



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 15 — May 9, 2022

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 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Mr. Mark Docherty, Chair
Regina Coronation Park

Ms. Betty Nippi-Albright, Deputy Chair
Saskatoon Centre

Mr. Gary Grewal
Regina Northeast

Mr. Travis Keisig
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Ms. Lisa Lambert
Saskatoon Churchill-Wildwood

Mr. Tim McLeod
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Greg Ottenbreit
Yorkton

[The committee met at 18:00.]

The Chair: — Hello all, and welcome to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. I'm Mark Docherty, the Chair of the committee. Substituting for Betty Nippi-Albright is Nicole Sarauer. Part of the committee is Gary Grewal, Travis Keisig, Tim McLeod, Lisa Lambert, and chitting in for Greg Ottenbreit is Mr. Friesen, yes.

Okay. So we're here to consider the consideration of Bill No. 70. And today we'll be considering Bill 70, *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 2021* before voting on the committee resolutions for the 2022-2023 estimates and 2021-2022 supplementary estimates no. 2.

Bill No. 70 — *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 2021/Loi modificative de 2021 sur l'Assemblée législative*

Clause 1

The Chair: — So we'll begin with Bill No. 70, *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 2021*, a bilingual bill, clause 1, short title. Minister Tell, you're here with your officials from the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. And I'm going to ask that if the officials who are not seated at the table wish to speak, they take a place at the table prior to doing so. State your name for the record before speaking. Also please do not touch the microphones. The Hansard operator will turn them on for you when you speak.

And yes, with that I will yield the floor. Go ahead and do your introductions, and then we'll turn to Ms. Sarauer.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Seated in the — I don't know — gallery or a reasonable facsimile of a gallery, we have with us tonight the Attorney General and his chief of staff, Michelle Lang. And seated beside the Attorney General is Neil Karkut. He is the senior Crown counsel of legislative services. And I have my chief of staff, Brayden, behind me. Beside me is Darcy McGovern, Q.C. [Queen's Counsel], director, legislative services. To my right is Deputy Minister Dale Larsen. And beside him is Rob Cameron, assistant deputy minister, policing and community safety services. Did I get everybody? Okay. Don't want to miss it.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to be able to offer opening remarks concerning Bill 70, *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act of 2021*. *The Legislative Assembly Act of 2007* is foundational legislation through which we, as legislators, set out various roles and responsibilities for ourselves as members of the Legislative Assembly. The Act also sets out various duties and functions for the Legislative Assembly Service that serves the public and the members of this Assembly as part of the legislative arm of government.

This bill proposes amendments to redefine the term "Legislative Precinct" to mean the floor of the Chamber in the Legislative Assembly; establish a new legislative district consisting of what geographically used to be the legislative precinct minus the newly defined legislative precinct; create the position of director of legislative security to be appointed by the minister responsible for *The Police Act, 1990*; assign responsibility for security within

the newly defined legislative district to the director of legislative security; authorize the director to make co-operative arrangements with the Government of Saskatchewan and the Speaker to meet that responsibility, including the employment or use of any police officer, sheriff, or special constable that may be required by the director to do so; confirm the existing security-related jurisdiction and responsibilities of the Speaker, Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Legislative Protective Service within the newly defined legislative precinct; authorize the Speaker to make co-operative arrangements with the Government of Saskatchewan to meet that responsibility; and restrict the possession of weapons in both the legislative district and the legislative precincts to authorized individuals.

I recognize that there has been some disinformation circulated on this bill. I want to take this time as an opportunity to be able to add some clarity. It has been claimed that this unit will infringe on Charter rights, shut down protests, or result in some sort of partisan or private security service. This is 100 per cent false. The purpose of Bill 70 and the proposed changes to legislative security is to enhance the security of the Legislative Building and surrounding area. The changes will allow these non-partisan civil servants access to the broad policing and public safety network available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety.

Police services and agencies across the country have seen an increase in public safety threats and risks associated with not only the pandemic but also heightened political rhetoric in recent years. For example, in a report published last spring the Canadian Security Intelligence Service states:

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated xenophobic and anti-authority narratives, many of which may directly or indirectly impact national security considerations. Violent extremists continue to exploit the pandemic by amplifying false information about government measures and the virus itself . . . Some violent extremists view COVID-19 as a real but welcome crisis that could hasten the collapse of Western society. Other violent extremist entities have adopted conspiracy theories about the pandemic in an attempt to rationalize and justify violence. These narratives have contributed to efforts to undermine trust in the integrity of government and confidence in scientific expertise. While aspects of conspiracy theory rhetoric are a legitimate exercise in free expression, online rhetoric that is increasingly violent and calls for the arrest and execution of specific individuals is of increasing alarm and concern.

Here in Saskatchewan we have seen public servants harassed, legislative events interrupted, and elected officials threatened even after changes were made in 2019 to help address these issues. With respect to the parliamentary function of the Sergeant-at-Arms and its office, we cannot ignore that these issues have continued to occur even with those changes.

The measures outlined in this bill are about being proactive rather than reactive. In neighbouring jurisdictions, we have seen lone and organized actions that have jeopardized the ability of our democratic institutions to safely function. We do not want to wait for another tragedy or incident to occur before discussions on security take place, as has happened previously.

Since 2014 jurisdictions across Canada have treated this issue as an evolving topic. For example, under the previous Speaker in British Columbia, a report was completed with the recommendation that included that the Sergeant-at-Arms' role should be recast as a primary ceremonial role, and perhaps sessional role, with a new director of security position created to have responsibility for all matters pertaining to the security of the legislative precinct, including liaising with external agencies.

In Manitoba, recent changes to *The Legislative Security Act* currently requires the Speaker and the Minister of Justice to enter into agreement respecting the provision of security within the legislative precinct, and further proposed amendments will require a chief legislative security officer to be jointly appointed.

And of course recent events in Ottawa have led to further conversation on what security looks like on parliament and the area surrounding. It is not impossible for another service to provide security in a legislative building, as we also see next door in neighbouring Alberta where the Alberta sheriffs are the primary security service there.

Institutions and roles must change to reflect the issues of their time. While we respect the role of the Board of Internal Economy, the nature of evolving security threats and risks mean that the response to these must evolve as well. Having security remain under an authority that can be slow to respond to these issues brings unnecessary risk to this building, the people in it, and the surrounding grounds. Placing the responsibility for this within the ministry allows for the proposed unit to be more flexible in responding to these concerns, as resources and supports can be added as needed in a manner that is currently not possible.

Silos exist across government and we're all aware of that, and it makes inter-ministry problem solving and co-operation a challenge. These challenges only grow when dealing with separate branches of government, in this case the executive and the legislative. The Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety employs professional, non-partisan, and dedicated civil servants committed to ensuring the public safety of this province. This has resulted in unique ways in which their expertise can be used, for example, as the Provincial Auditor referred to when discussing inappropriate purchasing of the Highway Patrol. And the Ministry of Corrections and Policing and Public Safety has the expertise in areas relating to policing and security matters. So having ministry officials sign off on purchasing of policing equipment, weapons, and training made sense.

We also saw this occur in the recent freedom rallies where a number of special constables, community safety officers, peace officers, and police officers worked together to ensure that the Frost Festival was safe for those who visited it. Having the flexibility to respond to these events is critical, as organized demonstrations have increased across Canada. As the Winnipeg Police Service has recently noted, in 2017 they saw 12 to 15 protests a year that required the police to respond. So far this year that number is 110. Not only does an increase of organized protests mean more opportunity for violent actors to infiltrate these events, they require additional responses from policing services which take away from the other community safety priorities.

Making sure that the building and the grounds and the people in it are safe in a changing world means having a service that can adjust to that changing need. That's exactly what this unit is intended to do. Again, changes were made in 2019 to try and address these concerns through its current structure, but we have seen that these changes were not enough. We have tried to work through to make sure this building is safe for everyone, but we also will not wait for a serious incident to occur before significant changes are made.

Thank you. And I welcome the committee's question regarding Bill 70, *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act* of 2021.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. Ms. Sarauer, if you've got some opening comments, great. If not, go right into your questions. You have the floor.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I'm going to go straight to my questions. I have many, some of which stem from the minister's opening comments, and I thank her for providing them to the committee.

Minister, you mentioned in your opening comments that your explanation for why this bill is before us is to enhance security of the Legislative Building and surrounding area. Can you elaborate as to why you feel this bill is needed?

[18:15]

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Do you have a copy of my introductory remarks?

Ms. Sarauer: — A copy?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yes, do you have . . . Oh, okay. I didn't know that you were given that. Okay.

I'm going to reiterate what was said in my introductory remarks. The purpose of this bill — changes to legislative security — is to enhance the security of the Legislative Building and the surrounding area. The changes will allow non-partisan civil servants access to the broad policing and public safety network available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety.

Police services and agencies across the country have seen an increase in public safety threats and risks associated with not only the pandemic but also heightened political rhetoric.

For example, in this report published last spring by CSIS [Canadian Security Intelligence Service] — some of the extremist views, and I don't really want to read through that again; violent extremists; violent extremist views — "These narratives have contributed to efforts to undermine trust in the integrity of government and confidence in scientific expertise."

Here in Saskatchewan we have seen public servants harassed, legislative events interrupted, and elected officials threatened even after changes were made in 2019 to help address these issues.

Ms. Sarauer: — Perhaps let me rephrase my question. You mentioned again that the purpose of this legislation is to enhance

security of the Legislative Building and surrounding area. How will this bill do that?

Mr. Cameron: — Rob Cameron, ADM [assistant deputy minister] of policing. So to answer your question, the biggest or greatest advantage of this will be the creation of an ability to respond to public safety incidences and concerns, along with greater collaboration among provincial enforcement agencies and police to assist in that response.

So to expand on that, by creation of this legislative district security unit we can leverage the connections that we have with policing, different law enforcement agencies. To expand on that, this does not necessarily mean enforcement actions but could also include things like logistical and intelligence gathering and usage to support the operations that would be within the legislative district security unit.

It also creates a professionalization of the legislative security which would enhance the ability to share information between enforcement agencies, also improving on how entities work together. So really a lot of it comes down to the collaboration, the ability to work within that larger policing envelope to ensure there is an increased presence, an increased enhanced ability to respond to issues and concerns that would happen in the Legislative Building and the district.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Can you explain . . . I guess my question is, isn't the Sergeant-at-Arms and his office already collaborating with policing — RPS [Regina Police Service], RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police], what were officers until recently under the PCC [Provincial Capital Commission] as well? Why would this new body do that collaboration better than what the Sergeant-at-Arms has been doing?

Mr. Larsen: — Good evening. Dale Larsen, deputy minister. Ms. Sarauer, I guess in response to at least part of that question . . . And we've seen it happen in 2014 with the shooting in Ottawa. We've seen it a few times since, and most recently we've seen it with the convoy that shut down Ottawa for some time over the last January, February.

The problem that they encountered in 2014, that we actually experienced in this building when we closed it down for a time that day, was the issue of the lack of interoperability in a flexible, speedy manner. We've seen it in 2014; Ottawa's seen it in 2021. And even though we have different security agencies assigned roles and understand the concept of not only building security but individuals' security, those connections don't seem to be something that's a fluid . . . built in to the process of a quick, immediate response.

So we have RCMP in Ottawa. We have Ottawa Police Service. We have the capital commission police agency. We have different, other private security agencies there. All of them failed to coordinate the rapid response required, as well as incorporating the intelligence that was gathered up and to that time period in January.

With this change and the enhancement of our current unit, we would expect that seamless type of communication, not only with the intelligence leading up to, but in the event that an occurrence does happen, that it would be much easier for our unit, our

ministry, to coordinate those responses and act accordingly.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Larsen. Unfortunately you didn't quite answer my question, and that was, is the Sergeant-at-Arms not already communicating and collaborating with other policing services like RPS and RCMP?

[18:30]

Mr. Cameron: — Yeah, so in answer to your question, I think the biggest component of this is the fact that through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, we have a very well-established national, interprovincial network that has the ability to reach into many aspects of law enforcement in the country and in the different provinces.

I think that's the biggest advantage to what you will see, is that we just have that much deeper root and able to reach out deeper into that community, which will enhance the security through providing more intelligence, more information, as well as our ability to interact with other law enforcement agencies. And I think that's what the biggest advantage would be.

Ms. Sarauer: — I mean, I think we're going to be here for a while because that still wasn't an answer to my question, which I thought was a fairly simple question about the collaboration work that the Sergeant-at-Arms is already doing in communicating regularly with policing services like RPS, like RCMP.

I'll try a different but very similar question. What will this new organization have access to communicating with that the Sergeant-at-Arms' office does not have access to?

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you. So I guess just to get to the root of your question, is that the Sergeant-at-Arms just does not have the ability to reach out and have the same capacity that we have. They cannot connect to the international . . . or the national-level intelligence network that exists in the country.

We have that ability through the ministry. We have those connections. We sit on several intelligence committees. We work within that law enforcement jurisdiction un-siloed. And I think that's an important part about this is that the Sergeant-at-Arms, as it now exists, is basically a siloed entity, an island unto its own, with limited capacity to reach out beyond that. What we have is the ability to reach out way further than that and to be able to use that information and bring it back.

Now in my time . . . So just to maybe set a bit of a stage for you, I've been involved in law enforcement now for 35 years, a good part of that with the RCMP. And I think one of the things I could speak about and may help understand is that throughout my career I've seen a variety of situations where there's been siloed approaches to law enforcement.

Some of the most famous things that we've seen in the context of protection is, for example, 9/11 in the United States where groups of agencies, law enforcement agencies, knew things but didn't share them. And then we've seen it just most recently in the Ottawa context where law enforcement agencies either didn't share information or it wasn't properly communicated through to other law enforcement agencies.

So in my time when we look at this, what we bring to the table in this new concept is the ability to bring all those players together. And recently we've been doing that. What it enhances is that ability to get that communication out to everybody and enhance that security footprint within the building itself. So that's what's not being done right now, is that the Sergeant-at-Arms cannot reach into those environments like we can.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. So I have a few questions that stem out of that. You've mentioned twice now what happened in Ottawa recently. However we saw, I would say, an appropriate and successful response to what happened in Regina with the convoy that happened here. Are you saying that the Sergeant-at-Arms was not involved in that process?

Mr. Larsen: — So our most recent incident that you're referring to, Ms. Sarauer, was primarily kicked off, so to speak, by Government Relations. The deputy minister there made a coordinated effort to contact different security units in the city. Of course the Sergeant-at-Arms was one of them.

And with those collective efforts, we've seen the result that we've seen and everything turned out for the better. Following that . . . I think everything was close to being wound down. So at the end of February, we brought the Sergeant-at-Arms, the chief of Regina Police Service, the head of the RCMP, Rob, myself, and the capital commission people together for a conversation on what had transpired over those last couple weeks.

We also made a commitment at that point to better understand everybody's authorities and jurisdictions in relation to this building and the grounds, and also start building those relationships with those policing entities and PPSB [provincial protective services branch] as well as CPPS [Corrections, Policing and Public Safety] to establish that foundation of working together better going forward.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I have a few more questions. So you indicated that conversation with those different entities happened after the convoy in Regina, correct?

Mr. Larsen: — It happened after, but it also happened before as well. So when Greg Miller coordinated the groups to get together, decide what kind of barricades we were going to put in place, we at that time also engaged Highway Patrol. Rob was on the calls, his executive director was on the calls; the deputy chief of Regina Police Service was on the calls; the Sergeant-at-Arms was on the call, as well as the capital commission.

Ms. Sarauer: — So are you saying that the success of the prevention of some of what we saw in Ottawa was led by and because of the Minister for Government Relations?

Mr. Larsen: — I'm not saying that the success was contributed solely to that ministry. I'm saying that the coordination of the process started there, and it was a success because of the work and the efforts of all of the teams combined.

Ms. Sarauer: — And again, the Sergeant-at-Arms was involved in that process?

Mr. Larsen: — A big part, for sure.

Ms. Sarauer: — A big part of that process.

Mr. Larsen: — Right.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. How were they able to assist that, in that weekend?

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you. So just to make sure I answer your question properly here, it's that the Sergeant-at-Arms . . . And your question was about that weekend and what action or what kind of part they had in that. They didn't have a part in that. The issue that it comes down to is when you talk about the security that was placed around the building itself, the issue is that their jurisdiction doesn't extend that far out so they cannot operate as a peace officer on those barricades. Their limitation is to the inner circle around the roadway around the building itself. So they don't have a peace officer or a special constable authority that goes that far out.

So that role inside of providing security during the Frost Festival was actually provided by members of the Regina Police Service. There was the CSOs [community safety officer] from the Wascana Centre. There was SCAN [safer communities and neighbourhoods] officers. There was the conservation officers and the Highway Patrol that actually provided officers to do that work.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. I need some clarification because Mr. Larsen told me that they did play a role, so can you . . . A big role, I believe he said. So can you clarify where I'm missing the boat here on the Sergeant-at-Arms? Because one of you told me he played a large role, and one of you told me he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Larsen: — I wouldn't go that far, saying that he had nothing to do with it or the Sergeant-at-Arms had nothing to do with it. This is kind of exactly what we're trying to provide, a more professional response to . . . By being one of the team, by providing information relative to this building, what the process would be if things didn't go as planned and barricades were breached, those types of things. You obviously have to have those people in this inner circle of security level engaged in all of the outer perimeter security levels that are being established for an incident like this.

And it's not saying somebody did more than somebody else or somebody did less than somebody else. But if you don't have the entire group together exchanging information, understanding what's going on at all the different perimeters, then you're not going to have a successful operation. And this whole process that we're talking about today is enhancing what we have to make things better when things do happen again.

Ms. Sarauer: — So this particular incident that we're talking about obviously has occurred before this bill has passed. And we talked about how successful it was and the different organizations that are involved. What I don't understand is, why is this bill needed when we are seeing successful interplay of different policing organizations that have led us to what I think is a positive outcome from that weekend in particular? And that's before this bill has passed.

Mr. McGovern: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the question to the member. Like I think one of the issues that we're having here . . . And of course in this Assembly I've made everyone aware that we're certainly not in the business of specifically criticizing an Officer of the Assembly. And I don't think that's a constructive way to move forward here. That's really not what we're looking to do or purporting to do here.

I think the conversations with the policing professionals is more along the lines of institutionalizing a professional police response when a coordinated response is required, one that doesn't require . . . to be relied on best efforts or personalities but rather one that is part of a professional policing organization that would be already tapped into that intelligence, would have a process to move forward on an institutionalized basis, as opposed to whether or not those calls were made in a particular instance.

And I think that's part of what Mr. Larsen and Mr. Cameron are speaking to when they're talking about not so much who's at fault in terms of whether that was done in the best way forward. We've seen incidents at the federal level for example where — and certainly in England for example — where there's a need to professionalize that process rather than have the historical process where it's limited to the front steps or it's limited to the parking lot. So without, you know, specifically criticizing an individual, I think that's the crux of what's being indicated by our police professionals.

Ms. Sarauer: — I appreciate that, Mr. McGovern. These questions are incredibly important because it goes to the root of why are we here discussing this bill in the first place. So when I'm asking these questions, trying to parse out, what is the problem we're trying to solve here? And why is this being the route chosen rather than — as we all know — other routes that are available and I feel and many feel are a much more collaborative process than the one that government has chosen? I think it's important that these questions be asked and be answered because this goes to the nature of ensuring that we're moving in a positive direction in this area.

Security for this building is important for everybody, not just government members but also non-partisan staff and visitors as well. And the fact that this bill even was introduced, for some raises the question of whether government has faith or had faith in the Sergeant-at-Arms and the role that they do and the role that they have done in the past and will continue to do in the future. I mean the whole crux of the legislation guts their jurisdiction, so I think it could be understandable why folks would wonder that.

So these questions frankly are questions that are raised because of the comments that are happening both here at committee tonight and have happened in the past, which brings me to another question. Mr. Larsen, you mentioned that this new force will professionalize the response for security. So my question is, is the Sergeant-at-Arms not providing a professional response currently?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Mr. Chair, first I'm going to respond to the member's comments. There has never been nor heard or spoken that any security machine or entity within this building would ever not ensure the safety of all members in this Chamber and in this building, which includes visitors. And I think I've made myself very clear on the floor of this legislature.

To suggest that the security service, whether it be the Sergeant-at-Arms security service or the proposed security service, would in any way differentiate members that sit opposite, government members, their visitors, is ridiculous.

Ms. Sarauer: — That's not what I said. My question was . . . There was a mention by Mr. Larsen that this new force would professionalize the response to security in the building. And so my question is, is the Sergeant-at-Arms not already providing a professional response to security in this building?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The Sergeant-at-Arms, in its current structure, is not providing the level of organized security within the building and the grounds. And the way it's structured since, somebody had said, 1980 . . . Times have changed. And the way in which entities need to manage the risks that are present and evaluation of those risks need to be done quickly and seamlessly with standard operating procedures should something occur. This is not occurring today.

Ms. Sarauer: — You also mentioned that the Sergeant-at-Arms doesn't have access to intelligence gathering that this entity will have access to. Can you elaborate on that a bit more?

Mr. Larsen: — In relation to intelligence, from the concept of gathering intelligence and specifically criminal intelligence, the current . . . As things are set up currently with the Sergeant-at-Arms, they are not connected to the intelligence agencies that we are. For instance, I was Co-Chair, Chair of the Saskatchewan arm of the criminal intelligence service network for a number of years, and we still have our people from our ministry on that committee. We have internal intelligence-gathering staff that work in all of our facilities in the province. I mean correctional facilities.

[19:00]

That combination of police intelligence from a municipal, a national level, as well as that intelligence that's gained at different avenues such as gang-related intelligence in facilities as well as police officer intelligence on the street, the current set-up of the Sergeant-at-Arms unit does not have the capacity or the ability to tap into those resources, even to the extent of their security clearance individually.

So the current process for a special constable — so that authorities can be provided in the province — are given by our ministry. So the Sergeant-at-Arms right now operates under a special constable designation that we provide that provides him with the authority to carry a firearm, for example, and his team. Those individual appointments should also have clearances for security clearance designations so that they have the ability to get intelligence of a high level that we're talking about, whether it be top secret or not. And, Rob, you might have some comments on that.

Mr. Cameron: — Yeah, if I can add to that. So just to give some context around how the levels of intelligence, how that works in the province here, so Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan is an entity that contains a variety of different law enforcement groups. Currently the Sergeant-at-Arms as it's now organized does not belong to that, so they don't have a mechanism or a way to access intelligence through ACIIS

[automated criminal intelligence information system] which is the automated intelligence service, or criminal intelligence service database, if you will, as well as just a context of how much intelligence, for example, our ministry . . .

In this province we're roughly about 48 per cent of the intelligence that is contributed to that larger database, which is actually accessed by policing and today's law enforcement entities, ourselves in the ministry. And to my knowledge there has been no input from the Sergeant-at-Arms, but they don't belong to that organization at all.

So they don't have a footprint in that intelligence world. Now when you look at criminal intelligence, one of the parts of that is predictability in that . . . to be able to prevent something that may happen. Obviously, and we've seen in recent times an increase in that, but also it has a lot to do with understanding what national trends are, what kind of things we're seeing across the country, and how those may impact our local area here.

So when we hear about the potential of a convoy, for example — and we saw that obviously just these last few months here — that information goes through a network and it comes to us, so we can better prepare for that and look at what contingency planning could be and to address it now. At this point in time, the Sergeant-at-Arms could never do that. They don't have that capacity.

As we go forward and we start to get into a situation where the legislative district security unit was in place, we'll be looking at a collaborative approach with the Sergeant-at-Arms. And I think that's important to recognize, is that very much so, there will be that sort of collaborative spirit to make sure that everybody in this — and you brought it up; it was a very good point — that everybody that comes into the House here is protected and has that security level.

We're seeing more and more, you know, there's obviously people in this that come here for daily business, but at the same time there's people that come here to visit their House, to see what's going on here, to sit in those galleries, to enjoy, you know, the conversation, the question periods and things like that. So I think it's important that we realize that that takes a collaborative effort to protect all those folks. We now see people that are bringing in their children. And I mean, that's the important part about this, is to have that ability to enhance that security presence to make sure those people are protected, and that is definitely a collaborative approach.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that description. I appreciate that. So I guess my question is, why can't that collaborative approach happen now? Why can't this information intelligence gathering that the ministry is doing be shared with the Sergeant-at-Arms in its current state?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — What this security unit can do and what it will likely do, is they have access to the ministry which has greater capacity, greater expertise. The resourcing is there, leveraging of human resources and supports, all of which the Sergeant-at-Arms does not have. And I'm going to turn it over to Rob here to speak a little bit about the security component and who has access to information. And he'll share with you our inability to share with the Sergeant-at-Arms the information we receive.

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you. So one of the challenges we face from just a protocol point of view is that the Sergeant-at-Arms' office right now does not have a security clearance that allows us to share privileged intelligence with them. So that's a challenge that we face. And when that information comes in, obviously it has to be controlled and protected to the level that it comes in at, so whether it's protected A, B, C. There's a variety of different terminologies for it on different types of intelligence.

The other thing that we have internally, obviously, and as the minister alluded to, is we have those intelligence mechanisms in place. We have the machinery in it to develop it internally inside the province here. We have the Saskatchewan integrated intelligence group. We have the CISS [Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan] connections. So there's . . . We have those mechanisms already built in that we participate in with the ministry.

So that's one of the challenges we have. So some of the intelligence quite frankly that we would get, we couldn't tell the Sergeant-at-Arms without them having that top secret- or secret-level clearances.

Ms. Sarauer: — What level of security clearance does the Sergeant-at-Arms currently have?

Mr. Cameron: — They don't have a security clearance.

Ms. Sarauer: — Or sorry, what level of . . . You say they do not have the clearance to receive the intelligence, some of the intelligence that you get. Do they have no clearance to get any type of intelligence?

Mr. Cameron: — That's right. They haven't been cleared through . . . There's a mechanism through the federal government that has a security clearance assigned. Dale and I for example have top secret level. But the Sergeant-at-Arms have never gone through that process.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why can't they go through that process?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — What the officials and what we're getting at is that this skill, this opportunity, exists currently. The access to appropriate information, access to greater capacity, expertise as was highlighted by the auditor, who has the expertise, the security and policing expertise, is our ministry. It doesn't lie with the Sergeant-at-Arms. It lies within our ministry. And we have the ability and it is all there. It's all set up. All the processes are all set up within the ministry.

[19:15]

The deputy minister and the ADM both have access to highly confidential information. They will take and do a risk assessment on that information that's provided and make a decision, because they're empowered to make a decision as to where that information actually goes. And making that risk assessment requires the ministry. All the entities, the capacity within the ministry requires that discussion.

And so the question is . . . All of the ability is within the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety because that's where the expertise is. That's where the security information goes, the

experience is. So the question I have is that, why wouldn't it be there?

The Sergeant-at-Arms does not have that ability and capability to run an operation when it's required, when a situation presents itself. We're trying to get away from one entity going to another, having a discussion. We need a security unit that can actually take the intelligence, take the information, and do what's necessary to protect this building, people in this building, and the surrounding grounds.

And precious little time, generally, to have discussions about somebody going to somebody about something. Self-contained units should be able to take the information provided — they'll have access to all the information — and make a decision on how to proceed with standard operating procedures. Going back and forth about, you know, the Sergeant-at-Arms having . . . You know, why doesn't the Sergeant-at-Arms have that capability? I don't know, but I do know that this entity has it. In order to operate a security unit, a professional security unit, you need to have access to that.

So I'm going to leave it at that at this juncture. But I mean, what the officials are trying to get across — and it's not, it's not easy to explain — we need a professional security service led by people who actually know what they're doing. Thank you.

Ms. Sarauer: — My question was very straightforward. I'm going to ask it again. Can the Sergeant-at-Arms get that level of security clearance?

Mr. Larsen: — I guess the short answer is, we don't provide that clearance privilege.

Ms. Sarauer: — Then what steps did you have to do, Mr. Larsen, to get that security clearance? I understand from Mr. Cameron that you and Mr. Cameron have that clearance.

Mr. Larsen: — So in my case the Canadian Security Intelligence group that has a bureau in Saskatchewan vetted me for that. And I believe Rob maintained his through the RCMP and still has it from the RCMP, correct?

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, that's correct. And there's an elaborate background check, security clearance, credit checks. There's a variety of things that are done by the government agency that sponsors that to go through and provide that security level.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sorry, I'm not interrupting. But the Sergeant-at-Arms is also a retired officer, so would he not have the same security clearance as yourself?

Mr. Cameron: — When he would have left the force? So the answer to that, I don't know if he retained his security clearance or not, so I can't comment on that.

Ms. Sarauer: — So you don't know if the Sergeant-at-Arms has security clearance currently?

Mr. McGovern: — So, Mr. Chair, I think it's difficult for the officials from the ministry to be able to indicate, you know, the level of security for a third party. I think it's fair to say that the deputy minister of Corrections will always have that security

clearance as a matter of employment, as will the director of policing in that, as part of their professional designation, as part of their employment, as opposed to a designation that they may or may not qualify for, in which they may or may not be able to share any information that they got with the other individuals, for example, in the Office of the Speaker or in the office of the . . . to the Board of Internal Economy, certainly, or to the other members of the legislative security team.

So I think, you know, rather than going too far down that rabbit hole, part of the issue in terms of saying, could the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms develop that capacity, is saying that that capacity already exists. And rather than duplicating and consistently having to improve . . . because of course security is an ever-improving process. And so — and this was, for example, in England with parliament there — rather than having a duplicate, ever-growing security capacity having to be developed within that parliamentary process, the recognition given there was that that role already exists within a professional policing service, and that's what they're trying to seek access to here.

So as far as the top secret issue itself, of course I don't have that clearance. I'm not able to have that information shared with me as a long-time lawyer with the Attorney General, for example, and I'm not sure what I'd do with it. But that's why we do have a professional service that would be in a position to take, distill that information, and operationalize it.

Ms. Sarauer: — The ministry's literally talking about creating a new position to deal with what they're saying is a challenge around sharing access to intelligence with the Sergeant-at-Arms. So that's an additional position, an additional person that you'd be speaking to, when the question around whether or not the Sergeant-at-Arms even has a security clearance can't be answered. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — If the ministry isn't aware that the Sergeant-at-Arms has a security clearance, you're right; they can't share the information. So they're not aware that he, currently who holds this position, has that security clearance, and they have no way of actually knowing. So therefore the ministry takes a risk assessment of the information that they receive and makes a decision as to how to share if it needs to be shared. Sometimes it doesn't. That's why they're in possession of the information.

Ms. Sarauer: — So what I'm hearing is that the ministry is trying to solve a problem that they don't even know whether or not it exists. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The Sergeant-at-Arms has no ability to collect the information. It's not a part of that network that these two gentlemen sitting here have access to. The Sergeant-at-Arms, as far as we know, does not have access to that information.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. But these two gentlemen are not going to be the director of legislative security. So there's still another step, presumably, of passing information on. My question is, why can't that information get passed on to the Sergeant-at-Arms?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Because it's confidential information, and it's up to these people to distill it down and decide what information goes forward and to whom.

Ms. Sarauer: — So what level of security clearance will the director of legislative security have?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Well I haven't got the answer to that question. Rob, have you got that?

What we're ending up talking about is the intelligence-gathering activity and who gets intelligence. And it is a part of it but it isn't the most important part. We have seen success with the PPSB. We have seen success when we've seen the convoy, the freedom convoy, and how it was handled. We want to replicate that and we want to do it every time we have an incident. We want information-sharing between people and that can happen within the ministry.

So for us to spend time talking about intelligence, which is an element of it, but it's certainly not the whole and it's not the most important, but it is an element and . . . The members think it's funny. Huh. The safety and security of people in this building and using this building and using the grounds is funny.

One thing I know for sure is that should something happen and we do not take the appropriate action to ensure to the best of our ability people are safe and secure, it isn't the members opposite that'll be answering those questions. It'll be members on our side and the government.

What we are asking here tonight is to create a security service that is managed and run through the ministry to ensure with proper processes, proper training, proper numbers, collaboration with all entities, not just intelligence services. That's a part, but it's not the biggest one. That's what we're asking for today.

[19:30]

And if the members disagree, fine. That's fine. But reducing the silos, using the resources that are already there through the PPSB and accessing those resources, collaborating with local police, that's what we're talking about. And having a security service that's actually trained and run by an entity that has all the experience and expertise right at their fingertips, that's what we're asking for.

Ms. Sarauer: — I mean the reason why we're talking about intelligence gathering and sharing is because you brought it up, Minister, as one of the reasons for this piece of legislation. An important piece of bill committee is to talk about why legislation is coming before the House. So my understanding now is that you're unsure whether or not the Sergeant-at-Arms has security clearance. And if he doesn't, you're not sure why. Does the Sergeant-at-Arms in Ottawa have a security clearance?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Don't know.

Ms. Sarauer: — What about other legislatures?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Don't know.

Ms. Sarauer: — What sort of work was done to determine what sort of intelligence gathering could be done here, if there was no cross-jurisdictional analysis of what already occurs in other provinces?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — What happens with their Sergeant-at-Arms in other provinces is not under the purview of this government. We checked . . . Yeah, well if you want to smile about that, that's fine.

Ms. Sarauer: — I will, yes.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yes. So what we checked on was how they, Alberta for instance uses their sheriffs and how that is managed. The information available to any security unit needs to be secure and it needs to be shared in order to facilitate any action, proactive or otherwise, that is needed to ensure that the people in this building, and this building itself, and the people using the building, and outside the building, driving around the building, are safe and secure as possible.

The issue of the Sergeant-at-Arms in any other province having security clearance is of no concern to us as we are designing and looking at what kind of security unit would we do, would we have here, what would work.

Ms. Sarauer: — The reason why I smiled, Minister, is because you've used other provinces as an example for why this legislation is needed. However, in every other jurisdiction, the Speaker is still involved in that reporting process. Why does the ministry feel that Saskatchewan should be done differently?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — I don't think that any security service in any legislative building across the country is the same. Nothing is structured the same. I don't see many other provinces that have a PPSB, for instance. This province does. The sheriffs in Alberta:

Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security employs . . . 350 Sheriffs (formerly known as Provincial Protection Officers) who play an important role in Alberta . . . enforcement. Sheriffs provide courtroom security in 75 communities across the province. They are also responsible for transportation of inmates between correctional centres and the courts, as well as . . . [the legislative] security.

I think every province has something unique. Not everything is the same, and whether it is the . . . And I spoke to it in my opening comments about what was under consideration in British Columbia, that the role of the Speaker, to be that of parliamentary and only parliamentary, is still on the table and nothing has been decided.

So to say that we're the only ones that have considered this particular option, no, it isn't. We're the ones that are realizing that our security within this building and beyond needs to be enhanced, needs to be improved. Coordination, capacity, resourcing, leveraging, it all needs to be there because as I said, that . . . And we need a service or a unit that can really be proactive in some of the issues of the day, issues of the month, issues of the year, and take the appropriate steps and measures, whatever that may be, to ensure that anything that may happen, they can . . . they're able to prevent it. And that's the key, be more proactive, not a reactive unit.

Ms. Sarauer: — You mentioned, Minister, the sheriffs in Alberta. Those sheriffs who work within the Legislative Building in Alberta, who do they report to?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yeah, the information I have in front of me is that the Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security employs the sheriffs.

Ms. Sarauer: — Are you saying that the sheriffs who work in the Legislative Building do not report to the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — As I just said, the information I have in front of me is just that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay, that's not the information I have in front of me. Just to clarify with the minister, in fact the sheriffs who work within the Legislative Building in Alberta do report to the Sergeant-at-Arms, who is reportable to the Speaker.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — No, that's not the information we have.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. You mentioned . . . There are a few things I want to highlight. The first, the Ottawa shooting in 2014 has come up a couple of times in some of these answers. There was both a federal security review as well as a security review in this building that was a result, that came out of that incident that happened in Ottawa. Federally, were there any recommendations for changes there that would remove the independence of that security force?

Mr. McGovern: — Could you repeat the last part of the question?

Ms. Sarauer: — There was a security review in Ottawa after the shooting. As a result of that there were some structural changes. I'm asking about the independence of the security that was maintained after that review that occurred and the changes.

Mr. McGovern: — The information that we have, Mr. Chair, through the member to the question with respect to the Ottawa process, is indeed that the Sergeant-at-Arms does have a role limited to the precincts, and that, as the member is aware, there were a number of concerns that had previously been discussed in terms of going from Wellington and the Ontario police service to another police service on the grounds of the Assembly into . . . sorry, the parliament, into the parliament itself, at which time it took a personal heroic effort by one individual to successfully intervene in what could have been a much worse situation.

And I think it, along with, for example, the British Columbia review which was done to give specific consideration to how best to modernize and move forward, that recommendation with respect to the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms, as the member's aware, was very much more limited and was one where . . . that followed more closely the parliament in England recommendations with respect to security.

And I think, you know, the member's made the point well that there's different ways to skin the cat here and that what's being presented here is a method for improving, professionalizing, and institutionalizing the co-operation and communication that's necessary to provide an improved police response within this difficult precinct area.

I don't think the argument is that it's the only one. I think the argument is that that's a made-in-Saskatchewan solution that

utilizes existing expertise, utilizes existing networks, rather than says, we think that we may have a Sergeant-at-Arms process that could be adapted towards that, that could build that capacity at an . . . that could duplicate and hope to achieve that capacity.

And I think the . . . I don't think the argument that's been made here is that this is the only way to do it or that this is identical to how another jurisdiction's doing it, rather than saying this is a distillation of what's available here and what would be an appropriate and effective response to a difficult circumstance.

Ms. Sarauer: — Let's be really clear. That one heroic individual in Ottawa was the Sergeant-at-Arms. What sort of powers and authority were removed from the Sergeant-at-Arms subsequent to that review?

Mr. McGovern: — In Ottawa?

Ms. Sarauer: — Yeah.

Mr. McGovern: — I certainly am not aware of anything specific that would have removed his ability. But again, the member is referring to an individual whose own handgun was used in a chase down a hall, in which one of the leaders of the parties was in a closet, hoping not to be shot. And there was a heroic effort that was made.

That can't be how you build a security process. And I think we can all agree that there was a heroic effort made. And I'm not putting words in the member's mouth. You're not saying that that would be ideal to have, you know, guns on the hips in the hope that you're able to intercept an evil actor in that circumstance.

But rather, having fewer jurisdictions that this individual walked through, with a clearer understanding of whose responsibilities were engaged at a particular time, is a better methodology. And this is the way that it is being brought forward by the Ministry of Corrections and Policing as the best way to institutionalize that professional police response within this difficult environment.

Ms. Sarauer: — I suppose what I'm trying to get at here is that, despite the horrific situation that Ottawa went through, the federal government still ultimately understood and maintained the independence of their security structure.

So while there is some difference between Ottawa city and our RCMP and where they fall into the fold now, ultimately even the federal government, after what was a horrific and terrifying shooting — which I think you aptly described, Mr. McGovern — still understood the importance of maintaining the independence of that security.

There was also a provincial review here in Saskatchewan about security in this building after that 2014 shooting. Is anything that's in Bill 70 from that report?

[19:45]

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The changes that have been presented in the form of this legislation are changes that address the concerns of today and going forward. What has been stated in a 2014 security review is not relevant to today's work.

Ms. Sarauer: — Why is it not relevant to today's work?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — This is intended to deal with the issues and the challenges of today and going forward. The issues identified in a security report, you know, whether it's scanners or whatever the case may be, have obviously been implemented. This is taking a security unit and professionalizing it, utilizing all of the structures within the Government of Saskatchewan, PPSB, and the like, and the expertise, to ensure that we're able to appropriately respond to and address the concerns that we're facing today.

Ms. Sarauer: — That report that was done, that review, was done by an independent third party. If what you're saying, Minister, is that that report is no longer relevant, why not commission another report that would be independent, and not the ministry putting forward a piece of legislation without consultation?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Anything that we're doing today does not preclude any continuous improvement measures that may take place. I think that the area of security and safety is ever-changing. And it's evolving, done on a risk matrix. We made that decision that we need to bring something forward and we need to get this legislation passed that will professionalize and utilize all the resources that the ministry has.

Ms. Sarauer: — But any other improvements moving forward will be at the behest of the ministry. It will not be at the call of, for example, the Board of Internal Economy, which is a multi-partisan committee. Is that correct?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — I don't know of any involvement of the Board of Internal Economy. And with respect to this particular security unit, there will be no role for the Board of Internal Economy.

Ms. Sarauer: — I believe there is another MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] here who has a couple of questions. I'm going to allow Ms. Wilson to ask a few questions.

Ms. Wilson: — Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — I recognize Ms. Wilson.

Ms. Wilson: — Minister, as I understand it, Bill 70 is designed to remove the authority of our non-partisan Sergeant-at-Arms for security of the building and put it under the direction of the Minister of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. So this, as you're saying, will internally move responsibility for security from the legislative branch to the executive branch. And that's very concerning because history shows us that governments do not always behave in a way that is intended.

For example, I was reading in *Hansard*, and archives showed a previous government in the late '80s set up the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. And it had a secretive security wing that engaged in surveillance activities outside the knowledge of the then Sergeant-at-Arms. So what I'm asking is, what happens if something occurs in the building again which is very similar that had happened in the past?

I know I didn't have one call of support for Bill 70, but I've had many against it. So we're trying to get the public to understand

what exactly you're trying to do. And this matter speaks also to trust, Madam Minister, trust on two levels. Citizens lack trust of their government to do the right thing. And why does the government have such little trust in its citizens that it needs to create its own government security force? So I'll start with that. Thank you.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — All public servants in the Government of Saskatchewan are deemed and are non-partisan. And yet all of those non-partisan officials end up having to report to somebody, but I can assure you that they're not reporting to me. So I hope that the member isn't speaking about the number of peace officers and police officers that are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan, that they're in any way partisan, because they are not. What is being proposed here is that they're not reporting to the minister. Just like what conservation officers do, just like what highway traffic officers do, they report through a structure and that is not going to change.

Ms. Wilson: — Thank you. What the public is telling me, Minister, is that there's a veil of secrecy and they want you to turn it back on this Bill 70. They want to know, what is the legislation basis for this new agency? And why wouldn't it be a non-partisan group to override or to overview the decisions that are made? I can't find any information on it and that's why we're here tonight.

So why is it necessary for a new security system to be brought forth when we have an existing one where we've all been very comfortable? And if there is some issues, we would also like to know about it. We would like the government to be accountable and transparent. Will this service be available to all MLAs in the building that you're trying to describe so eloquently tonight? Will this new security have debugging of our offices? Will all offices have these services, or will there be two standards? And what is the public expenditure? These are just general . . .

The Chair: — Hang on. Hang on. Let's make sure that we tie it, number one, to the bill, and ask one question at a time. Right? So one question at a time, and tie it to the bill. Thank you.

Ms. Wilson: — So will the opposition have the same courtesy as the government in this new security force that you're creating? Thank you.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — It's unfortunate. I already went through this already tonight, specifically about that, and that is, the security unit will be available to all members of this Assembly, all visitors to this Assembly, all those using the building and the grounds.

[20:00]

Ms. Wilson: — Thank you, Minister. Will there be close coordination with other security such as Wascana police, the city, RCMP, if there is an incident? Thank you.

Mr. Cameron: — So yes, there would be certainly coordination between those entities. Just for a point of clarification, there isn't a Wascana Centre police service. There's the Wascana Centre community safety officers. They currently reside under the provincial protective services branch. But absolutely, if there was a major incident or any kind of event here, there would be that working together to rectify or to remedy whatever the situation

was. We saw that recently with that convoy group and the security that was implemented around the building. So that certainly would be collaborative in nature.

Ms. Wilson: — Thank you. What will the expenditure be for this new security force?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The estimated cost is approximately 1.67 million, plus 300,000 in one-time start-up costs. But I caution that this is a very high estimate, and the cost will likely be lower for this particular year.

Ms. Wilson: — Thank you, Minister. What will happen to the existing security force that is currently here?

Mr. Larsen: — Our current assessment, we believe that 11 FTEs [full-time equivalent] would be utilized to provide the security to the building and the people in the building. We don't anticipate any job losses, but we also don't know how many individuals will stay with the current Sergeant-at-Arms group as well. And until we start the formal process of this unit, it's difficult to say how many will go under the new director that reports to Rob or stay with the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Ms. Wilson: — All right, thank you. And I just have one more question. If I thought something was occurring, nefarious, in my office, who would I go to to ask them to do some surveillance or debug it in case I felt there was something in there that shouldn't be?

Mr. Larsen: — Because your office would be in the district, that concern or complaint or worry would be brought to the new director position that would then share the information with the ADM of Policing.

Ms. Wilson: — So that courtesy will be extended to all MLAs in this building?

Mr. Larsen: — Certainly.

Ms. Wilson: — Okay, thank you.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer, you have the floor again.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I have more than one more question. What will the qualifications for the director of legislative security be?

Mr. Cameron: — So first of all, the job hasn't actually been classified or established yet. We're not there yet. But from a general point of view of what the qualifications would require, the director of security would be a senior leader. So you would have somebody with some experience in either public policing or other law enforcement that would have skill sets and transferrable skill sets that would apply to protection details, protection of an entity like this, maybe skill sets that come from what we would call a VIP [very important person] protection realm or tactical realm.

So you're looking for somebody that has an extensive policing background perhaps, or another qualification like that. It wouldn't necessarily be just a . . . doesn't necessarily have to be just a police officer or a retired police officer, for example, or it

could be somebody with another similar type of law enforcement background.

But they would have to have . . . The two key things there is not just managing the law enforcement part of that or the protective service part of that, but also the management and the leadership skills that go along with it, with managing a group of people. As DM [deputy minister] Larsen was indicating, we're anticipating a unit of around 11 individuals led by that director of security, and then a portion of those would be officers, if you will, and then support.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. How do those qualifications differ from the Sergeant-at-Arms?

Mr. Larsen: — We don't know what the current qualifications of the current Sergeant-at-Arms are. We do know what the expectations and the responsibilities of the director of security job position will be, as Rob just summarized those responsibilities and competencies.

Ms. Sarauer: — I suppose my confusion is, if the ministry doesn't know what the qualifications of the Sergeant-at-Arms currently is, why would they assume that the director of legislative security would do — as has been stated by officials tonight — would provide a more professional service than what is already being provided?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — It isn't about who occupies the position of Sergeant-at-Arms or the director of security. What the proposal is here is to make this unit a part of something that can actually, physically, mentally respond, whether it's proactive or reactive, to any of the security threats, public safety concerns. It is about creating that unit that is led by people who understand what a security service does and understand policing, have the networks in order to provide this security service within this Legislative Building and the grounds.

Who's in a position of Sergeant-at-Arms and what their qualifications are . . . I mean I think it's fairly obvious that the Sergeant-at-Arms would likely have a policing background, and that's exactly what Rob is talking about here. But it isn't about what those qualifications . . . They are going to go through the PSC [Public Service Commission]. Those qualifications will be developed given the nature of the job that we're asking this person to perform and utilizing the greater capacity of the ministry, PPSB, greater expertise than what is currently there, resourcing, leveraging, and the supports. That's what this is about.

[20:15]

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay, so why can't that person be the Sergeant-at-Arms?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Okay, so what we have just been talking about is under the ministry, who has the expertise and the ability to understand and to help mobilize a security service, not just in this building, but the grounds and the roadways.

It is really under and accessing resources that the current Sergeant-at-Arms and the current structure cannot do without the assistance of the ministry to mobilize these resources. We need a

security service that doesn't just operate in this building, but operates outside this building, and ones that are willing to do so.

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm sure the minister is well aware that those who are currently filling these roles are all ex-RCMP, ex-police officers. So why can't they be filling this role that . . . Well they're already filling the role that the director of legislative security will be filling. So why are you separating these roles?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — I've just explained. It's about being part of the ministry. That's what it is. These people, the ones that are currently serving in whatever positions they're serving in, are more than welcome to apply for those jobs if that's what they wish to do. All the job descriptions will go through the civil service and go through that particular process.

And yes, I am aware of the policing experience — what the level is I'm not aware of — of the current Sergeant-at-Arms. It is where it is placed as an entity. It is off by itself without any level of the . . . with respect to the ministry. So the accessing resources cannot happen or will not happen without a certain level, another layer, another silo, in order to access that information. So that's what this is about.

Ms. Sarauer: — So just so I understand, this is about ensuring that this role falls under the ministry. Correct?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — It is access to the ministry and the expertise that is required.

Ms. Sarauer: — So why can't the Sergeant-at-Arms get access to the ministry? Why isn't the ministry providing the Sergeant-at-Arms with that access?

Mr. McGovern: — We started the conversation with the top secret information and the intelligence, and I don't think we want to go back there. I think those points, you know, have been made in terms of what information can be shared, how it can be shared, when it can be shared, and how it's integrated. You know, the member is making the point that you have certain individuals who may or may not meet that same professional requirement that will be institutionalized and absolutely required within the new legislative unit, that those will be absolute requirements that will be within the public service process, and therefore of course subject to the scrutiny and to that accountability.

And I think it's one of the things we haven't talked about much here, but in terms of accountability, the new unit, the structure that's being utilized for a member of the public who encounters a difficulty with a member of a protective service, for example, they will be integrated within the complaint process under *The Police Act*. And so that public complaint process, that reporting process, that due process before a public hearing will all be integrated within that accountability structure. That accountability structure, of course, is one that is very important to maintain both the confidence and the professional level of reporting in that context.

And so when the individuals . . . Again I had mentioned, when you have an officer of the Legislative Assembly, no one is going to start from a premise of attacking such an individual. That's not what we were meant to be discussing here, I think, in terms of what the structure of the legislation provides. And I appreciate

the minister . . . that there can be an absolute difference of approach as to what's preferred, and that's been made clear, I think, by the member in terms of moving forward. But you know, individually disparaging a member of the protective service isn't what we're about.

Like I say, they may or may not have all of the same requirements. We will know what the requirements are under the public service process. That independent, accountable process is one that can be demonstrated and can be replicated in every case so that you have a continuity of that expertise as well as that institutional professionalism, is what the goal, I think, is that Mr. Larsen had referred to in terms of the structure for the process.

Ms. Sarauer: — And these questions are important because, again, they go to the why, what is the purpose of this legislation. We have conversations about legislation all the time, and we're always discussing what is the problem that this piece of legislation is trying to solve. So that's why this conversation is so important and these questions are so important.

I can understand why the ministry wouldn't want to talk, go back to our conversation around intelligence sharing, because there was no answer or, from what I've understood from these responses, no knowledge as to whether or not the Sergeant-at-Arms has security clearance, and if he does not, whether or not he could gain it, which . . . From my perspective, you know, if I were in government and, you know, not wanting to spend \$1.6 million on a new legislative security force, my first question would be, how can we empower what already exists?

So moving to one of your points, Mr. McGovern, around scrutiny and accountability, you had mentioned that they will be those who would fall under the director, I'm assuming — and correct me if I'm wrong — so the director and their FTEs will be subject to the public complaint process.

I suppose my question is, could the legislation be amended to include the Sergeant-at-Arms and those who currently work under the Sergeant-at-Arms to be included in the public complaint process?

Mr. McGovern: — Thank you for the question. Part of what's being proposed here is to set them up within a structure where you do have, in fact, an officer who would be able to serve within the structure, as the member's aware, of *The Police Act*, works with the structure where you have the Chief of Police, you have the reporting process, you have the hearing officer in that process.

Right now the individuals who are appointed within the legislative service, to the extent that there are those that are appointed as special constables, are answerable to the Speaker if there's a complaint. Full stop. And of course the Speaker isn't a professional law enforcement individual, isn't subject to a process under the legislation that would lend itself to a hearing with respect to a complaint of physical conduct or rudeness, for example.

And so that's where you are taking a professional process, allowing that to occur within the hearing process where it's subject to an appeal, can occur in an open court with respect to the hearing process, and is very much professionalization. And

you know, of course under *The Police Act* is a cornerstone of that professionalization of the policing service. So we think that's definitely improvement in terms of the accountability in that process, separate and apart from the professionalization of the appointment process itself through the Public Service Commission.

Ms. Sarauer: — I suppose my question is — and thank you, Mr. McGovern — but my question is again, and I think you and I both know the answer to this question, but could legislation be amended to move the accountability structure for the Sergeant-at-Arms and his staff, if there was a public complaint like you had just described, to move that accountability process under the Public Complaints Commission like we see now highway traffic officers, conservation officers, as well as peace officers.

Mr. McGovern: — There wouldn't be a precedent for that, where you're talking about someone who is in that role in the Legislative Assembly Service being made subject to a hearing process that's external to that under *The Police Act*. The linkage is the appointment for the constables, and that's a big part about what's happening with the protective service that I'll let the professional police people speak to, where those conservation officers, those individuals who have firearms in the employ of the ministries are made subject to a professional review process in clear accountability. And to the extent that these individuals will be brought into that system, they too would be part of that and members of the public would be able to see that accountability.

Whether the existing process could mirror that, because of course ultimately who you're reporting to in that process would have to be established, like I say, there isn't a precedent for that. Whether we can imagine one, you know we might be able to get to that spot, but we have one and we have one that's worked well and that is existing, has hearing officers who are well established, has a professional process for maintaining, and I guess that's what's there is being referred to as be accessed.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sure, but there's nothing preventing government from amending that legislation to ensure there's accountability. And from what I'm understanding based on answers in other questions, the Sergeant-at-Arms will still have members, officers as staff. So why wouldn't there be instead amendments to ensure that all of them are accountable under the public complaints process should there be a public complaint, like we see with peace officers, highway traffic officers, conservation officers?

Mr. McGovern: — And I think if the Speaker who, and you, is taking a position that they would want to make that, have that discussion, that's one thing subsequent to this process. But of course right now what we're talking about is if there is someone who is going to be performing that function. Again, if there's going to be use in this structure, someone who has the use of force, that they be accountable within a very serious structure, and that includes the hearing officer. It includes the training requirements that Mr. Larsen started with in terms of professionalizing that process, and we can guarantee that.

We don't set those standards within the existing legislative security service. We will set these standards with respect to the new process. And I think, you know, that's probably all I can say

in terms of what we could dictate for the Speaker, though I think the new director of legislative security, you know, may well be . . . would encourage those sorts of conversations. And in fact that's built into the legislation, of course, to have that ongoing communication with the new unit and the Speaker to promote that collaborative and co-operative function.

Ms. Sarauer: — When we're talking about the public complaints process, we're talking about, for example, when a member of the public feels like something that an officer has done to them was inappropriate, you know, use of force, often we see. Is there anything legislatively that's preventing an amendment to allow all special constables to be answerable to that process?

Mr. McGovern: — Just to explain how the special constable process works under the existing police Act, that those designations work. Those are appointments made by the minister under the structure of *The Police Act*, qua minister responsible for *The Police Act*, and that as part of the appointment process for special constables, the scope of their duties is set out in the instrument itself.

In addition, in that process there is an ability to designate whether or not part IV of the Act, which is the complaint process, applies with respect to those individuals if they're within a policing structure. And that's the key aspect in terms of the decisions being made.

[20:30]

And one of the things that wasn't clear previously with respect to some of the . . . For example, a special constable within the corrections context is how to best accommodate that to professionalize that process. And some special constables of course have very limited scope.

Now we're much more careful in Saskatchewan with respect to designation as special constables than in some other provinces, you know, where every individual who's in a correctional facility from the cook to the cleaner to the process has a peace officer designation that's separate from that. Where special constable here has been a calibrated process to professionalize that police response. And that's under the Act in terms of the complaint process, where you're complaining either for services or for conduct. They both funnel into that hearing process, and then they report back to a commanding officer structure which is itself then subject to typically, you know, the municipal police service, a board, and then as you well know with the hearing process through the court process and the Court of Appeal.

A very accountable process, very different from what's being structured. If something different is going to be proposed, I think these two gentlemen would be willing to hear it. It hasn't been, but I don't know that they wouldn't consider if there was a proper structure within that process, which there isn't.

Ms. Sarauer: — I mean I'm sure if this was a concern that resulted in this legislation, if this concern was brought to the BOIE [Board of Internal Economy], a discussion would have been had about what needed to happen to fold them into public complaints, accountability measures, but that didn't happen here. To be very clear, there has been no concerns raised about public accountability.

And government, as we all know, have many levers for legislative amendments to ensure that any sort of gaps are being filled. And where I'm left confused here is from what I understand, and maybe I'm wrong because the Sergeant-at-Arms won't have anybody reporting to them after this bill comes into force, but if the Sergeant-at-Arms does have individuals reporting to them, there will still be a gap in accountability for the public complaints process that this legislation isn't even covering.

So I'm left with the question as to why the decision was to create a whole new body answerable to a director who's not answerable to, as you described, as we know with municipal police officers, who are answerable to a board or commission that would be independent of government. This will be a director of legislative security who is a part of the ministry.

So I'm just left confused as to why a more simpler solution to this issue, that the current special constables aren't included in public accountability measures like the Public Complaints Commission, why a legislative change to *The Police Act* or something to that effect wasn't contemplated here?

Mr. McGovern: — Yeah, no. And just to clarify . . . And again from an official's perspective, I certainly respect that you're advocating for a different approach. In terms of seeking clarity for what's been described, I would just outline that when a special constable is responsible, under the part IV with respect to the public complaints process, that hearing process operates within the auspices of the Public Complaints Commission as well as the provincial police commission, both of which are independent of government. So that is the independence of government that you had suggested wasn't there but that I think is institutionalized.

Ms. Sarauer: — So that's what, yeah, that's what happened before.

Mr. McGovern: — And then the second thing that I would bring to your attention, given that again right now the people who work within the Speaker's offices aren't part of executive government, aren't part of municipal policing, they have . . . And I presume you're aware of 76.7 of the Act that we're amending, which isn't changing. So that, to the extent possible, does provide that a complaint initiated against a member of the LPS [Legislative Protective Service] — these people will continue to be members of the LPS depending on the structure that the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-Arms choose — subject to 80(2) of *The Police Act* apply with necessary modification and the complaints forwarded to the Speaker. The Speaker's responsible for handling the complaint, as opposed to the appeal and the court structure and the hearing process that was previously discussed and which is separate from, of course, the legislative arm of government.

So that's the benefit in terms of accountability. That's the benefit in terms of professionalization of the policing process, separate in part what we've talked about in terms of training with respect to these individuals and the hiring process. And so those are the immediate benefits that you can point to. And I take the member's position about saying, well what if we put more money into the existing legislative service? Could that be duplicated? Could it be tracked? And I think that's something that the choice wasn't made here, but I appreciate that it's not a choice that

you're advocating.

Ms. Sarauer: — No, that's not the choice that I'm advocating either. And maybe my question is more for the minister because it is a directional question.

Mr. McGovern: — Sure.

Ms. Sarauer: — It's why wasn't that process . . . Why wasn't that chosen as a legislative process rather than the process that we're faced with?

I'm saying that the public complaints process is great because it is independent. I'm not saying that's a bad thing. I'm saying, why wasn't the decision made, rather than creating Bill 70 with the whole new structure, 11 new FTEs . . . If this is part of the problem, again we're going to what's the purpose of the legislation? What's the problem we're trying to solve? If this is part of the problem we're trying to solve, why was this the choice that was made?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — To the member and what was asked, I have articulated the why a number of times, whether it's in my opening remarks, on the floor of this Assembly, in this committee. You know, it is okay if the member doesn't agree with what's put forward here. We're not going to continue to debate. We're not.

The why has been articulated more than once, and I'm not asking you to agree. We believe that this is an important . . . what is before you is important to the safety and security of the people here in the building. It's important enough for us to put together a professional security unit within this building and the grounds, and properly resourced, having access to resources, access to information. The collaboration that can be accessed through the ministry will assist us in being what we should be in the year 2022. Thank you.

Ms. Sarauer: — The purpose of this committee is to delve into the why, as well as operations with respect to the legislation. And what I keep seeming to find is when we delve a couple layers into what the why is, the why starts to fall apart.

Minister, you mentioned that there were heightened security risks. That was a part of your why for this legislation. Have there been any heightened security risks specific to this legislature?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Security is based on a matrix and the ebbs and flows of security, whether it's information coming in to the appropriate officials or whether it is information coming from another part of Canada, part of Saskatchewan, whatever the case may be. As I have said earlier, I am not going to discuss the specific nature of some of the incidents that have occurred, due to privacy of the people that brought them forward. They are part of that matrix. They are not the sole reason why any of this is existing.

As I highlighted again in my notes, in my introductory, was it is about information received, conversations that have been had, looking . . . In fact read the newspaper. Watch the news. All of it, and in touching base with our provinces throughout the country, we have arrived at this point.

It is imperative that the province take the step that is proposed

here to have access to whatever is needed to respond appropriately. I don't know anybody that doesn't want a service, whatever that service may be, if they're not able to respond quickly, definitively, with the right level of expertise and the jurisdiction to do so.

The Chair: — Okay, we're going to take a five-minute recess, call of the Chair, so five minutes. Take your time. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

The Chair: — Hello, everyone. Welcome back to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. We return from our recess and the floor continues to be yours, Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair. Just so that I remember where we were before we had a break, we were speaking about heightened security risks. And, Minister, I think you mentioned — and I just want to clarify — that there have been security incidents, but due to privacy you don't want to discuss specifics. Is that accurate?

Mr. Larsen: — Ms. Sarauer, as you I think realize, to get into individual incidents in relation to what may or may not have transpired and privacy breaches around those types of communications outside of the incident, as well as potential security concerns that may have accumulated because of some security breaches, those items shouldn't be talked about in public. From a policing perspective, whether it be obviously the individual concern or from a collective security reply concern, those things shouldn't be discussed.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I respect that and I don't disagree with that. In light of that, I'd like to move that this committee go in camera so we can discuss these incidents.

The Chair: — Yeah, that needed to be put at the preamble of the committee.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sorry, I had to move to go in camera at the very beginning of committee? At 6 p.m. when we started?

The Chair: — Yeah, there can only be one question at a time on the floor, and the question before the committee right now is Clause 1, short title.

Ms. Sarauer: — Can I ask for leave of the committee to go in camera?

The Chair: — Yes.

[21:00]

Ms. Sarauer: — I'd like to ask leave of the committee to go in camera.

The Chair: — The member has asked leave of the committee to go in camera. Is leave granted?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — No.

The Chair: — Leave is not granted.

Ms. Sarauer: — Oh, interesting. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Why would these concerns, incidents, not have been brought to the BOIE?

Mr. McGovern: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the member. And just in terms of the question that was asked, in terms of what was or was not told to the Board of Internal Economy isn't something that we're specifically aware of. Whether the Sergeant-at-Arms reported through the Speaker to the Board of Internal Economy isn't something, whether that occurred or not isn't something that we specifically have knowledge of in terms of your specific question.

Ms. Sarauer: — So is the ministry saying that this information was shared with the Sergeant-at-Arms?

Mr. McGovern: — When you say this information, sorry, you're talking about . . .

Ms. Sarauer: — The security incidents that the minister has mentioned.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — We share any security information, incidents that we become aware of with the Sergeant-at-Arms. What the Sergeant-at-Arms does with that information is out of our hands, and part of the reason why what you see today in Bill 70.

Ms. Sarauer: — Can you elaborate on what you mean by it's part of the reason why what we see in Bill 70? The end of your answer, please, Minister.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yeah. Once the information is passed on to the Sergeant-at-Arms it becomes the responsibility of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and by extension the Speaker. What happens with that information, what is done with that information is not under the purview of us. It is under the purview of the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker. So what the Speaker did and did not relay is not . . . We don't know what has happened in that regard.

Ms. Sarauer: — So are you saying that if opposition members have no knowledge of any security incidents that have happened in this building in the past, since 2020 for example, that would be because the Sergeant-at-Arms had not shared that information with us?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — What kind of security information are you talking about?

Ms. Sarauer: — Well I don't know because you won't tell me the details and you refused us to go in committee to have an in camera conversation.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — If there was any information that we received that was passed onto the Sergeant-at-Arms, it's up to the Sergeant-at-Arms to advise you if it involves the building or the people that work here and not on a personal basis. It's up to the Sergeant-at-Arms to relay that information as it's structured right now.

Ms. Sarauer: — So my question then, you had mentioned in your opening remarks some legislative events that had been

interrupted, some officials who had been harassed. If there have been concerns from government members about how those were handled by the Sergeant-at-Arms, why wasn't that information, that conversation about those concerns, presented to the Board of Internal Economy?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — We share all information — security threats, whatever the case may be, incidents — with the Sergeant-at-Arms' office. What the Sergeant-at-Arms does with that information, whether they report to the Board of Internal Economy, I have no knowledge of that.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. I understand that. You've said that before. But there are government members, both cabinet and non-cabinet members of government at the Board of Internal Economy table. My question is, why did those members not bring that to the attention of the BOIE?

Often in the past, any sort of concerns about security issues, what needs to happen here to enhance security, have happened at the BOIE table in camera with the members at that table, the Sergeant-at-Arms not being present. That's a discussion with the members because it's in camera of course. So my question is, why wasn't that information shared by those members at the BOIE table?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — We share all security-related incidents with the Sergeant-at-Arms. Whether the Sergeant-at-Arms brings it to the Board of Internal Economy, I have no idea about that. I also know that I am not and do not sit on the Board of Internal Economy, so I have no further knowledge.

Ms. Sarauer: — I guess my question is, why has the process that has been the process for over three decades now been thwarted with this bill? Security concerns at the Legislative Building have always been discussed at the BOIE table for the last 30 years. Why was that process not followed in this instance?

[21:15]

Hon. Ms. Tell: — We believe that the Board of Internal Economy is not the appropriate mechanism to, or repository for, security-related incidents and how to necessarily deal with them. And I'm going to turn it over to . . . And that's why this bill is reflecting there's no Board of Internal Economy in there, because it isn't the appropriate place to have discussions about security issues. And especially if a decision needs to be made, you can't go to the Board of Internal Economy and expect quick action. Dale, do you want to speak to the other parts?

Mr. Larsen: — Sure. Thanks. Thanks, Minister. I think you point out some of the concerns that bring us to where we are today in relation to that siloed approach, that lack of system process that we're trying to establish here in relation to whether it be incidents that need to be acted upon immediately or information that something is about to happen. There has to be a mechanism built in to a larger framework that as policing partners or people understanding the security concept of what needs to be done can, you know, without barriers make things happen and have that flexibility to make the appropriate contacts and get the needed people in place to rectify a situation.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right. And I suppose the BOIE never was nor

should be the body to decide whether something should be acted on and how quickly. It's more the oversight structure in terms of ensuring that the resources are provided to the Sergeant-at-Arms to make sure that the work that they need to do is . . . that they have the resources that they need to be able to do the work that they need to do. And the BOIE has been the one to allocate those resources for over 30 years. So my question is, Minister, you mentioned that the BOIE is not the repository for . . . You feel the BOIE should not be the repository for this work any longer. My question to you is, why has that opinion changed?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Why does that opinion change?

Ms. Sarauer: — It has been the repository for that work for over 30 years. So I'm asking, what changed?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Okay. The changes that are presented in the bill will allow non-partisan civil servants across a broad policing and public safety network available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Police services and agencies across the country have seen an increase to public safety threats and risks associated with, not only the pandemic, but also heightened political rhetoric in recent years.

Silos exist across government that make inter-ministry problem solving and co-operation a challenge. These challenges only grow when dealing with a separate branch of government, in this case the executive and the legislative. The Ministry of Corrections, Policing, Public Safety employs non-partisan, dedicated civil servants committed to ensuring the public safety of the province. Okay. That's it.

Ms. Sarauer: — I mean, I assume in reaction to those comments, Minister, that you of course, and your ministry, knows the importance of the separation of power between the branches of government — the legislative, the executive, as well as the judiciary — and the importance of the essence of that to our democracy.

But my question was specifically around, why does the government feel that the BOIE shouldn't be responsible for deciding funding, which is what they have been for, you know, over 30 years, of the legislative security any longer?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — While we respect the role of the Board of Internal Economy, the nature of evolving security threats and risks mean that the response to these must evolve as well. Having security remain under the authority of that can be slow to respond — and Dale alluded to that — to these issues brings unnecessary risk to this building and the surrounding grounds. Placing the responsibility for this within the ministry allows for the proposed unit to be more flexible in responding to these concerns, as resources and supports can be added as needed in a manner that is currently not possible.

Silos exist, and I said that before, that across government that make these inter-ministerial problem solving and co-operation a challenge. These challenges, as I said, only grow when dealing with separate branches of government, in this case the executive and legislative. And yes, we do understand that there is a separation between the two.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister. You've mentioned a few

times that the structure as it currently exists can be slow to respond to security threats. Can you provide an example of when the current structure has been slow to respond?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — With respect to the Board of Internal Economy, the Board of Internal Economy meets very infrequently and is not in a position to provide operational direction to a security unit. And I'm just going to turn it over to Dale to go through some of the examples of that.

Mr. Larsen: — I think probably the most recent example is one that we previously mentioned in relation to the convoy and how that evolved from the Government Relations DM to include the co-operation of not only the police agencies but the Sergeant-at-Arms and CPPS in relation to our Highway Patrol officers — they weren't under us at that time — but also the capital commission CSOs. And I'm not aware of the conversations that were held daily, daily briefings on that incident and leading up to and then following, if the board was engaged in that at all.

Ms. Sarauer: — They weren't. And I'm not suggesting that the Board of Internal Economy should be or ever have been involved in operational directions with respect to security. As we all know, that's under the purview of the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker, answerable to the Speaker. I suppose my question is, why would this structural change improve that from the ministry's perspective?

[21:30]

Mr. Larsen: — When we were initially asked to put a proposal forward in relation to what we thought we would do to enhance security of this building, the people that work in this building and the people that visit this building, we provided a framework that, in our minds and based on our previous knowledge, will not only enhance the current unit but will also enhance the security for everyone that works and visits this building.

The process that we propose going forward once this process is completed is, you know, a deep dive into a formal risk assessment of the entire building and unit that's currently in place, the formalized protection-detection-response application, how we look at our training of our people — not only the people that are currently working in the unit but new people that we hire into the unit — for example, active shooter type of training, those types of training mechanisms should be brought forward. And we've done that already with our conservation officers and our Highway Patrol people that weren't used to that type of training and that level of incident interaction.

We've already talked about criminal intelligence. What other points are we missing, Rob?

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you. So I think when you look at the totality of what the advantage of forming this kind of unit is, so one of the things that we haven't spoke about is the fact that the Sergeant-at-Arms entity is going to be a collaborative partner with this new security detail, but also the connections that we're making across the entire law enforcement network. Recently we've begun conversations that did include the Sergeant-at-Arms on a variety of different security things, but it involved the Regina Police Service, the RCMP, you know, the major players that are the entities that would provide security to the entire

building.

One of the things that's really important here is the advanced-level training that we'll be providing. And we see this within our provincial protective services branch as well, where we, at the commencement of the PRT [protection and response team], for example we saw a need to increase their ability to respond to active shooters. As Dale mentioned, that's just one component, but there's also the . . . just the processes of working with other police and law enforcement entities. Anything that comes into the building here, obviously there's going to be a collective approach to dealing with that. But there has to be some sort of concentric level of security around the building as well.

And I think that's an important part is to realize that when you look at providing security in this kind of environment, you've got to build those rings of security. And one of the things that this model does . . . So it will physically increase the amount of presence of security in this building. I can't speak to what the Sergeant-at-Arms' office will do with its resources, but I can say that there's 11 resources that'll be in this particular security unit. A large component of them will be actual peace officers and special constables that'll be able to provide that.

Some of the things that we're looking at differently that we don't have right now is, for example, there's no roving patrol around the building right now. There is no visible, for example . . . If you go to Parliament Hill, for example, you'll see a marked police car sitting there in the front part of the Parliament Building. We don't have that here. So outside right now, outside the doors here, there isn't a security presence other than the CSOs that belong to the PPS [provincial protective services] right now, and they're obviously not everywhere or in front of the building all the time.

So this is an augmented service. This is an enhanced service. This is providing . . . At the end of the day there will be more people providing security to this building. Those people will be highly trained. They will have . . . They'll come in. As we talked about earlier, there will be a variety of them. They will have law enforcement backgrounds. They'll come into this environment bringing those skill sets, but we'll also enhance that training with very specific things that apply to a building like this.

And that will work in conjunction with the EPU [executive protection unit] for example, and the . . . which is another component of what provides security here and to all the MLAs and the Premier himself. So these are other ways that these will all interconnect to be a cohesive approach.

Mr. Larsen: — And just to follow up a little bit on what Rob had mentioned. And I want to be sure that everyone understands that the convoy incident that we dealt with at our legislature wasn't . . . It worked because everybody played as one team, and there wasn't one portion of that team or one individual on that team that didn't do a great job. And everybody worked together.

And just codifying that and getting that systems approach and one-team concept institutionalized as the route that we . . . or the mechanism that we use to go forward is something that I think we should be proud of.

And I'm proud of the group that came together, not only from our ministry and the members of the RPS, the members of the

Highway Patrol, the members of the capital commission, the Sergeant-at-Arms, of course, and Government Relations that led it off. Everybody just understood what the issue was and made it happen.

And when we go forward and another incident happens — because it will — we want to have that same type of application to be seamless and flexible and just get the job done and keep people in this building secure.

Mr. Cameron: — I would just add that, you know, as a person that's been involved in law enforcement for the better part of three and a half decades, which seems . . . well that's a pretty long time. And the reality that I personally have done this kind of work in different areas, in different regions and in four provinces in this country.

There is certainly a . . . The model that we're speaking about from a policing point of view is an effective model. So creating that concentric rings of security, enhancing that presence, having the uniform presence, too — which is something that doesn't happen here now; we don't have that here — that's a deterrent factor.

And so when somebody is approaching this building and they have malice intent and they think they're going to do something that's horrible, the fact that they may . . . Their first encounter with that uniformed officer that's sitting outside the building may be the thing that is going to stop them from coming inside the building. We may have to deal with that issue outside, but that's a lot better from a policing perspective than having to deal with it inside the halls here.

And if you go back to what happened in the parliament, that event, I think we see what happens when one lone bad guy can get into the inner sanctum of that building unresisted. And it took a lot of folks to actually be able to deal with that. And the idea is that — again, I get back to that concentric rings of security — is that as a professional involved in those kind of things, if we can stop them before they get in the door, it's far better and with far less chance of collateral damage, people getting injured and hurt. So that's why the model looks — from a policing point of view — looks good. Thank you.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. The Ministry of Corrections already has officers who work under the PCC, now under their purview. What's stopping the ministry from simply hiring more officers and directing them to do that work outside of the Legislative Building that you had just mentioned?

Mr. McGovern: — When you say PCC, can you explain that acronym just so that we're responding to the right question?

Ms. Sarauer: — The Provincial Capital Commission used to have CSOs who reported to them. Now that's moved under the Ministry of Corrections as part of the provincial . . . yeah, the Provincial Capital Commission, not the Public Complaints Commission. It's the other PCC.

Mr. Cameron: — Thank you. So to answer your question, why we wouldn't just hire more CSOs, so community safety officers. And so to kind of understand why we wouldn't do that, you have to understand what a community safety officer actually is and

what its purpose is. First of all, they're not police officers. They are special constables, but they have a very limited amount of authority. That's controlled by their appointment and their role. Originally when the CSOs were under the PCC, you might remember there was a time when there was actually a PCC Wascana Centre police service. A decision was made at some point prior to the CSOs coming over to us to change that police service from an armed police service into a CSO program. So the CSOs, again, have a very limited amount of authority.

On top of that, CSOs are not trained as police officers. Their role is not to act as a police officer. Their ability to respond is very limited to . . . The actual intervention equipment that they carry wouldn't deal with somebody like an active shooter, for example. So if you had somebody that was similar to the situation we had on Parliament Hill where somebody came in with a rifle, I believe in that case, the CSOs would have no way of responding back to that threat. They would have to disengage and call for police response or some other kind of law enforcement to come in and provide them that aid because they just wouldn't have the tools to do that.

So therefore, if we were to look at hiring more CSOs, we wouldn't obtain that . . . The desired effect that I think you're speaking to is, could they not . . . we could increase that service, and they would be those people. No, in this context, not. We would have to change the complete design of the CSO program. And I think you would end up in essence doing what we are doing now, is creating an entity that does have that capability, does have that authority. And by expanding that security service to have a role outside of the doors of this building, they do have in fact then the capacity to respond to that person coming in that would want to try and shoot people inside this building. So that is certainly the way that we would do it.

So hopefully that made sense because really what you're talking about is . . . The CSO program would be a bit of a fish out of water with regards to response to those kind of really dangerous threats. You need a trained law enforcement individual that has the capacity, the training, the tools, and really important is the legal understanding of how to use . . . unfortunately you're talking about lethal responses. And so CSOs do not have the knowledge or the skill sets that would allow them to be able to do that in their current format.

Ms. Sarauer: — Well again, we keep bringing up the Ottawa incident. And just again to remind the committee the changes that happened structurally in Ottawa still very much respect the independence of security in the legislative building and the answerability of that security to the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker.

[21:45]

There was also a review that happened here provincially. None of that review suggested that that change be made either. Thank you for your clarification about what CSOs are and are not capable of. Again it sounds — and this goes back to this last answer as well as the answer before — that there are concerns about structure and some of the operational aspects. And I ask again, why wasn't that brought to the Board of Internal Economy?

Mr. Larsen: — We were tasked with a proposal that asked us, based on our experience and our combined knowledge of policing and security background — not only Rob and myself, but other people in our ministry that have years of experience as well — and we put forward a plan, a proposal, a framework for security of this building and the grounds and the safety and the security of the people that work and visit this building every day.

And from our collective wisdom, this was the best model that we came up with. And I think it's a model that will not only prove itself into the future, but it's already proven itself in concept, as we've already discussed. And other than that, Minister?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Oh, I thought the Chair was going to give me heck for touching the microphone again. Anyway, as you see before you, the discussions that we had . . . The Board of Internal Economy is an impediment to the operation of a security unit in modern-day security and modern-day policing. It is not in the legislation, nor has it been part of any discussion.

We've introduced the legislation. We've debated it on the floor of the legislature. And we're here at committee. That's how legislation works. And I know I'm not telling you anything you don't know.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. You mentioned that the ministry was requested to come up with a proposal. Who made that request?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Decisions like this are made in consultation with cabinet, with discussion with cabinet. The ministry is then tasked with operationalizing those directions.

Ms. Sarauer: — So this was a direction from cabinet?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yeah. There were . . . Hang on.

Mr. McGovern: — I think that's a fair response. Certainly it's a government decision. And as far as how cabinet communicates, the minister's of course aware that that's not something that's specifically discussed. But I think the minister's outlined that it's a government decision that the minister was asked to operationalize.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I've been keeping close watch on the discussion around . . . Oh, sorry. There was one other question I wanted to ask. When was that direction given?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — The discussion at cabinet would have been held just prior to the introduction of the bill in the fall of 2021.

Ms. Sarauer: — What I was going to mention before I realized that I forgot a question is that I've been keeping close watch on the federal discussions around the *Emergencies Act* and the . . . inquest? Sorry, my brain is starting to shut down now that it's past 9:30.

But the inquiry that's happening as a result, the mandatory inquiry that happens as a result of the *Emergencies Act* being invoked federally — and there's been a discussion around confidentiality of information, cabinet confidentiality, sensitive security information — the whole purpose of the mandatory inquiry, from what I understand it, is to ensure that government

powers with respect to security aren't used in an overbroad way. And the importance of that inquiry is to be able to provide as much information as possible, whether that's in camera or otherwise, so that there isn't a situation where government is saying, just trust us; if you knew what we knew, you would agree with what we were doing.

When we're having a discussion around this bill, we're left in a very difficult situation where we're being told it's to address some security concerns that have happened in this building, but we aren't being made privy to what those security concerns are. We haven't been made privy. I've made a request to go in camera to have at least a private conversation. I've suggested that this conversation go to BOIE instead.

I suppose my question is now that . . . And you've made that clear, very clear tonight, Minister, that the BOIE will no longer be involved in security questions further. What mechanism will be in play to ensure that there isn't overreach of government powers of security, other than the government saying, just trust us?

Mr. McGovern: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the member, I think there's two points I think I would make. One is baked into the legislation expressly. When the minister mentions that the Board of Internal Economy isn't expressly included in the legislation, that's absolutely true.

What's also true when you look at 76.2(5) is, as was alluded to by Mr. Cameron and more specifically, I think, was that this is meant to be a collaborative process, that:

The Director may make arrangements with the Speaker respecting services that the Director and the Speaker consider necessary for the security of the Legislative District, including the employment or use of any police officer, sheriff or special constable that may be required by the Director for this purpose.

I am, of course, not going to tell you because you well know what the role of the Speaker is with respect to the Board of Internal Economy. And what the Speaker chooses to take to the Board of Internal Economy is part of that process to keep the members engaged through the Board of Internal Economy on those security issues.

We're inviting that collaboration. We think it's important. It's also maintained in 76.4 where:

The Speaker may make arrangements with the Government of Saskatchewan respecting services that the Speaker considers necessary for the security of the Legislative Precinct.

The silos that our police professionals are adamant are an impediment to appropriate policing, this is a method for dealing with what happens when you do leave the floor, that that co-operation is recognized and needed. And to the extent that the Speaker already does and may continue to bring security matters to the Board of Internal Economy, this certainly doesn't prohibit that. That certainly can still occur.

You then asked about as well with respect to accountability, with

respect to that service, with respect to their conduct. As I said, I'm of the view that the structure in *The Police Act* that will apply to these individuals and apply to the collective service will be a much more transparent and demonstrably accountable process than currently exists if a member of the Sergeant-at-Arms' staff acts inappropriately. I think this new process will deal with accountability from that perspective.

So with respect to the two questions you've asked in that regard, I think there is a role for the Speaker, and of course it's the Speaker's responsibility or choice on how to engage the Board of Internal Economy in that regard. And then secondly, with respect to what we would consider to be a police conduct issue within that structure of *The Police Act*, there's very much a process by which either specific conduct or service can be the subject of a complaint under the Act. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Sarauer: — I know, Mr. McGovern, that you know legislative drafting far better than I ever will, and I would never purport to say anything to the contrary. 76.2(5) specifically uses the word “may,” not the word “shall,” the more prescriptive word as you well know. My question to the minister is, why was “may” chosen rather than “shall”?

[22:00]

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Yeah, there was the word “may” and yes, “shall.” These are parallel clauses that are in the current legislation. And I think the word “may” when we're talking about different entities . . . “The Director may make arrangements with the Speaker respecting services that the Director and the Speaker consider necessary . . .”

But then we go to the other “may.” There's another “may” here. Sorry. Oh yeah. “The Speaker may make arrangements with the Government of Saskatchewan . . .” I think that speaks to the collaborative nature that we are expecting and intending for it to be. Specifically for the Speaker, we can't order the Speaker what to do, so we've kept “may” in there to denote that there is an expectation that that will occur, that collaboration will occur, hence, the word “may.”

Ms. Sarauer: — This particular provision was brought up when I brought up concerns about ensuring accountability and oversight of government overreach in security. I don't feel that my question was answered as to if this is the provision and the hope for a collaborative relationship between the Speaker and the director, why “shall” wasn't used rather than “may.”

Hon. Ms. Tell: — So what's necessary is there's an element of discretion. We're not about to tell the Speaker what is necessary, and we're not about to tell the director what is necessary. That's their jobs. We do expect that the ongoing operation of this particular unit will collaborate with the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker. The “may” is collaborative in nature, and that's how it's written. Do you have something, Rob?

Mr. Cameron: — If I can, yeah.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Oh, sure.

Mr. Cameron: — I think from a point of maybe some comfort in building that the new legislative district security unit will

ultimately report to me as the ADM.

I've already mentioned today in these committee hearings about the fact that there's the . . . We will have a collaborative approach. That's how we'll operate. I think it's important to mention that there's a variety of other . . . And to your point on accountability and how does that work, and there's a variety of other peace officers and special constables that actually report to me within the province. And I am the person that ensures that their duty and their role is conducted in a non-biased and non-partisan way. So that's one of my functions is to do that.

So again, when it comes to this particular entity, this district security unit or the director of security, certainly that'll be part of my oversight is to ensure that they are maintaining that role, in addition to the part IV of *The Police Act* which has that accountability built in.

And then there's also an element of . . . We have, oh, I don't know how many exactly, but there's probably around 2,000 or so different peace officers and special constables that legislation speaks to the minister appointing, but the minister doesn't actually control them. They don't report to her directly.

Ms. Sarauer: — Right, but who specifically will be involved in hiring the director of legislative security?

Mr. Cameron: — That'd be me.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. And when will that job description go out?

Mr. Cameron: — Go out?

Ms. Sarauer: — I'm just tanking here. When will it be posted? There's the word I was looking for. Posted. When will that job description be posted?

Mr. Cameron: — Well ultimately it's the process that we follow with classification of any position or roles within the executive government. We'll work with the Public Service Commission to establish the job description, the classification. Now how long that takes, I'm not 100 per cent sure what that will take. It will depend on any issues or concerns we have with the PSC as we go through doing all that work.

We also have to classify all the other subordinate positions as well, so there'll be a variety of work for me to do on that. And of course we didn't have passed legislation yet, so we're not at a point where we have all that through. But once we get to a point where we have that, then we'll be advertising those jobs for hopefully willing candidates to come in, and hire our security group.

Ms. Sarauer: — You've mentioned already that the budget for this new security group is 1.67 million. Could you provide a breakdown for what that money is for?

Mr. Larsen: — So, Ms. Sarauer, in reply to that question, the budget, as you mentioned, is broken down primarily into approximately 700,000 in salaries and another 800-and-some thousand in, you know, capital and start-up costs for the first year.

But having said that, there's also already a budget in place that funds the current unit. So there's an expectation that there won't be an overlap of funding, or there won't be money . . . This isn't additional money from the base, I should say, right? We have to understand what the current spend is and determine if some of those dollars that are currently being spent will be into this number as well, right? So we're saying it's 1.6 for the total. Having said that, it's not entirely new money.

Ms. Sarauer: — Because, just to complete your thought, the plan is that the Sergeant-at-Arms' budget will decrease, and some of that money will flow to this new security force. Is that correct?

Mr. Larsen: — That's correct. But until we get, you know, a fuller understanding of what the cost of the current unit is, we don't have that information.

Ms. Sarauer: — Sorry. You don't know what the current Sergeant-at-Arms' budget is?

Mr. Larsen: — Well the current breakdown of how that unit is set up for Sergeant-at-Arms' positions, the Sergeant-at-Arms' end positions, and what the leftover group of primarily salaried people will be to move to the other security unit.

Ms. Sarauer: — Could you provide a breakdown? You mentioned 800,000 for capital and start-up costs. Can you provide more detail as to what that budget will entail?

[22:15]

The Chair: — [Inaudible] . . . Minister?

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Pardon me? No, I didn't hear anything. I was just waiting for you to finish talking.

The Chair: — We're going to go till 10:30.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — We're going to go to 10:30? Okay.

The Chair: — [Inaudible] . . . I'm not sure what's going on.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — With respect to your question, we do not have access to the budget of the Board of Internal Economy and I'm sure you're aware of that. What we have done is taken the best information that we could, put together numbers the best we could. They aren't written in stone, that's for sure, in their estimates.

We don't know what we don't know. And we do not know what we're going to find when we look into the board of . . . once we have access to that. We just don't know. So you know, the ministry has factored in what they thought was a best guess and an educated one. And you know, really that's all we could say with it.

Ms. Sarauer: — I appreciate that. I know this, at this stage, is probably not an exact science until you have more detail. I'm just wondering if there is a high-level, ballpark thought as to what that 800,000 will be used for.

Mr. Larsen: — You know, until we get into that detailed treasury board process, the outline that we've provided is

probably the extent that we can give you at this time.

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Keisig.

Mr. Keisig: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to adjourn debate. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — The member has moved to adjourn debate. Is it the pleasure of this committee to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Just before we move into estimates, Minister and Ms. Sarauer, if you would like to thank officials. Not closing comments, so if you'd like to thank your officials, that's where we're at.

Hon. Ms. Tell: — Thank you to everybody that has spent a fair number of hours here tonight. And I know that the Calgary Flames game is going on and some of you are watching it closely, but anyway I want to thank you all, staying here for this number of hours. Dealing with a subject matter is necessary but it is long, and I appreciate everyone's attendance here tonight. And you guys too, and you too. Thank you.

The Chair: — Ms. Sarauer, you got . . . No closing comments. You want to thank some people?

Ms. Sarauer: — I just want to reiterate what the minister had said, that important discussions are happening, but we understand that takes a lot of work. And I'm, like the minister, very grateful for everyone who was here this evening and for answering our questions and continuing to answer our questions in a later date. And thank you to my colleagues for joining me this evening. I'm not used to having such a large audience. Yes, I'm usually by myself. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you. I'll ask the officials to please leave while the committee votes on the estimates.

General Revenue Fund Corrections, Policing and Public Safety Vote 73

The Chair: — All right. So the committee will proceed to vote on the estimates. So vote 73, Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, central management and services, subvote (CP01) in the amount of \$883,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Public safety, subvote (CP06) in the amount of 97,779,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Police Commission, subvote (CP12) in the amount of \$1,766,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of \$198,113,000, is that

agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of \$303,735,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, vote 73 — \$602,276,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Corrections, Policing and Public Safety in the amount of \$602,276,000.

Ms. Lambert. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Firearms Secretariat
Vote 92**

The Chair: — Vote 92, Firearms Secretariat. Firearms Secretariat subvote (FS01) in the amount of \$2,564,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Firearms Secretariat, vote 92 — \$2,564,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Firearms Secretariat in the amount of \$2,564,000.

Mr. Grewal. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Integrated Justice Services
Vote 91**

The Chair: — Integrated Justice Services, central management and services, subvote (IJ01) in the amount of 54,527,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Integrated Services, subvote (IJ02) in the amount of \$60,984,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Capital improvements, subvote (IJ03) in the amount of \$60,272,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$9,995,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

[22:30]

Integrated Justice Services, vote 91 — \$175,783,000. I'll ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Integrated Justice Services in the amount of \$175,783,000.

Mr. Friesen. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Government Relations
Vote 30**

The Chair: — Okay, we're at Government Relations. Central management and services, subvote (GR01) in the amount of \$7,545,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (GR06) in the amount of \$1,888,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal Relations, subvote (GR07) in the amount of \$566,654,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. First Nations, Métis and Northern Affairs, subvote (GR12) in the amount of \$66,235,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial Capital Commission, subvote (GR14) in the amount of \$8,054,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$100,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of \$650,376,000.

Mr. McLeod. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — All right. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3. Central management and services, subvote (JU01) in the amount of \$1,065,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of \$47,282,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Innovation and legal services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of \$47,246,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards, commissions and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of \$48,666,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3 — 144,259,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of \$144,259,000.

Mr. Keisig: — I so move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — All right, we're now moving to Parks, Culture and Sport. Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport. Central management and services, subvote (PC01) in the amount of \$9,700,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, subvote (PC12) in the amount of \$26,430,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Resource stewardship, subvote (PC18) in the amount of \$7,866,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community engagement, subvote (PC19) in the amount of 39,539,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$6,383,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27 — \$83,535,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of \$83,535,000.

Ms. Lambert. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Tourism Saskatchewan
Vote 88**

The Chair: — Vote 88, Tourism Saskatchewan. Tourism Saskatchewan, subvote (TR01) in the amount of \$19,673,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Tourism Saskatchewan, vote 88 — \$19,673,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Tourism Saskatchewan in the amount of \$19,673,000.

Mr. Grewal: — I will move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Corrections, Policing and Public Safety
Vote 73**

The Chair: — All right. We're at supplementary estimates no. 2. Vote 73, Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Public safety, subvote (CP06) in the amount of \$4,755,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of \$8,010,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of \$27,647,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, vote 73 — \$40,412,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2022, the following sums for Corrections, Policing and Public Safety in the amount of \$40,412,000.

Mr. Friesen moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Justice and Attorney General
Vote 3**

The Chair: — Still on supplementary estimates no. 2. Vote 3, Justice and Attorney General. Boards, commissions, and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of \$1,053,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney General, vote 3 — \$1,053,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2022, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of \$1,053,000.

Mr. McLeod. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Okay we're having a pause.

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

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

Mr. Keisig: — I do so move, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Is that agreed, the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Okay. That concludes our business for today. I would ask a member to move . . . Oh, sorry. This committee stands adjourned to the call of the Chair. We're adjourned to the call of the Chair. Thank you all.

[The committee adjourned at 22:44.]