d like to move an amendment to:

Clause 36 of the printed Bill

Amend Clause 36 of the printed Bill in clause (i) by striking out “and the form of a disclosure”.

The Chair: — All right. Mr. Meyers has moved an amendment to clause no. 36. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. All right. Clause 36 as amended, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 36 as amended agreed to.]

[Clause 37 agreed to.]

The Chair: — All right, committee members. Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Publicly-funded Health Entity Public Interest Disclosure Act*.

All right. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 20, *The Publicly-funded Health Entity Public Interest Disclosure Act* with amendment. Ms. Ross moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Hon. Mr. Merriman: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just thank yourself; Hansard; the committee members for the questions; and my official, Max Hendricks, and the officials that were back at the office; and my chief of staff, Morgan Bradshaw. Thank you everybody for going through this, this evening.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — Thanks everyone for your time today and for conversation. And like with *The Massage Therapy Act*, I am happy that we have this bill being enshrined into legislation, and I do hope it leads to more productive disclosures. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Ms. Mowat. Committee members, thank you for your indulgence this afternoon. That concludes our business for today. I would ask a member to move a motion of adjournment. Mr. Domotor has moved. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. This committee stands adjourned until the call of the Chair. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 17:35.]