



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 19 – May 11, 2009



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-sixth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Delbert Kirsch, Chair
Batoche

Ms. Deb Higgins, Deputy Chair
Moose Jaw Wakamow

Mr. Fred Bradshaw
Carrot River Valley

Mr. Greg Brkich
Arm River-Watrous

Mr. Michael Chisholm
Cut Knife-Turtleford

Ms. Joceline Schriemer
Saskatoon Sutherland

Mr. Trent Wotherspoon
Regina Rosemont

[The committee met at 15:00.]

The Chair: — Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. Before we start, I have a letter here that was to be tabled by the Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport. So that will be passed out to you. Thank you.

Bill No. 94 — *The Profits of Criminal Notoriety Act*

Clause 1

The Chair: — Our next item of business is Bill No. 94, *The Profits of Criminal Notoriety Act*. And Mr. Minister, if you would introduce your people, and any opening comments.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined today by Susan Amrud, executive director, public law; and Darcy McGovern, senior Crown counsel, legislative services branch.

Thank you. Members of this committee will be well aware of the public debate that arose after it was learned that Colin Thatcher planned to write a book. People questioned whether Saskatchewan should have legislation to prevent criminals from profiting from the notoriety of their crimes. We appreciate and understand the concerns raised in recent weeks, and we are responding with this Bill.

The purpose of this Act is to prevent persons convicted of or charged with a designated crime from financially exploiting the notoriety of their crimes and to compensate victims of those crimes or their family members and to support victims of crime. In Canada, similar legislation exists in Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia. Approximately 40 US [United States] states have some version of this legislation; however, because of the different constitution and legal system in the United States, we do not attempt comparisons with Canadian laws.

As I have previously noted, I approach this type of law with some significant caution. It is very easy to say that criminals should not profit from their crimes. It is much more difficult to craft legislation that will stand up to challenge and scrutiny. Anybody drafting criminal notoriety legislation must balance constitutional issues such as avoiding the appearance of adding further punishment on top of the court's sentence and the effect on free speech against victims' interests and legitimate expectations. I also recognize the Bill introduced today only addresses a particular set of circumstances. As such, this government intends to continue working towards comprehensive legislation, legislation that will be capable of seizing revenues from a variety of sources. We understand that we may have to amend or add to this Bill in the future as a result.

A few words now about the content of this Bill — the Bill does not prohibit the recounting of a crime. Rather it provides for a process to prevent the financial exploitation of the notoriety from that crime. We are sensitive to and supportive of freedom of expression as a cornerstone of our society. Accordingly this Bill is carefully focused on restricting profit rather than limiting publication. In our view, this is a reasonable and proportionate

response to the pressing need to prevent exploitation of criminal notoriety and the re-victimization that profiting from such crimes would surely cause to Saskatchewan victims and their families.

Except as allowed by this Bill, no person shall pay consideration under a contract for the recounting of a crime. That consideration, that money will instead be paid to the minister. Similarly no person shall accept consideration under a contract for the recounting of a crime. Any money paid or payable to that person must be sent or directed to the minister. Consideration directed to the minister under this Bill will then be provided to the victims of that particular crime or to the Victims Fund.

Under this Bill, contract for the recounting of a crime means a contract entered into before or after the coming into force of this Bill. Under such a contract, a person convicted of or charged with a designated crime provides or agrees to provide a recounting of the designated crime either directly or indirectly in return for compensation. Recounting is defined to include the recollection and re-telling of circumstances relating to a designated crime, an expression of thoughts or feelings about a designated crime, and also a re-enactment of a designated crime.

Finally, designated crime is defined to mean an indictable offence pursuant to the Criminal Code for which the maximum penalty is imprisonment for five years or more and that involves the use or attempted use of violence against another person or conduct that endangers or is likely to endanger the life or safety of another person or that inflicts or is likely to inflict severe psychological damage on another person. It also includes corresponding offences from other jurisdictions, as well as a series of specific sexual offences and other offences that will be detailed in the regulations.

As part of the balance we are trying to achieve, the Bill also provides for a process whereby a person may apply to the court to allow consideration to be paid and kept in accordance with the contract. This would be in cases where the court is satisfied that the recounting has a value to society despite the importance of preventing exploitation of criminal notoriety.

The Bill does not apply to any contract for the recounting of a crime that is entered into for law enforcement purposes, in support of crime prevention, or in support of victim services programs. In keeping with our commitment to freedom of expression, we recognize the value to society of these forms of expression. Accordingly the Bill will not apply to these types of contracts.

This Bill will apply if the crime is committed in Saskatchewan or if consideration of the contract is paid or payable to or by a resident of Saskatchewan or to a person serving a sentence of imprisonment in a penitentiary, correctional facility, or other custodial facility located in Saskatchewan.

I would also note that the Bill removes profits gained from the sale of memorabilia where that profit is increased by the criminal notoriety of an individual. This includes autographs, personal objects, and objects related to a designated crime.

In passing this legislation, we should think of all victims of crime and recognize that this Bill is not a comprehensive answer. It is however an important and significant step in increasing support for victims of crime.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would be pleased to answer questions at this point.

The Chair: — Thank you. Mr. Quennell will be asking questions.

Mr. Quennell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. The minister mentioned that the legislation that exists in Canada — the five provinces and soon to be Saskatchewan — isn't comparable to American legislation. My understanding that one of the significant reasons why they're not directly comparable is that the American legislation, the Son of Sam legislation and its successors, as a rule enables individuals to sue for the recovery of these profits from criminals and would-be victims with a standing with the court to do that, whereas the Canadian model and the Canadian examples are an administrative model where information's reported to the minister. The minister responsible for the Act — which would usually be the Minister of Justice, I would think — administers the funds. And the dispute, I suppose, is between the minister and the person writing the book or whatever as to whether the recollection and retelling of the crime falls within and is caught by the Bill.

First of all, if the minister or his officials confirm that that is roughly correct, and then secondly, if it is . . . I appreciate this isn't going to come up very often, but to what part of the Ministry of Justice would be delegated the administrative part of collecting this information and ensuring compliance with the legislation?

Mr. McGovern: — Darcy McGovern. With respect to the Son of Sam description, I think that's a fair characterization that the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, when it looked to prepare the model Act that the Canadian legislation has since been based on, it described its model Act as an administrative model, meaning that rather than requiring the victims to sue separately with respect to an alleged tort or a statutory cause of action, that instead the money would be paid into the ministry and subsequently paid out under the terms of the legislation. So in general terms, that is the administrative model or the Canadian model and how it differs.

Now there's 40 states involved, so I appreciate there are differences and that they've continued to evolve in light of how the litigation works there. But that certainly was the intersection where the two Acts meet, one being the administrative and one being the litigation model, if I can use that as a general phrase.

With respect to the ministry's approach to this, it'll be a matter of our civil litigators pursuing this within the civil law branch as opposed to the prosecutors, for example. So that would be where the primary responsibility for following the Act would be.

Mr. Quennell: — Okay. No dispute with that designation. But there is an inherent independence in the office of prosecutions within the ministry that maybe doesn't exist elsewhere in the ministry. And what gave rise to this particular Bill might be a

good example of a concern about the decisions that are being made as to the purpose for which the book was written and that type of decision which, depending on what decision is made by the ministry, the legislation either catches the book or doesn't catch the book, if the book is written for law enforcement purposes or whatever or these are crime prevention purposes. These can be somewhat subjective decisions.

And I wonder what thought, if any, the minister has given to ensuring that these are administrative decisions and not political decisions made within the Ministry of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think that's something that we'll want to spend some time and decide whether it's something we want to encompass in regulations or we have a policy decision. My initial thought when we were approaching this was that we wanted to have a piece of legislation that would (a) enable victims to get a restitution order a lot easier and that we would give some assistance to the victims once they had a restitution order through the ministry, using the various collection vehicles we have. And that would go towards the specific victims of a crime.

But in the Thatcher situation, you know, there is no determination as to where those monies might go to yet and then setting up a framework for . . . [inaudible] . . . And it's something that probably, over the next while, we'll want to try and develop a template. I don't know whether Mr. McGovern wants to add something, but we're in the early stages of something.

Mr. McGovern: — I think the only thing I would note as well is that just to keep in mind that of course we're not dealing with criminal legislation, which is typically the purview of our prosecutors with the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt and with naturally their priority being dealing with criminal matters.

I think with respect to this legislation — like the SCAN legislation, the safer communities and neighbourhoods, or the civil remedies for organized crime piece with seizure of criminal property — that we are building a capacity, certainly within the civil law branch, to deal with this property and civil rights-based matters from a litigation perspective.

Mr. Quennell: — I don't believe there is in the legislation — you can correct me if I'm wrong — the ability for a private citizen, say a victim of one of the designated crimes who disputes the judgment of the ministry that a book is written, say for the purposes of crime prevention or in support of victims services programs, there is no provision to give that person standing to go to a court and say, notwithstanding the decision made within the Ministry of Justice, I don't think this book was exempt from the Act. I think the Act should apply to this book. And I'd be looking for the certificate that I think the minister should have provided.

And if I'm correct in that, individuals don't have any ability to challenge the decision of the ministry in the legislation about what the Act applies to and what the Act doesn't apply to. I know the minister, I think in the second reading speech . . . I recognize that this may require some fine tuning, and I wonder if that's fine tuning that the government would be looking at.

Mr. McGovern: — To the member, no other province currently does take that approach of a separate process for the challenging of a decision that's made under the legislation. I think as the member well knows, there's administrative law precedent with respect to prerogative writs with respect to decisions that individuals can seek mandamus or in the nature of mandamus if they fit in with that criteria. But you're correct in saying that there isn't anything specific in the legislation that would provide for a third-party-at-large claim under the structure of the statute.

Mr. Quennell: — And the second half of my question is more a political question, so maybe it's to the minister as to whether that might be considered.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm looking at the Bill now. I'm looking at section 8 which is the application of the court, and there's nothing in section 8 when I look at where the regulations are. It could certainly be something that could be included in the regulations where we would give those persons standing.

I'm trying to think of where your example might go to or where it might come from, that a person that's a victim may be concerned that the province would want to give the money to the Victims Fund rather than a victim or that they would want the book to be released without having the money yet taken. Is your question that a victim would not want to see the money taken by the province? Is that . . .

[15:15]

Mr. Quennell: — My concern, and it's, I mean, hypothetical. But say in the future or after this legislation's been enacted someone writes a book about retelling their part as a criminal in a violent crime or any other designated crime, that the ministry — in this case the civil law branch of the ministry — takes a look at it and says, oh this is for crime prevention purposes; therefore our Act doesn't apply.

There's no provision in here, express provision, for the victim to say to a court, I disagree; I don't think that is the purpose of this book, and I think the Act should apply and should be . . . [inaudible] . . . and I think that the ministry has made the wrong decision.

Now there are the administrative law remedies that Mr. McGovern mentioned. My question, I guess, to the minister is, do you think it might be worthwhile — and I'm not asking for a commitment, but recognizing that the legislature moved quickly in this Bill and that the minister referred to it possibly requiring amendments in the near future — it might be worthwhile to consider allowing the victims of crime, for example, to have standing to challenge the ministry's subjective decision as to the purpose of the book and whether the Act applies or not.

And what gives rise to that question is the current circumstance that we're talking about, in respect to Mr. Thatcher, which is that people might fear that the Ministry of Justice would make a political decision about whether the Act applied to a particular book or not in the future in some hypothetical case. And what would be the recourse of victims or anybody else in that case?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think what we would want to do is see

how the Act worked in this. You know, we haven't seen the book that Mr. Thatcher is planning to write yet, so we don't know how it will fit in. But I think what we would want to do is have a circumstance or two work their way through, see how it works. But the point you raise is certainly a valid point. That's one we'd want to take into account as we go through whatever updates or amendments might be there, and I appreciate the point.

Mr. Quennell: — I wasn't asking for amendments today in any case.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — And I appreciate, you know, this is a Bill that both sides of the House agreed to pass in a quick fashion, and I don't think any of us have spent the amount of time and consultation that we might like to have.

Having said that, when I read through this, I thought this catches not only this circumstance but — when you compare it to the other legislation, it's pieced together some from the different sources — and I think I'm pretty pleased with this as a piece of work. I'm very pleased with the legislative drafting folks for what they put together on short order.

Mr. Quennell: — Which takes me to my next set of questions. As has been mentioned, the Bill for the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly is based upon a model, a national model. And I take it that all the current Acts in the other five provinces — Alberta, Ontario, Nova Scotia, BC [British Columbia], and Manitoba — are all somewhat based on that model legislation. Is that correct? . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . The provision in the definition or the interpretation section as to contract for the recounting of a crime and it's including a contract entered into before coming into this force of this Act. I don't believe is in the Manitoba legislation for example. Is that part of the UCC [Uniform Commercial Code] model, or does that come from a particular province?

Ms. Amrud: — Susan Amrud. It is not in the Uniform Law Conference model. But the other provinces have different provisions that take that approach. For example Nova Scotia, the Nova Scotia Act applies to crimes that occurred before or after the coming into force of the Act. The Alberta Act applies to contracts entered into before or after the coming into force of the Act, to crimes that occurred before or after the coming into force of the Act and consideration paid or payable after the Act came into force. The Manitoba Act applies to crimes that occurred before or after.

The Ontario Act applies to contracts entered into before or after their Act came into force and crimes that occurred before or after. There's the specific provision that provides that the obligation to provide a copy of the contract entered into applies to contracts entered into on or after May 1, 1995, which is the date that their first Act came into force.

Mr. Quennell: — The provision in the definition of recounting as to “an expression of thoughts or feelings,” is that in the model legislation, or does that come from . . .

Ms. Amrud: — That is in the Uniform Law Conference model. It's also in the Alberta Act.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That particular term, “an expression of thoughts or feelings,” would probably catch a situation where there was a denial of a crime. The *Leader-Post* had an article that we didn’t comment on, saying that the book publisher was of the belief that the book would not be caught. Well they’ve got the advantage of having seen the book. We don’t.

But the Uniform Law Conference wording was, in the opinion of our drafts people, broad enough that it would catch a denial and the circumstances surrounding it. So had we been asked by the media to comment on it, we certainly would have explained that that was specifically contemplated by the drafts people, was addressed through what was in the Uniform Law Conference drafting. So anyway, if that answers your question and supplements . . .

Mr. Quennell: — Did only Alberta pick up on the use of that phrase out of the model?

Ms. Amrud: — Yes.

Mr. Quennell: — The list of exemptions that we discussed earlier, recollections or recounting I guess in our legislation — recountings “for law enforcement purposes; in support of crime prevention; or in support of victim services programs”— are those exceptions, where the Act doesn’t apply to recounting? Are those from the model legislation?

Ms. Amrud: — Every province and the Uniform Law Conference took a slightly different approach to that issue. The Uniform Law Conference model exempts contracts for a law enforcement purpose entered into with a law enforcement agency or a government.

In Nova Scotia the exemption is a contract entered into by a law enforcement agency or a government. In Alberta it’s a contract for a law enforcement purpose or in support of crime prevention programs or victims’ programs, entered into with a law enforcement agency or a government. Manitoba, it’s a contract entered into by law enforcement or a government. And in Ontario the exemption is an appearance to address a victims’ group or imprisoned persons.

Mr. Quennell: — Now that takes me a little bit back to my first set of questions about potential concern that a much broader set of exemptions than seems to exist in other legislation across the country might lead to concern about subjective decisions being made within the ministry and not, with all respect to the ability to ask for judicial review, not a lot of ability to challenge ministry decisions made within the ministry.

This seems to be one of the broadest set of exemptions just in that the contracts don’t even have to be entered into with the government and then some have a much shorter list than the three that the government proposes here. And that clearly was a deliberate decision on the part of the government proceeding with this legislation.

Ms. Amrud: — In looking at the different exemptions in the other models that we looked at, what we thought was more important was the purpose of the contract rather than the parties to the contract. So for example, if it’s an appearance to talk about crime prevention, if the contract was entered into with a

school or a church, it seemed to be as validly deserving of an exemption as if it was entered into with the government.

[15:30]

Mr. Quennell: — I don’t disagree that the purpose probably should be the guiding principle, just that somebody’s got to make a more subjective decision in the case of the provincial legislation in Saskatchewan than is made in other provinces.

The next section or subsection I’m interested in is 5(2): “Subject to the regulations, each party to a contract for the recounting of a crime entered into on or after June 1, 2007 . . .” Now “subject to the regulations,” I assume the government’s leaving open the ability to go back further than two years, but this would catch it as hoped, I trust, payments that have already been made in a certain case.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We don’t know what the payments, when they were made. We have no knowledge about it. We felt it was a reasonable period of time, and the two-year period reflects the general limitation period that’s used in our various limitations. So we thought it was a reasonable period of time to go back. It’s consistent with the other legislation. And we left another option through the regulations if there was another situation that arose that we had to deal with it.

Mr. Quennell: — That takes me to my next set of questions which are about, I guess, the best understanding that the Ministry of Justice has in respect to the constitutionality of the legislation. First of all I think I’m correct in my understanding that none of the provincial legislation across the country that we’ve discussed has ever been challenged as to its constitutionality in respect to limiting free speech.

Mr. McGovern: — That’s correct. That’s our understanding as well.

Mr. Quennell: — And secondly, that American legislation may have been challenged, but it’s the sense of ministry officials that that’s not too educational or indicative of what could happen with Canadian legislation because of the difference in legislation, the difference in the constitutions of the two countries, and even perhaps the difference in attitude towards the role of government in these types of matters.

Mr. McGovern: — That’s correct. I think it’s fair to say that the American experience is instructive as usual but certainly not determinative of the Canadian circumstance given how our Charter is structured and how the legislation is structured.

Mr. Quennell: — Now we have other limitations on freedom of speech, and I mentioned a couple in my second reading speech on this legislation in respect to limits on, to use shorthand, hate speech in provincial human rights legislation and in the Criminal Code. And other limitations might come to mind. Is the ministry aware of any litigation involving those limitations that might be instructive in predicting how a court might look at this legislation if it was challenged?

Mr. McGovern: — I don’t think for the purposes of the committee that we have a list of comparable litigation or cases that we would be bringing specifically to the committee’s

attention. I think in more general terms what certainly the ministry is able to express is that the Act has a very focused purpose, that in our view it's a reasonable, proportionate response to the pressing need to avoid the profiteering with respect to the recounting of crimes. So in that extent it's a very limited and proportional response and as the member knows, those are key elements in terms of proceeding with legislation of this type.

Mr. Quennell: — I don't disagree with what Mr. McGovern said. I think it is a proportionate response, obviously. I've said as much. Is it because the legislation I've referred to, that limits speech in Canada, not been challenged? I would have thought that the hate speech had been. Are there no indications from those cases as to how courts might deal with this?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — My suggestion might be that that area of the law might be under some flux. There's a bit of significant public press back against some of the rulings of some of the human rights tribunals and I suspect things will wind their way through the courts. But I think where there's a difference is that the hate crimes, the human rights rulings, are more in the nature of an outright ban on what somebody is saying, or saying that the words constitute hate and therefore can't be spoken or can't be spoken in certain public settings.

So there's the direct conflict between what they can say and what their right to free speech. And here we're not limiting anybody's rights to say or write anything or appear in the media. What we're saying is, it's reasonable and proportionate for a specific purpose that we are saying that you cannot profit or earn money from those things and in the event that money is payable or earned by that, that that money is forfeited.

So there's nothing specifically that says you cannot say it or there is a penalty for saying it. All this Bill says is that in the event that money is earned, the money is forfeited. So I think that's the distinction between that area. The opinion that came from the constitutional . . . [inaudible] . . . they expressed the opinion that they felt this was reasonable. It was fair. It was proportionate. It was done for a publicly acceptable purpose, and that their belief was that it did not constitute criminal law. It did not infringe on somebody's right to free speech, so that was . . .

Mr. Quennell: — Mr. Chair, I agree with the minister. I think that is an important distinction. I think some of the limits on speech themselves would be more easily challenged than legislation of this type, even though I believe this is a limitation on speech. I still think that the distinction that the minister makes between banning the recounting of a crime and profiting from that recounting is still an important distinction, and I think it further limits the limitation that's being made here.

Those are all my questions, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Quennell. If there are no other comments or statements, we'll proceed with the vote.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Mr. Chair, we have no objection to voting this off by part. Not wanting to get your officials all wet or saturate them with comments, I just think it might be a quick and easy way to do this.

The Chair: — I've got it straight now. By leave of the committee, if we can vote it off by parts, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 24 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: Bill No. 94, *The Profits of Criminal Notoriety Act*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 94, *The Profits of Criminal Notoriety Act* without amendment.

Mr. Chisholm: — I so move.

The Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Thank you. And, Mr. Minister, have you got any closing comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I would like to thank all members of the legislature for agreeing to move this Bill forward. I would also like to thank the officials in the various parts of the ministry — there's people working in constitutional law and people working in legislative drafting — that worked through a weekend and came up with an end result that I think all of us were very pleased with, and certainly deals with not just the current issue but probably also some significant others. So I'd like to thank everybody that was involved in the process.

The Chair: — The Chair recognizes Mr. Quennell.

Mr. Quennell: — If you don't mind, I'd like to join with the minister in thanking the ministry for their expeditious but still excellent work on the Bill.

The Chair: — Thank you. That concludes this section.

General Revenue Fund First Nations and Métis Relations Vote 25

The Chair: — Okay, if we are ready to continue, we're on vote 25, First Nations and Métis Relations, page 83. Central management and services, subvote (FN01) in the amount of 3,992,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Northern economic programs and policies, subvote (FN05) in the amount of 2,350,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Northern industry and resource development, subvote (FN06) in the amount of 934,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policy coordination and support for Aboriginal organizations, subvote (FN02) in the amount of 7,227,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Gaming agreements, subvote (FN03) in the amount of 68,696,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Treaty land entitlement, subvote (FN04) in the amount 4,885,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Amortization of capital assets in the amount of \$7,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: —

Be it resolved that there be granted by Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2010, the following sums for First Nations and Métis Relations in the amount of 88,084,000.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 25 agreed to.]

**General Revenue Fund
Lending and Investing Activities
First Nations and Métis Relations
Vote 163**

The Chair: — We now move to vote 163, First Nations and Métis Relations, page 166, loans under *The Economic and Co-operative Development Act, The Northern Economic Development Regulations*. Subvote (FN01) in the amount of 400,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — I needed someone to move the resolution on the last one. If I could have someone do that, please. Mr. Chisholm.

I will now ask the member to move the following resolution:

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2010, the following sums for First Nation and Métis Relations in the amount of 400,000.

Ms. Schriemer: — I so move.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 163 agreed to.]

**General Revenue Fund
Intergovernmental Affairs
Vote 81**

The Chair: — We now move to vote 81, Intergovernmental Affairs, page 111. Central management and services, subvote (IA01) in the amount of 904,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Intergovernmental relations, subvote (IA02) in the amount of 3,110,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2010 the following sums for Intergovernmental Affairs in the amount of 4,014,000.

Mr. Bradshaw: — I so move.

The Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 81 agreed to.]

[15:45]

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

The Chair: — We move now to vote 3, Justice and the Attorney General, page 113. Central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of 20,443,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of 34,613,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Marketplace regulation, subvote (JU07) in the amount of 3,992,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Legal and policy services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 26,956,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community justice, subvote (JU05) in the amount of 18,358,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards and commissions, subvote (JU08) in the amount of 25,123,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts capital, subvote (JU11) in the amount of 22,243,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Amortization of capital assets in the amount of 750,000 — this is for the information, not to be voted.

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

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 13, 2010, the following sum for Justice and Attorney General, the amount of 151,728,000.

Mr. Brkich: — I so move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 3 agreed to.]

**General Revenue Fund
Municipal Affairs
Vote 30**

The Chair: — We now move to vote 30, Municipal Affairs, page 119. Central management and services, subvote (MA01) in the amount of 4,772,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal financial assistance, subvote (MA07) in the amount of 259,450, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — 259,450 — sorry, my mistake here — it's 259,450,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Bradshaw: — But we knew what you meant.

The Chair: — Carried. You knew what I meant. Thank you. Federal municipal assistance, subvote (MA10) in the amount of 60,187,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal relations, subvote (MA08) in the amount of 7,397,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (MA06) in the amount of 1,527,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2010, the following sums for Municipal Affairs in the amount of 333,333,000.

Mr. Chisholm: — So moved.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 30 agreed to.]

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

The Chair: — We now move to vote 27, Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport, page 137. Central management and services, subvote (TC01) in the amount of 10,122,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Tourism, subvote (TC13) in the amount of 16,354,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Capital City Commission, subvote (TC14) in the amount of 700,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, subvote (TC12) in the amount of 29,021,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Building communities, subvote (TC11) in the amount of 16,493,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Cultural, subvote (TC03) in the amount of 39,604,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Heritage, subvote in the amount of

13,013,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Strategic policy, planning, and partnerships, (TC15) in the amount of 2,525,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community Initiatives Fund, subvote (TC06) in the amount of 10,451,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Communications Network, subvote (TC08) in the amount of 6,267,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Amortization of capital assets in the amount of 2,267,000.

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

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2010, the following sums for Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of 144,550,000.

Ms. Schriemer: — I so move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Vote 27 agreed to.]

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

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

Mr. Bradshaw: — So moved.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would now ask for a motion of adjournment. Mr. Chisholm. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. This committee now stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 15:54.]