



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 38 – December 6, 2010



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-sixth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Warren Michelson, Chair
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Kim Trew, Deputy Chair
Regina Coronation Park

Mr. Greg Brkich
Arm River-Watrous

Mr. Michael Chisholm
Cut Knife-Turtleford

Mr. Wayne Elhard
Cypress Hills

Ms. Deb Higgins
Moose Jaw Wakamow

Hon. Laura Ross
Regina Qu'Appelle Valley

[The committee met at 19:00.]

The Chair: — Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice committee meeting. Tonight we have two items on our agenda — the consideration for supplementary estimates for the Ministry of Justice and the Attorney General, vote 3, and the consideration of Bill 158, *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010*.

My name is Warren Michelson. I am the Chair of the committee. And the other committee members are Greg Brkich, Michael Chisholm, Wayne Elhard, Laura Ross; Kim Trew, and sitting in for Kim Trew is Andy Iwanchuk; and Deb Higgins, and sitting in for Deb Higgins is Kevin Yates.

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

Subvotes (JU03) and (JU11)

The Chair: — Minister Morgan, we'll welcome you to the hearings this evening. We'll give you a few minutes to introduce your officials, and if you have any opening remarks, you can do them then.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to attend supplementary estimates debate this evening to provide you with information regarding the additional funding being provided to the Ministry of Justice and Attorney General for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. I would be pleased to answer questions following my brief remarks.

I'm joined by a number of officials from the ministry tonight to help answer specific questions. I'm joined this evening by deputy minister and deputy attorney general, Gerald Tegart; assistant deputy minister of courts and civil justice, Ken Acton; assistant deputy minister of regulatory services division, Rod Crook; executive director of corporate services, David Tulloch; and Courtney Phillips, executive assistant to the deputy minister of Justice and deputy attorney general.

I intend to provide a brief opening comment and then turn the floor over to the Chair and answer any questions the committee may have.

The ministry requires additional funding of \$7.689 million. This is split into four areas: court services, Provincial Court judges, provincial guardian and trustee, and courts capital. Court services and judges' salary require an additional \$3.158 million. These funds are for operational pressures largely within the courts area.

The workload continues to grow for the court system. Since 2000 the number of court appearances, which is a good measure of the activity in our court, has grown by 42 per cent. And while budgets have increased, the additional costs for the program continue to grow at even faster pace. The additional funds will help to pay for increasing costs of such items as court-ordered appointments, travel expenses to a court in the Far North, line

charges for video conferencing, and salary pressures related to operating the court system. As I mentioned, these additional costs total \$3.185 million, an amount which includes judges' salaries.

The provincial guardian and trustee office requires additional funds for workload pressures in the deceased estates agent unit and the accounting unit. Currently the provincial guardian and trustee has approximately 6,500 clients and holds in trust \$154 million in assets. The office makes 50,000 payments annually to more than 29,000 clients, family members, or service providers, and I know the public values the work that is done by this office. I know as well the provincial guardian and trustee office, through the fees charged for its services, does generate revenue that offsets a considerable portion of the costs of the operation of that office.

The ministry also requires an additional \$4.3 million for the Meadow Lake court house. This funding is required in this fiscal year due to delays in the past spring when wet weather delayed the planned work from last year. So really this is in effect a carry-over of costs from the last fiscal year to this one. The project is still on target to come in on budget, and most recently I've learned that it is actually slightly under budget.

This concludes my opening comments, and I would now be pleased to answer any questions the committee may have on these additional costs for the Ministry of Justice and Attorney General.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. The amount I do believe that you'd mentioned was 3.185. According to the estimates it's 3.186. We can entertain questions now.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I stand corrected.

The Chair: — Thank you. We'll entertain questions now. We would just ask if the officials would just state their name if they're directed any questions, just for the record please. So we'll open it for questions. Mr. Yates.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I just would like to ask a number of questions through each of the areas of the estimate. In court services you had indicated that it was due to operational pressures and increases of 42 per cent increase in caseloads and a portion of that was for increased salaries for delivery of those services. Could you tell us, is that an increase across the province or is pressure more predominant in some areas of the province than others?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'll let Ken Acton . . . [inaudible].

Mr. Acton: — Ken Acton, courts and civil justice. It's more prevalent in the North and in the major centres as opposed to some of the other locations, but there's really increases across the piece. But we see significant growth in Meadow Lake and Prince Albert, La Ronge, and those areas in particular.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. Do you see these pressures being ongoing, or are these just a balloon in the current system?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think it's probably fair to say that the increase in caseload will continue. We've made efforts and done work with the judges and with the court system to try and have greater efficiencies, reduce the number of appearances, and the type of efficiencies that you should look for. But it seems that as our population grows, court activity grows. And we've been more aggressive. We've hired more police officers, so more charges are in fact laid. So we anticipate the court case count not likely to go down.

And also the complexity of criminal litigation will continue to grow with the Charter. Every year or two, the Supreme Court will make a decision that will require greater obligation on the part of the Crown for disclosure and a variety of other things, interpreters and other court services.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chair, through you to the minister, is this a . . . Are we seeing this across the country, or is this something that's peculiar only to Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We actually see it not just across the country, but across North America as well. There's newspaper articles you read that the US [United States] is, you know . . . They've got some different pressures than we do, but it's a pressure everywhere.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. Are the pressures going to result in additional FTE [full-time equivalent] requirements within court services and the department?

Mr. Acton: — We are seeing some increases in our FTE utilization, particularly on the Provincial Court side, just to manage these pressures. Some of it is as a result of overtime, particularly in Saskatoon for example, where we've been holding some extra sittings just trying to make sure that there isn't a backlog. And of course that puts some pressure on.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. Mr. Minister, in the area of court services, are we seeing in areas like Regina and Saskatoon greater attempts to try to do video conferencing and use measures other than direct court appearances to speed up the court services?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The video conferencing is used primarily in the North in the more remote areas or where somebody's incarcerated. We wouldn't use video conferencing for an accused that's being held in Saskatoon . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I stand corrected.

Mr. Acton: — We are using some video conferencing for some appearances from the correctional centre here in Regina to Provincial Court, and it's helped in terms of just the amount of transport taking place. And we're doing some of the same in Saskatoon as well where we can, so just to make it easier so that the accused don't have to travel. And it helps in terms of our costs for transportation as well. But as the minister said, a lot of it is in northern communities.

Mr. Yates: — Is video conferencing working? Is it effective and is it resulting in any cost savings?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'll let the officials provide an answer as

well. It's not used to conduct a trial, but it's used for an adjournment or a bail application or that type of thing. So there's some significant benefit on that. It's only done with the consent of the accused, both counsel, and the judge.

So in some cases there's a reluctance or an unwillingness to do it, but there seems to have been a better uptake on it than most people anticipated. So it seems to be regarded as a success. And we're planning to expend the capital to put it in more locations, or at least that's the direction we're wanting to go with it. I don't know whether . . .

Mr. Acton: — Yes, it certainly is beneficial. And as all the players get more accustomed to using it, there's a greater acceptance. I mean the legal community are now starting to appreciate how helpful that is as well, and so a big part of it is making sure that legal aid or defence bar are comfortable with it as well. But they're finding it for first appearances and that to be quite helpful.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. Do we have any estimate on cost savings as a result of not having to transport individuals back and forth for hearings in the Far North that can be significant cost impact?

Mr. Acton: — It is significant cost, but I don't have any estimates at this point just in terms of the dollars saved.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It's probably a better approach to look at it, that we're not seeing as rapid an increase in prisoner transport as we might otherwise. We know that it's used on a regular basis, and every time that it's used is one less prisoner that has to be transported. Now in a lot of those cases, there may well have been a vehicle or an aircraft that was travelling in any event, but to the extent that we're able to eliminate or minimize or use it, it's that many less people that are transferred. It also reduces the possibility of an accidental release or an escape.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. My next set of questions have to do with the Public Trustee. We see an increase here of \$204,000, an indication that that's as a result of increased workload. My question is, how was this not foreseen or foreseeable at budget time? It's usually when you see an increase in workload, it's gradual. It's not a bump or a jump in an office like the Public Trustee.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — That's a good comment and a fair question. I think both myself and my predecessor were always optimistic that the costs would be able to be brought down, but there was always continuing growth. But I think everybody felt that they would work with the administration to try and reduce staff. And it just has, the caseload has continued faster than the efficiencies that have been added.

You know, I mentioned earlier the number of cases that are there, the amount of money that's under administration, and the nature of the files that are done through the Public Trustee's office. It's individuals that can't care for their own affairs, and usually the family members are people that aren't represented by counsel and need a lot of additional assistance. If you spend any time at the office and you look at things on an individual case basis, it's surprising that they do as well as they do with

the number of files they're handling.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Is the changes being made today, sufficient to deal with the ongoing growth moving forward?

Mr. Crook: — It's Rod Crook, assistant deputy minister. Yes, we believe it is. There has been some decline in the number of estate files so that we're now getting that workload more manageable. So we think this level of funding should be sufficient on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. My next questions have to do with the capital funding. You indicated that it was a result of carry-over from year to year in the courts, and that it's a \$4.3 million carry-over.

Last year when the work was not able to be done, did we see \$4.3 million returned to the General Revenue Fund?

[19:15]

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — It largely deals with the Meadow Lake courthouse. The weather was such that they were not able to complete it. So they were under budget last year and then that expenditure was made this year.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. So you were under budget last year. All right, my final question has to do with Provincial Court judge salaries, an increase of some \$203,000. It is statutory, but was this an expense that again could not be foreseen at budget time?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The statutory increase in the salaries was because that's determined on a multi-year basis, but there's been greater usage of relief judges and temporary judges. We had one judge that was off for an extended period of time, so we had additional costs in accommodation and transport. And then we were using, we have judges that have retired that we use on a call-in basis.

Mr. Yates: — All right. So this wasn't for an increase, a general salary increase. This was for greater utilization of retired judges and transportation.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — There was a portion was salaries . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Go ahead.

Mr. Acton: — Yes, a portion of it was salaries as part of the Provincial Court Commission recommendations as well.

Mr. Yates: — When did we receive those recommendations?

Mr. Acton: — Those were in '08, I believe. Yes, in '08.

Mr. Yates: — So we should have been able to budget for those increases earlier at budget time? What I'm trying to understand is, if there's a salary portion there, was the agreement reached after the budget was approved or prior to the budget being approved?

Mr. Acton: — It was reached prior to the budget being approved. And there was an error in terms of how we did the

calculation and laid in the increases which was not . . . We did an error in the calculation in terms of the compensation set out by the commission as opposed to the general compensation increases for in-scope and out-of-scope staff in the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Yates: — Okay. Thank you very much. That concludes my questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Yates. Is there any other questions from the committee members? Seeing none, we will proceed with the voting off of the Justice and Attorney General supplementary estimates. For courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of \$3,186,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. The \$203,000 for provincial court judges is a statutory amount within this subvote.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — We had raised the issue before whether it was 185 or 186. My officials are confirming now that it should be 185, much as I'd like an extra 1,000. But it should be one . . .

The Chair: — Carried. We will need some clarification on that. According to the supplementary estimates for November, the court services is 2,982,000. And the public guidance and trust is 204,000, which should give us a total of \$3,186,000.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — A . . . [inaudible] . . . mathematical ability has prevailed and we appear now to have agreed on the higher number, the 186.

The Chair: — Thank you. Did vote on the subvote (JU03) in the amount of \$3,186,000. The 203,000 for the provincial court judge is a statutory amount within this subvote. Therefore it does not require a vote. The courts capital subvote (JU11) in the amount of 4,300,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General vote 3 in the amount of \$7,486,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2011, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of \$7,486,000.

Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Brkich: — I so move the resolution.

The Chair: — Thank you. Mr. Brkich makes the motion and that's agreed.

[Vote 3 agreed to.]

The Chair: — That concludes the supplementary estimates.

Since we have voted off the supplementary estimates for our committees, we need to report this back to the Legislative Assembly. Committee members, you will have distributed to you the ninth report, which we will have to vote on. The ninth report of the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice you have before you now. We require a member to move the following motion:

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

Mr. Chisholm: — I so move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Thank you. That report will be made to the Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Minister. We will continue now with the consideration of Bill No. 158.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. With your indulgence, I'd like to take the opportunity to thank the minister and his officials for coming this evening and answering our questions. And I'd like to thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'd like to thank the officials for coming out this evening as well.

The Chair: — Thank you again, Mr. Minister and the officials. We will take a five-minute break until the other officials take their chairs.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Bill No. 158 — *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010*

Clause 1

The Chair: — Well thank you and welcome back to the Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We are now in consideration of Bill No. 158, the correction service amendment Act, 2010. I welcome Minister Huyghebaert and ask him if he would introduce his officials. And if you have any opening remarks, you could make them then.

Hon. Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm very pleased to be here this evening with the committee. I'd like to introduce the officials which to my right is Deputy Minister Al Hilton. To my left is Tammy Kirkland who is the executive director of adult corrections. Jason Rumancik is sitting behind us. Fred Burch is at my far left at the table here. Rick Davis is director of strategic business and information technology, sitting at the back. And also you all know Rob Nicolay who is my chief of staff. Rick Hischebett is our executive director of the civil law division, and he is on his way. But I felt we could get started beforehand.

I'm going to keep my opening comments brief because we have visited this recently, *The Correctional Services Act*, so I think we would probably just like to refresh everybody on what the

Act is and what it's designed to do. It's designed that we can record inmate telephone calls where appropriate and be played back to the individuals that are authorized to be able to listen to it. The system is currently being operated on a limited basis to comply with legal authority provided in the existing regulations and legislation. But this Bill is essential to utilize, to fully utilize all of the features of the new system.

We know that a number of judicial rulings have established that telephone monitoring is legal if the infringements are prescribed by law, and courts and other jurisdictions have ruled that inmates have a diminished expectation of privacy. So that is why this legislation is important, and we feel that that way it will be legal. We know that it will be legal under our law to have, once this is passed. The courts have also ruled that similar established systems do not, do not violate freedom of information and privacy laws.

Once the amendments have passed, the ability to listen to existing recorded calls will be prescribed by law. And the facility director will be able to approve listening to the calls if they have grounds to show risk to the public or other inmates or staff. And we are very confident that when the system is fully engaged, it will help us to reduce the kinds of criminal activities within our correction facilities and also will add to public safety in the province so illegal activities cannot be conducted over the . . . or minimized.

There's going to be always exceptions, I suppose. But it's going to enhance public safety within the province, as we've talked about previously, because calls now that we know have been made to witnesses from our institutions . . . And there have been harassing calls to citizens from within our institutions. So that's why this piece of legislation is very important. And with that I would be very prepared to take questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would just ask if any of the officials on answering any questions would identify themselves for the records. Is there questions? Mr. Yates.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'd like to start by saying in principle we, as I indicated through the various second reading speeches, support the legislation. I believe that it is both appropriate and needed to protect the public and other inmates, others that are incarcerated.

Are there any plans to expand this at any time to other facilities — open custody facilities or community corrections facilities — that also house adult inmate offenders? Currently this is for the four main correctional facilities.

Hon. Mr. Huyghebaert: — No, it was designed and brought in for four main secure facilities, and at the moment there's no plans to expand it to lower risk facilities. That doesn't preclude it from happening in the future, but there's no plans at the present to do that.

[19:45]

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. In our consultations with others about this particular Bill, the only issue that was raised with any major concern was actually that of the cost of the facility . . . or pardon me, the cost of the system and the fact that

families and vendors were paying a significant surcharge for the system. Could you outline for us why this system was chosen and why the additional costs are . . .

Hon. Mr. Huyghebaert: — Sure. The company that was chosen, it went through the RFP [request for proposal] process. And so there's probably an awful lot of technical reasons why the company was actually chosen, but they have a history of dealing with inmate phone systems from the United States and other jurisdictions within Canada. It was also of no cost to us. They put the system in, and they recover their capital costs and the operating costs through their percentage of the monthly phone calls that are completed.

The cost of the calls are consistent with other jurisdictions, and I personally don't have a problem with the costs. We look at it comparative to previously where the costs were local calls were borne by the taxpayer, and in the previous system, long-distance calls were still paid for by the inmates. So when you put all that together, the delta cost difference may be a little bit higher today, but I think it's very worthwhile that it's done in this manner.

Now if there are issues with inmates who have financial issues that cannot make calls or do not have the funds to make calls, or they don't have family to be able to put money into their call account, there are provisions within the system to allow for those individuals to be able to make calls. And that would be done where an inmate can approach one of the officials within the institution, one of the guards, or get to the level where they can say, we have a problem; and I really want to talk to my family and I can't afford it. There's provisions for that within the institution to do that. In addition to that, remand offenders are allowed three free calls per day. So I think the system the way it's designed right now is very fair.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. My next question has to do with the monitoring of calls. There have been concerns raised that the monitoring is going to be done by the Texas company outside Saskatchewan. Could you just put on the record who actually will be monitoring the calls here in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Huyghebaert: — That will be covered in regulations. But what I can advise you on now, there'll be very, very limited numbers of people that will be monitoring calls, and it will be directed and appointed by the director of the institution. What I see happening in discussions with officials is it would be the intelligence officers within the institutions that would have the authority to monitor the calls. And we're looking at having two IOs [intelligence officer] in each facility except for Pine Grove, where there's one.

And so that's what we're looking at as the individuals that would be authorized to monitor the calls. Which to me makes sense, if you have your intelligence officers are the ones that are in the picture of the high-risk or the high suspect individuals. And so they would be the ones. That to me makes sense that they would be the ones that would be authorized to monitor.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I think the concern was that it would be people outside Saskatchewan monitoring the calls and not locally. I'm glad you were able to

clarify that for us. With that, I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Yates. Thank you Mr. Minister. Is there any other questions from any committee members? If there are no more questions, we will proceed with the voting. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clause 2 agreed to.]

Clause 3

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. There's a number of . . . three amendments that we are proposing tonight that I will present as they come up, basically necessitated by the change of the effective dates of when this legislation was originally written. It was initially wanted to be brought in on January 1, 2011 because of the importance of this legislation which normally would not have possibly happened until the spring session.

But as a result of the co-operation of the opposition and the government, I am pleased to be able to propose these amendments to make this legislation come into effect without any time difficulties.

So I will proceed.

Clause 3

Strike out Clause 3 of the printed Bill and substitute the following:

“New section 56.1

3 The following section is added after section 56:

‘Inmate communication

56.1(1) The executive director may establish communication systems for use in correctional facilities that provide inmates with means to communicate with other persons, including other inmates.

(2) Subject to subsection (3) and in accordance with the regulations, inmate communication:

(a) may be recorded by electronic or other means;

(b) may be intercepted, monitored, censored or restricted; and

(c) may be prohibited or blocked.

(3) Nothing in subsection (2) applies to a privileged communication”.

The Chair: — Will the committee accept the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 3 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 3 as amended agreed to.]

Clause 4

The Chair: — Clause 4. I recognize Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. The proposed amendment to clause 4 reads as follows:

Subsection 57(2) as being enacted by clause (c) of Clause 4 of *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010* is amended by striking out “January 1, 2011” and substituting “the day on which *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010* comes into force”.

The Chair: — Will the committee accept the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 4 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 4 as amended agreed to.]

Clause 5

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Clause 5, the amendment would read as follows:

Strike out Clause 5 of the printed Bill and substitute the following:

“Coming into force

5 This Act comes into force on proclamation”.

The Chair: — Will the committee accept the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Carried. Is clause 5, coming into force, as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 5 as amended agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: Bill No. 158, *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would like a member to move that . . . I would like a member to report . . . I would like to ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 158, *The Correctional Services Amendment Act, 2010* with amendment.

Mr. Elhard: — So moved.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. That concludes the hearing on Bill No. 158. Mr. Minister, thank you very much for your indulgence. And to your committee, to your officials, thank you for coming out. Thank you to the committee. I would ask that we have a motion to . . . I’m sorry, Mr. Minister. Did you want to have some comments?

Hon. Mr. Huyghebaert: — Yes. First I’d like to thank my officials for being here this evening, but I would also like to thank the committee. And I’d like to thank all members for their co-operation in putting this Bill through in a timely manner. We feel this Bill is extremely important for the enhanced safety of our residents of the province and within our institutions, so I’d very much like to thank the committee for their support in having this Bill passed this evening.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That concludes the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. Members . . . Oh, Mr. Yates, please.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. With your indulgence I would like to thank the minister and his officials for coming this evening and answering our questions, and helping to move this Bill forward as well. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Yates.

Could I have a member move adjournment. I’ll recognize Ms. Ross.

Hon. Ms. Ross: — I move to adjourn.

The Chair: — Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 19:57.]