



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 16 — May 10, 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 15:12.]

**The Chair:** — Hello and welcome everyone. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. I'm Mark Docherty, the Chair. Sitting in for Gary Grewal is Ryan Domotor. Travis Keisig is part of the committee sitting. Tim McLeod is sitting. Alana Ross is chitting in for Lisa Lambert. And Greg Ottenbreit is here. Substituting for Betty Nippi-Albright is Nicole Sarauer.

Today we'll be considering Bill 70, *The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 2021*, a bilingual bill. Before I call clause 1, I would ask committee members if they have any general comments that they would like to make about our agenda today, the process, or anything of that nature with regard to Bill 70. Seeing none, we'll begin our deliberations with clause 1, short title.

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

**Clause 1**

**The Chair:** — Minister Tell is here with her officials from the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Minister, please introduce your officials.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — In the gallery is . . . Thanks. Neil Karkut, senior Crown counsel — I always remember their names but not their positions — with legislative services. Beside me is Darcy McGovern, Q.C. [Queen's Counsel], director of legislative services. To my right is Deputy Minister Dale Larsen, and beside him is Rob Cameron . . . let's see . . . assistant deputy minister. Thank you for joining me today. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister. Ms. Sarauer, the floor is yours.

[15:15]

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think when we adjourned yesterday evening, we had started talking about the budget allocation for the planned new legislative security service. I think we'll go back to that, and forgive me if I'm asking a question that we asked toward the end. I just want to get to the right spot again from yesterday evening.

Now if I remember correctly our conversation from yesterday, there is about 700,000 budgeted for salaries, 800,000 budgeted for capital start-up costs. But those are estimates. Because from what I understand, the ministry is waiting to have this bill passed, at which point the ministry plans on accessing the current budget amount, understanding what the current budget amount is for the Sergeant-at-Arms' office, and that will help finalize those details. Am I correct in that?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Good afternoon. Dale Larsen, deputy minister. Ms. Sarauer, as you mentioned, last night we had the discussion about the breakdown of the budget. And as we mentioned, some of the guesstimates that we used, I guess, on putting the budget together are still unknown to us.

So when we talk about a salary allocation, as Rob had mentioned, for the 11 FTEs [full-time equivalent] and the director position, those are unclassified. We have to have them classified through PSC [Public Service Commission], so they could be subject to a plus or minus. And you know, based on our experience with those ranges for those positions, we'll be relatively close, but we could be up a few, you know, tens of thousands actually, or a little bit less.

So we'd allocated about 700,000 for salary operating the first year, as you mentioned . . . was in relation to those start-up costs as well as some potential accommodation and improvement cost that will be assessed when the new unit forms and does an assessment of security needs within the building and the exterior of the building. We estimate those to be in that neighbourhood of 765, and then another 220 to bring us to that 1.66 million. And Rob might have a bit of a, you know, more granular breakdown of some of those numbers.

**Mr. Cameron:** — What I'm thinking might be helpful . . . Oh, sorry. Rob Cameron, assistant deputy minister. What might be helpful is to get into some of the areas of what that money might be spent on, and the caveat being of course that there's yet to be determined exactly how these numbers will play out.

But some of the things we're looking at is an expanded work or coverage period, so looking at a longer 16 hours of coverage. So there's a certain amount of allocation there. Roving patrol capacity, which would include obviously the need for a vehicle or vehicles, depending on how that works out. Basic equipment that would be used by any kind of a unit like this where you're getting into uniforms, duty belts, batons, OC [oleoresin capsicum] spray, firearms, identification, flashes, badges, that kind of stuff.

As well as you get looking at . . . Dale mentioned the Corps of Commissionaires which would be a . . . the Corps of Commissionaires operate the access-egress points within the building. And given that would be in the district, the assumption being made is that will roll into the new legislative district security unit. So there would be the cost as applied to that. That cost is estimated somewhere in the 400 to 500,000 mark. And that's an existing contract, obviously.

Other things, looking at radio communications. Obviously there they can be quite pricey, expensive, and the infrastructure will go around that. And then things that are more typical of what you would hear for any kind of organization, you know, desktop computers, copiers, scanners, cell phones for communication as well. Maintenance of vehicles, gasoline costs. Some of the things that I would mention about the things like gasoline costs and maintenance of vehicles is, obviously we're seeing the increase in those prices too. When we did our initial estimations, prices have gone up since then. So frankly that would have to be recalculated.

Accommodation is also something we'd have to consider in there. At this point in time I don't know if we will be . . . what kind of accommodation we would be able to obtain in the Legislative Building here or if we would have to be off-site or how that would look. So those are logistics that I would still have to work through. And they'll have a cost that will have a varying

range. So when you take a look at all of those items and the logistics behind them, there's going to be some flex in that. I would like to say plus or minus, but likely it's more plus. But these are the things we'll have to look at.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thanks. And you mentioned the commissionaires in particular. As you stated, there are several commissionaires that are employed in this building. Is the intention that that contract will roll under the director of legislative security? And will that be maintained?

**Mr. Larsen:** — The assumption that we're currently making is that the Corps of Commissionaires would fall under the director, and we would maintain their service until we at least get a chance to assess the overall needs. And they could be expanded or they could be decreased; you never know until we find out what we need to find out when we assess the building and the security in the building. But there's no immediate intent to not have the contract with the Corps of Commissionaires.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — When does that contract expire?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The contract with the Corps of Commissionaires is with the Speaker's office, and we do not have access to that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Would the ministry commit to, at a minimum, ensuring the jobs of the current commissionaires, the positions that currently exist at least until the end of this calendar year?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yes.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — When are you planning on completing your review of what the needs assessment will be for this new security service?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Well, obviously we must wait until the bill is passed. And then the work begins, you know, an analysis of what we have and when we have access to what we need access to, and make a determination from there. I mean, I can't give you a date. I can't give you a month. So it will happen as soon as we can get to it, and that's about all I can say at this point.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So the 11 FTEs would be in addition to the commissionaire positions that already exist. Is that correct?

[15:30]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The 11 positions that we have referred to are over and above that of the Corps of Commissionaires. Now having said that, there will be analysis, ongoing analysis once we have a look at the . . . We don't know what the contract says with the Corps of Commissionaires, but the analysis needs to be done just to make sure that the unit has exactly the correct complement. Corps of Commissionaires are ancillary to actual security and the officials will have to make a determination as to what is actually needed.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — What about the special constables who currently work under the Sergeant-at-Arms? Are they going to be in addition to the 11 FTEs, or is the plan that they will continue their employment as one of these 11 new FTE positions?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The security people that are currently with the Sergeant-at-Arms are with the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Sergeant-at-Arms makes a decision as to what complement they're going to keep. We have no say on that. And that's between the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker.

The people currently in the position, if they choose to apply for the positions, the 11 positions that we've talked about, they're more than welcome to do so.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Would the job qualifications for the new FTE positions be different from the positions they currently occupy?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — We don't have access to the job descriptions of the current Sergeant-at-Arms security members. We do not have access to that yet. So I don't want to, I do not want to compare it to what may or may not be there when, you know, here we go again. We know what we don't know, and we don't know that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — What will be the job descriptions for the new FTEs?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So generally speaking, the qualifications that you would see in a legislative district security unit member would include a former law enforcement background, a peace officer or police officer involved in public policing roles. That could be something similar to RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police], municipal police, provincial peace officers, special constables. And when you speak about peace officers and special constables in the province, it's with the appropriate SKA, so the skills, knowledge, and ability.

Not all special constables in the province have the same levels of training and skill sets, but those that would, for example, a conservation officer would likely have this, the right training and skill sets to bring over. Some preferred backgrounds would include things like tactical units such as SWAT [special weapons and tactics] or URT [underwater recovery team] — depending on, you know, if you're a municipal or an RCMP organization — public order units, critical incident command, investigative units such as major crimes and general investigation.

Some of the role of these individuals, obviously there'll be potential criminal investigations. There will also be other statutory enforcement that would be done. Underlying all that is multiple years, several years of general duty or patrol capacity. A lot of good skill sets are built in that realm. So speaking to people, engaging with the public, interviewing folks — all that kind of stuff is developed in that general duty and then enhanced when you get into these other specialties that I spoke about.

But obviously with the legislative security unit like this, we would be looking at having some of those tactical skills too because that's the response to . . . Unfortunately and sadly those are the things we would respond to. So you need to have a high level of those skill sets. Part of that would be the use-of-force training, which is use of their service weapons; duty weapons; pistols; potentially patrol carbines; conducted energy weapons or a.k.a. [also known as] the taser, most people probably know it as; skill sets in handcuffing, expandable batons, OC spray.

But also more importantly is a really sound knowledge of the

legal aspects of utilizing, use of all those pieces of equipment in the use of force, because obviously one of the things we want to do is make sure that when those types of devices or that kind of response is required, that it's done legally and in a proper context. So beyond that of course, defensive tactics, that's personal defensive tactics, Criminal law, good basis in criminal law: powers of arrest, elements of offences, Charter, good knowledge of the Charter and how that applies to law enforcement and policing, specifically things like rights to counsel and that kind of stuff.

And then the other part of everything that you do in law enforcement is the reports and the note taking and having a great base in that, the reports to Crown counsel if charges are to be laid. If that's something that the LDSU [legislative district security unit] would be looking at, then they would have to develop those or have those skills coming in to be able to present those reports to Crown counsel if required.

A good solid basis in provincial stats because a lot of what they will be dealing with will involve provincial statutes: *The Traffic Safety Act*, *The Trespass to Property Act*, *The Summary Offences Procedure Act*, a variety of other statutes. I won't name them all, but there's quite a few that could be involved.

A very important skill set that we'd look for is that verbal de-escalation technique or the verbal judo, maybe you've heard it called. The ability to interact with people that may be in a crisis situation or in some sort of distress, mental health distress, and the ability to react to them and to try and de-escalate that situation and bring them down so they don't have to resort to using force. So there's another skill set.

And then some very technical skill sets: use of communications and radio communications, how to communicate properly with other law enforcement, ability to describe situations, situational awareness, that kind of thing. And then, generally speaking, patrol techniques. In the context of a building like this, how to actually effectively do security sweeping and screening.

Making sure that they can recognize signs of somebody that may be a threat or a danger. There's certain threat cues that we look for when somebody's coming in. Maybe perhaps somebody's coming in intoxicated or in a state of crisis and they need to intercept that person early to prevent them from becoming a threat to anybody else in the building here.

So there's a very quick rundown of what kind of skill sets. A lot of this is also relying on that experience that a person would bring in, a police officer would bring in or a law enforcement officer would bring in, of just their own experience in interacting with the public and doing investigations and dealing with dangerous situations.

And part of that is, I would also suggest that it's important that they have the right personality. I mean, that's harder to assess but the reality is that our law enforcement people and our peace officers need to be able to work with people and be able to work not only with the public but the individuals that occupy this building each day. So there's another very important aspect to that. And you look for that, you know, that interaction, that ability to communicate, that ability to work with people, I think, is really important there. And I guess I'd leave it at that for now.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. The minister has already indicated that they don't know yet what the current job qualifications are for the special constables' positions that currently fall under the Sergeant-at-Arms, but we do know that they are all retired officers. Is there any indication from the ministry's perspective that those positions don't already meet those qualifications that you have described?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — As you said, and what I've said is that we don't have access to that particular information, and I can't speak to what experience they have or don't have. A policing background doesn't necessarily . . . It equates to different aspects of it. Not everyone has the same skill set with respect to policing, and so we can't speak to that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. So just to clarify, not all retired officers would match the qualifications that have just been described?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I would agree.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — You've indicated already when we've been talking about what the budget will be for this moving forward, that the anticipation — and correct me if I'm wrong — that the anticipation will be that the Sergeant-at-Arms' budget will reduce, because his jurisdiction will be reducing, and that that money will move to the new legislative security force. In light of that, is the ministry anticipating that the Sergeant-at-Arms' office will see a reduction in staffing?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — With respect to the Sergeant-at-Arms' office, this is not what we're talking about. We're talking about what's going to happen when a security unit is formed. Any agreements, anything that occurs between the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Speaker is between them.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — What I'm trying to get at is how much Bill 70 and the new legislative security force will cost, which I think is an important function of this committee to scrutinize when we're talking about pieces of legislation.

So I guess I'll back it up a bit. Moving forward, is it the anticipation of — and I swear this is what I heard yesterday — the anticipation of the ministry that some of the costs of this force, the money will come out of what is currently money allocated to the Sergeant-at-Arms' office?

[15:45]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I think what you heard yesterday and what was, you know, anticipated, what the intention was is that we are anticipating that that may be likely. However it is a strong assumption because we're not involved in any discussions with respect to the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker and the positions currently in the security unit with the Sergeant-at-Arms. So we can't say with absolute certainty how it's going to unfold.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, you mentioned before — and I can't remember, I think this was to media — that just because the roles are being separated out, the director of legislative security and the Sergeant-at-Arms, that doesn't mean that one person cannot perform both roles. Does that mean that the ministry is

contemplating the Sergeant-at-Arms being the new director as well?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Can you repeat what it is that you think you heard through the media?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — You said on December 2nd in question period, “. . . the roles can be separated out, as I’ve said before, that does not mean that one person cannot perform both roles.” So I’m asking if the ministry is contemplating having the Sergeant-at-Arms fill the director position.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — So that was December 2nd of 2021. This unit or the, what has gone . . . you know, with respect to the creation of the legislation, was still in flux. We have said, I believe publicly, that the Sergeant-at-Arms, the current Sergeant-at-Arms is most certainly welcome to apply for the director job if he so chooses. But no, as you can see in the legislation . . . I’m going to turn it over to Darcy for a more fulsome explanation.

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and the minister. To the member, so I think the structure in the Act that’s set out, the legislative protective service is continued — that of course is an arm of the Legislative Assembly — it is continued, consisting of the Sergeant-at-Arms and any other employees that may be required by the Sergeant-at-Arms. So the two positions are contemplated within the legislation as being separate.

And so I think in the response, the minister mentions the individual. The individual of course is welcome to apply for the new position with respect to the director. But it is not contemplated that the Sergeant-at-Arms, the statutory position within the Legislative Assembly, would also be the director as defined within the Act as well.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. So I guess my next question is, what has changed from December 2nd, as you mentioned, Minister? At that time it was more in flux. What has changed since then?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Well I mean, the bill you see in front of you is what it is. So there were discussions and it was just, you know, really at that point in time was forming, you know, and trying to work through what we needed to work through. So what you see today is exactly where we land on and this is the decision that we made.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — But the bill would have been introduced prior to that December 2nd quote. So I’m wondering what has changed from the bill being introduced to December 2nd to present time.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — It was something that was under consideration. But as you can see, the current bill as it’s written, the Sergeant-at-Arms and the director positions are separated out.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — It was still beginning and, you know, discussions were ongoing but this is where we landed.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Now I understand from SaskBuilds’ estimates that there’s \$600,000 allocated from SaskBuilds toward legislative security. Could you provide some more information about that?

**Mr. Larsen:** — So could we get some clarification on the SaskBuilds line item that you’re talking about?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Perhaps what I’ll do is I’ll pull the exact *Hansard* and bring this question back at a later time. I don’t have the exact *Hansard* in front of me, but I’ll pull it and then hopefully that’ll provide some more information.

There was mention of roving patrol capacity and the potential for cost for vehicles. Could you elaborate on the roving patrol you spoke about?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So just to speak about the roving patrol capacity a little bit more, so currently right now that’s not something that’s done around the building here. That roving patrol capacity would allow the legislative district security unit to patrol the area immediately around the Legislative Building, and that would be in conjunction with the CSOs [community safety officer] that would patrol the area outside of that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Okay, so you’re clarifying that their jurisdiction would fall under what is stated in the bill in terms of outside of this building?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So just to give some clarity on what’s meant by roving patrol, so part of that could be vehicle operated, where a vehicle would actually circle the Legislative Building but it’s only the area that’s defined within the legislation. But I think what I need to add to that as well for some clarification is that roving patrol is just not necessarily just a vehicle operation. For example, foot patrols around the building that are currently not done.

I think in the past there’s been issues with, you know, people loitering around the building. And plus there’s people working like tonight, or will be tonight later on, that there could be a walk-out service and things like that. So what that means is, so if somebody was feeling uncomfortable about walking later at night to their car, for example, that somebody could walk them in safety to that point. So those are concepts of the roving patrol.

The other part about that is that the vehicle is also . . . it could be a static deterrent as well. So this is a very common situation. How it’s done with a security environment like this is . . . And you see it on Parliament Hill where they park a vehicle in the front and it’s a visible deterrent.

[16:00]

The other part of that is emergency evacuation or having . . . if somebody were to be injured or somebody . . . For example, there was an attack on the building and somebody was injured and they needed to extract somebody quickly to medical aid or whatever, they’d have ability to do that too. So there’s more than just driving around the yard sort of thing.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — No, thank you. Thank you for the clarification. I only mentioned it because you mentioned the cost of potential vehicles and gas. And my confusion is, the Ministry of Corrections already operates CSOs within the park, so the jurisdiction outside the legislative district as it’s defined in the legislation. So the ministry already has the ability to direct this roving patrol that you are describing. Is that all correct?



**Mr. Cameron:** — So just with regards to the CSOs, the CSOs are not trained to respond to the situations that the LDSU individuals would be trained to respond to. Could they be used in an emergent situation? Yes, I think they could, but their jurisdiction is very limited. Their training is not to the level, nowhere near the level of what we would be expecting for the LDSU individuals.

They do have a jurisdictional patrol within the park, or the Wascana Centre, and they would continue doing that. They would certainly provide that service. But with respect to protection of this facility, this building, no, they wouldn't be utilized in that way.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — But just to clarify again, and I'm just confirming what's in the bill. The LDSU — I know the ministry loves acronyms — the LDSU's jurisdiction will be confined to what is stipulated in 76.1(b), the definition of "legislative district." Correct?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So with regards to the jurisdiction of the LDSU individual, so there will be a primary jurisdiction which will be confined to that of the building as per the Act. Now often what we'll have inside of an appointment for a special constable is a secondary jurisdiction, which may be something to the effect of, if a police service requests immediate assistance or help, that they are permitted to go outside of that jurisdiction for that immediate emergent response. So that is something that we have in many of our appointments.

What it allows for is the ability to break down those silos, to be allowing a collaborative approach to allow for emergent or mutual aid to other law enforcement agencies and whatnot. For example, something like the convoy, if there was a . . . One of the difficulties we had was that the jurisdiction of the Sergeant-at-Arms was limited to basically that sidewalk. In this case, if police had requested that assistance we would . . . If we go with an appointment that has that secondary jurisdiction, we'd just eliminate that silo and allow them to be able to assist, which is really the goal of trying to get this more collaborative, and an approach where we see law enforcement, whether involved in the security of the building or the grounds here, able to work more completely together.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. For further clarity, who would have to make that request for this force to step into their secondary jurisdiction?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Generally it's the police force's jurisdiction that would do that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So for clarity, who would that be in Wascana Park area?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So in the case of this location, it would be the Regina Police Service would be the police force jurisdiction that would contact or call for the assistance.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. For further clarity again, the RPS [Regina Police Service] would be the body that would have to make that request for the legislative security force to step into the secondary jurisdiction?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So primarily it would be the Regina Police Service. However the way that that particular part of the appointments are worded, it could be another law enforcement agency, for example, the CSOs. If a CSO was, for example, in immediate danger, they could ask for that assistance. And that would also allow them to utilize that support, you know, obviously in an emergency situation. So other law enforcement could also call them out. In the context of this area, it would probably be the other one would be . . . The CSOs would be the other group other than RPS.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So the CSOs could ask for that help. And the CSOs now fall under the . . . that were operating Wascana Park area, now fall under the Ministry of Corrections?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, they do.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I have the *Hansard*. I think it's probably easiest if I just give it to the officials, if that's all right, so the *Hansard* around the \$600,000 from SaskBuilds. With permission of the Chair, it's probably just easier that way.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Would you like us to address this question?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Please.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Okay, yeah. The funding cited in your *Hansard* here is out of the scope of this bill. And questions, that would be questions for SaskBuilds and/or the PCC [Provincial Capital Commission].

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Okay. I'm confused because it does say it's for the legislative security. So that's in addition to the money that's already been discussed, the 1.67 million?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah, this money that you're referring to, or the amount in a line item, is just not part of this bill.

[16:15]

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So the 1.67 million that we've been discussing is separate from this dollar figure that's been discussed in SaskBuilds estimates?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — As far as we're aware, yes. Assumptions being made here.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — And any questions about this, what this money is for, should go through the PCC?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Or SaskBuilds.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Or SaskBuilds.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah, okay.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Just to reiterate again, the ministry is unsure at this time what the current cost of security for the legislature is. Is that correct?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The questions respecting the security unit and the Sergeant-at-Arms currently is best asked of the Speaker.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Has the ministry made any requests to the Speaker for details on the current costs of legislative security?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Once this legislation passes, that will be one of the first priorities that we look at, for sure.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Prior to this bill being introduced, who did the ministry consult on this legislation?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Since this bill has been introduced, officials from the ministry have begun conversations with partners, the RCMP, Regina Police Service, and will continue to work collaboratively with the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-Arms to improve security service in the legislative district.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you for clarifying who has been consulted since the bill has been introduced. Who did the ministry consult with, with respect to legislative security, prior to this bill's introduction?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — On the bill specifically, there was no specific consultation. However the decision by government — and this is a government decision — was informed by a number of factors, and I have highlighted them in previous responses. And that is police services, security 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.

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

So all that to say what I started out to say, and that is the decision of government to go down this route, and hence the legislation, was as a result of a number of factors that were in play and have been over time.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. You mentioned that the ministry has, subsequent to the introduction of the bill, spoken to the RCMP. What is the RCMP's position on the changes in Bill 70?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Following the introduction of the bill, we've had conversations with the RCMP. That's correct.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — What was the RCMP's position on the changes in Bill 70?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The discussions that were had with SACP [Saskatchewan Association of Chiefs of Police] and the RCMP were to collaborate. And once the bill was introduced, this is what we're looking to do and have discussions with our policing partners. We didn't ask for their position and they didn't provide it.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Just to clarify, are you saying that the RCMP didn't tell you what they think about the changes in Bill 70?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — No, they did not. And that wasn't the nature of the discussion. We didn't go to them asking for their opinion. We went to them to have a discussion about how we can work together.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — You mentioned the, you just mentioned the Saskatchewan Association of Chiefs of Police. Are you saying that they also didn't tell you their position on the changes in Bill 70?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The discussion we had with SACP and the concern they expressed was that we were creating a police force here. And once we had the opportunity to clarify what it was we were doing, you know, I don't . . . None of them had actually seen the bill, of course. And that we're looking to forge ahead with those collaborative relationships because we have to be able . . . any entity must work with the police. The local police have jurisdiction, and of course the RCMP are always involved at some level. And once the clarification was made, and you know, and the discussion that we had, they were okay.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Just to clarify the end of your comment, Minister, are you saying that the SACP are no longer concerned about anything in Bill 70?

[16:30]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Well I was part of that conversation, and with respect to how I saw the conversation, and my colleagues, no, there isn't an issue.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — What about Regina police?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — They're part of the SACP.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Correct, but did they provide you any feedback with respect to Bill 70 as well?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — As I said earlier, is that the concern that was expressed to us was that this was going to be a police force, a police service. Once we went through what it is we're proposing and what the function is going to be, there were no issues.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Okay. Just to reiterate, the Regina Police Service are . . . no longer have any concerns with respect to Bill 70?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Not as far as I'm aware. They certainly haven't expressed them. If they have concerns, haven't heard them.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Interesting. Okay, thank you. Ms. Wilson last night asked questions around security in MLAs' [Member of the Legislative Assembly] offices, and I believe the response was around offices that are in the Legislative Building. I have a question about security for MLAs' constituency offices, so outside of this building. If an MLA has a concern about a potential security threat even outside of this building, right now they would contact the Sergeant-at-Arms. Who should they contact after this bill is passed?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Specific to a concern in their constituency office, they may want to bring that up with the Sergeant-at-Arms. But depending on the situation, I would think their first call would be to the police agency of jurisdiction that their constituency office is in.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Right. Because after this bill is passed, the

Sergeant-at-Arms will no longer have the type of security purview that they currently have. So if an MLA has a concern about safety in their constituency office, subsequent to the passing of this bill, they should go straight to their local police force. Correct?

**Mr. McGovern:** — I think in terms of the preamble of what you said, I think our policing experts would say contact immediately a police service that has a response capacity in the location that you're at. So if you are in Arm River, for example, and you need an immediate response, then you should be talking to the police service that has immediate response jurisdiction within that.

There is absolutely no reason that you would not be able to continue to contact the Sergeant-at-Arms, for example, or the . . . if, in this context, if you wanted to talk to the director. But the Sergeant-at-Arms, with the Speaker, continues to have primary responsibility for privileges. If what you're suggesting is that it is an issue that may affect the ability of the MLA to exercise their privileges in the House, for example, to attend, in that case then that jurisdiction hasn't changed and won't change.

And so in your example the local police first, because that's who's going to keep . . . have a response capacity to keep you safe. But certainly there would be no problem raising that again for the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the collaboration that Mr. Cameron has discussed should allow for that discussion as to how best to attend to address that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So maybe just to clarify or give an example. If a member in . . . I've had a safety issue before outside of this building. Instead of calling just the local detachment's regular number, I have the ability right now to call the Sergeant-at-Arms who has a very direct connection to high levels at RPS who can then, you know, elevate the issue quickly. And the response I received was very quick.

If a member in Saskatoon has an issue, for example, they don't have to call just the detachment main line, they contact the Sergeant-at-Arms who has a connection to high levels at SPS [Saskatoon Police Service] to make sure that that issue gets elevated quickly and dealt with quickly. So that's where the concern is, that the Sergeant-at-Arms will not be that person anymore. And if not, will that be the director?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Sure. I think the answer would be that that certainly can still continue. I think the answer would still be that's not the recommendation, you know. And I'm more than aware that you're a highly competent professional. But in terms of, you know, a policing response to the inquiry that you've made, you know, that's a 911 element.

If there is someone who feels they are at immediate risk, you know, there is an immediate response team there, rather than saying, phone the . . . try and contact the Sergeant-at-Arms as a more effective method to seek an immediate response, wouldn't be how that policing, ordinarily policing response would be structured.

That being said, if you choose to continue to contact the Sergeant-at-Arms for that purpose, absolutely no problem. Nothing that will be done in the bill would remove your ability to contact the Sergeant-at-Arms for that purpose. If that's your

choice in Arm River rather than . . . or in your constituency for example, that rather than phoning the RPS or a 911, you chose to phone the Sergeant-at-Arms, this would in no way preclude their function in that regard.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Just to clarify, I'm not talking about an example where somebody is, like, immediately coming at me with a weapon. I'm talking about something that happens more common to probably all of us, where we receive some sort of threat online, for example. I'm not going to call 911 for that, but I want it handled and taken seriously. So we contact the Sergeant-at-Arms, who makes sure it immediately goes to . . . who speaks, connects with local police leaders to ensure that it's looked at quickly.

So I just want to ensure that that connection is still maintained, that that power is still available to all members and that ability is still there.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yes. Everything maintained. That ability for a member to go to the Sergeant-at-Arms with respect to anything, or the director, whatever the choice is, but the Sergeant-at-Arms will be available to take those inquiries, those calls.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So the members can now choose to either take their security concerns to the director or to the Sergeant-at-Arms?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — They can if it's, and I'm going to get Darcy to elaborate on this, if it's a question of, you know, parliamentary privilege or whatever the case may be, that would obviously have to go through the Sergeant-at-Arms.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — You know, I'm talking about outside of the legislative precinct, outside of the Chamber, our constituency offices, our homes — that sort of thing.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I'm going to get Darcy to answer that question.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thanks.

**Mr. McGovern:** — You know, all I can do I think is reiterate the . . . What you're describing right now isn't a jurisdictional exercise of the Sergeant-at-Arms with respect to what occurs in Arm River. He or she is not choosing to exercise a special statutory jurisdiction in that regard. So to the extent that the bill provides for increased authority for preserving, maintaining public peace, protecting life and property within the district, and protecting the privileges of the Assembly, which is parallel exactly to the Sergeant-at-Arms' functions with respect to security, then there is again, just to reiterate, there would be no problem raising that with the Sergeant-at-Arms if you thought that was the most effective method or a method that you're most comfortable with in moving forward to then circuitously contact a police service in that regard.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I suppose the concern is with a change in the Sergeant-at-Arms' jurisdiction to being just this Chamber — and being very clarified that it's just this Chamber — that the authority that they utilize right now, whether it's illicit in this statute or otherwise, will mean that they won't be the individual that members can contact if they do have security concerns outside of the legislative precinct and the Chamber.

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. And to the member, I think again as the point of clarification requested, that yes, the Sergeant-at-Arms would not have any different authority than they already have right now or don't have right now, depending on how you want to phrase jurisdiction, with respect to what occurs outside of the city, for example with respect to an MLA. So no change there.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Now historically, all-party agreements around security have served us well in the past. It for example successfully allowed us to ban indoor demonstrations. Why does this government think it's advisable to move away from all-party agreements around security?

[16:45]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The legislative district security unit is expected to collaborate and work with all members of the Legislative Assembly, all members of both sides of the House, and this bill does not stop that from happening. And they will be encouraged and are going to be encouraged to work explicitly with the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Speaker, and all members.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — However that's not what's in the legislation: 76.2(5), and we spoke about this last night, states that "The Director may make arrangements with the Speaker respecting services that the Director and the Speaker consider necessary . . ."

There's actually no mention in here about collaborating with all MLAs, all parties, and actually no mention that there's an expectation to make arrangements. There's just the allowance for. Why wasn't what you just said, Minister, in this legislation?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you. The reference that the member has made with respect to 76.2(5) is an important one and I think it . . . And just to clarify what it says. It says 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.

That provision is mirrored by the existing provision which is carried forward in 76.4 that:

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

So what this carries forward in the reference to the Speaker, Mr. Chair, is that the Speaker is the nominative focal point for the legislative arm of government, that that's who's responding qua Legislative Assembly within this context, that the Speaker would be able to speak on behalf of the membership of the Legislative Assembly as the Speaker of the House, rather than indicating specific reference — which hasn't occurred, as you say — in the existing legislation or in the bill that's being put forward as the methodology for the input on the security.

And so I think the reference to the Speaker is what's being discussed here, as the reference to the MLAs . . . who's represented as MLA. Not a party, not a government party, not a . . . Rather that it's the Speaker as a whole in that regard.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Correct. I'm not talking about the provision around the legislative precinct, which we all know just encompasses the floor of this Assembly. I'm talking about the legislative district, which is everything else. And that's where 76.2(5) falls in, as you well know, Mr. McGovern.

So my question again is, where in that subsection in that legislation does what the minister just stipulated fall?

**Mr. McGovern:** — And I think the . . . When I made the reference to 76.4, saying that the Speaker may make arrangements within the precinct, the reason for that cross-reference, I think, is the parallelism there: that the Speaker, as you say, right now within the precinct . . . and you're familiar with that process. This is the parallel process that's being discussed with respect to the director and making arrangements with the Speaker that's considered necessary. So it's a reference. Same methodology for referring to the Speaker.

Now you've had the minister's statement that the intent — and it's been mentioned by Mr. Cameron as well — on a functional level, that consultation, that discussion is going to be, continue to be an important part of informing how that works. And presumably that can be brought forward either to the director or through the Speaker to improve and inform how that moves forward. So we certainly don't view that as being antithetical to what's expressly being set up here to promote that sort of consultation.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — But again, the minister used the word "expectation." And for the legislative district — and again, we need to focus our discussion around the legislative district, not the legislative precinct — specific language in the legislation was used. That is not an expectation. It is an option.

So my question again is, why, if the minister says that it is going to be an expectation, why was that language not used in the legislation for the legislative district?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think when we look at the structure of the provision itself and where we . . . and again, making reference to the previous provision because it is a parallel, where it provides that the parties may make arrangements between themselves that the Speaker and the director consider necessary.

So considering "necessary," as the member well knows, is a discretionary aspect in and of itself, if the word, if there . . . And so ordinarily, you wouldn't say "shall" make arrangements that they then consider necessary. Because of course it invites one party or the other to just say they don't consider it to be necessary. The collaborative aspect of that is baked into this provision, I think, and that reflects the language that's here, as it reflects with the existing practice that I've previously mentioned in 76.4.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So just to clarify, are you saying that your opinion is that if the "may" in subclause (5) moved to "shall,"

that that would force the director and Speaker to make arrangements that both parties didn't think were necessary?

**Mr. McGovern:** — No.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Okay. What are you saying then?

**Mr. McGovern:** — I'm saying that the substance of the provision in (5) of 76.2 — as the existing provision provides and is reflected in 76.4(3) — has within it the requirement that the director and the Speaker consider it necessary collectively. That that is a collaborative process, and that that's what's being enshrined and promoted within the legislation in that regard.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So I guess my question is, if the Speaker feels that there needs to be a . . . Sorry, I'll get the exact wording of 76.2 again. If the Speaker considers an arrangement necessary for the legislative district, that there is an expectation that the director will make those accommodations?

**Mr. McGovern:** — The provision in 5, again as the mirror, 76.2 speaks to the director. That "The Director may make arrangements with the Speaker . . ." so that's the initiating process with respect to the Speaker, as conversely with the precinct, the Speaker makes the ". . . arrangements with the Government of Saskatchewan . . ." And so in a functional way, I don't think it's going to turn on who initiates the conversation, how the conversation works.

We've also made clear that the director's responsible for the security of the legislative district, as is . . . the Speaker continues to have the responsibility with respect to the legislative precinct. And the absolute thrust of the legislation is that they should work together, that that should be collaborative, and they should inform each other. And I think that's, you know, in large part what our policing experts have indicated is one of the key aspects of the Act.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So subsection (5) is a provision that essentially the director would trigger, is that correct?

**Mr. McGovern:** — It authorizes the director to be able to make those arrangements in the same way that the Speaker is authorized to make the arrangements with respect to 76.4(3), and it is an aspect of the co-operation that they want to build in here.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. I believe Ms. Mowat is going to be chitting in for me for a few moments while I go get my kids from daycare. You haven't seen the last of me, but I'll be back. Ms. Mowat will be chitting in, if that's all right with you, Mr. Chair.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So thank you. I'll give you an initial warning that I am not a lawyer, so I don't well know many of the legal implications that have been discussed here. So if I ask more follow-up questions than Ms. Sarauer, then that is understood. But I don't think I am qualified to pick up her children from child care either because they barely know who I am. So this is probably a more appropriate role here.

And actually, before we get started, I think Ms. Wilson is actually going to ask some questions.

**The Chair:** — Well we'll recognize Ms. Wilson.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well I've been in this business for a while. I think we were elected, Minister, the same year, 2007. So I've made many contacts across Saskatchewan and the territories and regions in Canada. And I was reaching out to some of the colleagues across the country, discussions about Bill 70. What were their concerns or challenges about Bill 70?

And while there was some debate that was varied, the same theme has occurred in our discussion, and that is that the Speaker of the Assembly needs a good working relationship, a positive relationship with security, as he has probably today. It's an open door policy. And bricks and mortar is one thing in the building, but human relationships is another. And we build human relationships, and that's what we thrive on, and that's how things move along forward.

So probably the first staff that the Speaker sees every morning will be the security at the door. And they probably welcome each other and chat and ask, how's the weather? And I don't think they probably discuss the security at the door just yet.

[17:00]

But I've heard so many stories of courtesy and professionalism and kindness involving the Sergeant-at-Arms and the security. Once the Speaker locked himself out and the security was able to come, no problem, and unlock his office. So, Minister, can you guarantee the same courtesy and human kindness from this new agency? Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Are you able to clarify who you consulted with across the country?

**Ms. Wilson:** — No, not at this time. I have many friends, colleagues, MLAs across the territories. These are probably a few MLAs, backbenchers, that you wouldn't recognize since you've been in cabinet for so many years. So I've probably travelled around the world with these MLAs and got to know them and we became friends. So I just reach out to them. Thank you.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Sure. The short answer is yes, and the longer answer is in continuation of the comments that Assistant Deputy Minister Cameron made in what's the expected competencies that individuals will bring to this position. It has long been our position as leaders and hiring managers that we hire people of good character who understand respect and respectfulness and trustworthiness. And the common courtesy that goes with that type of behaviour will be an essential basic requirement for these individual officers to portray in their . . . whether it be in their interview or their application for the jobs.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you for that answer. We did discuss last night 1.6 million, I believe, for this new security force. But what is the cost to our social structure, Minister, our new social culture? And what are we trying to preserve? Is Bill 70 going to preserve the culture that we love and hold dear? And where is the direction coming from, Ms. Minister? Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Are you able to . . . Can you please clarify what you mean by culture, what you mean by social structure?

**Ms. Wilson:** — Madam Minister, we need unity and harmony immediately to heal divisions created these past two years, and

we don't need to turn this building into a fortress. We need to be open and transparent. We don't need bodyguards. We need unity. Thank you.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Again the individuals that we hire for these positions will understand the history, the culture, and you know, the provincial tradition and love for democracy that comes with this building. And should they not bring that type of attitude to their position, or should we find out that perhaps we made a mistake in relation to the attitude that they portray, then they will be dealt with, you know, accordingly in relation to PSC process.

But we feel that the screening that we put in place, the expectations that we have, whether it's in our previous careers of hiring police officers or hiring people in security fields, that that customer service aspect and competency that they bring will be an expectation.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you. A former Saskatchewan government decades ago created a security force that was awfully similar to what appears to be created with Bill 70. And like what we've seen in this committee and in the debates on the floor of this Assembly about Bill 70, secrecy was key. A former principal secretary to the premier at the time later admitted that the secrecy was important, important because the government felt that the operation would be politically flogged in the media.

Madam Minister, are you refusing to be forthcoming about this bill, about the purpose of this bill to avoid political fallout similar to that last government that created a security force responsible for the minister and ministry? Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — We think that what is presented in Bill 70 will provide an enhanced security unit for access in this building and the grounds outside this building. The accountability that is based, or will be part of the members of the security unit being accountable under *The Police Act*, there's expectations that will be laid out with respect to, you know, who's going to be hired and, you know, and how they're going to be hired and what criteria that we're looking for here. And we are anticipating that we will have a very well-trained . . . And being trained will also increase the professionalism of the people that are doing the job. And so we fully anticipate that we will get a much better, comprehensive, collective service through Bill 70.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. The opposition at the time, decades ago according to the press after the fact, found political hypocrisy in creating a security force similar to what Bill 70 may be creating today. And at that time, the government had told Saskatchewan people to tighten their belts while the government doled out expensive security and surveillance contracts quietly. Today times are tough, as we all know, and we're asked to tighten our belts. We have another mysterious security force being created.

Does the minister see any hypocrisy in this bill to do this in such an economic and political climate, or is the political climate exactly the reason for Bill 70? Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — There's absolutely nothing mysterious about Bill 70. And I'm not going to be speaking to what happened 20 years ago. I wasn't here. You weren't here. And this service will be, this unit will be structured to ensure that people are as safe

and secure as possible in this building and in the grounds.

The type of people, and Mr. Cameron has stated that, that the type of people that you hire will definitely affect the professionalism of any security unit. We are anticipating that the selection process will be rigorous and . . . Oh and of course, they're going through the PSC. And we anticipate that this will be an enhanced security unit looking out, not just within the building, but outside the building, which currently isn't the case.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. So you're saying that the catalyst for Bill 70 does not come from any paranoia about political opposition or perceived surveillance, or the opposite, a desire to quell political opposition and carry out surveillance?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Could you repeat the beginning of that question?

**Ms. Wilson:** — So you, Minister, are saying that there's no paranoia for Bill 70 about political opposition or perceived surveillance by another threat or an opposition? You're saying Bill 70 is only coming for the good of the people. Is that what you're saying?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The changes, the bill you see in front of you, will allow non-partisan civil servants access to broad policing and public safety network available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety.

Policing services and security services 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. For example, a report was published last spring by CSIS, Canadian Security Intelligence Service, and they talked about the exacerbated . . .

The . . . pandemic has exacerbated xenophobic and anti-authority narratives . . . Some violent extremists view COVID-19 as a real but welcome crisis that could hasten the collapse of Western society.

These are not my words. They are the words of CSIS officials.

Other violent extremist entities have adopted conspiracy theories about the pandemic in an attempt to rationalize and justify violence . . . 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 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 some of these issues. We respect the parliamentary function of the Sergeant-at-Arms and its office, and we cannot ignore that these issues that I referred to still and continue to occur.

[17:15]

Bill 70 and the legislative district security unit is based on a number of conversations that we've had with respected security

officials across this country. We've also witnessed instances and issues here in Saskatchewan. All jurisdictions are having a discussion — whether it's now or have or will have — with respect to how security is presented in the provincial legislatures. These are the reasons why Bill 70 is before you today.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. It was a few years ago that the head of the security force similar to what could be created with Bill 70 was someone who was highly trained, with much experience and experience with intelligence gathering, exactly what we've heard the minister say she's looking for in the director for this security force. His name was Harry Stienwand.

And several years later, the equivalent of what would be the director in Bill 70 left that role in unclear circumstances. Mr. Stienwand was charged with seven counts of fraud related to hiring a private security firm during this time as a director of that security force in Saskatchewan. And once again, this could be very similar to what could be created with Bill 70. And as we know, past behaviour is the best predictor of future behaviour.

So as you can see, Madam Minister, the public has been very concerned and coming to me with these questions. Why do you need more bodyguards in this beautiful building that belongs to the public, while in rural Saskatchewan, nothing's happening? So you can see why we're concerned about Bill 70 simply because of previous experiences with ministry-led security forces. Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Well I can't speak to the situation that the member referred to. I am not aware of it and nor can I speak to it. But what I can speak to is what we will have in the province of Saskatchewan. We'll have a security unit that is accountable under *The Police Act*. They are accountable to the members. This will be, I would suggest, probably the most transparent and accountable legislative security unit that we've ever had.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I appreciate your heartfelt remarks. And I know you're trying to protect the public as well as the staff. And security staff are trying to protect everyone. If it is really heartfelt, I would like you to tell the public exactly what has happened — what have you heard — to the cabinet or to other MLAs, so they can understand why you need additional security, Madam Minister. Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The purpose of Bill 70 and the proposed changes to legislative security is to enhance security of the Legislative Building and the surrounding area. The changes will allow non-partisan civil servants access to broad policing and public safety networks available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Police services and security 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.

The purpose of Bill 70 is to build and provide an enhanced security unit in the Legislative Building and beyond.

**Ms. Wilson:** — Thank you very much, Madam Minister. It's been a pleasure asking you questions and getting some good answers. So I appreciate your heartfelt answers. And I will turn it over to the other members. Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I recognize Ms. Mowat.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I might just say that I find it incredibly frustrating to receive the same verbatim answer from the minister multiple times here. I think that if we were asking the same verbatim question that that might be appropriate. But I would ask you to take that under consideration, Mr. Chair, that if she's providing the same verbatim answer to different questions that it might not necessarily be a fruitful use of the committee's time.

**The Chair:** — No. Appreciate that, but the minister can provide a response even if it's a decline. And so the minister can answer; she can take notice; she can orally decline the question. The minister may decline with or without reason in committee. So this is where we are. We're in committee as opposed to question period. This is totally different. The minister can decide, so however she wants to answer is . . . It was within order. Thank you.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you. So I suppose I will just point out that I find it very disappointing to see a verbatim answer repeated.

With regards to some of these questions that have been just asked here, I have a couple of follow-up questions. The minister has referenced a CSIS report a couple of times now in my presence while I've been observing the committee. Can she clarify which report she's referring to?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — It's a public report, online.

**Ms. Mowat:** — What is the name of the report, date of publication? Just what are you referencing?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I can get that information to you when we have it.

**A Member:** — We're looking for it right now actually.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Okay. You'll bring it back to the committee once you have the name? Okay. Thank you.

There have been a number of comments about what other jurisdictions are doing in relation to legislative security, and the minister has been mentioning the fact that all jurisdictions are considering changes to security or maybe most jurisdictions are considering changes to security at this time. So my question is, what is the impetus for Saskatchewan to have to trailblaze on this legislation to create a unique model that does not yet exist in other jurisdictions? What is the rush in our province, if other jurisdictions are carefully considering these changes?

**Mr. McGovern:** — To the member, as the member has alluded to, what is being proposed is a Saskatchewan approach that has been based on a made-in-Saskatchewan solution that will be the best for Saskatchewan.

You have referred to some of the other provinces. You are aware that British Columbia, for example, underwent a security review within recent years, an independent review of the Sergeant-at-Arms. That report made recommendations that the Sergeant-at-Arms' roles would be recast significantly, with a new director of security position created to have responsibility for all matters

pertaining to the security of the legislative precinct. Manitoba was referenced in terms of looking at security in a way that would propose amendments to the legislation to provide that you would have a chief legislative security officer under the province's public service legislation.

So having a process here that is appointed through the Public Service Commission — with a set criteria under that independent commission — has been identified as being the best practice available, that by having accountability within that structure under *The Police Act* rather than as an entirely separate, unique process, that their accountability under *The Police Act* would be an important aspect of this if there is a complaint, for example, through that complaints structure.

Additionally the SIRT [serious incident response team] process would apply with respect to these individuals, so if there were a serious incident that required a response, the new process under SIRT would apply to these individuals.

[17:30]

So the member has asked a question about what in Saskatchewan would be different with respect to what's being proposed. And I think it's that accountability as well as, as has been mentioned several times, the need to speak to the siloing that has occurred with respect to movement from, in our case, from Albert Street to the front, through the front into the building. And to have a process that would allow for the best possible communication between those different agencies. And I think that's what our police professionals have been recommending to us in that regard.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So specifically I asked what the rush was. What is the rationale for rushing through the process and not completing our own security review that is based on our models in this province? Which my understanding is that there are different models in different provinces, different amounts of buildings, different resources, that it is actually quite difficult to compare between jurisdictions.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — In 2014 there was a security study done. Few, if any, of those actions or those recommendations have ever been implemented or actioned. I fail to understand the member referring to this process as rushing through anything. We've had debate on the floor of the legislature. We'll have a number of hours in committee, whatever that may be. There is nothing about rushing this process. Legislation is tabled, and the process unfolds as it needs to.

And so with respect to that security report, albeit I have not seen it, but my understanding from those close to it that nothing has been actioned. It was a good idea at that point in time, with nothing been actioned, that we as government must take that step to ensure that safety and security in this building and beyond is addressed.

I had one more thing, and I lost it. But anyway, my failure to understand the issue of rushing . . . Oh, I know what it was. That, I guess, we do know and understand that if something were to happen in this building or on the grounds, and we're aware of areas that needed improvement and didn't make them, it wouldn't be the opposition that they would be coming to. It

would be the Government of Saskatchewan. The government has undertaken to place this bill in front of you, and this process has unfolded as it needed to.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So a couple of questions about the process. You referenced the 2014 security review, and I believe that process happened through the Board of Internal Economy. That also predates my time as an MLA. But I find it quite alarming that the minister would not have even seen the last security review, when we are talking about a very large-scale security change here.

And I'm struggling to understand the rationale behind the fact that those recommendations were not implemented, when my understanding of those recommendations are that they have nothing to do with the bill that is in front of us today, that they are quite distinct from the bill that is in front of us today. I fail to understand how not reading the last security review is seen as appropriate by this government.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The security review that I referred to was provided to the Board of Internal Economy and the Speaker. I have not seen a copy of this review.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So I think that points to one of the central concerns that I have as a member of the Board of Internal Economy who has requested repeatedly and in some quite public ways that this process go to the Board of Internal Economy. One of the central concerns is, why has the process that has been used in the past been circumvented in this situation, and what is the rationale for intentionally circumventing that process?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The government has determined that the professional and the skill and the expertise in the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety is the best way to deal with security issues and concerns that could be or will be or can be in this building and the grounds. The Board of Internal Economy is in no way structured to be able to move quickly and to make decisions quickly, and the ministry is where the expertise in security and policing exists. And that's where the decision making needs to happen.

**Ms. Mowat:** — So to be clear, I would submit that this conversation should have happened at the Board of Internal Economy. I find it disrespectful that I'm not even getting eye contact. This is a conversation that has typically taken place at the BOIE [Board of Internal Economy]. If there is a significant desire by government to take over that process and remove it from the existing process, at minimum that conversation should exist with BOIE members.

The statement about the BOIE moving slowly, I completely reject the premise of that. We've asked for BOIE meetings. We would meet . . . The BOIE could call a meeting at 9 p.m. tonight. We would be there to have this conversation, and there would be an ability for those . . .

**Mr. McLeod:** — Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Hang on. Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chair, just a point of order. I would ask that the member get to a question. She's making a long preamble, if that is in fact what she's getting at, but we're here to ask



questions of the minister and ministry. I would ask that she get to her question if she has one.

[17:45]

**The Chair:** — Yeah. As long as the member gets to her point, that's what I'm waiting for. So I'm waiting for the member to get to her question or point, but you still have the floor.

**Ms. Mowat:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Has the BOIE . . . Has the minister asked the BOIE to be called? Has there been a delay in that process that she can point to that supports her point that the BOIE cannot act quickly on this?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — As we are all aware that this is a government bill, and as the Minister Responsible for Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, I was tasked, my ministry was tasked with coming up and arriving at what you see now in Bill 70. We believe that the best debate in a democracy happens on the floor of the legislature. This bill has been debated on the floor of the legislature and we're now in committee, rather than utilizing a very closed-door system such as the BOIE.

The BOIE can obviously continue to look after matters under the Sergeant-at-Arms and with the Speaker. And I envision that continuing, however I have no say in that. But the most active and lively, informative debate happens on the floor of the legislature. And we believe that this bill and any related issues that may arise as we move forward should be debated on the floor of the legislature.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Ms. Sarauer.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you, Minister. In the interests of openness and transparency and democracy, who in cabinet directed your ministry to come forward with this bill?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Ms. Sarauer, you asked that question knowing I cannot say and will not answer that question.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, as you know and you've indicated already, this legislation, *The Legislative Assembly Act*, came before the House with some changes to the definition of "Legislative Precinct" in 2019. Why isn't a change similar to that being considered now?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Mr. Chair, and to the member, when you say "similar to that," do you mean . . .

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Sorry, I should be more specific. So in one of the minister's answers, she indicated that the amendments to the legislation in 2019 were to address some security concerns at that time. I guess my first question is, why has cabinet and the ministry deemed that not sufficient?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I wasn't involved in these discussions in 2019. However my understanding is that the change that was done in 2019 was actually done to try and address what Bill 70 is addressing today. The efficacy of that change did signal to government that the security unit is not providing, isn't able to provide what is needed in the year 2022.

2019 was obviously before the pandemic. What has happened

with that is that it's heightened rhetoric. People's behaviour toward each other, you know, more violence, and I hate to use that word because it denotes something . . . but people more aggressive. You know, frequent lines are crossed with respect to threats and intimidation and harassment.

So what that one issue . . . and what we did in 2019 was really, if we look back on it and having the benefit of hindsight, is that what we were really trying to fix and what we were really trying to address is something Bill 70 addresses today.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — The legislative changes in 2019 went through all stages on the same day because conversations happened prior to that by both sides that allowed for that to happen. Why was a different approach taken to this?

[18:00]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The changes that the member refers to in 2019 were very specific changes, very narrow in scope. Bill 70 is a structural change. It is not set out to address a specific security inadequacy that was noticed. It is to deal with the structural issues that we see happening with the security unit, and hence the most appropriate place for this to be debated is in the House, is on the floor of the legislature.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — *The Legislative Assembly Act* has rarely, if ever, been amended without all-party consent. So my question again is, why is that tradition being breached today?

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** — Mr. Ottenbreit.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Mr. Chair, would it be okay to grant a five-minute recess for a few of the committee members to have a break?

**The Chair:** — Yeah. Five minutes seems more than fair. Yes. We'll be back at the call of the Chair. Thank you.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

**The Chair:** — Hello everyone, and welcome back to the Committee of Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. Ms. Sarauer, you still have the floor. Oh, wait a minute.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I was waiting for an answer, I have been told

**The Chair:** — Okay. Minister, and then Ms. Sarauer. Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. And it was about legislation. Oh, man. Okay. I'm just going to answer it and if you have any questions following that, by all means.

[18:15]

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Sounds good.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Each piece of legislation is, it's on a case-by-case basis, right? And in this particular case the fullness, it was deemed that the breadth and the scope of Bill 70 required it to go on the floor of the Assembly and be debated and go to committee.

I don't know if that answers your question.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. I appreciate that. Minister, can you describe whether any, after this bill comes into force, whether visitors to this building will experience any changes in terms of how they encounter security? And if so, how?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So I guess from the premise of what you would actually see from a change in security, at the first part of this we won't see really anything change because there'll be some time to go through a set-up and getting to doing the evaluation, what's required, and how that's all going to look.

As we move forward and we get into establishing the actual LDSU and we build our protocols, the systems in place, really there's not . . . For a person coming into the building, they won't see a change there really to access the building. They will have the same ability. If somebody's coming here for a purpose that is lawful and appropriate with the building, they of course will be able to access the building like they have always been able to access it.

What people will see is, I mean, they will see uniformed security personnel now that are attached to the LDSU. They may see that static patrol that I referred to earlier. They may realize that there are security members now walking around the perimeter of the building.

But they won't see a presence that will be overbearing or not trying to hinder anybody's access. Internally what you'd see in the building is again some uniformed presence. You would see the Sergeant-at-Arms' staff working with the LDSU staff. These are the things that the public will see.

Behind that would be the interoperability and the connectivity of the two security elements — communication from the point of view of exchanging information, and security information that may relate to threats, for example, if there was somebody that was known that may be trying to disrupt the sittings or anything like that. But what there will be is an increased presence.

Now whether or not the public actually notices that, I can't say. Like I mentioned, they will see some of those uniformed members. And of course they'll see the commissionaires as well that would be in the normal access and egress points as they always have been, or at least how I envision it, it would be.

I think from the point of view . . . And I think, to the points that were made by the other member, is that the expectation would be that those LDSU — in fact, not an expectation, actually it's a mandate — it would be their mandate to be working with everybody that would come into the building, ensure that they are providing that service and a standard of service delivery that is . . . Well quite frankly, it's a friendly place.

We don't want this to become, I think somebody mentioned about a fortress. This certainly is not the intention, and that's not the expectation that we would have for any of our folks that were working inside of that LDSU. Collaboration, positive service delivery, friendly faces, and that's important. This is the people's legislature and they need to be able to come in here and experience what goes on here, and in safety.

And I think ultimately that's the issue, is making sure that it's as safe as it can be for anybody that comes here. I think that's probably what most people will see.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. So specifically, right now when a visitor comes to the building, they exchange their photo ID [identification] for a visitor pass. They go through the metal detectors, and then they're connected with a person who works in the building who will then escort them to wherever they're going. Will that process change in any way?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So from the point of when people come to the building, and as you described, they would go through a certain process. In a modern situation in today's world where we have an established security protocol like that, I don't foresee any change to that. It's well established as a best practice.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Will anybody who currently has a pass in this building need to go through screening criteria again to be reissued their pass through the new LDSU once it comes into force?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So I guess at this point I can't really comment on how the issuing of the passes are done here. Certainly once the legislation passes, and if it passes and we go into setting up the LDSU, that'll be one of the protocols. We'll work with the Sergeant-at-Arms and the building itself to figure out how that all works. At this point though I'm just not informed at how that actually works, so I can't provide comment on that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, you mentioned before that you feel security in this building should be taking a more proactive approach. Can you explain what you mean by that?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Proactive policing or proactive security is considered to be a cornerstone of policing in this modern era. I'll turn it over to Dale Larsen to further highlight what proactive means in this regard.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Thank you. Proactive in the concept of the question that you're asking, Ms. Sarauer, is really identifying those things that we could either harden the target of the building or increase the competency of the people providing security to the building. So for example, in policing and common security assessments there's the CPTED process, that's crime prevention through environmental design.

So there's people that are trained in that process that will come in and look at potential concerns in the building and the external portions of the building. For example, is there good lighting at night for people walking to the parking lot? Is there brush that needs to be removed so that, you know, it decreases the opportunity for people to hide and those types of things and as well as, you know, door security, window security, those types of things.

And we also look at the proactive approach in relation to training security officers. And we do that through, as Rob had initially said, through their basic training and their skills that they'll develop once they're in the unit.

But we also do tabletop exercises. We do those in conjunction with the other policing agencies that we would expect to

coordinate resources with, should an incident actually happen. And by doing those types of scenario-based training processes, we're more ready and readily accessible to assess and deal with a situation as it happens, you know, instantly, basically. So those types of things are that proactive nature that we ensure are in place. You know, hopefully we won't have a situation that we have to deal with, but we're always on the ready for those types of things that when they do happen.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So several of those examples you've mentioned are types of things that are included in the 2014 security review. I guess my question again is why aren't the recommendations in the 2014 security review being looked at for implementation?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — That question is best directed to the Speaker and BOIE.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — But, Minister, you've said that this was a direction from cabinet. You do have members of cabinet who are at BOIE. So my question is, why wasn't the direction to implement the recommendations from the 2014 review? Why was this bill chosen instead?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I cannot speak to what happens at the BOIE. And those questions — and you know, good questions — the one who can answer the question or will take the question is the Speaker because that's where the responsibility lies. It does not lie with my ministry nor does it lie with the officials here today.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Right now, yes. But the ministry is going to take over what the Speaker has control over, and that's the whole crux of why we're here to begin with. So if the ministry wants to take over this responsibility, why haven't the recommendations from 2014 been considered?

[18:30]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I do not know specifically what the recommendations are. Never had access to the report because the report is at BOIE.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Have you requested that information from the members of BOIE who are at cabinet?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I've never had a discussion about what went on at BOIE with respect to this security analysis report. Because as I . . . I mean, the contents of what happens at BOIE is not a subject that we have discussion about.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I guess my question is, why does the ministry feel that the Sergeant-at-Arms isn't currently equipped to take the proactive approach that your ministry has just described?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The changes as presented here with Bill 70 allow the non-partisan civil servants across the broad policing network and public safety network available through the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Policing services and security agencies across the country have seen an increase to public safety threats and risks associated with not only the pandemic, but also the heightened political rhetoric in recent years.

I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Cameron to highlight the

structural changes that are being proposed in Bill 70 and how they will significantly impact in a positive way, enhance the security in this building.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you very much. So I guess I'll start with just some of the immediate impacts to the internal security as it relates to the LDSU as well as the Sergeant-at-Arms, obviously that increased collaboration, the removal of the silos if you will. Certainly we will, you know, be able to improve the communication back and forth, leverage the information that we would obtain through our various sources, assist each other in providing that security footprint inside the building itself.

Beyond that obviously there's the . . . As a collective or co-operative group you can reach out into the greater policing network, certainly leveraging the relationships we would have with RPS, the RCMP, even some of the agencies such as, well, Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan, our PPS [provincial protective services] branch for example. There's another entity that we can certainly leverage in the cases. And I think the best example again, and we've talked about it before, is the convoy event where in this model we're able to leverage all those different resources.

And so if you have an emergent or an emergency situation, if there's a significant, even a natural disaster, something that would strike the building here, I mean, security itself . . . We talk a lot about individuals coming in to do bad things. But security is actually more than that because there are some times when you have issues that are environmental in nature, plow winds, things like that. So if we had to mobilize a large contingent here quickly, we have that ability to reach out very, very rapidly and through a command-and-control structure that can leverage a lot of resources to bring them to the aid of the building. So these are certainly some of the most fundamental structural changes that we would see under this model. We've also talked about the ability to leverage other intelligence areas, and can share that information back and forth.

I think what might be an important conversation right now is to talk about some of the integration and collaboration type of things that we've envisioned with this particular security model. And if I can start with sort of the building itself as an entity, obviously any kind of organization like this needs some kind of governance. And I recognize for sure the fact that we have, or would have under that model, two distinct operating security forces, but they need to work together in collaboration.

So part of that would be a governance committee of some sort that would involve obviously me as the ADM [assistant deputy minister], and then potentially the Speaker or some other delegate that the Speaker may name, to have that ability to work collaboratively in the House here. And so that is one piece of governance. But also that part of governance becomes then an ability to set a tone or a direction with regard to how that service is going to be provided in this legislature. Things that were spoken about earlier, you know, engaging with the public and how that would happen, we can set those directions, those policies, you know, standard operating procedures through that communication of that governance.

The other part is looking at how an operational committee might function inside of this environment. So in that sort of, if you can

call it where-the-rubber-hits-the-road type of committee, you're talking about the actual physical security provision inside of the House here. And so that would involve the director of security obviously, the Sergeant-at-Arms, but it also would include some outside partners — or they're not really outside partners; they're actually attached to government already — but the CSOs from the Wascana Centre for example, who have a part in sort of that concentric circles that I was talking about yesterday. They're a part of that. And then of course the police force of jurisdiction, which is Regina Police Service. So key partners, big stakeholders, people that need to be involved in that operational conversation as we look at delivering this type of service.

And then beyond that, the next layer as I would envision it, would be then that external information sharing and security committees or . . . And that's an ad hoc name. I mean, I don't know if that's what it'd be called, but there's something to that effect or at least with that sort of that *raison d'être*, if you will. And that would provide a venue to share information and the trends related to security that we're seeing, not only here but across a bigger macro picture.

Those are the kind of things that allow us to, from a security point of view, to prepare for what might be the next issue that may face this building and anybody that's visiting this building. People involved in that obviously, as we've been talking about the legislative district security unit, the Sergeant-at-Arms, RCMP, RPS, PPS. But now we're getting also potentially into the Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan. And I'm not sure how familiar you are with that, but they're a group that obviously is almost like a clearing house for intelligence. And most law enforcement entities inside the province belong to that, but not the Sergeant-at-Arms at this point in time.

And then lastly, I will get into another group that involves all the main sectors within, and sectors being government, provision of power, electricity, gas, and basically the critical infrastructures of the province. And that group, critical infrastructure advisory network — and I don't know if you've heard of that — CIAN, they're sort of referred to. Yes, we do love the acronyms. So it refers to that.

CIAN is a very good group that I think it would be important to belong to, because they talk about the bigger picture of everything going on and what impacts . . . When I mentioned something about natural disasters, for example, those are people that have experts internally into that group that can advise us on how we can do things. Hence the name, you know, the critical advisory network but . . . or critical infrastructure advisory network.

So that's a whole lot of structural change that we can bring together from this model of security. And probably I'll leave it at that for now, I think.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. I believe Ms. Young has a few questions.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Ms. Young.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to circle back to something that was mentioned about 20 minutes ago, and forgive me if I don't get that acronym quite right. As you rightly noted,

there are several.

I believe the term used was crime prevention through environmental design. And this was referenced as a potential structural change that could be undertaken.

And just to make sure I'm not out in left field here, that's potentially making physical changes to, you know, hypothetically the building or the grounds to adapt to risks identified to the building, the people, wherever that place may be. Is that a fair layperson's characterization?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Yes, to potential risks identified.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. So you know, recognizing we are talking about security, which is quite important, a lot of the discussion over the past couple nights has really centred around those worst case, kind of unthinkable acts. And I realize the work being contemplated is to consider those unthinkable acts, you know, active shooter, whatever that might be.

So I guess given that there's been some consideration given to this crime prevention through environmental design . . . And we're talking about, you know, these terrible risks. But as was noted, they're not only going to be active shooter risks or, you know, terrorism threats or anything like that. Do you know how many tickets have been issued in or around the Legislative Building since 2020?

[18:45]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Any tickets — traffic tickets, parking tickets — anything like that is not under the purview of this ministry.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Right, but I imagine it would be, with the expansion of the legislative precinct and, you know, the changes that would be implemented with the passage of Bill 70. So that wouldn't be information that would have been canvassed in regards to . . .

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — No. No, it was not.

**Ms. A. Young:** — So there wouldn't be information available as to how many, even, you know, like criminal charges related to activities in and around the legislature since say 2020, would have occurred.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — This is again not under the purview of this ministry.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Right. And I suppose my reason for asking is, with so much of the commentary in this Chamber and outside of it focusing on heightened risks, and references have been made to, you know, risk assessments undertaken as a part of the contemplation of Bill 70, I guess I'm . . . Just to be clear, there was no information sought in regards to establishing how many tickets, any criminal charges, anything resulting in convictions.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety does not have access to this data.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you, Minister. And to be clear, that information was never sought?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — It wasn't part of our analysis as to why the enhanced security unit is being requested as illustrated by Bill 70. The matrix, the scale that was used to determine what was required, after the ministry officials had a look at it, came back with what was required based on not parking tickets, not traffic tickets. It's based on much more than that, so no, it was not.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you, Minister Tell. And you know, to that end I appreciate it wouldn't be based on necessarily parking tickets, but you know, the security concerns that have been cited as a cause, an impetus for the introduction of Bill 70.

I suppose just to be clear again for the committee and the record, you know, even going beyond those traffic violations, things like . . . I'm not a lawyer. There are many in the room. But you know, more concerning things, uttering threats against people or places. There's, just to be clear, there was no knowledge of whether any charges have actually been laid as it would relate to this building.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Putting a framework to the unit that is built on protection and a protective service as opposed to a police agency that works, you know, you could debate it, primarily from an enforcement perspective, some of them — and crime prevention should be the primary focus of any police agency — but the consideration of the framework that we've provided for a secure environment, a secure grounds, and safety for the people in this building was based from a perspective of a protection type of framework, not so much a law enforcement, hard type of, you know, arrest and control type of perspective.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. And I suppose my question is, hearing what you're saying about this, you know, being focused on mitigation and anticipating risks as opposed to the enforcement side, I guess my — maybe it's not a question, maybe it's more of a reflection — is more I'm surprised to hear that that wasn't based on real-world information about, you know, concerns or threats or parking tickets, speeding tickets, or otherwise as it would relate to the legislature and its contemplated expanded precinct.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I appreciate the comments from the member, and the approach that we're taking is a proactive approach. We're not waiting for things to happen. The structure as outlined in Bill 70 will ensure that that happens in a strategic, professional way and . . . But I thank the member for her comments.

**Ms. A. Young:** — So hearing that that information wasn't sought for the legislature, the contemplated expanded precinct, was this information sought for the constituency offices of members?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Constituency offices are not under the purview of what's laid out in the legislation or under the district or under the precinct. That is not to say that the current Sergeant-at-Arms as it exists . . . I know from experience and other accounts that they can be helpful to members should they experience issues or concerns, not of an immediate nature but something that, you know, they just ask for the advice. That's all I'd say.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you, Minister. You rightly note that I think many members have experienced that service through the current Sergeant-at-Arms. So again just to make sure I'm fully understanding, in building this risk matrix, in making a recommendation to cabinet in regards to Bill 70 and its necessity

for improving security in this building and, you know, for all members as has been stated by government members, there's no knowledge of any tickets, charges, or convictions as it would relate to the legislature or constituency offices of members. Like, none of that information would exist.

[19:00]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — If there were incidents around my constituency office by chance, I guess the RPS would have that information. Doesn't necessarily have to be reported by me, but I have not been aware of any incidents that have occurred. As I said, the constituency offices themselves are outside the purview of the legislative precinct and the legislative district.

**Ms. A. Young:** — And will be under this new legislative security force?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Oh, of course. And it speaks to the collaborative nature. I don't know if you were present earlier when I went through this in detail about what the director and/or Sergeant-at-Arms . . . Sergeant-at-Arms is still available. That doesn't change anything. If a member is at immediate risk, we anticipate them not phoning the Sergeant-at-Arms, but calling 911. The Sergeant-at-Arms can be notified of course if the member chooses — there's no imperative here — and/or the director as laid out in Bill 70. That's the member's choice if they choose to. Nothing is making them do so.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Minister, could you foresee a situation in which some members may choose to go through the Sergeant-at-Arms and others would go through the director of legislative security?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I guess so. If that option is open to members, they can make that choice themselves.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you for your indulgence. One further question on this, circling back to the conversation around how the legislative security force wasn't in the business of enforcement necessarily, but rather prevention, anticipation. Under the new model, who will be responsible for issuing tickets in the legislative precinct?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I need you to clarify. The legislative precinct under the new system is right here on the floor.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Pardon me.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — So I don't know if you have people driving around in cars . . .

**Ms. A. Young:** — I certainly hope not. Pardon me, legislative district. Thank you.

**Mr. Cameron:** — So thanks for the question. So I'll kind of break it down into the different parts here. So from the point of view of the legislative district security officers, they would have the powers of arrest. They would have the powers to be able to lay charges within the district. And that's the confines of the Act, right, how it's defined in the Act. And these are the same powers of arrest that, for example, a police officer would have or a conservation officer may have in certain circumstances within

their jurisdiction proper.

When you go outside of that, so if you were to go out to the front of the sidewalk here on the inside perimeter of the sidewalk — and it's a little hard to explain without a map — but on the inside perimeter, they have a jurisdiction there and they can lay those charges. But their primary role won't be charging people for provincial offences or things like that. They're a security organization first. Primary mandate is to protect this building, protect those grounds.

And so if there was an occurrence, I would foresee more . . . Potentially you could have an assault that took place, for example, on the grounds. I see more of that interconnection, but not necessarily would they be out there with a ticket book, for example, to lay a charge of maybe a liquor offence of some sort or whatnot. Doesn't mean they couldn't, but that's not their primary role.

Beyond that, once you get past that jurisdiction, then we have the CSOs, the Wascana Centre CSOs. Police force have jurisdiction, and potentially other peace officers or special constables that would have authority and jurisdiction within the province of Saskatchewan. So that's how it would kind of break down.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you, Mr. Cameron. You know, you spoke just now about the primary goal being protecting the building and people in it. But earlier in the discussion tonight you talked about, you know, establishing a threshold for threat, and one of the examples that you cited was the likelihood that somebody would disrupt proceedings potentially, or disrupt the building.

Again I suspect there would be agreement around, you know, concern for stopping those extreme situations that have been discussed — active shooter, terrorism, all of those terrible, terrible things — but in mentioning, you know, the threat of disrupting proceedings, that kind of caught my attention. And so my question is, how is this going to be established? Will the LDSU operate with a different criteria or an additional criteria of risk beyond, say, criminal threat or violent activity?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So very interesting question, and I'm going to try and give you a straightforward answer on this. So one of the challenges with it . . . And when I talked about disruption of the proceedings here, it's really about a balance of assessing threat versus somebody's ability to come in and conduct a protest or some sort of, I guess, a statement, or make a statement. When you look at a security envelope and what it's doing, it has to be . . . And this is where the high level of training will be important and the ability for the security officers inside of the building to recognize that difference.

One of the foundations of providing security, or even when you look at things like maintaining public order at a protest, is balancing that right for peaceful protest with what is potentially a threat to others. And obviously it's a bit of a challenge. There's no easy way to do that, but through experience, through training, through good intelligence, you get to a point where you can recognize when somebody's actually a threat versus when they're exercising a right that's guaranteed under the Charter.

So these are the kind of things that would happen. I can't give

you a very, you know, it always looks like this, and it always looks like that. That's not possible. In my experience, that's not something I can do. What I can say is, there's trends and there's typical things that people do when they're looking to disrupt in the point of view of something illegal versus something that wouldn't be illegal.

So it's a bit of a complex scenario. It's part science and part art. And so with our security officers, it'll be instilling the science part, the training part, and then have through experience — and hopefully they bring in that experience — be able to use that art part as well.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. And since this recommendation was brought to cabinet, have there been any arrests or concerning disruptions that have not been mitigated by the current security processes in the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — As the Sergeant-at-Arms and the security service in this building exist currently, we are not privy to any of the interactions that may or may not have happened with the security service in this building. I'm going to turn it over to either Rob or Dale to talk about one incident where the ministry was involved. And Dale?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Sure.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah, take it away.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Thank you, Minister. And you had alluded to a possible incident since the bill was tabled, in relation to something towards the legislature as well as was the ability for the current security unit to be involved in it. And that would be the incident regarding the convoy outside of the building, primarily, you know, confined to Albert Street or restricted to that Albert Street location.

But it turned out to be an interesting time in this transition, and almost a pilot project for what this bill and what this new unit are capable of when they work together.

And in that incident, as we said yesterday, with Government Relations leading the discussion and coordinating the groups together, including the Sergeant-at-Arms as well as RPS, the RCMP, members of Highway Patrol, members of our SCAN [safer communities and neighbourhoods] team, and working within our ministry, it came together as it should.

And it came together as it should because of that coordinated approach and one team approach to that incident.

[19:15]

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. So in regards to anybody considered to have disrupted proceedings, you know, once in a while we have people in the galleries who feel occasionally even more passionately about an issue than members on the floor.

You know, occasionally somebody slips up and, you know, heaven forbid there is hypothetically somebody in the gallery who yells down at the member for Regina Douglas Park, "you're wrong." And they're considered to have — which of course never happens — but, you know, they're considered to have

disrupted proceedings.

There's no list, like blacklist being contemplated for access to the legislature. I just want to be really clear that the only threshold for preventing, you know, a person access to this building is illegal activity or threats of violence.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Can you repeat the first part of that question?

**Ms. A. Young:** — Sure. Occasionally we have, you know, folks in the galleries or who come to this building who feel quite passionately about issues. And they're not doing anything illegal or, you know, threatening violence, but may feel passionately about things.

You know, we've seen the Speaker in the past week, you know, caution members of the gallery to not engage with proceedings. And you know, in a situation in which somebody could be considered to have disrupted proceedings, a guest, a visitor to this building, my question is, is there going to be, you know, a blacklist for individuals which will prohibit them access to the building?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So right off the bat, I would say I can't speak to a blacklist. I don't have a blacklist. I don't have anything like that, so I can't speak to that. What I can speak to is the ability . . . So when — and this is a very dynamic situation — so when individuals come to the House, or any venue really, there's a constant security assessment that goes on. And I spoke about it earlier where through training and experience that our security officers would be able to look at individuals that are coming in and determine the best they can if that person is going to be a threat to any person in this House.

If in fact somebody were to come into the House, for example, highly intoxicated and a danger to themselves, I mean we would have to deal with that. If somebody were to come in and sit in the gallery and, for example, throwing objects down from the gallery, obviously that's a disruption. That's the kind of disruption I speak about. My interest isn't in it.

If somebody has a commentary and they speak to a member and it's about whether they're right or wrong, I mean that's . . . the Speaker has to determine if that's a problem. If the Speaker determined that was a problem, the gallery would be in the jurisdiction of the district and we would assist the Speaker to deal with that. But that's a constant, evolving, dynamic, threat assessment. It's not static. Again it kind of gets back to that issue of part science, part art.

And so for us to determine quickly, you know, we will develop that capability, but it'll be constantly, minute by minute, an assessment if we determine somebody looked like they were going to be a threat. But you only react to them when you have the appropriate amount of information to determine that they are in fact a threat.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Sorry. I'm just going to finish off with, there is no intention, nor any desire to create — your words — blacklist for anybody. Rob highlighted, you know, what some of the actions and/or reactions internally that a person goes through to assess risk. The Speaker will have, as usual, will have the authority to call order, whatever he or she deems appropriate at

the time. So no.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. So then going forward, the individuals would not be prohibited access to the building unless deemed a threat, charged with criminal activity?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So if I understood your question correctly, then you're asking whether or not somebody could be prohibited from coming into the building. And in the case if they were charged criminally and there was a prohibition or some sort of notice that was issued by the court that they couldn't come in, yes, they could be — case-by-case basis, you know. If somebody was coming into the building and they were deemed a threat because there was something so obvious, then obviously we would prohibit their access.

But generally speaking, no, we wouldn't just prohibit people from coming into the building. In fact I spoke about earlier about trying to ensure that people that come to the building have a great experience and that they don't feel like they're entering into a fortress, I think was the terminology used. But no, because that's not the desire of this at all. But to answer your question, yes, somebody could be prohibited if there was court orders or some kind of . . . something like that.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. And one final question. Earlier . . . Sorry I think it was actually yesterday. My brain starts to skip a beat too if I haven't eaten in a few hours, so forgive me. I believe yesterday there was an extensive discussion on various levels of security clearance. And forgive me, I can't remember, Mr. Larsen or Mr. Cameron, but one of you has this highly elevated level of security clearance. Is that correct? Both of you possibly?

**A Member:** — That's correct.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Okay. Thank you for that. I'm seeing nods. My question is for Minister Tell. Minister Tell, do you have that same level of security clearance?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I don't have the same level of security clearance as Deputy Minister Larsen.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. And would there be any members of cabinet who would have that level of security clearance?

**Mr. McLeod:** — Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — What's your point of order?

**Mr. McLeod:** — We're here discussing Bill 70 this evening, Mr. Chair, and I fail to see the relevance of the security clearance of cabinet ministers with regard to Bill 70. I'd ask you for your ruling on that.

**The Chair:** — No, that's fair. I'll ask the member to tie it into the bill.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Happy to. Happy to. So last night there was extensive discussion about, you know, threats, which have not been shared with certainly members of the opposition and I believe BOIE, which were the *raison d'être* for Bill 70.

And we can certainly go back and check *Hansard*, but I believe there was again extensive discussion on the necessity of having this elevated level of security clearance, which the officials can inform me what the official term for that is, but this top secret security clearance. And yes, let the record show everyone's laughing.

And Minister Tell indicated an unwillingness or inability to disclose the nature of those threats because of this security clearance, which neither she nor her officials were clear whether the current Sergeant-at-Arms had or could have. So my question for the minister is, if she does not have this level of security clearance, how is she aware of these threats?

[19:30]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The reason and the purpose for Bill 70 is to respond in an appropriate way in a level that's commensurate with what's going on globally. Nothing in Bill 70 is designed, or was designed, for any specific threat. It is about the collective — what's happening in the province, what's happening in Canada, conversations that we've had with security individuals. And that is the reason for why this Bill 70 is before you today. And I'm going to turn it over to Deputy Minister Larsen.

**Mr. Larsen:** — In regards to the conversation or the question regarding security levels and different security levels, whether they're a confidential level or secret level or top secret, those provide those positions, not those individuals, with the ability to receive that potentially top secret information that may be . . . is most likely a national threat, and it would be specific.

And the interpretation of the risk that Rob and I would take once we receive that information would be provided to the minister if we deemed it specific enough that the minister needs to know or somebody else in the legislature needs to know what the potential of the threat is. But the actual operational process as to how it's evolving, that stays with the ministry or the positions that have access to that information.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. So just to understand the decision-making process around the impetus and recommendation of Bill 70, the minister said last night that it was a recommendation from cabinet that was then developed by the officials as is appropriate. So if Bill 70 is in response to threats in the specific or broad sense and these threats, as canvassed last night, may be top secret or secret or confidential, what I'm seeking to understand is how that recommendation came about in the first place if neither the minister nor cabinet members have that level of security clearance.

**Mr. Larsen:** — Thank you for that question. When we were discussing the protection services unit that was framed and put forward for Bill 70, we're talking about the ability to quickly share information. And that could be criminal intelligence information that Rob mentioned primarily comes through CISC, which is the Criminal Intelligence Service Canada, which there is a bureau in Saskatchewan — there's a bureau in each province and I think the territories have a combined bureau — as well as the Canadian Security Intelligence Service agency, which is CSIS, which is more of that national terrorist type of threat assessment that they provide.

So when we talk in the context of people that will work in this building and the surrounding grounds and our ability, because we are associated to these agencies and receive that information, we are better positioned as they will be to share information back and forth, for us to give them that proactive information intelligence that we were talking about should they need it to operationalize.

**Ms. A. Young:** — Thank you. That didn't really answer my question though. So if the impetus for Bill 70 was the changing nature of threats in general as well as specific threats as has been articulated, and neither the minister nor cabinet members have additional security clearance, can you help me understand how the minister and cabinet would be in a position to understand those threats and bring forward a recommendation for Bill 70? So I suppose my question's likely to the minister.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The reason for Bill 70 is based on information that we have garnered over time. It is conversations that we have had, you know, intelligence agency identifying some specific areas. And I spoke about this today. It isn't about confidential or top secret information. It isn't about that at all. And what you have before you in Bill 70 was formulated based on the generalized risk and information that we received right across the country, policing agencies, whatever the case may be. And that's where we are.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Sounds like my colleague has concluded, so I will resume asking some questions.

**The Chair:** — Okay. I recognize Ms. Sarauer. Thank you.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Minister, you mentioned that the director will be hired pursuant to the Public Service Commission's usual course. Can you commit that the director will not enter into any contracts for security provision services with any sort of private company?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Setting aside the employment contract with the Corps of Commissionaires, yes, these people will be providing security services in this building, will be employees of the Government of Saskatchewan. There will be nothing entered into with the exception of having government employees and the Corps of Commissionaires.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. How can members, guests, and those who work within this building be assured that there will not be any surveillance done inside of this building?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — If you wouldn't mind being a little bit more specific. Surveillance? We have cameras outside the building. Is that what you're considering surveillance? Because that is a type of surveillance.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Cameras inside the building? I said, inside the building.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Oh, okay. Sorry.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Yeah. Yeah, that's fine.

[19:45]



**Mr. Larsen:** — So surveillance broadly, we can be talking about surveillance by officers of the unit walking around the building surveilling things. We can talk about cameras that I would expect are positioned in certain common areas in the building as well as externally. But I'm talking about a security camera, and I'm not sure if we're talking in the same context.

When we talk about surveillance in the capacity of keeping people in this building and people that work in the building safe, we're talking ensuring that they have that safety associated with a camera coverage, either in a dark stairwell or perhaps an elevator, those types of common security camera areas that we walk through probably three or four times a day if we walk through them all, or something like that.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So are you asking me to be more specific?

**Mr. Larsen:** — In regards to what we would expect, I can't comment on what currently is in place right now because I'm not aware of what those devices are, if there are devices. I assume there are. That's where we would be going with surveillance.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Could you speak into more detail as to those inside cameras that you had mentioned in terms of . . . And I'm not asking you what currently exists, but what the LDSU plans are.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I can assure the member — as some questions that have come to us over the last number of weeks from an independent member — there will not be security cameras or any electronic devices in MLA offices.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Oh, sorry. Unless you have something else, I was supposed to turn it over to Dale. Unless you have something specific to this.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Not exactly specific to this.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Okay. Can I let him finish? Or can I let him start and finish?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Depends how long he wants to go for.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Okay.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Yeah, for sure. Yeah, go ahead.

**Mr. Larsen:** — And I think it was just a restatement of what we consider the use of camera surveillance. You use the words "surveillance camera," "security," "data." That we would use it for . . . utilize it in this building and on the exterior of the building is just what we had talked about in relation to people that are in the building and ensuring that they are safe while they are in the building or while they are coming and going from the building.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Thank you. Right now staff under the Sergeant-at-Arms has keys to the doors in this building. Will the LDSU have the same accessibilities?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So from the point of view of the keys, so if there's a reason that makes sense from a security point of view

that they have access to the keys, that would make sense. So if the MLA offices are in the district, obviously that becomes the jurisdiction of the LDSU. Then that would make sense if that's currently the practice here. I don't know what the practice is here, and my apologies for that, but if the Sergeant-at-Arms has them now, then there must be an established security reason to have those keys. And as those things were to transition, we would of course be working with the Sergeant-at-Arms to ensure that what was appropriate and reasonable happens in the future as well.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Now, Minister, just to confirm, in some of the questions that Ms. Wilson had asked you — just to confirm what you stated — you stated that you were not aware of any previous cabinet or ministry-initiated security forces in Saskatchewan. Is that correct?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Well specific to what she was asking me, yeah. No, I have no idea what she was talking about.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Okay. Is that the same for your officials here this evening?

**Mr. McGovern:** — No, Mr. Chair, I think it's fair to say that the officials at this table didn't come to the meeting with any knowledge of what Ms. Wilson was speaking about, and it didn't twig anything in particular for us.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So just to clarify, Minister, you nor any of your officials had done a scan of previous or similar initiatives in Saskatchewan historically like the one that is being proposed in Bill 70.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I'm not sure what year the member that asked the question or made the statement, what year she was referring to. The purpose of Bill 70 is based on what's happening and what has happened in the last couple years. The information, and I mean, I can go through it again and again. The reason, it's not based on anything that's happened in the 1970s or the 1950s for that matter.

This Bill 70 is based on information received right across Canada, in Saskatchewan, from policing agencies, from public safety agencies across the country. And of course our provincial counterparts, everybody, everybody in Canada and beyond, is having a look and seeing what is necessary for the threats — and again, nothing specific; it is generalized — the threats that public institutions, in particular government buildings, are facing today, not what happened . . . And again I don't know what year this was, but it's not within my time here. And times have changed.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, we've spoken a bit about what other jurisdictions do in this area. We already spoke about Alberta's experience yesterday. Manitoba's was another one that has been mentioned. The changes that they have proposed, and I haven't checked recently if they've come into force or have been passed . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Not yet. Okay. But those still mandate an involvement with the Speaker.

And BC [British Columbia] was another one that was mentioned by yourself yesterday, Minister. Now my understanding is that there was an attempt to restrict the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms by BC Speaker Plecas, who ultimately . . . Once he was removed from his position, the legislature there actually augmented the

role of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

And I wanted to read into the record an article that's in the spring 2022 edition of the *Canadian Parliamentary Review* — quotes from the article, not the entirety of the article. My apologies.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — It's not the entire article. Is that what you said?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Not the entire article. Quotes from the entire article. Quotes from the article that speak to the experience as it exists currently at the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and the role that the Sergeant-at-Arms plays there, as well as the Speaker.

And just for the record, the article I'm quoting is called "Protecting Our Parliament: The Legislative Protective Service at Queen's Park." And as we all know, Queen's Park is situated in a city much larger than the one that this legislature sits in. Theoretically, one would assume, would have more exposed threats than this one.

And I just wanted to read a few quotes into the record and then ask you to comment on why cabinet feels, and yourself, a minister, that Saskatchewan should be and is any different than these other jurisdictions. So in this article it states:

As with all matters in the parliamentary precinct, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly bears ultimate responsibility for the safety of everyone who enters the parliamentary precinct and the security of the buildings and grounds. The Speaker is involved in all discussions of the security policies, procedures, and practices implemented by the LPS. While many parliamentary practices are deeply rooted in tradition, the LPS is a modern, continually changing part of the organization which includes an historic first in the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Which is that their Sergeant-at-Arms is actually the first female in Ontario's history to hold that position.

[20:00]

And then another paragraph I wanted to finish with that's towards the end of the article, that I think is pertinent to this discussion states:

Elected members often say that our Legislative Assemblies are the people's Houses and members are elected to represent their communities there. Balancing public access to the building with the security of staff, visitors, and members has been a long-standing and evolving practice in parliamentary protection. Finding the security balance in a parliament requires a constant review of the threats, risk, and needs of the communities we serve. The key to our success to date has been the collaboration and support received by all fellow MPPs, the Board of Internal Economy, and the LAO staff.

So the Legislative Assembly of Ontario still retains the independence of their security through the Sergeant-at-Arms, answerable to the Speaker. My question to you, Minister, is why, like I said, why do you and cabinet feel that Saskatchewan is and should be different?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — We are very aware that different jurisdictions, various jurisdictions, have a different way of conducting business with respect to security. The proposed approach is a made-in-Saskatchewan solution that is intended to consolidate overlapping security solutions and address gaps in the current legislative security.

A review of Canadian jurisdictions suggests that after various events across Canada, such as a dramatic shooting in 2014, legislative security is an evolving topic. Legislative branches of various provincial governments have considered or taken steps to alter the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms through legislation.

BC — and you did speak to it quite eloquently — underwent an independent review of the Sergeant-at-Arms following significant and publicized concerns over security. The report did contain a recommendation: Sergeant-at-Arms should be recast as a primarily ceremonial and perhaps sessional role, with a new director of security position created to have responsibilities for all matters pertaining to the security of the legislative precinct. Now the precinct is described by them, not us, including liaising with external agencies. Although these recommendations have not been adopted at this time, it does demonstrate a shift in the perceived role of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Manitoba: *The Legislative Security Act* currently requires the Speaker and the Minister of Justice to enter into an arrangement respecting the provision of security within the legislative precinct — again, "precinct" as defined in Manitoba — which covers the legislature as a whole and surrounding grounds. The proposed amendments in Manitoba legislation require the appointment of a chief legislative security officer under the province's public service legislation. The chief would be responsible for legislative security under the general policy direction of the Speaker and the Minister of Justice.

And my last one is of course in New Brunswick. The Lieutenant Governor may appoint a Chief Sheriff, and a Chief Sheriff or other sheriffs may provide security services in the legislative precinct — again, New Brunswick-speak. "Legislative precinct" includes the legislative grounds and buildings. The Chief Sheriff and other sheriffs provide legislative security, continue to be employees within the *Civil Service Act*.

There have been a number of jurisdictions outside Canada, and I don't necessarily believe that we should be following exactly what happens outside Canada or any other provincial legislature for that matter. United Kingdom: security has largely shifted away from the Serjeant at Arms. The Serjeant at Arms is largely ceremonial. Serjeant is responsible for access to public gallery, the main hall, Westminster Hall, and various galleries, public access to select committee meetings or hearings.

Parliamentary Security Department is responsible for the security of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Department is led by a director of security for parliament, who is appointed by both Houses but reports to the Director General of the House of Commons, a senior civil servant. Director works in partnership with Metropolitan Police, which provides both armed and unarmed policing for parliament. The department also provides security vetting within parliament.

All this to say that in Saskatchewan — and it's anticipated and it

is written in Bill 70 — the Speaker and the Sergeant-at-Arms will be actively involved with collaboration depending on the need at any given time. We have decided to go down this route, based on the analysis that I talked about earlier within Canada.

But the interesting thing is, is that most jurisdictions, provinces, are having these discussions. Where they land will be specific to them and whatever is significant to them. Not each province does things the same way, and I mean that's the beauty about being provinces. We're not all part of the . . . We're all part of the same country, but we have our own ways of doing things. And this, as identified in Bill 70, you know, using the word "may" for the Speaker, "may" for the director, in my opinion . . . And Darcy gave a great explanation about why it was written that way. And that that collaboration between the entities is important.

It's also important to have a security entity that is able. And I mean that in training, in skills, having access to the broader community under the PPSB [provincial protective services branch], SCAN, highway traffic officers, whatever the case may be. We can't always . . . Even though Regina Police Service is more than willing to provide what they can provide, we do need to be able to handle and deal with incidents, perceived or real, within this building and the grounds without necessarily relying on the RPS. The RPS does provide . . . is a partner, but we need to ensure that we can handle the business of keeping people safe and secure here in the building and on the grounds. And that's about all I have any energy for.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, I have a question about the coming into force clause. It's by order in council. Why was this chosen?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the member: the decision to have it come into force on order in council reflects that there will, as it usually does in legislation as the member is well aware, that the date of assent may not be the date on which a transition can occur in an orderly and appropriate, professional fashion. So order in council here allows for a date to be identified that would ensure that when that occurs, all the appropriate steps have been taken.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Any ballpark idea for when that date may happen?

**Mr. McGovern:** — I'm being assured that we're talking about months rather than weeks or days.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you for the clarity. Could you provide any context as to whether it will be in 2022 or 2023?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Implementation of the new unit will not begin until the legislative amendments are passed. The ministry will need to engage in detailed operational planning and consultation with the Sergeant-at-Arms and other important partners. The unit will need to be staffed — and again you understand that process that we have to go through with PSC; we're not there — find office space, and develop operational procedures.

This will likely take several months. That's probably being a bit generous. I would suggest that it likely will . . . may be in place late fall of 2022. And again that's a guess, and if everything goes according to plan, which nothing ever does . . . Yeah. And I mean, I don't think I'd be talking out of school if I said it could

be early 2023 too.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you. Minister, you had mentioned what happened last Throne Speech day as one of the catalysts for this bill. Can you elaborate on what you mean by that?

[20:15]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Can you repeat your question? I mean, I know basically what it is. I just want to . . . specifically.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Minister, you had mentioned last fall's Throne Speech day as one of the catalysts for Bill 70. My question was whether you could elaborate on what exactly occurred on Throne Speech day that was the impetus for this legislation.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah, and I can't highlight enough that it's one of the very public, very much reported events that occurred. It was a known event that was going to take place and as we . . . And again I don't know if it was reported in this regard that . . . but I did say it in some of my speaking notes that legislative events interrupted that one, and elected officials threatened.

This event was very public and very known it was going to happen. The security analysis before, during, and after the event . . . If an event like this is planned and information is shared, communication is open, intelligence sharing, pre-planning an event like this makes it somewhat seamless while still allowing those that are attending the event as spectators their right to protest. The augmentation . . . We're anticipating that with this particular bill before us, that when an event is known — and unknown of course, but particularly when an event is known like what happened on Throne Speech day — the analysis is needed. What will be needed? What can we anticipate? And I mean, I can let Rob discuss some of this.

The augmentation that's going to be required of resources, utilizing the PPSB personnel, if those aspects are in place, people are in place, it really does prevent something happening. Now lucky, we're fortunate here that this isn't a catastrophic event. But the potential was there for it to be something more than what it was. And it's really the risk assessment, the potential for something happening. The more we have an organized team all communicating, all on the same page, understanding what their roles and responsibilities are, can prevent unnecessary incidents from happening.

And I did speak to it further on something else. You know, I said unelected public officials. And in this regard, evasive action was required to ensure their safety into the building. So you know, and as I said, it's a good thing that nobody got hurt, that there wasn't something a lot more serious. That's what this Bill 70 is and the legislative security is intended to address. Again it's about keeping people safe and secure while allowing them to exercise their constitutional right to protest. I don't know, Rob, have you got anything to add about large events or planned events?

[20:30]

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sure. Maybe I can speak a bit about the process that goes behind a large event that would occur in any type of a venue like this or other locations. So the first thing you

would look at is the event information itself, so the type of event, what's the purpose of it, what's the expected audience, is there any kind of controversialness around the event itself, the size of the potential crowd, etc.

When you take all that information in, then you go through a process of threat assessment. And that threat assessment is, obviously you look at all those things I just mentioned in the context of where's the security risk. Is there an elevated risk? Is there a known risk? Is there a history of that event, for example, having issues with it?

Once you get into that threat assessment . . . And that'll take in a variety of information sources. It could be open-source information, so things that are being said on social media. It could be police information. It could be information that's derived from known things inside, in our case here, the Legislative Assembly and what we might have been privy to there.

When you start to get into that threat assessment, that's when you also engage with partners to see what kind of things they are aware of, what they may know. And they may be involved. So for example, an event of a significant size here at the legislature or perhaps even something like a July 1st Canada Day celebration, things like that, will involve more than just one group in that process.

When you've gone through that threat assessment then you can determine what your level of threat is to that event. Then the next thing you would be looking at is resourcing and potentially special equipment. So that could be barricades, it could be extra lighting. It could be extra human resources for security points and that, for example, if you have a visit of a dignitary to a location here. A prime minister would be a good example, where you require a lot of extra security because of the . . . and I go back to those concentric circles of security, and you have to build that up just because of the elevated threat of the person that's actually coming in.

When you go beyond that, so you would take the steps you would require to get the resourcing, the special equipment if there's anything like that required. Then you get into the creation of your operational plan. That's where you put everything down so you have something to give to those that'll be executing the plan, implementation of a plan.

And that's the next step. We implement the plan, operations happen. So the event takes place, your security arrangements hopefully do what they're supposed to do. At the end of it — now here's a very important part of that — is when all is said and done, then you have a security review. You do a review of the event. And that's a critical part because that's where you get your lessons learned and that's where you see was there things we could have done better. And that usually involves something we call a hot wash. And then eventually you get into discussions of what people saw on the ground, what kind of problems they ran into. Did we not have the right equipment? Did we have too many people? So it covers a vast variety of the things that you would do in a big, large event like that.

And once that's all done, then hopefully you're able to put those lessons learned into some kind of document that you can use later

on to refer. And then another event happens and you start that process all over again. So that's the typical way an event is coordinated and security applied to it.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So, Minister, are you saying that for Throne Speech day this past fall, the Sergeant-at-Arms did not do that threat assessment or that partner engagement?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I'm unable to speak to what the Sergeant-at-Arms did or didn't do. It's not within our purview, and that's between the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Speaker.

I do know that what you have before you in Bill 70 to the best of our ability, in a structural, orchestrated way will ensure that all people at whatever event and, you know — I mean we can speak about this particular one — whatever event is taking place at the legislature . . . And the one on Throne Speech isn't going to be the only one and it's not going to be the last that the pandemonium that occurred on the grounds of this Legislative Building did interfere with a ceremony that was planned.

And what Bill 70 is designed to do, as what Rob Cameron has gone through, is designed to ensure to the best of our ability with all the necessary skills, intelligence sharing, communication, resourcing that's available, that we'll be able to access that so that people can access and access their right, utilize their right to protest. And our job and our duty is to ensure people are safe — all people are safe.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Would the current security arrangement under the Sergeant-at-Arms preclude any of that work from happening? Threat assessments, partner engagements for example.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — We are unsure about what the Sergeant-at-Arms did or didn't do prior to the event. We're unsure about the capacity of the Sergeant-at-Arms to do what Mr. Cameron has highlighted. Doing an integrated assessment can again — and he spoke to that in detail, about what that actually entails — can be brought to bear when we're facing anticipated events or impromptu incidents, events that occur on the grounds of this building or in the legislature . . . in the legislative grounds, sorry.

That's what Bill 70 is intended to do. And we can be sure that that's exactly what would happen. Before an event would happen the analysis as Mr. Cameron has highlighted will be done, the necessary resourcing will be done so that we can keep . . . And I mean there's no doubt that what happened here on Throne Speech day caused a disruption to an event that was planned.

And we want to do what Bill 70 is intended to do, was to keep these events or to allow these events to continue as planned, with all the necessary security that we can bring to bear, utilizing PPSB, utilizing intelligence, utilizing the skill and the experience of the ministry. So all I can speak to is what we will do, and Mr. Cameron has highlighted that very well I think.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — So digging into that a little bit deeper, the disrupted event, as I understand it, is the ceremony that happens with the LG [Lieutenant Governor] outside of the building, and because there was a large group of protesters on the steps and the street, that had to be cancelled. So I'm assuming that's what you're talking about.

From what I understand, that protest that occurred was lawful. So my question is, should the exact same thing happen again next Throne Speech and the LDSU is in force, how will the LDSU handle that differently than the Sergeant-at-Arms did?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — What I can ensure is that next Throne Speech day or whatever the planned event is or an impromptu event, what Mr. Cameron had highlighted is exactly what will happen each and every time. The resources are available. The communication, the intelligence gathering will all be done as highlighted by Mr. Cameron.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I'm just wondering specifically how the LDSU would prevent that sort of ceremony from being cancelled due to a protest.

[20:45]

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I do think that the freedom rally and what went into organizing the security component is critical, and I think that — and by your own words — the protesters had a right to protest, and they exercised that right. Everyone else that was in the vicinity, in the area, were all kept safe. And I'm not sure which one of them has talked about that process that was gone through to ensure that the safety and security of all protesters and the people using the park was in place. And so I'm going to turn it over to . . . Who was going to talk?

**Mr. Larsen:** — I'll start.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Okay, Dale.

**Mr. Larsen:** — So just to go over, once again, the approach that was taken on the convoy when it positioned itself outside of this building, and the intelligence that led up to the dates and times that those big rigs were expected to be in the city, the coordinating process of the agencies involved prior to those vehicles even getting to the city, and obviously the tactic that was implemented to ensure that the strategy of keeping people in this building safe and keeping a protest lawful — and if it did go unlawful, how do deal with that — came off seamlessly. And again it was because of that pre-prep, that coordinated approach, and the process that evolved before and during the set-up of controlling that convoy.

It also continued in the southern part of the province in relation to Regway. And we don't often talk about how well things worked down there, but it was again a coordinated effort through the intelligence gathering, through the RCMP working with Highway Patrol. And numerous times the assistant commissioner of "F" Division has mentioned how grateful they were for Highway Patrol members being . . . working side by side with them and providing their members with a better understanding of what to watch for and how to deal with those big rigs.

So going forward, as the minister has mentioned, the processes that will be put in place once this bill is passed and once we start the formal formation of the unit will just be an automatic protocol for dealing with incidents that will be in place within the bigger, you know, policing, law enforcement type of security system that we have already set up and operationalized on a daily basis primarily.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Maybe I could take this opportunity just to kind of explain about how, and I think one of the questions is about how we deal with potential protests and people having the access to be able to do that. And so throughout my experience in my career, I've been involved in many situations where there was an anticipated large protest. The largest one I was involved with personally was the Olympics, and then different other variety of ones from there on down.

But when you start to look at the planning for that, you must plan for that. It's a right of people to have that ability to do that. A practical example that I'll give from a Saskatchewan perspective is the Regway incident that Dale's speaking to, where the RCMP involved with our Highway Patrol folks realizing that people were coming to protest or to have their message heard, required a place to do that. And as we saw in other locations across the country, those trucks and vehicles basically obstructed highways which is unlawful in its context.

But where the great planning came in is the RCMP had worked with the organizers to develop a protest area, which was immediately adjacent to the roadway. So that led to the protesters being able to park safely off the road, still in visible access to people that are driving by but not impeding the lawful right of people to use the border point or the highway.

That's the kind of planning that goes into . . . When I spoke about the steps of planning for any large event, that is definitely one of the pieces of that. And that would fall right into that, well that part, the event information threat assessment.

And then when you create that operational plan, if I was the planner on that, I would be looking to say, how can I arrange? And I can't speak about the last Throne Speech event, that would be hypothetical. I wasn't involved in that. But I can speak in a generality of I would be looking for an area that I could safely have people be able to do their protesting and have their voices heard but yet not unconnected to the event. And that's the part about making sure that people have that rightful ability to lawfully protest.

So that hopefully gives you some context about how that's looked at from an event planning and a security point of view.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I'm going to conclude my questions for now. I do want to end by saying a few things. First of all, I appreciate the discussion that we've had today and yesterday. Minister, in your explanation for why this bill is before us, you mentioned several things: enhancing security at the Legislative Building and surrounding area, that there's heightened security risks, the need to share intelligence, the need to break down silos. I think we've canvassed all of those points for the past few hours.

What I haven't heard is really an explanation as to, well, first of all, why there isn't a full understanding of what the Sergeant-at-Arms currently has the capability of doing, whether or not he even has security clearance for example, and why there hadn't been any consideration to beefing up the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms, the office that he currently has. As we've indicated many times, we have never and have no intention to in the future stand in terms of blocking any sort of request for the need for enhanced security in this building. Where we get up in arms is when the independence of that security changes.

That leads me to the amendment I will be moving at the appropriate time. And I've given this proposed amendment to both the Chair as well as you, Minister, a while ago, so I anticipate that there's been ample time to review this amendment. But to be clear, what I'm proposing we amend in this legislation is that instead of having the Minister responsible for *The Police Act*, so yourself, appoint the director of legislative security, that it would be the Speaker.

So it would maintain all of the organizational structure that you're proposing in Bill 70 in terms of the new director for legislative security, if the ministry believes that that's what needs to happen to have a breakdown in silos, enhanced training and qualification requirements for those who work within. I don't necessarily agree with any of those, but if that's what it is, this amendment would still maintain that. It simply will change who appoints that director.

So it would maintain the independence of security in this building. So I think if the concerns as you mentioned, Minister, are in fact the concerns that have brought Bill 70 before us, it should be a simple amendment to vote in favour of, and I pass that on to committee members as well.

If in fact Bill 70 is more about controlling security in this building, then to me that would be the only reason why this amendment would be voted down. And it brings me back to why the changes occurred to security in this building back in the '80s. And from talking to those who were around at that time, it was really to address, frankly, a desire from cabinet at that time to not want to be involved in any way in these sorts of the politicization of protests that occurred at that time — the desire to essentially stay out of it.

I'm not sure why cabinet would even want to have any involvement in that. To me, staying as far away from that as possible would be wise from a political standpoint. But in any event, I think it's really important that we learn those lessons from those who were here at that time who came here, who were here before us, who realized the importance of ensuring that whoever is in government, whichever party — and I'm not saying that, you know, one party should be responsible for it and one party shouldn't — I'm saying no party should be responsible for it ever, that this should be a reasonable amendment to pass.

I have concerns that there isn't a full understanding of how much ultimately this is going to cost, how much it currently costs, and what that difference would be. And I think we've stated the rest of our concerns on the record as well.

With that, I think I will take this opportunity to thank the officials for being here this evening and yesterday. It's been a long process. I recognize that and I thank you for sticking through, as well as you, Minister, for answering my questions and sticking through as well. Hopefully the Ministry of Corrections will never have a piece of legislation that requires 10 hours of committee — at least while I'm the critic — in the future.

[21:00]

And thank yourself, Mr. Chair, committee staff, Hansard, committee members who are here, as well as those in audiovisual. And I also want to particularly thank the people who

are currently here keeping us safe right now, the Sergeant-at-Arms, his staff, the commissionaires, and the good work that they do.

It's hard to not see this bill and the conversations that we've had about this bill and not see it as an affront to the good work that they've done and continue to do. So I ask committee members to remember that when they're voting on this bill tonight, when they're voting on this amendment, and when they leave this building this evening. With that, I'll conclude my remarks.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Ms. Sarauer. Is there any other questions from the committee?

**Mr. Keisig:** — Yes, I have questions, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Keisig.

**Mr. Keisig:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm just curious. What qualities, what kind of a skill set do the officials at the table tonight bring to the table and allow them to bring forward a new legislative security force?

**Mr. Larsen:** — I guess I'll start. My previous career was in policing and was with the Moose Jaw Police Service. I left as deputy chief in 2007 and took over director of security for Casinos Regina and Moose Jaw for one year, and then was invited back to interview for the chief's position, which I accepted and was chief until 2013.

I came to this ministry as an executive director, and then through the process of ADM and DM [deputy minister]. I have a bachelor's degree in policing and years of experience. Oh, and I co-chaired the security for the 2013 Grey Cup.

**Mr. Cameron:** — So I started my career back in 1987 as a warden with the Ministry of Natural Resources with Ontario, went to the RCMP in '89. Twenty-eight-and-change years with the RCMP. During that time I was involved in federal operations, tactical operations, public order. As I mentioned, I was one of the deputy incident commanders for the Olympics in the ISU [Integrated Security Unit]. I was the commander for what's called "O" Division public order unit. I was also a protective services member for the RCMP and conducted VIP [very important person] or basically bodyguarding for individuals.

I was in "F" Division here in Saskatchewan. I was the incident command coordinator for the province as well as the superintendent in charge of federal operations and provincial support services, which included the ERT [Emergency Response Team] teams, police dog services, the air services, a variety of other units that would be involved in these kind of operations. And then eventually I retired from the RCMP and came to be the executive director of policing for the province here. And then a little later, maybe a year or so after that, I stepped into my current role as the assistant deputy minister of policing.

**Mr. Keisig:** — Perfect. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Domotor.

**Mr. Domotor:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you tell me exactly

what type of training will the new legislative security unit receive that is different from what the existing training model is, used by the current security staff within the building?

**Mr. Cameron:** — The members that would be coming in to the LDSU would obviously come in with a certain level of police experience or law enforcement experience already. Some of the things that will be specific to that role would be the active shooter response type training, so what would be called IARD [immediate action rapid deployment], immediate rapid action deployment training. That would deal specifically if you had somebody coming into this building that was similar to what happened in Ottawa. That training would provide them the necessary skills to deal with that situation.

There would be some education and training with regards to de-escalation as well as the training with regards to . . . I mentioned about security operations. So those are the kind of training that they would receive in addition to what's happening when they come in with their police or law enforcement backgrounds.

**Mr. Domotor:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Ottenbreit.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wonder if the three or four officials actually at the table, including the minister, could expand from their own perspective on the relationship, in detail, that the Sergeant-at-Arms will have with the new legislative security unit?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So as I mentioned during the course of our conversations over the last couple days, certainly I envision a very collaborative, very co-operative arrangement, relationship, certainly utilizing or working with the Sergeant-at-Arms in ensuring that we can develop the best security presence within this legislature.

That's going to include things, like I mentioned before, with committees, joint committees, working groups, certainly anything we can do to expand that connection and be able to communicate back and forth, share that intelligence, share those operational assistance.

For example, if there was some kind of situation that developed in this Chamber and there was a requirement to provide some assistance to the Sergeant-at-Arms, certainly in my vision of it that that would be something that we would be able to assist with, and hopefully vice versa.

Those communications obviously will, as we go into a transition and we start to work through this, certainly opening the conversation as to what the Sergeant-at-Arms and our new director of security would be able to work together on, maybe ideas for cross-training. Certainly I think there's a lot of opportunity to work through scenario-based training as well.

And so when I get into the scenario-based training, just for clarity, what that would be is mock issues or mock events that would occur, setting up the ability to run through first a tabletop exercise, for example. A scenario, for example, an individual comes into the legislature here and they take over the Chamber — one example. Working through building up a plan where we

could tabletop what would the response be, what equipment we would need, what type of stakeholders would be involved, certainly involving things like what would be our emergency operational plan for evacuating people. What would be the types of responses we would have into the Chamber, connecting with those police forces of jurisdiction, looking at of course communication out? How do people get notified?

When you work through these tabletop exercises . . . And they're fairly common and actually required in some cases. To be able to ensure that there is a contingency plan, an emergency operational plan, and that that's shared because you're going to have two entities in here that will have a shared security responsibility, they need to be connected and cohesive to some degree. Working through those tabletops, you can go into live exercises. Not necessarily would they be occurring here, but they may be simulated in other areas. But those are the kinds of things we would discuss from a training point of view.

We have inside the ministry access to and a variety of training courses that I'm not at this point sure that the Sergeant-at-Arms actually had any kind of access to, which I would look at basically opening the door to being able to offer that training to them as they partner in the security here.

Communication standards, looking at how we would communicate within this particular building — and that can get as technical as the radio communications themselves — and also looking at how we would communicate in other ways, communications externally, internally. So when you go through all the different types of areas where a relationship would occur between these two entities, it's not really . . . it's a multi-faceted approach to security and the ways we would look at that.

I mentioned earlier about communication with the Speaker of the House. Obviously as the ADM that would have responsibility for this entity, I see that as a critical component, is that we share that responsibility. And I would envision and hope that I can foster and create that relationship. Certainly between the director of security and the Sergeant-at-Arms, there needs to be a strong relationship. And whatever it would take from me to make sure I could facilitate that relationship is critically important. They are the key individuals that will keep this House safe.

It's making sure that they inspire their officers and create a culture of working together. This is critically important to me personally as much as it is to I think the spirit of the bill, is that there needs to be that culture of security, that it's a shared responsibility. And that'll be obviously where I'll spend a lot of time making sure that gets installed here.

Other areas where that relationship would take us is looking at equipment. Right now I can't say for sure what the Sergeant-at-Arms have for law enforcement-style equipment, so what firearms they're using, what batons they're using, do they have batons, do they have spray — OC spray is what I'm speaking to — so things like that. Certainly we want some compatibility. Not necessarily would we have exactly the same things, but those would be discussions on an operational sense of what I would be looking at.

And these are all parts of forming . . . And I've created a few units in my day, and these are the basic questions that you look

at, is where do we have similarity, where's the gaps, how do we decrease the gaps, how do we ensure we have the best operational efficiency we can get. I think that probably . . . I know that was a bit of a long description on how that relationship would look, but I think that's a pretty practical one.

[21:15]

**Mr. Larsen:** — Just to continue with some of Rob's comments as well, you know, Rob and I especially, we almost take this relationship discussion for granted because it's just the nature of how we work day to day — not only between ourselves but within our DMO [deputy minister's office] as well as our new group of security and protection and that policing component.

Right now, as we speak, the Saskatchewan Association of Chiefs of Police is meeting in Moose Jaw and having an event this evening. And at that event are at least three or four people from our ministry, actually more than that. There's two from conservation officer leads. There's the Highway Patrol and our . . . executive director of PPSB . . .

**A Member:** — Executive director. Yes. Yeah.

**Mr. Larsen:** — As well as one or two others from the ministry that work in that basically collegial family grouping with policing. And there are not only just those police officers from our municipalities and the RCMP, but there are also primarily retired police officers that are now ventured out into a different field. And that working together is just so ingrained in the entire process of protection and security and policing that it's second nature, as I mentioned.

And we've completed that a few times since I've been with the ministry, and then Rob joining a few years later starting with the CTSS [Combined Traffic Services Saskatchewan] program and organizing with the work that SGI [Saskatchewan Government Insurance] was providing and what the provincial priorities were in relation to keeping our highways safe and keeping impaired drivers off the road.

But it was a challenge working . . . getting municipalities and boards of police commissioners to understand that by allowing some of their officers to work outside the geographic limitations of the city or the boundaries of the city and work in the rural community alongside RCMP officers, that it would impact crime, potential crime processes coming into the city. That we know that drugs don't just appear, and we have very few manufacturing facilities for some of the type of drugs that we're dealing with right now. So they're primarily brought in on some type of transport, whether it be a heavy rig or just through vehicle transport.

So that CTSS process and that working-together approach that's evolved now to include Highway Patrol — conservation officers are also engaged in that to some degree — has just continued to build on those relationships and that whole relationship aspect of applying enforcement measures and proactive policing in the province.

The PRT [protection and response team] that evolved a few years later in 2017 and 2018, that partnered conservation officers and Highway Patrol officers in rural communities, that if there was

an incident that an RCMP officer wasn't readily available to respond to, they would take the initial 911 and contain the scene or contain the incident until a police officer could arrive and take over the investigation process.

Some of the training that evolved to get Highway Patrol officers up to the level of being able to deal with some of those types of responses . . . including, as Rob just mentioned, an active-shooter type of incident that we actually had in some of our rural schools after that process started. But when highway officers were initially going down that road — no pun intended — they weren't armed and they didn't have some of the training that is required, that they currently have today.

So it's that connection through those different agencies, but that common understanding of what their mandate is in relation to providing safety and security for the province through, whether it be enforcement or proactive policing or crime prevention or simply being a uniform presence in a security setting to deter some type of criminal activity.

They all work so well in this province. And actually we've had more than one comment made at our CACP . . . and then the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, how this province is kind of the golden example of how, especially RCMP, municipal officers and agencies, as well as those Highway Patrol, conservation officers and those other groups that move together and work together to make up the entire process for safety and security in the province.

**Mr. McGovern:** — The member had asked for a response from officials with respect to the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and obviously as legal counsel what I would speak to in terms of . . . is in the structure of the legislation, what the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms is, just for clarity for the record.

76.4, which is a carry forward, provides that "The Speaker is responsible for the security of the Legislative Precinct." And so "Precinct" being a defined term. It goes on to provide that:

Under the direction of the Speaker [so the Speaker is providing direction with respect to the Sergeant-at-Arms], the Sergeant-at-Arms shall provide physical protection and security for the Legislative Precinct, including . . .

preserving and maintaining public peace within the Legislative Precinct;

protecting life and property within the Legislative Precinct; [and]

protecting the privileges of the Legislative Assembly.

So that's the existing mandate for the Sergeant-at-Arms. It's not a different mandate; it's a different location or a more limited location in which that mandate will be exercised. And subsection (3) speaks directly to the member's point when it says that:

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



I had mentioned previously there's a corresponding provision with respect to the district and the director of the legislative security making arrangements with the Speaker respecting services that the director and the Speaker consider necessary for security of the legislative district.

Now the Speaker is the individual with the Sergeant-at-Arms who would determine what are the appropriate steps for the Sergeant-at-Arms to take in his mandate to preserve, protect, and promote the privileges and the life and property. We would view that as a co-operative process between the members of the Legislative Protective Service, which is the Sergeant-at-Arms and any other employee required by the sergeant for that purpose. We would consider that to be part of the co-operative process in making arrangements to see what is necessary for the security of the legislative precinct.

So that's the legislative framework within which — the points made by Mr. Cameron and Mr. Larsen — that co-operative, ongoing process could occur. The Act contemplates that. The Act promotes that, and I think it's fair to say that, as they had mentioned, it's viewed as being an integral process, integral to the process of ensuring that we have a method of breaking down some of the silos that have been identified as a concern. But I hope that's a response to your question.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Yeah. I'm not sure if the minister has some additional comments, but I just really appreciated the comments. Being a former minister of Highways responsible for the Highway Patrol during that transition, I really appreciated your comments about the additional training and then the collaboration moving from what they were, basically enforcing truck traffic and things like that, to a true security policing force. And I know that collaboration and how that fits into your vision of this legislative security force.

So it paints a very, I think, a very detailed mental picture, for me anyway, a more clear mental picture of not only where we've come from, some of the existing patterns we've used to transition to this, you know, different policing models throughout the province, a collaboration through different police models and, you know, somewhat enforcement models, whether it's conservation officers, Highway Patrol, or any other entity we use in the province for enforcing different actions to those agencies.

And again, a mental picture as to what we're seeing, and what your vision is as security and policing experts. And the minister as well, I mean, a former police officer having that knowledge and the vision that you have for this security force. So I'm not sure if the minister has any additional comments.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah, I certainly can appreciate what the ministry has done to execute on these particular units. And I can recall in a big way that . . . I mean, silos wouldn't even answer that question, or it wouldn't even address what actually existed between conservation officers, highway traffic officers, RCMP, municipal, whatever the case may be.

And I have seen, and I was involved right from the beginning, that what the ministry has been able to do, has been able to bring together with that main thrust being that we all have, whether it's a policing agency, whether it's highway traffic, everybody has their specific main function. But ultimately we are all here

together to provide safety and security to the people of the province.

Accessing with training really required, and I'm talking about the highway traffic officers in particular and the conservation officers, we figured out, and the ministry did . . . I say "we." I'm talking about the ministry. Figured out what training would be necessary, what is it they need in order to do . . . perform the function of when they are not involved in their main function, what is needed. What do we need to do as a province to ensure that we have them available, you know, especially in our rural areas and not so much in the cities, but in our rural communities, to provide a presence, to provide a service when they're able to take a call from a . . . respond to a call from a citizen and see it through from beginning to end instead of responding, securing the scene, whatever they did at the time, hold the scene until the real police arrived.

And what we have seen is a coming together of that overarching mandate, which is public safety and security, no different than what we're talking about here with respect to Bill 70. And it's because of those experiences that the ministry has developed the ability to bring those entities together.

And I mean, we were talking about the transition of highway traffic, conservation officers into PPSB. And the reports that I received on a weekly basis, Rob, were ones that, you know, they're having their town halls. They get . . . The ministry set it up to ensure that all the members had a common understanding about what this was about, what the goal was, and to answer any questions they may have.

Police, and I can speak to this because I was one, have traditionally not accepted the . . . not the function per se, but we couldn't have done this 30 years ago. It wouldn't work. With the efforts . . . And it was full-court press on ensuring that everyone understood what it was we were trying to accomplish. Highway traffic officers are in that job to do highway traffic. That's what they applied for. Same with conservation officers. And to get them to think that they can still do that and have an enhanced role with respect to safety and security in the province of Saskatchewan.

[21:30]

And it is only because of the ministry that that has been a success. People are very excited and thrilled to be part of what we now know as PPSB.

And probably 20 or 30 years ago I would suggest if it was tried, I don't think it would have been successful. The issues that we're facing in rural Saskatchewan needed skilled and trained people, and it wasn't necessarily hiring more police. Why not use the resources that the province of Saskatchewan already pays for? Why not use them when they're not performing their main function?

And again it speaks to what we were able to achieve. People in rural Saskatchewan should not only be safe, they should feel safe. And with more presence of uniformed personnel, as long as that person is able to respond appropriately and effectively to whatever concern a citizen may have — whether they're, you know, whether they feel violated or at risk — as long as someone

responds to it in some fashion. Rural communities are extremely at risk. I mean at risk, but they're extremely vulnerable because we all know what the distances are between, you know, each farm or each house.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair. I'm just wondering how this is relevant to Bill 70? Relevance to Bill 70?

**The Chair:** — Yes. I'd ask the minister to actually refer to the bill at question, which is Bill 70.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Absolutely.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Mr. Chair, if I could comment, I think if we listen to the questions from the opposition, quite often they've brought into question the training of, you know, a lot of the qualifications around this new security force. And the minister might be drifting a bit, but my next comment to her was based on her comments, you know. And I'm happy to hear from the officials, you know, when it comes to training, firearms expertise.

When I was the minister of Highways and again, responsible for transport and the highway traffic patrol, that you know, quite often I had to defend as the minister, I'd get questions about the qualifications and the expertise of the police force. And I'd like to hear the comments based on the Bill 70 to this security force in the Legislative Assembly.

**The Chair:** — All right. No, thank you, but again I'll ask the minister to . . . the questions to be in regard to the Bill 70, period. Thank you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — You bet. All of this to say that the ministry has the expertise, when we're looking at Bill 70, they have proven success, proven expertise, even notwithstanding their individual CVs [curriculum vitae]. It has been put into practice.

I have no doubt that what has been said here tonight and last night, that the ministry is more than capable of ensuring that we have a security unit in the Legislative Building and the grounds that will provide that safety and security because of what they're able to ensure, understanding what is necessary, understanding what training is necessary. I have no doubt that what is before you in Bill 70 will be realized. And the goal of the province of Saskatchewan is to ensure the safety and security of everyone.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** — I recognize Ms. Sarauer.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I just want to be very clear about what's happening here this evening. I have been to many IAJ [Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice] bill debates with members opposite over the past six years. I have never seen a single committee member put up their hand and ask a question on any of those bills, Mr. Chair. IAJ committee members, other than myself, are a part of a majority government who will pass this legislation. What they're doing here, Mr. Chair, is preventing us from having, or trying to prevent us from having the opportunity to debate this legislation at further stages.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Sarauer, I'll remind you that we need you to

ask a question in regards to the bill.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — I am supremely disgusted and disappointed in this display by IAJ committee members this evening, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Okay, point taken. Mr. Goudy.

**Mr. Goudy:** — See, I was down in Santa Fe, New Mexico not so long ago and took a tour of their government building in New Mexico. So when I went in, I was surprised at the lack of security there and started talking to the fellow at the front desk. And he said, you know, surprisingly enough this will be the last day in New Mexico — which from what I understand was the most open state in the US [United States] with their government building, from what the security guard described — and he said, this will be the last day that you can walk in and be able to freely tour like this.

And I asked him, you know, why? Why is that? Like, is there any specific instance that had, you know, caused them to increase their security? And he said, you know, nothing specific, but just the way things are going in the world.

And you know, when I hear you guys discuss the things that you're being proactive . . . You know, what are the other provinces doing? What are the roles and duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms in other provinces across Canada? And like, have you had those discussions with them or looked into what other provinces are doing?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — A review of Canadian jurisdictions suggests that after various events across Canada such as, it is but one, but a very dramatic Ottawa shooting in 2014, legislative security across the country is an evolving topic. Legislative branches of various provincial governments have considered or taken steps to alter the role of the Sergeant-at-Arms through legislation.

British Columbia recently underwent an independent review of the Sergeant-at-Arms following a significant and publicized concern over security. The report contained a recommendation that the Sergeant-at-Arms' role should be recast as primarily ceremonial and perhaps a 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. Although these recommendations from the report have not been adopted at this time, it does demonstrate a shift in the perceived role of the Sergeant-at-Arms. And it also demonstrates that conversations with respect to security at our legislative buildings across the country are taking place.

In Manitoba, *The Legislative Security Act* currently requires the Speaker and the Minister of Justice to enter into an arrangement respecting the provision of security within the legislative precinct — and the legislative precinct is how Manitoba defines it, whatever that looks like — which covers the legislature as a whole and surrounding grounds, which is not our definition. Proposed amendments to Manitoba's legislation require the appointment of a chief legislative security officer under the province's public service legislation. The chief would be responsible for the legislative security under the general policy direction of the Speaker and the Minister of Justice.

New Brunswick. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a Chief Sheriff, and the Chief Sheriff and other sheriffs may provide security services in the legislative precinct. The legislative precinct in New Brunswick includes the legislative grounds and building. The Chief Sheriff and other sheriffs provide legislative security, continue to be employees within the *Civil Service Act* of New Brunswick.

You know, Member, you were speaking about, you know, what you observed within the United States. The jurisdictions that we have looked at outside of Canada, in particular the United Kingdom for obvious reasons, security has largely shifted away from the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Sergeant-at-Arms' role is largely ceremonial. The sergeant is responsible for access to the public gallery of the main hall in Westminster Hall debating chambers, the visitors galleries, and public access to select committee hearings.

The parliamentary security department is responsible for the security of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The department is led by the director of security for parliament, who is appointed by both Houses but reports to the director general of the House of Commons, who is a senior civil servant. The director works in partnership with the police service, which provides both armed and unarmed policing for parliament. The department also provides security vetting within parliament.

So suffice it to say that the discussions are evolving and ongoing within most provinces in Canada. As I have said many, many times on the floor of this legislature, that times are evolving; times are changing. To not respond appropriately to the changing times, what our communities and what our cities, our provinces are facing, I think is . . . It abrogates the role of government.

So Bill 70, as it's presented, in our opinion, in the opinion of government, will provide what is necessary to keep this institution safe and secure, will keep the people that visit here, that work here, safe and secure. The grounds currently, under the current configuration of security, is not covered. We've expanded that for obvious reasons.

[21:45]

We need to have a fulsome security unit that can address the threats, the risks and the threats. They must be able to assess the risks and the threats to ensure that we have the appropriate people, numbers of people, the people that are trained that are able to respond appropriately and efficiently. With all the things that have been stated here tonight on analyzing threats, making sure that the right people are in the right places at the right time, that can be done and it will be done under what's before you here under Bill 70. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. McLeod.

**Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I could, as part of the preamble to my question for the minister, I'd like to briefly respond to Ms. Sarauer's comments a moment ago about fellow committee members participating in this debate . . .

**The Chair:** — No, terribly sorry, Mr. McLeod. You need to address questions specific to the bill, to the minister.

**Mr. McLeod:** — The question is to the minister, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Specific to Bill 70.

**Mr. McLeod:** — I guess I would ask the Chair then, at what point . . . Specific to Bill 70, Ms. Sarauer has indicated she will be proposing an amendment to the bill as it is read. So at what point, am I able to make my comments with regard to . . .

**The Chair:** — Yeah, yeah of course. You can speak to an amendment.

**Mr. McLeod:** — I guess I'll ask for clarification if that amendment is on the floor. Because she referred to it, but I don't know that it was made. So I just have comments and I'd like some clarification.

**The Chair:** — Yeah, the amendment, we haven't . . . When we do clause-to-clause voting, that's when you'll see the amendment.

**Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Question to the minister with respect to Bill 70: there's been some question about the wording of the bill surrounding the minister appointing a director of legislative security. I would ask the minister, are there any other pieces of legislation with similar wording where the minister is responsible for appointing a director?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I am making an assumption here that members opposite should know that this language is actually quite common, very common, in legislation. "The member of Executive Council responsible for the administration of *The Police Act* . . . shall appoint a Director of Legislative Security." So that's the phrase that we're actually discussing right now.

Section 279.1 of *The Business Corporations Act* empowers the minister to appoint a director of corporations. Section 14 of *The Residential Tenancies Act* empowers the minister to appoint a director of residential tenancies. Section 4-2 of *The Legislation Act* empowers the minister to appoint a registrar of regulations. All of these positions are very important and are held by our very professional and dedicated non-partisan public servants. The director of legislative security will also be a professional, dedicated, and non-partisan public servant.

Section 43(1) of *The Farm Financial Stability Act* empowers the minister to appoint supervisors for each commodity. Section 9(1) of — didn't know if it was a short A or a long A — *The Apiaries Act* empowers the minister to appoint a chief inspector. Section 3(1) of *The Witness Protection Act* empowers the minister to appoint a director to administer the Act, and any deputy directors the minister considers necessary. All of these positions that I've just cited are very important and are held by our professional, dedicated, non-partisan public servants.

Section 3 of *The Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act* empowers the minister to appoint a director of community operations. 3(2) of *The Court Officials Act* empowers the minister to appoint a deputy registrar to the Court of Appeal, Court of Queen's Bench, and the Provincial Court. Again all of these positions are important and are held by our professional and

dedicated, non-partisan public servants. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Are there any further questions?

**Mr. Keisig:** — I apologize, Mr. Chair. I'm just conferring with some of my colleagues.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Keisig.

**Mr. Keisig:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To all members of the committee, I'm just really curious. We are entering summertime, the most beautiful time, and honestly one of my favourite things my wife and I do is walk our dog around the lake. It's everyone's property. It's the people's park. Anyway I'm very curious. What's the role of the Wascana safety officers, and how is that going to change with the new legislation?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So in response to your question, the duties of the CSOs in the Wascana Centre won't change. They'll continue to complete the same functions and the same set of duties that they have currently. What will change is, once the passing of Bill 70, is that it'll be . . . In essence, we'll be looking for opportunities where the CSOs could provide some assistance or enhance that package of security that we will see with the LDSU and the Sergeant-at-Arms that provides security inside the building here.

And I think I mentioned that prior, but that's what the biggest change would be. But from the point of view of their actual appointments and the authorities they'll have and the duties they'll have, there won't be any change to that.

[22:00]

**The Chair:** — Any further questions?

**Ms. Sarauer:** — They seem to be needing to confer every single time for a period of time before they ask a question, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Domotor.

**Mr. Domotor:** — This question's for the minister or one of the officials. Like with the new unit that's going to come into place, what additional resources will this new legislative security unit have direct access to in terms of either weapons or gear or access to additional information that maybe the Sergeant-at-Arms didn't have access to?

**Mr. Cameron:** — All right. So I'll start with the resources that the ministry specifically could provide and will provide to the LDSU starting with the . . . So I think everybody's aware that recently the provincial protective services was established. Inside the provincial protective services is a variety of entities — conservation officers, Highway Patrol, SCAN officers.

There are of course the Wascana Centre CSOs, and deputy sheriffs that conduct court security and prisoner transport. In addition, within the policing division, there's a variety of other groups that are the security intelligence unit, the witness protection program, the . . . Who am I missing there? Investigative services branch.

So there's a variety of resources within the policing division that

PPS is one part of that division that certainly, depending on the reason they would require it, can certainly support the LDSU, and conceivably the Sergeant-at-Arms at the same time, with security operations.

A good example of that would be intelligence or threat assessments. Inside the SIU [security intelligence unit], we have analysts that are involved in doing analytics, intelligence analytics, threat assessments. And they do this for a variety of other folks right now within our corrections side. So there's that component as well that if we were to have . . . And in talking about, I think earlier I was responding to Ms. Sarauer's questions with regards to the steps of managing a major event, a part of that being a threat assessment. So if there were major events to occur here, there is some support built into the LDSU, but they could reach out into that intelligence network and into that component of the SIU.

But also the SIU is part of a bigger group called the Saskatchewan integrated intelligence group, and that includes other law enforcement entities, including RPS for example, that's part of that. So there would be access into that kind of intelligence for completing that threat assessment and looking at how that would work from a resourcing point of view.

The intel network also includes or will include the Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan, which I sit as a member on the what's called the provincial executive committee. We will be looking to move membership into CISS [Criminal Intelligence Service Saskatchewan] for this particular group. That also might be an area where I can assist the Sergeant-at-Arms and also get them involved into that as well. But that intelligence network will provide the materials that they will require for conducting those proper threat assessments based on those large events that would be occurring.

And then you spoke about what kind of equipment they would have access to, and I guess I can cover off first the basic equipment that you would see, because these would be uniformed members. So the first presence that people would see is a proper uniform resembling very similarly what you would see on a variety of other special constables: a navy blue-type uniform with the appropriate identification. From a point of view of personal protective equipment that you would see, they'll have ballistic body armour that is required to stop threats from bullets. And that'll be properly marked, although at this point in time I can't tell you exactly what that marking will look like. It may say "special constable" or "peace officer." It may identify the legislative district security unit itself. But these are discussions we'll go through when we look at the uniform and what that's going to look like.

Beyond that, typically you'll see a duty belt, a duty belt that will contain basic personal protective equipment. Kind of going around how that typically would go, the most obvious piece of equipment is going to be a firearm in a holster. You'll have a pouch for handcuffs, magazine pouches for the additional ammunition for the service pistol, an extendable baton, the OC spray that I mentioned before. So these are all typical pieces of equipment. The other thing we'll be looking at, and part of our evaluation will be whether or not tasers . . . I think I mentioned to Ms. Sarauer the CEW, conducted energy weapon. That is typically known as a taser. Considering that for also deployment.

But when we look at that suite of equipment, what that's about is a . . . It used to be called continuum force; now we call it the use-of-force model. This is all based in a standard that comes from the Saskatchewan Police College, so when you speak about the qualifications that an LDSU member would have — or other special constables, for that matter, inside the province — we hold the standard to the police college standard. So when they do their annual qualification for firearms, they shoot that standard. When it comes to their baton training, their use-of-force training, their OC spray training, that's to the police college standard. And that's built into their appointments.

Their ability to carry that gear . . . And that's a lot of responsibility. There's tremendous amount of potential for danger with that equipment, so they need to be . . . We figure that the Saskatchewan Police College standard is a tested and bona fide standard, and it's consistent with other law enforcement across the country, including the RCMP standards. So we're very confident that allows them to safely use that equipment because when you're in an environment like this, obviously that's going to be an issue.

I think the other components that I would speak about, we'll be looking at some sort of safety, you know, whether it be . . . And it's a tough thing to talk about, but if one of our members, you know, an LDSU member or anybody was injured — in fact anybody; it doesn't just have to be just the officer — because of gunfire and whatnot, common practice now, best practice now is to look at use of tourniquets and special gauze that seals wounds to prevent bleeding. Unfortunately most people that are shot, they tend to bleed out, and so that's what we need to stop right away. But that's the kind of equipment we would see on a typical officer.

Being a uniformed entity, they will have ability to carry more of that equipment, but they may have a role where they have to be in plain clothes too at some point in time, and that would be obviously case-by-case and situation-dependent. So the equipment would change slightly. They would have . . . They can't carry as much on their belt in the same way. But we would have a secondary, not a uniform, but a secondary gear issue that would be able to accommodate that type of duty as well.

**Mr. Domotor:** — Thank you for that.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Sarauer.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Mr. Chair, if government members want to continue to thwart opposition's ability to debate this bill at a later stage, which is what the minister said was the reason why it's going to the floor of the Assembly, I'd at least ask that they ask questions that haven't already been answered.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Ms. Sarauer. I ask that any of your comments are directed to the minister. Any further questions? Mr. Goudy.

**Mr. Goudy:** — So a question was raised about, you know, kind of surrounding the friendliness and, you know, the ability of some of the security guys. We come in without our keys, whatever. We need to get into our office. You know, the question was asked earlier, would they have keys to the office? I sure hope they do because I may be forgetful the odd time, left my keys at

home. And certainly understand the friendliness of the building, the environment.

You know, I've worked with the police for years as a chaplain and, you know, seen what they go through. But some of them are good friends, happy, friendly guys. Just because you're carrying a — or girls — gun or a taser or all the equipment, doesn't mean you're not friendly, you know, and doesn't mean you can't greet and welcome. And you know, these are the people that are out on the streets every day serving, you know, my children, your children, everybody, keeping us safe.

Like how can you assure — like this is going to be, I'm sure, moving forwards — that the atmosphere of the building, whether you're a police officer carrying the right equipment to keep us safe according to what you deem necessary or not, these people are going to be friendly moving forward? I'm quite sure that that's your plan. That's part of the plan. This isn't going to become a place of, you know, that's kind of being described here, I guess, by some people.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — This institution, this building is different than any other in the province. And each province has their symbol. We have and will continue to be welcoming to anybody who wishes to visit this building, when they're here that they're made to feel welcome. And I think that's very important.

And I do believe that in the . . . especially when we're sitting, I think we are all very welcoming to people in the galleries. In fact I sometimes think we go overboard. But maybe overboard is okay, and I think it is in this regards. It could be considered an intimidating building. It shouldn't be. But this is where the work, the people's work occurs, in this very building. And debates occur on the very floor of this Assembly. And it's important for people that are visiting here to feel welcome, that they are participating, albeit as a viewer, watcher of what we deem to be democracy. And that will not change.

[22:15]

And that is something that is very important to me. It's very important to the ministry officials that this building continue to be accessible. What the goal of Bill 70 is, is to make it as safe and secure as possible. We have gone through a litany of what the ministry is going to be doing when this bill passes: hiring, training that personality type that is welcoming, that recognizes their role is to keep people safe. But that doesn't mean that they have to . . . You know, I shouldn't be gruff about it. It is just that.

And as you said, Member, that even though if something were to happen, they would be expected to act according to their training and according to standard operating procedures that will be laid out. You can still be friendly. And when you're required to put on that it's-time-to-act hat, they're prepared to do that too. And I think people that come into this building expect to be safe and secure, and that will continue.

**The Chair:** — Mr. McLeod.

**Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Minister, I have a question for you. I'd like to start by reading a quote that's actually . . . it's in *Hansard* from this debate on Bill 70. It reads:

... I encourage committee members, at the very least committee members from the committee that this bill will go to, the IAJ committee, to ask questions of their minister at committee. I know I will be asking a lot of questions. But they have every opportunity to do so as well.

That of course was a quote from Ms. Sarauer on the first reading debate on this bill. So my question is, Mr. McGovern made the point that the Speaker of the Assembly has no qualifications in security or the subject matter expertise that the Ministry of Corrections, Policing and Public Safety does. To that end, we could draw parallels that this Chamber and courts of law are comparable, where the Speaker can be compared to judges that preside over those chambers and the matters that occur within them.

Now I'm not aware of any occasions where the presiding judge was responsible for appointing security personnel in those facilities.

Will the security personnel, through the proposed Bill 70 that will be in this building, fall under the same umbrella as those who keep our courthouses safe and secure for everyone who attend there regardless of their views, political or otherwise?

**Mr. Larsen:** — Thank you for that question. The deputy sheriffs that came over under our PPSB unit on April 1st have similar responsibilities as the officers that will be forming the legislative security unit in the capacity of their abilities for court security and prisoner transport. They are armed. They are trained. However they're not trained to the capacity of the expectation that we have for the officers that will be working in the legislative security unit.

The deputy sheriffs work during court sessions to ensure the actual courtroom itself is in order and secure, and follow the directions of the judge. The judge acting in that reporting capacity, or them acting in a reporting capacity to a judge, is while they're in the courtroom and are a court official. The process for them in communicating with the ministry and how that works in a court setting is through a collaborative approach in relation to the court security legislation. And now our minister has a share of responsibility with Minister Wyant on that legislation, and that's how this whole process of that reporting structure works.

In the legislative security environment, those officers, that director will report directly to the assistant deputy minister, as Rob had previously mentioned. Their training, as also Rob previously mentioned, is at a higher level than what our current deputy sheriffs are trained to. And obviously, as previously mentioned, the expectation for them to deal with larger events and protests of a nature that might become confrontational is a required training skill that they will be expected to bring. And the use-of-force options that they will have available to them as well is a little bit of a higher level expectation than the deputy sheriffs.

So those are primarily the differences between our court security, prisoner transport, deputy sheriffs, and our legislative security officers, not only in relation to the reporting structure and how it works in courts, but also the reporting structure and how that unit will report up through Rob but still have that working relationship with the Sergeant-at-Arms.

**Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Any further questions? Mr. Ottenbreit.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess this is more directed to Mr. McGovern. I recall in second reading speeches, the member for Saskatoon Nutana had some concern about the minister not being responsible to all MLAs. And what tweaked my mind was talking about accountability through the structure. So, Mr. McGovern, and I guess if anybody else can comment as well, could you explain how the minister would be accountable to MLAs under this Bill 70?

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you for the question. The process by which ... the minister responsible for the policing Act under the legislation would remain accountable to the Assembly through the Office of the Speaker. All MLAs of course in the structure of the legislation are represented now under *The Legislative Assembly Act* through the auspices of the Speaker, who is the, of course, duly appointed minister responsible for the Legislative Assembly, if you want to put it in those terms, that that's the hierarchical structure in which the Speaker is at the top of the pyramid in that regard.

And as such, the MLAs are able to report through the Speaker and to the Speaker, and the Speaker is able to exercise, with respect to security, a legislative responsibility for the security within the Assembly. That's a codification of the responsibility of the Speaker regarding security that's occurred within *The Legislative Assembly Act*, and so that legislative arm of government has chosen to codify that responsibility.

When we carve out the specific issue of legislative security, as has been chosen to be done in division 3.1 of the legislation, having the Speaker act on behalf of the members in reporting, through the reporting structure, will ensure that, for example, making arrangements with the government to ensure that you have the security addressed in a professional and proper manner.

[22:30]

The new provisions that are being discussed in Bill 70 further institutionalize that by making that a two-way street, if you will, that the relationship between the Speaker, on behalf of the members, to the government is mirrored by a process by which the director, who is appointed by the minister but has a statutory duty under the legislation which they will be required to perform, also has the ability to identify and work with the Speaker in a co-operative fashion to ensure that any changes that are required or any steps that are required with respect to or considered necessary for the security of the district, that includes the employment of police officers, sheriffs, special constables required for the director for this purpose. And I think you could say that that would occur either on a permanent basis or could be on more of a flexible basis. And that's something that the officials have been very specific about how to move forward with.

But you know, that's the representative aspect of the role of the Speaker for MLAs, and that's part of the accountability structure that I think the member was referring to.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Keisig.

**Mr. Keisig:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we can all agree in this Chamber that our democratic right to protest is critical to a functioning democracy and everything else, and I really want to hear some insight from the committee on how will Bill 70 protect all of our rights to protest on this legislative ground.

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you to the member for . . . The member's question was with respect to the constitutional rights, and I think what I'll speak to is just the framework in terms of what constitutional rights may be at play before turning to our policing experts with respect to how that, within the context of the enforcement, the security team will address that.

But the two primary countervailing rights that we're talking about here, one is, of course, the right for freedom of expression for individuals who come to the legislature to either protest, promote, or otherwise express themselves with respect to an issue of the day. And that is, of course, an important right, and it can strongly be argued that this is exactly where we want those views to be expressed. That rather than at an official's home who is executing a government, who's simply executing a government program, that the location where that legislative item is debated is an appropriate place to express concern, and that the built-in access to both the decision makers and to the media, for example, is an important aspect of the right for that explanation.

The countervailing right that I think a security team has to be aware of under this legislative framework is the parliamentary privilege which is part of the Constitution for elected members of this Assembly to be able to act and speak freely within the Assembly, to promote the views of and the interests of their electorate. And so while you have a right to protest certainly, with respect to certain matters, it's not an absolute right. It can occur within . . . For example, it doesn't give you a right to have a, to conduct a protest at a particular location.

And so that's part of the issue here is to try and manage how, on a given contentious topic, there would be an ability for members of the public to express their concerns while the legitimate aim and important debate of the House could proceed without being impeded. And that's, when we talk about security of the Assembly, that's the very important context, that it's preserving and maintaining public peace within the precinct, protecting life and property within the precinct, and protecting the privileges of the Assembly.

And so it's purposive in that regard. It's not security for security's sake, like you might have at a private corporate entity. It's more specific to providing security within this context to allow the MLAs individually, but more importantly the Legislative Assembly as a collective, to perform its constitutional duties and functions without impediment.

And so that's the balance that we're talking about from a high-level constitutional rights perspective. But I would perhaps turn it to one of my policing colleagues to speak to the more granular, how would we expect a member of the unit to try and strike that balance.

**Mr. Cameron:** — So I guess I'd start off with just maybe a bit of discussion on law enforcement generally as a principle, and it dovetails into what Darcy had mentioned with regards to Charter and that right to freedom of expression. Within the law

enforcement, I guess, environment, or universe, or however you want to say that, there's an understanding of the need to respect and to support those Charter rights. As I've mentioned before, there is . . . When we look at a large event, we always are considering the need to provide for that ability for people to exercise their right to that free speech to be able to express themselves. But it has to be done in a safe and balanced way.

One of the things that . . . you can't, for example . . . And I spoke about the blocking of a road, for example. And that was a very common thing we saw over the last few months. And that's really not a lawful protest. So for us in the law enforcement side of it, and what we would be looking for from the security unit, is first of all that training to know how to look at an event and how to ensure that you're protecting those that would come to say their piece, to have their, you know, do their protest, but also those that would be there for the purposes of enjoying the event or maybe even a counterprotest. I mean these are dynamics . . . When you start to look at event management, you have to consider that there could be people from different sides of different, on an issue, that all want to have their ability to say their piece. All of that has to be in the planning. And when I went through those steps, that's a big part of the first three steps particularly, is getting that information, understanding what the situation's going to be, who's going to arrive, and what their concerns are or could be.

And one of the things that we do when we look at event management, particularly if you think there's going to be a lot of protest, is engaging with those groups and understanding what their concerns and what they really like to accomplish. In different law enforcement entities in the country they have specific groups that are trained to go out and speak to these folks and say, okay, tell me about what it is you're wanting to do here, and let's see how we can facilitate that.

In the LDSU we will have some limited ability to do that as well, but that would be working . . . If we thought there was going to be an exceptionally large protest or event even, we would be able to count on and leverage our policing partners too in that context to provide that additional support. In my time in the RCMP we had, like I mentioned, these specialty groups that would go out. And they were trained and experienced in going and speaking to different groups about what the situation was for them and how we were going to deal with that.

At the end of the day it has to be balancing that right to that free speech, access for others to their legislature and to the grounds here, and then also making sure that everybody's safe and secure no matter what their goal or what their part of that event is. Ultimately we don't want to see anyone hurt. We don't want to see property damaged. We don't want to see any of those kind of things happen, and so that's critical in our planning process.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — The Premier has made it very clear that if people wish to protest, as is their right to do so, he wants them to be here. He wants them to come here, not go to other places, other areas. And when he said that, it is . . . And as I was thinking about what he had said, he wants them to be here because we want to ensure that people that have come to protest — and it's okay; it's not a bad word — come to protest, we want them to be able to do that in a secure and safe environment.

[22:45]

With Bill 70 . . . and as has been explained by Mr. Cameron a number of times that it is critical that we have a well-trained security unit to address those particular areas. Everyone on the legislative grounds should be safe and secure, and it can only happen through planning, through training, guidance, governance, accountability, which is what Mr. Cameron has already spoken to. Thank you.

**Mr. Keisig:** — Thank you very much for those detailed answers. I appreciate that. I'm really learning more in the last hour tonight than I have in the previous 10, so thank you for that, committee.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Domotor.

**Mr. Domotor:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can the minister or any of the officials that are here tonight explain or indicate how Bill 70 will improve response to any potential security threats at the Legislative Building by this new legislative unit? And if you can, how that would compare to possible responses from the Sergeant-at-Arms or the Regina Police Service for the same threat?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Before I turn it over to Rob Cameron, I want to speak to the issue of jurisdictions. And specifically it is the jurisdiction of the Wascana Centre and the Regina Police Service, long time ago. There's been a few machinations since that time, that the jurisdictional issues between . . . And the Wascana Centre is within the confines of the city of Regina.

I have to speak to and say that the disagreements, the lack of understanding about who does what, and whose responsibility it is probably to take a report, which nobody ever wanted to do, were constant. And RPS members at that time — I'm not saying what happens today — RPS members at that time, you know, understood from a 90-foot level what Wascana Centre was to do, and where they were to work. However there wasn't a formal or collaborated, a formal instruction and advice given to us with respect to what their duties and responsibilities actually were, where their jurisdiction started and ended. And you know, that didn't make for good public safety when you have two entities — both are armed, both are able to, Wascana in a limited degree — providing a security policing service to the area of Wascana Centre, for instance.

And with what we're talking about with Bill 70, the silos, the arguments over jurisdiction, who should take what, who does what, no you do that . . . And I can't speak enough about the discussions that were had in the, I would say the '80s sometime, that definitely interfered with what we were really all supposed to be doing. It got in the way. I'm going to turn it over to Rob to further highlight the jurisdictional issues and the silos.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you, Minister. So I guess to kind of dovetail into something that the minister had said, she spoke about the silos and the jurisdictional conflicts and whatnot. And the question, as I interpret it, was that what's different or what will be different. Well certainly the, at least it's my belief that the ability to remove those silos will be improved, and in fact, the relationship . . . well and to some degree, those silos have already been removed but this will enhance that. The building of those relationships to enhance the ability to provide the security service here at the legislature, as well as working with our partners. And one of the things that I had spoken about earlier was the

provincial protective services branch. I guess I'm getting a little punchy too. There is certainly a lot of resources there that can be leveraged, so that is a different thing. That's something new that we didn't have previously.

The communication is going to be something different with the new security element and the Sergeant-at-Arms as well as those external partners. And probably the closest one to the door is going to be the Wascana Centre CSOs, and certainly they would be an entity that could provide assistance to the security units here. I think that's a tremendous advantage when you're speaking about providing security, and not just from the point of view of the four walls here or the grounds just in front, but from a more holistic point of view of security, well, for the entire centre, or expanding beyond that even the province to some degree.

Another thing that'll be different is the ability to access and leverage training. And I think I mentioned it before where obviously the ministry has access to the Saskatchewan Police College. We use their training standard for our qualifications. That is our standard. Certainly I look forward to those opportunities to engage with our police college in the sense of looking for where we could not just train for the LDSU, but training for everybody that's involved. We are going through a review of training now from a provincial point of view, and this will be something that we include into that particular review as well.

I think in closing on this question is that we're talking about efficacy of service, an ability to just provide a more complete security package, enhanced security package to the legislature here, and without hesitation make sure that we can use all the different pieces of the law enforcement machinery that's around us to benefit and ensure that everybody that comes here is safe and secure.

**Mr. Larsen:** — As Rob mentioned, the process of those relationships and breaking down those silos has already begun. And in late February we formed a committee that consists of the current Sergeant-at-Arms, the chief of Regina Police Service, the head of the RCMP in the province, Rob and I, the Co-Chair, the staff sergeant, I believe is his rank, of our CSO capital commission group; and — is there somebody — oh, Government Relations, right, that looks after the capital commission committee.

[23:00]

We met. We laid out the parameters of what the purpose was and not only to discuss the recent success that we had in the convoy protest and how it was handled around Wascana area and this building. And the go-forward with that committee is to continue either quarterly or at least, you know, two times a year but likely it'll be quarterly, to maintain those relationships and work together in relation to what our legislature security people might need in relation to and dealing with an incident where they need to call Regina Police Service. There's going to be a seamless process for that.

But also that whole tabletop exercise process where we can ensure that in our operability component of, you know, radio systems talk to each other and how officers are trained similar so that if they have to go into a situation, they understand what the



other officer is going to be going into and what his training or her training was in relation to that as well. So that process has already began and it will continue as we go forward.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Goudy.

**Mr. Goudy:** — I don't have mine on tonight but the mace pins, you know, and some of the tradition that was neat to see when I came here first time. I wasn't a real politician guy who really knew much about politics at all actually. And one of the surprises was coming in, they give you your pin. That's your way in and then your wife gets a tag and her picture.

Some of the stuff that they've done in other . . . like the UK [United Kingdom]. We get a lot of what we do here obviously from the UK. Have you looked . . . Like, their changes that they've made and like the mace pin, is that moving forwards going to be, you know, same kind of thing? Get in with a pin and . . . moving forwards?

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — I understand that this particular issue with respect to the mace pin that we all have was brought up in debate on the floor of this legislature. I want to ensure or assure all members that those parliamentary traditions will be honoured. If a person is able to, right now, gain access to this building with a mace pin, that tradition, that tradition will be honoured. And we want to make this transition as seamless as we possibly can. Those traditions are like no other. In buildings such as this, those traditions are important, they're recognized, and they will continue.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. McLeod.

**Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the minister and her officials, much has been made about transparency in the line of questioning that you've received. The opposition members have had more than eighteen and a half hours of questions, and that was covered largely in that eighteen and a half hours.

So I just . . . if you could comment on the increases to transparency that Bill 70 offers, specifically over the current arrangement with the Sergeant-at-Arms.

**Mr. McGovern:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. The question of transparency and its, I think, the companion aspect to that which is accountability, is one that, you know, that is important within this context whenever you're dealing with a security agency.

The corner post for accountability with respect to policing services and accountability in that regard in Saskatchewan is *The Police Act, 1990*. It does a few things in that regard. Importantly, it sets that the minister responsible for the legislation is responsible for ensuring adequate policing throughout the province. And that is . . . When it says "throughout the province," of course that's the mandate in terms of ensuring that, in all aspects and all corners, that adequate policing occurs.

This enforcement mechanism includes a public complaint process that meets the due process requirements that should be expected when you're dealing with serious use-of-force allegations of misconduct within that context, so that you have a process whereby if there's a complaint, the complainant is guaranteed to have a statutory response time in which they're

allowed to hear what progress was made with respect to the complaint and what they can expect to happen in that regard.

That doesn't occur right now with respect to the existing process within the legislative security unit as it is. It is of course much more tricky when you have a very small unit to meet some of those full accountability requirements. And by linking that in the new legislation, providing that when these individuals are appointed as special constables under the new process, they will be subject to section IV of *The Police Act* and the public complaints process.

A new element of accountability and transparency that's very recent and is indeed still in implementation is with respect to SIRT, the serious incident response team. If there's a circumstance where an individual who's been appointed for this purpose, who carries firearms, is involved in a serious incident with respect to another individual — so if there was a shooting, for example — within this framework the serious incident response team would ensure that, rather than simply reporting that to the Sergeant-at-Arms or the Speaker within that small framework, that the legislation would require that the independent, statutorily appointed SIRT team would be in a position to investigate such an incident, and that as a result of that investigation process, which is a public process and which would be the subject of a report — again a public report by statute — that that could then be responded to for further either criminal or disciplinary action.

And that's, you know, it's important to remember that when there is an incident like that, there may well be complaints that the use of force was excessive, for example. But it may be a situation where you've had a heroic act and it was exactly done right. That doesn't lead to discipline, but it does require a very public process for that to occur.

And I think that's an argument for what is a sea change here in accountability — that rather than an in-camera report to a committee of the legislature, you have a statutory process for both complaints from members of the public with respect to specific conduct for service, as well as the new SIRT team applying to those circumstances.

The second aspect, in terms of transparency and accountability that's separate from *The Police Act*, is with respect to the Public Service Commission, and that, by having the Public Service Commission as the governing body within the independent hiring process of the Saskatchewan police . . . of the Public Service Commission applied to these new bodies, rather than hoping to get the best individuals, you have a competition that's required to occur. You have a process under the Public Service Commission whereby standards are set that are required for this position to occur.

And so having that accountability of a public servant, where they have to meet that requirement, they have to be in that position, is another area where right now the process for the identification of and the hiring of those individuals is, to speak specifically to your question, less transparent — that there is no specific requirement that that would occur.

As with any hire under the public service provision, the salaries for that individual would apply. The requirements with respect to

conflict of interest would apply. That individual would be subject to the public service rules with respect to what other employment or what other service they can provide while they're serving in that primary role.

And so those are requirements that, while not necessarily unique to this process, are certainly brought into this process to improve it in the sense that accountability and transparency is statutorily required. It's not hoped for, it's not a best practice. It's a statutory requirement — both from the concept of the complaint process that we've discussed but secondly, also with respect to the hiring and the conduct of the individuals as employees of the Government of Saskatchewan.

And I think Mr. Cameron had raised that issue with respect to the need for, in setting out through the public service, what the nature of the employment is and what the requirements would be, that that would occur in every case. And I'll let him speak to the steps needed to be taken to establish that position within the public service.

[23:15]

**Mr. Cameron:** — Thank you. So generally speaking, when we create positions within the public service, regardless of what the role is, there's a requirement to first develop and identify the specific job requirements, the duties and functions, and take those duties and functions and put them through a classification process. And the classification process determines a level within the public service.

After that there's a requirement to create a job posting. The job posting is put into, generally speaking, through . . . And I can't remember what the website . . . I think it's Taleo? Taleo. And then it's posted into the public venue for people to apply. Most of our jobs that we put out there are a two to three week time within the public arena for people to apply. Once they've applied and the competition closes, or for applications closes, we go through a process of screening to ensure that they meet the basic qualifications, that the prerequisites or any of the training requirements that we have. And then some things, just are they capable of working in Canada, and do they have some basic requirements for us would be things like a driver's licence. So that's asked in the process.

Some of the things that we do have in that job posting is we make people aware that there's a requirement for criminal record checks, vulnerable sector checks. Potentially there could be global reference checks and enhanced background checks, so depending on the role and function. Once that's complete we create a short list of candidates that meet the requirements and functions, and then we put together an interview committee. Generally speaking, it's two or perhaps three people that are SMEs [subject matter expert] in that particular area and a representative from the PSC. In in-scope positions, if it's an in-scope position, the union also has the opportunity to sit in the interview process.

Once that process is done, there's a decision made on a successful candidate and the job is offered. And then there's . . . I could go into a variety of different processes, how that goes, but it all culminates in a letter of offer and a discussion. There's a pre-discussion on the benefits and salaries if it's out of scope. If it's

in scope, it's all predetermined. And then we make the letter of offer. And hopefully the person accepts because they're a great candidate, and we bring them in and go through the rest of the on-boarding process.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Domotor.

**Mr. Domotor:** — Thank you. Will the new legislative security unit be present and visible on the grounds of the legislative precinct, not only during day-to-day activities, but will it be more visible when the Assembly is sitting versus when the Assembly is adjourned?

**Mr. Cameron:** — So in answer of your question, the requirement for security within the building here is not dependent on whether session's on or not on. There is a large group of people that work inside the building, that tend the building during many parts of the year, including when session is on. However when you do have something like session on, there may be some more visibility, if you will, but not necessarily. It would be depending on what's going on that day and what kind of situation it is.

And that's where that threat assessment and the . . . It's a daily assessment. It's not something we do once a week or once a year. It's always being done. And if there was a need, we could increase that visibility or we can decrease it, depending on what the circumstances are.

**The Chair:** — I recognize Mr. Ottenbreit.

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Mr. Chair, I've canvassed the members and they're out of questions, so I'd move that we do now adjourn debate.

**The Chair:** — The member has asked to adjourn debate. Is that agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Are there any closing comments? Minister, we'll start with you.

**Hon. Ms. Tell:** — Yeah. I'm not going to take very long, obviously. We've been here long enough. I just want to thank everyone. I want to thank our members, Minister Wyant's chief of staff, my chief of staff, and all the officials here with us today, and of course you and the legislative staff and Hansard. Thank you for clicking on when I went . . . Thank you. Anyway it's late and thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Minister. Ms. Sarauer, closing comments.

**Ms. Sarauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to again take the chance to thank the officials. I've had the opportunity to thank nearly everybody. Again though, thank you to the officials for answering these questions. And just to reiterate what we've seen since I concluded my questions, members opposite can try and put as much lipstick on the pig that was the display we just saw, Mr. Chair, but I think it's pretty clear what happened here tonight. And the stifling of debate moving forward is incredibly disappointing to see, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — Thank you for the comments. So seeing that it is past . . . Wait a minute. Did you want any closing comments?

**Mr. Ottenbreit:** — Mr. Chair, thank you for your time, and thank you to Hansard and all the legislative staff for staying to this late hour. And all committee members and officials, thank you very much.

**The Chair:** — I would also like to take the chance to thank all the . . . thanks to all the officials. And I'd like to thank Anne for being a part of all of this, and thank the committee for their attention. Minister, thank you. Opposition side, thank you. And seeing all of that . . . And Hansard of course. And seeing that it is past the hour of adjournment, this committee stands adjourned to the call of the Chair. Thanks.

[The committee adjourned at 23:24.]