



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 27 — May 9, 2023

**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. Terry Dennis, Chair
Canora-Pelly

Ms. Erika Ritchie, Deputy Chair
Saskatoon Nutana

Mr. Gary Grewal
Regina Northeast

Mr. Travis Keisig
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Ms. Lisa Lambert
Saskatoon Churchill-Wildwood

Hon. Tim McLeod
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Greg Ottenbreit
Yorkton

[The committee met at 15:30.]

The Chair: — Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome everybody to Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice. I am Terry Dennis, the Chair of the committee.

With us today we have Mr. Gary Grewal, Mr. Travis Keisig, Ms. Lisa Lambert, Mr. Tim McLeod, Mr. Greg Ottenbreit, and subbing in for Ms. Erika Ritchie is Mr. Nathaniel Teed.

Today this committee will be considering two bills before the consideration of the committee resolutions for the 2023-2024 estimates and the 2022-2023 supplementary estimates no. 2.

Bill No. 125 — *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Amendment Act, 2022*

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will begin with Bill No. 125, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Amendment Act, 2022*. Ms. Carr is here with her officials. As a reminder to the officials, please state your name for the record and do not touch the mikes. A Hansard operator will turn them on for you.

Minister, please introduce your officials and give your opening comments.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Great. Thank you very much. So with me today is Fiona Cribb, vice-president of regulatory services, and Lynnette Skaalrud, director of policy and legislation. So before we get into your questions, I would like to provide a quick update on the legislation we are here to discuss.

The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Amendment Act, 2022 establishes the provincial legal framework to authorize First Nations to license and regulate the distribution and retailing of cannabis on-reserve. The changes in the legislation will allow SLGA [Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority] to enter into agreements with First Nations that have established a First Nation cannabis authority to license and regulate on-reserve cannabis sales and distribution.

Once a First Nations cannabis regulator is established under the provisions of the Act, First Nations stores, regulated by First Nations cannabis regulators, will have access to federally regulated cannabis products. This will improve the safety of cannabis products being distributed on-reserve while further eroding black markets in cannabis. The change further fosters reconciliation by ensuring First Nations can fully participate in the economic opportunities of the regulated cannabis industry.

In addition to the changes described above, the amendments will also address an irritant to both consumers and retailers by removing the requirement that all individuals entering a cannabis store or making a purchase provide ID [identification].

With that I'll end my remarks and take any questions that anyone may have.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. I'll open it up for questions. Mr. Teed.

Mr. Teed: — Thank you so much. I left remarks during adjourned debates, so I'm going to jump right into questions if that's all right. My first question is, just broadly, what stakeholder groups were engaged during this amendment of this legislation?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So SLGA and Justice have been in ongoing discussions with several First Nations over the past few years. While those First Nations have expressed a preference that government formally recognize their inherent jurisdiction over on-reserve cannabis sales, they do see this approach as a good compromise that allows them to access the legal supply of cannabis without giving up their jurisdiction.

Mr. Teed: — Thank you so much. Did they have any advice for SLGA during the process as to the best process of making, you know, this legislation a reality, kind of recognizing their self-governance rights?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Yeah, for sure. As we were having those discussions with different individuals, what they did express is obviously they don't want to lose the rights that they have. But they did see the framework that we have and how that could work within their system. So obviously we're going to set this up and it is opt in. They have the option to do this or they can do what they're doing.

Mr. Teed: — Thank you. What supports are being offered to First Nations who would like to open stores, some of the Nations that may not already have engaged in this? Are there any specific supports that the government is offering those folks?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I think what I would say to that is basically what we have is the regulatory framework that is already set up and that they will be able to access. So they'll be able to access our professionals as they're setting up their store. That would be the form of support that we would give.

Mr. Teed: — Thank you. Moving on to Check 25, I just had a few questions about what supports and programs are in place to ensure that retailers are prepared for this transition. You know, I know we had for our SLGA stores, there was things about serving intoxicated or folks who are partaking, ensuring IDs are being checked. Just wondering what like educational resources are being put out.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So there is already a program that retailers are expected to take when they open up the stores called CannaSell, and it talks about the rules and regulations about ID'ing people. And of course up to this point you've had to ID everybody that comes in the store. So right now we're just changing that to 25. As a rule you can normally judge if someone's approximately that age or if they're much younger than that.

And this is the practice that we already use in all of our liquor outlets as well. So it is something that has worked. And so now that the stores have been up and running, we see that it's working, we decided to just make it even across the board.

Mr. Teed: — Okay. What are the processes that SLGA has in place to ensure that retailers are following along with those

regulations?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So we do have the inspectors that go out and randomly check on stores as their day-to-day work. But one of the things that we also do is, it's called the minors test program. So we will send people in who are minors and get them to try and buy a product, and test to see if our retailers are actually following the rules.

Mr. Teed: — Do you have any data on what you're seeing from that, efficacy or things like that?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — So I think to date with cannabis, everybody's had to be ID'd. So we don't have any numbers to date.

Mr. Teed: — That's very fair. I know I've asked this before and I recently took some media questions about it. And I've been hearing feedback from stakeholders. I know we've opted to cannabis . . . or sorry, liquor consumption in public spaces. So I thought I would ask again. Do you have any plans to align cannabis with public consumption of alcohol at this time, or are there thoughts looking to that down the road?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — Not at this time. We're actually just going to monitor the market and see what's happening in other jurisdictions and just take it from there.

Mr. Teed: — That's all the questions that I have today.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Teed. Seeing no more questions, we'll proceed to vote on the clauses. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 37 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Amendment Act, 2022*.

I'd ask a member that we move, report Bill No. 125, *The Cannabis Control (Saskatchewan) Amendment Act, 2022* without amendment. Mr. Keisig?

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

The Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is there any closing comments, Minister?

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I guess just briefly, I'd like to thank everybody for being here today, the members and Hansard and of course my support staff that are always here. And Mr. Teed, thank you for the thoughtful questions.

The Chair: — Mr. Teed, do you have any questions or closing

comments?

Mr. Teed: — Thanks to the minister for taking the questions today. Thank you so much for bringing your officials here today. To my fellow committee members, thank you so much. And the Chair, I appreciate the time today.

The Chair: — Thank you. We'll now have a brief recess while we change committees.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

[15:45]

Bill No. 132 — *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel (Automation and Remote Supervision Pilot) Amendment Act, 2023*

Clause 1

The Chair: — I'd like to welcome everybody back, and welcome Ms. Erika Ritchie back into here. And we'll move on to Bill No. 132, *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel (Automation and Remote Supervision Pilot) Amendment Act, 2023*, clause 1, short title.

Minister McMorris is here with his officials. Please state your name, officials, and Hansard will turn on the mikes. Mr. McMorris, please introduce your officials and give your opening comments.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Thank you for that. To my right is Jeff Markewich and to my left is Bill Hawkins. They'll be answering all the tough questions. I've got an opening statement here that I'll go through and then we'll see what questions, if there are any questions . . . There doesn't have to be questions.

So the province is committed to reducing red tape and ensuring that Saskatchewan remains an attractive place to invest. This includes looking for ways for legislation to reflect modern standards.

Current legislation requires large boilers and pressure vessels to always have a licensed operator on site. The proposed amendments will allow for the chief boiler inspector to exempt owners from having an on-site operator in limited circumstances to test automation and remote supervision when using a performance-based alternative model.

These owners will still need to ensure a quality operator is responsible for their boiler pressure vessel and respond to the operating and service needs of the boiler when data from the remote monitoring and supervision indicates service is warranted.

The Government of Saskatchewan has committed \$100,000 for analysis of a test project by the Technical Safety Authority of Saskatchewan, better known as TSASK. The review completed by TSASK will inform development of future changes to boiler and pressure vessel legislation, regulations, and technical standards moving forward for possible use by a broader segment of industry.

Without this legislative amendment, there is no legislative

authority that allows a chief boiler inspector to authorize a pilot project, gather the data, and prepare the analysis for future consideration. I would like to note that currently only one pilot project is being considered. This is to ensure these technologies are well understood and appropriate to the Saskatchewan situation prior to being considered on a wider basis.

With that I would open it up to the committee for any questions.

The Chair: — Thank you for your opening comments, Minister. We'll open it up for questions now. Ms. Ritchie?

Ms. Ritchie: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the minister for those opening remarks. I wonder if you could maybe start by telling us who was consulted, you know, before bringing these amendments forward.

Mr. Hawkins: — Thank you for the question. Do appreciate it. We consulted with the Technical Safety Authority of Saskatchewan. We consulted with the proponent who was interested in moving this forward. We consulted with a boiler manufacturer who was also part of the proponent's team.

Ms. Ritchie: — And who is the proponent?

Mr. Hawkins: — The proponent is a feedlot operator here in Saskatchewan that finishes cattle for the slaughter market. They want to install a boiler so that they can process corn. They call it flaking. Flaking corn apparently makes it more readily available in the digestive tract of cattle, improves the finishing ratio so that fewer pounds in creates more pounds on, as opposed to processing feed in other ways.

Ms. Ritchie: — And maybe you could, Mr. Minister, explain a little bit in more depth the rationale and the reasons that have been brought forward for why these changes are necessary. Is it that . . . Yeah, I'll maybe just leave it at that.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I'll start and, Bill, you can fill in where I'm not making the full argument. But right now the way legislation stands is that there's no way to have a stand-alone boiler in this particular feedlot. You'd have to have somebody there 24-7 and then it makes it really cost-prohibitive to have it manned.

And with the automation now, they can tell remotely what's happening with the boiler. And if there's any problems, I'm sure there's all sorts of redundancies, shut-offs that would shut it off. But it's a way to see how it works, get it operating in the province. And this is the only way we can do it, is doing it through a pilot project and then studying, learning from the experience.

So as was said in my speaking notes, this is the only one. There aren't a number of these. This is one just to see it up and running and how effective it is on a remote basis. Otherwise maybe finishing off . . . You know, and not that this is the reason why we did it but I think other provinces are looking at moving in this direction and we may lose a bit of a competitive advantage if we don't move in this direction.

Ms. Ritchie: — Has the pilot already been identified then?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Yeah, as Bill mentioned, there is a feedlot or a proponent that wants to bring this in. They've done all the background work on it so there is, yeah, one proponent that this would fit into.

Ms. Ritchie: — And you mentioned that TSASK had been consulted in bringing forward these amendments. What about other groups representing either owners or licensed power engineers? And what feedback did they provide?

Mr. Hawkins: — We have not consulted directly with other groups that represent power engineers. I will mention though that TSASK has an ongoing conversation with the chief power engineers across Saskatchewan. They call it the Saskatchewan Integrity Association. It's an ad hoc group, power engineers from many of the major owners in Saskatchewan that meet regularly together and with TSASK on an ongoing basis to talk about different initiatives in their industry.

So while we at the Ministry of Government Relations did not consult with them directly, they are in regular conversation with officials in the boiler program at the Technical Safety Authority of Saskatchewan. We assume that those conversations have taken place at a certain degree, but we didn't ask for that feedback specifically.

The chief inspector at TSASK worked closely with the Saskatchewan Integrity Association and other operators of boiler and pressure vessel equipment to keep in touch with common interests, common trends, common challenges. And through conversations with officials at TSASK, we know that there has been conversations about automation or remote supervision from various groups of people in the past. The legislation and regulations, however, didn't allow it so there is concern about moving forward too far without having tests, without understanding what's possible, what the limitations are, before more permanent or broader changes are made.

Ms. Ritchie: — And so just for clarification, you're not aware specifically of any feedback from licensed power engineers on the proposed amendments?

Mr. Hawkins: — Not directly.

Ms. Ritchie: — Okay, thank you. So I do note that in the explanatory notes that owners are still required to have licensed power engineers take responsibility for the operation of the boilers, and I'm wondering what kind of additional liability they may be exposed to in the remote operation circumstance.

Mr. Hawkins: — So just for clarity, additional liability to the owner or to the operator?

Ms. Ritchie: — Either.

Mr. Hawkins: — Okay. Additional liability to the owner, I'm not sure if there is any additional liability. It's one of the things that has to be examined and explored. We operate all technical safety legislation based on five simple principles. The owner's responsible for compliance, so he must comply within whatever licence he receives to operate his plants.

The chief inspector will have a certain degree of latitude in

issuing a licence for a particular plant, and the owner must operate in that mix. The authority, which is TSASK, is responsible for administration and enforcement. So they'll provide the oversight on that plant after the licence is issued to ensure that it is operated within the parameters of the licence.

The Government of Saskatchewan is responsible for the legislative, regulatory, and policy oversights. So again, here today to discuss this legislative amendment to look after that so that things line up.

The inspectorate who works for TSASK is responsible to TSASK, and they will do that work on behalf of the authority, which in turn has done it on behalf of government. And then finally the architects, the engineers, the contractors that are involved, the boiler manufacturer, the boiler service company, in this particular case all work for the owner. Everybody is obligated under those five principles to ensure that compliance is adhered to.

So in terms of liability, the liability of the owner is likely no greater as long as he's operating under the licence issued by the chief inspector. The chief inspector operates under the limitations of the Act and regulations and policy.

So I think that's how I see the circumstance relative to the owner. In terms of the chief engineer, very similar. The chief engineer is going to . . . or the engineer responsible for, the power engineer responsible for this plant will work for the owner and as an extension of the obligation to the owner, has to comply with the Act, the regulations, the licence, and the inspectorate, and the authority, TSASK.

So I don't see an increase in liability provided that they're working within the framework that is set out. It's one of the reasons, in order for the pilot project to move forward, there was need to amend the legislation to create the framework that provided for it.

Ms. Ritchie: — So you mentioned sort of economic drivers for the amendments. And I'm wondering if there were any sort of operator or labour shortage concerns that also fed into the amendments. I ask the question because I am generally familiar with, you know, in the past there being, you know, high demand for licensed power engineers and shortages of those key specialized service providers and how that sort of contributed to the proposed amendments.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think this is driven more out of, you know, the advancement in technology and being able to remote monitor, and doing that at a price that's much more cost-efficient than having a person there 24-7 for one boiler pressure vessel. And this is on a feedlot, as was already mentioned, so you know, probably the decision by the proponent, the operator, was to look at this as new technology coming into the province.

But we couldn't allow it unless we change this amendment. And I think it's a great opportunity then, through the pilot project, to see if this can be looked at into the future. We'll gain data through the operations of this. I know the Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association is very pro this. They want to see this pilot project go forward because it has the potential of really improving the output from feed.

And so I don't think it is necessarily driven by human resources as much as it is driven by the efficiency of a remote site being remotely monitored because the technology is there now. At least we believe it is.

Ms. Ritchie: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. So you mentioned that, you know, these provisions would be available under limited circumstances where minimum performance standards are adhered to. I wonder if you could elaborate for me on what those would be and how they would be assessed.

[16:00]

Mr. Hawkins: — So we've looked very carefully at *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act* and *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Regulations*. The chief inspector and I spent some time going through it line by line and developing objectives. You've got a provision; what's the objective of this provision?

And so in advancing what we're calling performance-based alternative model, each of those provisions of the Act and regulations that would apply in these circumstances have an objective associated with them. Some of those objectives are around safety; some of those objectives are around economic well-being of an operator.

And so the proponent must bring forward a plan for the consideration of the chief inspector. It demonstrates how this alternative approach or this pilot approach will achieve the same objectives of the provisions of the Act and regulations so that the chief inspector can measure effectively whether or not the proposed project use of automation or remote supervision will achieve the same level of safety and economic stability and well-being of the operator that the current legislation and regulations they use. It's a concept and approach we've borrowed from the building code where it's well-documented and well-tested since about 2005.

Ms. Ritchie: — I guess one of the things that I'm flagging here is that this isn't an existing operator. You mentioned that this is a new feedlot operator so they won't have any sort of a track record already established in terms of achieving minimum performance standards. And so I wonder if you can tell me how assurance will be undertaken by the ministry with respect to the provisions that they will be operating under.

Mr. Hawkins: — Could you repeat? How the ministry intends to . . . sorry.

Ms. Ritchie: — It's an assurance question. You know, so you look at a plan of how the owner-operator intends to operate using remote equipment. And so what I'm wondering is what sort of assurance plan will you have to fulfill your sort of compliance-assurance responsibilities?

Mr. Hawkins: — The compliance plan that's anticipated, and it's not fully developed yet, the proponent, both the owner of the feedlot and the boiler manufacturer that they've been working with are still in the development of what that compliance plan looks like. They're still in development of their answers to what the objectives to the provisions of the Act and regulations apply. That all has to be assessed by the chief inspector to determine that their approach, their proposal meets the objectives of the Act

and regulation in that they can act on it.

In terms of assurance long term, there will be regular reporting. This plant will still need a licence by TSASK, just like a plant would if they had power engineers on site supervising it. It will still be subject to inspections on a both regular and ad hoc basis without warning to the owner or operator.

We anticipate the plan to give TSASK some assurance will include things like the company that does the remote supervisions, flies the automation controls, will have some track record in both technologies that are being developed and applied, and that data will be delivered to TSASK to analyze on a regular basis as part of the pilot project so they can determine whether this is effective or not.

Ms. Ritchie: — So as a new feedlot operator, what sort of assurances will you be looking to receive upfront that the proponent has the requisites, skills, competencies to, you know, operate under these conditions?

Mr. Hawkins: — May I clarify one item. We're using this term "new feedlot operator." It's a new boiler for a feedlot operator that exists. So just the feedlot operation has been there for some time. They're just trying to change their feed process.

In terms of the again, assurance in that, I'm going to go back to the proposal that the proponent will take forward to TSASK. They have to demonstrate in that proposal what their intention is. They need to identify who their key personnel are that are responsible for it. They need to give the chief inspector some assurance that this is a secure site, that not anybody and everybody will be allowed to go in and operate it or make changes. So there will be key personnel.

I know in the last conversation I had with the proponent, they were talking about what is the minimum requirement of training we have to get for a select group of people so that they are conversant in the operation of this boiler. Not that they operate it directly themselves, but they have some on-site view of the boiler. They can see what's going on. They can see what's operating, and they can converse with the boiler service company who may not be on site; they may be in Saskatoon; may be in Regina; may be in another location, but they can converse effectively with the company that provides the automation and remote supervision. Because if that company were to see something come in through the data, they could phone the proponent and say, there's something going on; we think you should shut this down; or there's something going on that you should do this.

So they have to build those sorts of relationships with people that are identified at the employment of the other proponent so that those relationships, those conversations take place easily and effectively. TSASK would be a party to that too. There would be some people at TSASK that would have some interaction with the same group of people at the proponent and with the company that provides the automation, so remote supervision and the boiler service.

Ms. Ritchie: — Just for clarification, so are you saying that while there may not be a licensed power engineer on site, that other front-line workers would be there, would be present and sort of

interacting and operating? Was that the scenario you're referring to?

Mr. Hawkins: — There will be other on-site personnel that will have some interaction with the boiler facility. The proponent has expressed an interest in having them receive some training so that they're not totally blind to what the equipment does or how it operates.

Ms. Ritchie: — And so then are there any scope-of-practice conflicts with that approach? I mean do the licensed power engineers have exclusivity over the operation of large boilers and pressure vessels?

Mr. Hawkins: — The operation of boilers and pressure vessels works on a scale — the larger, the higher class of power engineer certificate is needed. That is being taken into consideration. The proponent is looking to train the people at a low scale, so at the entry-level scale for boilers and pressure vessels. Anticipate that the company that provides services both through automation supervision and boiler services will have those higher level personnel on staff.

Ms. Ritchie: — And when you talk about sort of criteria, standards, conditions, how will these be codified? You were a moment ago sort of describing the conditions under which a remote operation would be permitted, and I'm asking whether those would be codified in some fashion. Or is that basically just sort of at the discretion of the chief engineer or chief inspector?

Mr. Hawkins: — The standards and conditions will be codified by the chief inspector in this circumstance, as measured against *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act*, the regulations, the standards that apply.

This in particular is about the operation of the boiler and not the boiler manufacture or installation. The standards that apply to it and the licensing that applies to it under *The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act* will continue to apply. The operation is being codified through (1) the proposal, (2) the approval by the chief inspector, and then through practice after it begins and regular supervision of the chief inspector. The data that is captured, the experience that is acknowledged, will feed decisions in the future.

Ms. Ritchie: — So I'm assuming that's going to be some kind of approval issued by the inspector and then posted at the place of operation? Or what are the requirements in terms of how that is made available or on display at the place of work?

Mr. Hawkins: — The installation and the authority to operate will be issued by licence under the authority of the chief inspector.

Ms. Ritchie: — And who will that be made available to? Who will have the rights to view and inspect those approvals?

Mr. Hawkins: — The owner and I expect all the operators or all the people that have access to the facility on site would be permitted to see the licence.

Ms. Ritchie: — Are there any other jurisdictions that currently offer this sort of remote operation?

Mr. Hawkins: — We understand that this is happening in Europe and in Asia. We also understand that there are other pilot projects taking place in Canada, although smaller. They're in that 50 and 100 horsepower range compared to the 600 horsepower of this plan.

Ms. Ritchie: — And have you consulted with those jurisdictions to learn from their experience?

Mr. Hawkins: — We did an environmental scan of other jurisdictions across Canada. We did not reach out to Asia or any jurisdictions in Europe. That information has come to us more recently. We did examine what was happening in the United States to a certain degree, and there are many jurisdictions in the United States where licensing is governed by their insurance industry rather than by state regulators. And it's a different model there entirely. So this is new. This is innovative. It hasn't been tested at length in Canada before.

Ms. Ritchie: — Oh, so that's interesting that the industry in the States is kind of overseen by the insurance industry, because it would suggest to me that it's sort of seen as, you know, sort of a liability kind of a model. And it does sort of take me back to my earlier question in terms of what those, you know, implications would be in terms of if this is seen as increasing risk around an operation, and then how that might impact on either insurance rates or liability of operators. Can you care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — So I think you can probably go down on the insurance side path that doesn't really apply here. We, as a government, are the regulator and are following, you know, the Act that has been set out for quite a long time. This is just an amendment to be able to study that on a remote basis. The Act ensures, you know, with the head boiler inspector, that that safety margin is there. And that's what will be tracked as opposed to in person each and every day, but remotely.

[16:15]

Ms. Ritchie: — And so sort of moving on to understand the nature of this pilot, could you describe for me the criteria or items that will be assessed as part of this pilot? Are they purely operational? What is the scope?

Mr. Hawkins: — They are numerous. The boiler Act and the regulations, dozens of pages. We looked at many provisions to determine which ones would apply. We wrote objectives for somewhere between a third and a half of the provisions that will all come into play as this proposal is developed by the proponent and considered by the chief inspector.

What they are specifically, again I categorize them by safety provisions and I categorize the objectives both for safety and for economic loss, should it fail.

Ms. Ritchie: — Economic loss, should it fail. Could you expand on that?

Mr. Hawkins: — Sure. So we never eliminate all risk no matter what we do. We limit the likelihood that it will happen. And some of those risks are related to safety; some of those risks we associate as being related to economic loss. So we examined them in both contexts and developed objectives to limit the

probability that there would be loss or risk based on how this project proceeds or performs during its operating period.

Ms. Ritchie: — And so in terms of the safety aspect, I guess I would like to understand what, you know, how . . . Maybe you could expand on that. Like what does that actually look like when you're looking at risk or safety of employees and the public? What sort of a model are you using to assess that?

Mr. Hawkins: — Yeah, absolutely safety of both employees, people expected or likely to be on the site and in close proximity to the facility. Their safety is paramount. Anybody that would have direct access to it, their safety would be paramount too. We know that the boiler and all boilers today have many levels of safety devices built into them. Redundancy, both mechanical and technological, that already exist to limit the risk of safety to individuals expected to be near or around the facility.

Ms. Ritchie: — And in terms of economic loss, I guess that's in the case of some kind of a failure. Is that what you're looking at?

Mr. Hawkins: — We were concerned if they're relying on this device to flake corn, what if it shut down or failed? What is the economic impact of its failure? And I'm not suggesting failure in terms of an emergency-type failure, if it fails to operate based on whatever circumstances. It's not much unlike a furnace quitting, failing to operate in a home. What is the impact of that? What would be the economic loss to the operator if they had to order a new boiler and go without it for many months or something? So that was the context around that.

Ms. Ritchie: — Okay. And is that specific to that sector, in the feedlot industry? Or how would that be applicable to boilers in other sectors?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think I'd just say though on economic loss, I mean that's a factor for sure, but that would be on the proponent if this is their technology that they're . . . We don't own this. This is their technology. We're just making sure that it's following along with the chief boiler inspector and those guidelines.

So economic loss, and although that is a factor, but that would be up to the proponent then. He's going to invest a lot in this, and if it doesn't work, if it fails, if it doesn't meet the safety standards that we need it to, that would be his economic loss.

Ms. Ritchie: — Okay. Yeah, that seems to make a little bit more sense to me. I guess I'm also, you know, concerned about the potential should this pilot be deemed a success and then it's sort of rolled out further. When you're looking . . . I mean if you're assessing economic loss in addition to safety considerations, are you also then looking at potential economic loss in terms of lost job opportunities and how this will impact on the job sector?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think from our perspective, we want to make sure that if this is new technology, remote monitoring, that it's safe for all that are there. And if other proponents want to utilize this because it increases their feed efficiency, then we'd look at this as a pilot project just to see that it can operate safely remotely.

Ms. Ritchie: — And is there a certain class of boiler and . . .

Pardon me if my terminology is not correct, but in what sort of circumstances or classes of boilers do you anticipate or expect that automation will be suitable? I mean at some point I imagine, you know, that the risk as you call it, it would be at a level that would have this kind of an option not be desirable. So could you tell me sort of where the application would apply?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think I'd just say that, you know, that's quite a hypothetical. Let's see if this one's going to work. I mean, would it be the 30-horse, whether it be the 500-horse or whatever, this is one application that's come into the province in a feedlot setting. We want to make sure that it operates safely and is monitored remotely, that gives us all the information that the chief boiler and the operators need to make it run safely.

Ms. Ritchie: — So then are you saying that these amendments are tailored specifically towards a pilot and then future amendments would be necessary to broaden it beyond that?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Yes.

Ms. Ritchie: — Okay. You know, you mentioned TSASK and some indirect consultation or an assumption that, you know, operators would have been engaged. Do you anticipate or had you thought perhaps of engaging the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists for their feedback on these measures? And if not, why not?

Mr. Hawkins: — No. We didn't take it outside the group that is directly engaged in this particular project, that being the boiler manufacturer, the proponent, and TSASK. We did not go beyond those groups.

Ms. Ritchie: — And what are the qualifications of the chief inspector?

Mr. Hawkins: — The chief inspector is a professional engineer registered to practise in Saskatchewan. He's been at TSASK approximately 20 years.

Ms. Ritchie: — So then wouldn't it make sense to have engaged the association for scope-of-practice considerations?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think what we'd do is . . . This is a pilot project. This is a one-off pilot project. And if we were to make changes to legislation that would allow many of these to operate, there'd be much further consultation. But right now, you know, the engineers wouldn't have experience with this either. They're not operating here. So this is to give us the information that we need to either make this a possibility for others into the future. And if that's the case, then there'll certainly be more consultation with the APEGS [Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan] or whoever it might be.

Ms. Ritchie: — Can you tell me what mechanisms are being put in place to ensure that, as it's called, systems of remote supervision will adhere to acceptable safety standards?

Mr. Hawkins: — Could you repeat? I didn't hear that very well.

Ms. Ritchie: — There is mention in the amendments of the legislation that systems of remote supervision will adhere to

acceptable safety standards. Can you describe for me what those are?

Mr. Hawkins: — Acceptable safety standards would include multiple layers of redundancy built into the equipment both mechanical and digital or operated, where they'd feed an information box on the boiler, attached to the boiler, that would shut certain components down. Like there would be a fail-safe device on the burner. There would be a fail-safe device on the gas supply, a fail-safe device on the water levels in the boiler.

So all of those are acceptable safety measures when it comes to a boiler and how a boiler operates. And usually each one has more than one level of redundancy built into it.

Ms. Ritchie: — And in sort of identifying that list, this is I guess the purview of the chief inspector to identify what those are and augment them in whatever way to address sort of the remote nature of the operation. And I'm wondering if there's been any further consideration or input from other jurisdictions that have started to go down this path to ensure that those measures are fulsome.

Mr. Hawkins: — I am not aware that we've gone to any other jurisdiction for that information.

Ms. Ritchie: — Okay. In what circumstances might the chief inspector suspend the requirement to comply with clause 33(1)(b)? I'm just wondering why that's been added to the Act.

Mr. Hawkins: — That was 31 . . .

Ms. Ritchie: — 33(1)(b).

Mr. Markewich: — It's Jeff Markewich here. Just for clarification, are you talking about "Subject to the regulations, a suspension of the requirement to comply with clause 33(1)(b)" and then the renewal?

Ms. Ritchie: — That's right.

Mr. Markewich: — And in what situations would we renew? Is that kind of your question?

Ms. Ritchie: — Yes.

Mr. Markewich: — So this would be for a 24-month period that the pilot project would be. So subject to that 24-month period, if there was a situation where we still wanted to further that pilot for additional time, then the chief inspector could allow for that to happen.

Ms. Ritchie: — Thank you for that reply. And yeah, I'm just a little curious as to how, you know, the 24-month period was arrived at for the pilot.

Mr. Hawkins: — Twenty-four months was arrived at . . . It was determined that that was an acceptable period of time to test it through multiple seasons, and more than one experience in each season in case there was any seasonal challenges related to the operation of the boiler, and to capture data over a period of time.

[16:30]

Ms. Ritchie: — There are provisions in the Act to establish regulations. Is it the minister's intention to establish regulations regarding remote operation either now or at some future point when it is expanded?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think as far as regulations, again this is a pilot project for two years to collect data to see whether it can be expanded. And if that was the case there'd be more consultation, especially as well as on the regulations that may be established.

Ms. Ritchie: — And when does the minister intend to bring the Act into force?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — As soon as we're done here. Oh, actually I should correct that. It's got to go to the House.

Ms. Ritchie: — Yeah, Committee of the Whole. All right, thank you for that reply. And I guess maybe just sort of one final question. I wonder if you could tell me what specific actions will be undertaken to ensure workplace safety is not compromised as a result of these amendments.

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — I think Bill has kind of answered that in the previous questions. Again this is in a remote setting with lots of redundancy built in, with the chief inspector still in charge, and you know, monitoring that as we go. Bill had mentioned that there'd be some training, you know, for people that would be on site, not necessarily managing the boiler but certainly on site, you know, if something needed to be powered off or powered on, even though there's, I would imagine, the redundancy and the remote nature that that could be done remotely too, I would think, by the chief inspector. But yeah, I think Bill has already kind of touched on that.

Ms. Ritchie: — Thank you, Minister. Mr. Chair, I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Thank you. Seeing no more questions, we'll proceed to vote on the clauses. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: the boiler and pressure valve (automation and remote supervision pilot) amendment Act, 2023.

I'd ask a member that we move the report Bill No. 132, the boiler and pressure valve (automation and remote supervision pilot) amendment Act, 2023 without amendment.

Mr. Ottenbreit: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Ottenbreit moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Minister, is there any closing comments?

Hon. Mr. McMorris: — Sure, quickly just thanks to the committee for this late afternoon and the critic for raising the concerns and especially to the people on my left and right for all the work that they've done to make this a reality. And hopefully we'll be back here in the near future to talk about furthering this project.

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Ritchie.

Ms. Ritchie: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just like to thank the minister and his staff for being present here today to answer our questions and explain sort of the purpose of the Act. Thanks also to committee and Legislative Services for their assistance today. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you. I'd also like to thank the minister and his officials and the committee members too as well as Hansard and the staff too here as well. Minister and officials, you may leave. Thank you.

General Revenue Fund Corrections, Policing and Public Safety Vote 73

The Chair: — We'll now proceed to vote on committee resolutions for 2023-24 estimates and 2022 supplementary estimates no. 2. Vote 73, Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Central management and services, subvote (CP01) in the amount of 833,000 . . . Oh, sorry. 883,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. The Saskatchewan Public Safety, subvote (CP06) in the amount of \$91,773,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. The Saskatchewan Police Commission, subvote (CP12) in the amount of 2,103,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody, supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of \$196,976,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of 323,583,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Oh, sorry. Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, vote 73 — \$615,318,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following sums for

Corrections, Policing and Public Safety in the amount of \$615,318,000.

Do I have a mover? Mr. Grewal. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Firearms Secretariat
Vote 92**

The Chair: — We'll now move on to vote no. 92, Firearms Secretariat. Central management and services, subvote (FS01) in the amount of \$4,071,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Chief Firearms office support, subvote (FS02) in the amount of \$2,632,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan firearms ballistics laboratory, subvote (FS03) in the amount of 927,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Client services, subvote (FS04) in the amount of \$1,297,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$334,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

Firearms Secretariat, vote 92 — \$8,927,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following sums for Firearms Secretariat in the amount of \$8,927,000.

Mr. Grewal: — I do so move.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Government Relations
Vote 30**

The Chair: — We will now move on to vote 30, Government Relations. Central management and services, subvote (GR01) in the amount of 7,523,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Saskatchewan Municipal Board, subvote (GR06), in the amount of \$1,886,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Municipal relations, subvote (GR07), in the amount of \$682,017,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. First Nations, Métis, and Northern Affairs, subvote (GR12) in the amount of \$97,182,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Provincial Capital Commission, subvote (GR14) in the amount of 7,274,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

Government Relations, vote 30 — \$795,882,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 795,882,000.

I have a mover, Ms. Lambert. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — We will now vote on vote 91, Integrated Justice Services. Central management and services, subvote (IJ01) in the amount of \$50,058,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Integrated services, subvote (IJ02) in the amount of 61,632,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Capital and improvements, subvote (IJ03) in the amount of 98,710,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expenses adjustment in the amount of \$11,027,000. Non-appropriated expenses

adjustments are non-cash items presented for information purposes only. So no amount is to be voted on.

Integrated services, vote 91 — \$210,400,000.

Do I have a mover? Mr. McLeod. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Courts and civil justice, subvote (JU03) in the amount of 47,737,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Legal and policy services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 48,075,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Boards, commissions and independent offices, subvote (JU08) in the amount of 50,292,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Justice and Attorney, vote 3 for 147,169,000. I will now ask a member to move the following:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following sums for Justice and Attorney General in the amount of 147,169,000.

Do I have a mover?

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

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

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport. Central management and services, subvote (PC01) in the amount of 10,021,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, subvote (PC12) in the amount of 26,891,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Resource stewardship, subvote (PC18) in the amount of 8,434,000, is that agreed?

[16:45]

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Community engagement, subvote (PC19) in the amount of 43,413,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of 6,774,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only, so they don't have to be voted on.

Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27 — 88,759,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of 88,759,000.

Do I have a mover?

Mr. Ottenbreit: — I'll so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Ottenbreit has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Tourism Saskatchewan
Vote 88**

The Chair: — Vote 88, Tourism Saskatchewan. Tourism Saskatchewan, subvote (TR01) in the amount of 20,223,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Tourism Saskatchewan, vote 88 — 20,223,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2024, the following sums for Tourism Saskatchewan in the amount of 20,223,000.

Do I have a mover? Mr. Grewal has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — 2022-23 supplementary estimates no. 2, vote 73, Corrections, Policing and Public Safety. Public safety, subvote (CP06) in the amount of 8,336,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Custody, supervision and rehabilitation services, subvote (CP13) in the amount of 7,761,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Policing and community safety services, subvote (CP15) in the amount of \$1,000,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Corrections, Policing and Public Safety, vote 73 — 17,097,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2023, the following sums for Corrections, Policing and Public Safety in the amount of 17,097,000.

Ms. Lambert has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Firearms Secretariat
Vote 92**

The Chair: — Vote 92, Firearms Secretariat. Firearms Secretariat, subvote (FS01) in the amount of 3,154,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Firearms Secretariat, vote 92 — 3,154,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that it be granted to His Majesty for 12 months ending March 31, 2023, the following sums for Firearms Secretariat in the amount of 3,154,000.

Do I have a mover? Mr. McLeod. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Government Relations
Vote 30**

The Chair: — Vote 30, Government Relations. Municipal, subvote (GR07) in the amount of 17,312,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. First Nations, Métis, and Northern Affairs, subvote (GR12) in the amount of 21,361,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Government Relations, vote 30 — 38,673,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for 12 months ending March 31, 2023, the following sums for Government Relations in the amount of 38,673,000.

Moved by Mr. Keisig. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

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

The Chair: — Vote 3, Justice and Attorney General. Courts and civil justice, vote (JU03) in the amount of 338,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

Innovation and legal services, subvote (JU04) in the amount of 1,092,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

Justice and Attorney General, vote 3 for 1,430,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — No. 2
Parks, Culture and Sport
Vote 27**

The Chair: — Vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport. Community engagement, subvote (PC19) in the amount of 2,974,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Parks, Culture and Sport, vote 27 for 2,974,000. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to His Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2023 the following sums for Parks, Culture and Sport in the amount of 2,974,000.

Do I have a mover?

Mr. Ottenbreit: — I so move, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Mr. Ottenbreit has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

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

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

Do I have a mover?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I would move:

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

The Chair: — Mr. McLeod has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. That completes our committee's business for tonight. I'd ask a member to move a motion of adjournment.

Ms. Lambert: — I so move.

The Chair: — Ms. Lambert has moved. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. The committee stands adjourned to the call of the Chair.

[The committee adjourned at 16:55.]