

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

April 25, 1991

Mr. Chairman: — We'll call the meeting to order, a quorum being present. Although it is not necessary to have a quorum, we like to have a quorum.

Before we call in the first witness who's here, the Clerk tells me that he has some news from Manitoba that may be of interest to us. It's a letter to him from the Clerk of the committees of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba telling us that the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees will be holding their conference in Winnipeg, August 11 to 14. Please advise us if you wish invitations to be mailed to your members directly. Essential for reservation purposes to have your reply by Friday, April 26, quite soon, and that there will be a \$100 per person delegate fee.

So in the past the committee has usually had two members attend these conferences. Personally I'm of the opinion that as many members as possible should be attending this conference, from the viewpoint that we are seeing a number of changes in the legislation that governs the auditor's department and we may well see more changes in the future. This will place some additional responsibilities on the Public Accounts Committee as well.

I think that it might be beneficial for members to meet with members from other jurisdictions, get a handle on how they handle their affairs, especially when it comes to matters such as value-for-money audits and the like. It's August 11 through 14.

Also, Winnipeg is about as close a location for this conference to take place as anywhere we're likely to see until it's held in Regina some years down the road. But given the change of flux that we're in, I would certainly encourage members to attend. Having said that, we would require some form of motion, and perhaps after the break members might get together and figure out what kind of motion might be appropriate on that.

Mr. Swan: — You'll have to send me. I'm the only one that knows about . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Are there any other matters you want to raise before we bring in Mr. Styles . . . or Mr. Boys of the Housing Corporation?

Good morning, Mr. Boys. I wonder if you might introduce the officials that are here with you.

Mr. Boys: — Sure. To my left is Peter Hoffmann, director of financial operations; to my far right is Darrell Jones, director of property management; to my immediate right is Maureen Yeske, director of intergovernmental affairs and northern housing. Those titles are under our new Community Services, housing division organization. My title is executive vice-president of Sask Housing, and tomorrow's my last day with the government so . . .

Mr. Chairman: — It's the housing division now.

Mr. Boys: — Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: — It's the housing division of Community

Services.

Mr. Boys: — It's housing division effective May 1.

Mr. Chairman: — Well I want to welcome you here this morning. I want to make you aware that the instruction that I gave when you and Mr. Styles last appeared is still in effect; that is to say that when you're appearing as a witness before a legislative committee, your testimony is privileged in the sense that it cannot be the subject of any libel action or any criminal proceedings against you. However what you do say is published in the *Minutes and Verbatim Report* of this committee, and therefore is freely available as a public document. And you are required to answer questions put to you by the committee. And of course where written information is asked for, we ask for 20 copies of that.

The reason that we've asked you to come back today is because of the response that we received from Mr. Styles in his capacity then as the president of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, in which Mr. Styles writes to the Clerk and indicates that he is providing the information requested from the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation at the November 27, 1990, meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. And he provides answers to certain questions but then goes on to say:

We are unable to provide the committee with a legal opinion regarding the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation's ability to recover administration fees from the client.

This causes us some concern, because when the question was put to Mr. Styles on November 27, 1990, the question was, and it came from Mr. Anguish, and the verbatim shows:

Mr. Anguish: — Could you provide us with a copy of that legal opinion?

Mr. Styles: — Sure, we can undertake to provide a copy.

It is unusual for witnesses who appear before the committee — and given the privilege that is extended to them — it is unusual for witnesses to agree to provide information or answers to questions and then subsequently not provide that information.

And the reason that you're here today — I understand Mr. Styles for valid reasons cannot be here — the reason you are here today is to provide an explanation of that so that the committee might know what it should do further. And I want to give you an opportunity now to hear your side of this.

Mr. Boys: — We certainly appreciate, I guess, the committee's concern. In the past we've tried to provide all information that's been requested, and I think we've done that. Relating to the specific item that the legal opinion . . . it was Mr. Styles' understanding that a written legal opinion had been received on this matter from our corporate solicitor, Mr. Pat McDonald. One could not be located in our files and it was concluded that

the matter had likely come up with Mr. McDonald during meetings with him on other home program matters, but that no specific written response had been obtained on this item. The corporation has contacted Mr. Pat McDonald and requested a written opinion and we'll commit to provide a copy of this opinion to the committee.

So there was no intent to mislead the committee or to withhold something that was — I believe it was an honest mistake on Mr. Styles's part. He believed there was a written opinion on it. So as I say, we regret any problems that this may have caused or any concerns, but that is the story from our side.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. Boys, what you have done is you've asked for a legal opinion after the fact. Is that correct?

Mr. Boys: — We have requested an opinion from Mr. McDonald and hope to have that within several weeks or so.

Mr. Anguish: — Well did Mr. McDonald recall the conversation where he offered this verbal legal opinion?

Mr. Boys: — On the telephone he didn't recall it, but he's dealt with a lot of matters relating to the home program.

Mr. Anguish: — What have you done with outstanding administration fees that you've tried to collect? Have you in fact collected all of those outstanding administration fees?

Mr. Boys: — In terms of the actual collection process, as we indicated in the past or as Ron indicated at the last meeting, we've taken the position that the costs recoverable apply both to the interest subsidy and the administration cost. In the broader context, collections are based on a reasonable cost-versus-benefit analysis. And where costs are excessive, collection activity is limited to written communication, telephone inquiries, as opposed to hard legal collection. In terms of the specific administration fee item, since 1986 to date we've collected approximately \$16,750 which would be between 100 and 130 accounts.

Mr. Anguish: — 130 to . . .

Mr. Boys: — 100 to 130 accounts. Now we don't have exact numbers because of the different rates for the loans above and below 5,000. So the 16,750 is the number that's been collected now. There may be other ones that we're still pursuing, but it's a relatively small proportion of the total administration fees.

Mr. Anguish: — How many administration fees have you waived after first trying to collect them?

Mr. Boys: — I don't have that information.

Mr. Anguish: — You have done that though.

Mr. Boys: — The policy of the corporation is that we would try and collect the administration fees. And again it's not a question of waiving them *per se*, it's a question of

looking at the total picture.

For example, if we had a situation where we had a \$9,500 loan that we were trying to get repaid and subsequently collected that and they said, I'm not going to pay the \$125, we would probably try and follow up with some letters. But in terms of taking a hard legal action to collect that, you know, we obviously wouldn't because the cost versus benefit wouldn't be there.

Mr. Anguish: — But you have waived some administration fees.

Mr. Boys: — I'm not aware of what's been waived. In terms of, I guess, the term waive, I'm not sure what you mean by that.

Mr. Anguish: — Wrote it off. You decided at some point to not in fact collect the administration fee.

Mr. Boys: — Again if it's a cost-versus-benefit item, then there could well be some that had been not pursued — not from a hard legal action. I think we would try and pursue all of them through some avenues. If it came down to a hard legal action process, it's like any other lender or loan situation.

Mr. Anguish: — It seems to me that you've, in the absence of a legal opinion, chosen at some point to accept the money of those people who when they get a letter from a government department or agency, accept it as fact without checking any further, and in fact have in these cases of the loans over \$5,000, sent the \$125 in. In other cases where people have protested, you have not collected the \$125.

I don't find it very easy to reconcile that in my mind, whereas out of the basic honesty in dealing with government for some Saskatchewan people it's cost them \$125, where others who have protested because you have no legal grounds in many of these cases to collect the \$125, you've dealt with people unfairly.

And that was the whole thrust of when we last appeared on November 27 of 1990, when I asked Mr. Styles a question about the legal opinion. And he led us to believe there was a legal opinion, and we had dropped the matter at that point.

Now I think in the interim some people have sent in their \$125 in the specific cases that I'm talking about, and others have not sent in their \$125. And when they protested, you've dropped it.

And I find that, sir, to be very unfair to people who have dealt with the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation in the home repair program or in this case I guess the renovation program where many applied for the \$10,000. And so I think that there must be some remedy you would offer as to why some people have been dealt with in one way and why some other people have been yet dealt with in another way with very close if not identical situations.

Mr. Boys: — I think in response to that, there's a couple items. In terms of dealing inconsistently or differently with people based on whether they pay or not, I think is

not . . . it's hard to draw that conclusion. Obviously you'll have some people that will understand their obligation and will pay and other people will protest it.

I think, from the corporation's viewpoint . . . and I think it's important to understand that with the rules of the program effective June '87, individuals had six months to complete the work, and they had to start within one month. Now in terms of the corporation saying, well, you now, that's fine, we're going to waive those fees, we don't think we have the right to collect; we clearly do.

We think that by and large the . . . when individuals applied for the loan, there was the intent to . . . or there should have been the intent. Estimates had to be provided. And where they, for whatever reason, decided down the road that, no, we're not going to do the work and appreciate that there are, you know, there may have been individual circumstances, the reality is that these were taxpayer dollars that were at stake here.

And the corporation believed that it had a right to recover the administration costs and interest subsidies. And the administration cost, I guess, is a . . . we saw that as a smaller issue, a smaller item, but clearly one that, if we can recover it, we would have a right to. And we tried to.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Boys, we might be talking about two different situations here. You mentioned people who participated in the program fully. They took the money; did the work. I agree. If there's an administration fee as part of the contract, they should pay the administration fee.

I'm talking about the group of people who applied to the program, for one reason or another did not participate — family situation might have changed, might have lost the job, didn't want to take the money. Your corporation tried to collect the \$125 administration fee from all those people in the latter group that I mentioned.

I submitted to you, to the corporation — Mr. Styles to be more accurate — on November 27, that they had no legal grounds in those cases of the latter people to collect the \$125 administration fee.

He said you had a legal opinion. I see no evidence that you had a legal opinion. That group of latter people that I referred to — some paid it, some didn't. I'm saying you took unfair advantage of those people who did in fact pay the \$125 because they had applied but not participated. That's the cases that I want to talk about. And I just see no evidence that you had any legal opinion at that time.

Mr. Boys: — Well I think in terms of whether the appropriation would have . . . we certainly don't get legal opinions for every particular policy procedure that we have in a program. This one was one that . . . or get certain opinions. This is one that, you know, the policy was established and we had actually done some collections on this back in '87 and '88.

We tried to be as fair as possible with individuals. It's difficult for the corporation — I think for government — to somehow make an assessment of individuals' intent when they sign up for the program, and distinguish

whether a person actually has signed up and never intends to do the work or then goes ahead and does the work.

The policy in terms of the administration piece — and just so we're clear on that — is that if any work is undertaken at all, if they spend \$500 if they'd applied for \$10,000, to get \$10,000, if they do \$500 of the work, then there's no attempt to recover administration fees. We don't prorate it or anything because we believe that that's been appropriate.

Mr. Anguish: — There's no attempt . . . I'm sorry, I didn't hear you correctly. There's no attempt to recover?

Mr. Boys: — If they've done any work at all, okay. So if they've done some work and for whatever reason they don't use part of the loan and they choose to repay it, then we don't try and prorate the administration fee recovery there.

We're trying to take what we think is a fair and reasonable approach. I appreciate that some people may believe that it's a hard approach. We've always tried to, I guess, take a very responsible approach to the administration and the care of public moneys, if you like. So I don't, I guess, agree with the fact that it's an unfair approach.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I submit to you it's an unfair approach in the fact that in some cases, or at least one case that I'm aware of, you wrote letters to the individual threatening to take collection action against them. They continued to protest and you continued to correspond. They continued to protest; you dropped the \$125 administration fee.

Other people would send in their \$125 because they felt they were dealing in good faith with the government or an agency of the government. That is an unfair advantage. People should not have to protest to the government to be dealt with in the same manner as their neighbour who might have the same situation.

Now I want to go back to the legal opinion. Is there any evidence at all that there was a legal opinion? Is there an itemized item in a diary? Did someone call a lawyer on a certain date? Is there a letter? Is there a recollection of a specific conversation on a specific date? Is there any evidence that there was a legal opinion?

Mr. Boys: — Ron Styles believed there was a verbal opinion and I can't speak to his diaries and things that he may keep. I was never . . . or I don't recall an opinion that Mr. McDonald gave to us on that.

Mr. Anguish: — What's the normal procedure for gathering a legal opinion? Would the president of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation be the individual that would call the corporation solicitor and get that legal opinion directly? I would think that that would be delegated to someone else to say, look we need a legal opinion, we have to know what our footing is on this particular case. It looks like it's reoccurring more than once. There's about a 100 to 130 accounts involved. How would that normally work? Who would get that legal opinion?

Mr. Boys: — Well in terms of say 130 accounts, we don't . . .

Mr. Anguish: — You don't normally get a legal opinion on 130 accounts, do you?

Mr. Boys: — No, it would have to be something that . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Then why in this case did Mr. Styles tell me there was a legal opinion? That would be out of the ordinary. Was it because we were questioning on that specific topic?

Mr. Boys: — Well as I say, Ron's memory, I think, is quite good and I think he must have recalled that it came up in a verbal discussion. I'm not sure. I can't speak for what . . .

Mr. Anguish: — What's the normal way in which you would get a legal opinion on a hundred accounts if you are having some collection on it? Who does that? Does Mr. Hoffmann do it or Mr. Jones or who?

Mr. Boys: — I don't think there's a normal approach. Sometimes it's done by the president. Sometimes it's done by myself or individuals in the area. It's, I guess, decentralized if you like.

Mr. Anguish: — So just anybody in the corporation can phone the company lawyer and ask for a legal opinion. I find that a little loose if you're looking for legal opinions. How many times have you asked the corporate solicitor for a legal opinion since you've been with the corporation?

Mr. Boys: — In my 10 years? I don't know.

Mr. Anguish: — Well would it be greater than 10 or less than 10? Would it be greater than a hundred? How many times have you asked for a legal opinion from the corporation solicitor?

Mr. Boys: — I can't really . . . I couldn't even guess.

Mr. Anguish: — Do you recall any occasion where you've asked for a legal opinion?

Mr. Boys: — Sure.

Mr. Anguish: — Well how many times would that be?

Mr. Boys: — Well I can recall at least several times in the last year or two. But again, in terms of a 10-year period I can't recall. In terms of a 10-year period I couldn't guess at maybe 10 maybe 20, maybe. We would be in discussion with the lawyer if we had a . . . maybe it's an issue regarding regulations or . . . and it may be over the phone. It may be a phone discussion, depending on what issues are there.

Mr. Anguish: — So you believe that, under testimony in this committee — and I remind you about that — you believe that Mr. Styles has picked up the telephone and phoned the company solicitor for a legal opinion regarding about a hundred accounts when you've already said to us that would be unusual to give a legal

opinion.

Mr. Boys: — No, I didn't say that. I said that during other discussions with Mr. McDonald, it was likely an item that . . . it could have been a one or two question item and that was provided. I'm not sure of the . . . I certainly am not involved in terms of all the meetings that occur with our solicitor. The best I can do is go from what Ron has indicated to me and I believe that.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I imagine you would believe that. And that's proper if your president told you that, then it's proper for you to believe it. You'd have no reason to disbelieve that.

I, on the other hand, am not under the same obligation as you are in the situation. Usually when someone says, under testimony in a Public Accounts or a Crown Corporations Committee, when they say that they can provide us with a copy of a legal opinion, it is not a few words maybe in with another conversation with the corporate solicitor or it might have been a special phone call or . . . That's not good enough. And I would hope that in the future that individuals who appear from your corporation before the Public Accounts Committee are more precise in their information.

And when you talk about legal opinions, it may in some cases look to members of the committee — or at least some members of the committee — that to get out of a line of questioning that was being pursued by members . . . that it may have been a situation where that answer was given that there was a legal opinion to avoid the topic that was being talked about at the time. Because certainly when something like that is done, you have a distinct advantage, as a witness, that we do not have. And that is that if you say that, and you're testifying before the committee, and we have every reason to expect that that is the real facts in the situation.

But I don't know that we want to continue this any further at this point in time. But I would say that there is no evidence whatsoever, absolutely no evidence whatsoever, that you had a legal opinion in this case that we asked you about on November 27. And I think that it's a waste of your time now to likely be gathering a written legal opinion because you're now being pressed by the Public Accounts Committee.

It just seems like you're creating a paper trail after the fact, and I know at least for myself as a member of this committee I do not appreciate that because we are here to assure that the public purse is taken care of in a proper way with the due authority for the taxpayers' dollars. And I want to let you know, and you can pass on to Mr. Styles, that we do not appreciate that type of testimony.

That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lyons: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering where is Mr. Styles?

Mr. Boys: — He's been sick the last few days.

Mr. Lyons: — I certainly hope him a quick recovery. Is it something that's been ongoing or is it committee-itis?

Mr. Chairman: — That's really an inappropriate question. It's been communicated to us that Mr. Styles can't be with us because of illness, and the details of which are no business of ours. Are there any further questions of the witness?

Mr. Lyons: — Yes, if you let me, I'm going to ask a further question on that. Is there any indication that he will be recovered quickly or is this a long, ongoing thing?

Mr. Boys: — Having worked with Mr. Styles for a number of years, I think it's fair to say that he would have to be close to his deathbed before he would miss work and I'm sure that he will be back very soon. If he could have been here, he certainly would have been.

Mr. Lyons: — Perhaps, taking that at face value, Mr. Chairman, that we want to reserve the right to ask Mr. Styles some of the questions — I know that the witness that appeared today was unable to give direct answers from his own experience — and perhaps we'll want to at some future date when Mr. Styles is correct, or well.

Mr. Chairman: — Any further questions at this time? Thank you very much for being with us, Mr. Boys.

Bring in Mr. Dedman. Did members receive a copy of a list of questions or a question that was put to the Property Management Corporation?

A Member: — I'm distributing it now.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Good morning, Mr. Dedman.

Mr. Dedman: — Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — We welcome you here this morning. We want to make you aware that the instruction that I gave last November still stands, and that is that you're appearing as a witness and your testimony is privileged and cannot be the subject of any libel action or criminal action against you, but what you do say is published. You are required to answer questions put to you by the committee, and that accounts for your presence here this morning.

We find that subsequent to a question being put to you by the committee . . . The question was, could you provide a list of individuals or companies that have been checked by your access to the CPIC (Canadian Police Information Centre) system for the years '87 and '88, '87-88, and 1988-89? I don't have the verbatim directly in front of me but apparently you undertook to provide that information. Your response is now that you would not, in fact, be able to provide that information. This is unusual for the committee, and we want to ask you about that.

I just might back up. I believe you indicated that information could be provided on a confidential basis, which suggests to us that if the need is there that it not be published, that the committee could meet *in camera* to receive that information.

Secondly, there was another question we found. You were asked to provide a list of successful dealers who

were credited with the acquisition of CVA (central vehicle agency) vehicles. You had not, in fact, provided that information although it has been provided now this morning. And we understand . . . Well anyway you can explain that, and maybe you can explain that latter one first and then we'll get into the matter of CPIC, and I turn it over to you.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we missed the question on the car dealerships, and so when we got the call from the Clerk's office on Tuesday that that was an outstanding question, we collected the information. So I apologize for the fact that we did not provide that information.

Mr. Chairman: — Are there any questions on that?

Mr. Anguish: — On the dealerships?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — No, this is the list that complies with the question.

Mr. Lyons: — These dealers, Mr. Dedman, they tendered didn't they for the . . . They were let tenders?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder if you'd explain why it would be that in some cases . . . First of all let me ask: were these tenders let province wide?

Mr. Dedman: — Maybe, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lyons, I can go back on the . . . On the front page it does have our policy on the response, and all the vehicles are tendered except that for executive vehicles and ministers' vehicles there is an option that they can buy those vehicles from a dealer at a set limit that they have. However, in the past three or four years we have had the executive vehicles included in the tender, and that usually means that you can get more value for the allowable limit if you take them off the tender.

Mr. Lyons: — So within the overall policy of us having manufacturer's discount or rebate or whatever it is, that would be the reason, for example, why Mainline motors in Watrous would have sold 68. They would have . . . What dealership are they — Chev, Ford or Olds?

Mr. Dedman: — I'm afraid I don't know that.

Mr. Lyons: — So they would have provided the lowest sort of dealer slice and worked the best deal with the manufacturer?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes, the way it works, as I understand it, is that the . . . From the dealer's point of view, they can be as aggressive as they want and have as sharp a pencil as they want in their offerings, but overlaying that is how anxious the car manufacturers are to sell the vehicles as well.

So as I understand it, these will be the lowest dealer's price . . . or the dealers that have won will have the lowest price of the . . . for the class of vehicle that they're bidding

on at a particular time. But which manufacturer it is or which dealer representing the manufacturer it is can be determined by how much money the manufacturer wants to cut their prices.

Mr. Lyons: — Given that, why would it be that over, for example, in the 1988-89 year, you would see bulk purchases? I guess I can assume it was bulk purchases from different dealers. Wouldn't one dealer be able to provide . . . wouldn't there be a dealer to provide the lowest price?

For example, you have 18 from Bennett Dunlop in Regina and 89 from Crestview Chrysler and then maybe 33 from Morrison Chrysler. For example, between Morrison Chrysler and Crestview Chrysler, you're dealing with the same manufacturer. Wouldn't Crestview Chrysler have the lowest price if that was the case? Why wouldn't there be just one dealer dealt with?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't think so, because they did on different classes of vehicles. So there's subcompacts, compacts, full size, vans, half tons, and whatever. And I'm not sure I understand the system, but car dealers I understand have quotas and whatever, and so they may be more aggressive to help reach their sales levels at a particular time.

Mr. Lyons: — So there's different classes of tenders sent out then throughout the year.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Or are they all sent out at one time?

Mr. Dedman: — Generally they're sent out in the fall and we try to go all at one time because if you do that, you get more manufacturer involvement.

Mr. Anguish: — I just have one question. Mr. Dedman, can you tell me the purchases from Morrison Chrysler in North Battleford for the year 1988-89? I know that at least in the latter part of 1988, Morrison Chrysler did not exist as a business in North Battleford.

Mr. Dedman: — I don't have that answer. Within the latter part of '88, it didn't exist?

Mr. Anguish: — Well the sale of these vehicles would have had to have come early in 1988. I'm not really prepared to ask the question but I know for a substantial portion of 1988, Morrison Chrysler did not exist. At least they didn't have a store-front entity in North Battleford. I'd be interested if you could provide us with the date of the vehicle purchases.

Mr. Dedman: — Because the timing on this would be, for that quantity, that it would be the fall of '88.

Mr. Anguish: — The reason I know there's something wrong there, because in the fall of '88, one of the political parties used Morrison Chrysler garage as their campaign headquarters. So I know there wasn't a dealership operating out of there in the fall of 1988, being a federal election in the months of September, October, occupied the committee rooms. I know it was vacant quite some

time before that. So this is inconsistent with what you're telling me about purchasing the vehicles in the fall because the dealership didn't exist in the fall.

Mr. Swan: — If you read on the front page, Mr. Chairman, it says purchases for '87-88 and '88-89. So it would have been bought in the fall of '87.

Mr. Anguish: — No it couldn't, because if you look, Mr. Swan, at the top, this page is '87 -88 at the top. These two pages are '88-89.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, the one thing we don't control is when we order in the fall. There are some occasions where the fall order will come before the end of the fiscal year. So like normally, if you order in the fall of '87, the vehicles don't come until after April 1 so that . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Yes, I'm sure there is an explanation. I'd just like to know what it is.

Mr. Baker: — Did they close up or did they go in receivership?

Mr. Anguish: — I think they just closed the business.

Mr. Baker: — They could have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, but they could have quite conceivably had the order and it was delivered a long time after they closed the doors as well.

Mr. Anguish: — It's possible. Anything is possible.

Mr. Chairman: — The other question that raised our interest was the matter of access to CPIC. Do you want to make any comment on that now, Mr. Dedman?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, when I said I could provide the information in November, I believed that it was something I could do with the committee in confidence. When I checked further, the issue proved to be somewhat more complicated than I had believed. As the answer states, we did check with the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) at a high level while providing the information. And they came back to us with some concerns about the confidentiality and what making an inquiry upon an individual might do to that individual, his reputation and whatever.

I guess from my perspective, at the level of access we have, we don't get very much information from CPIC and so I didn't see it as a problem. But the issue that was brought back to me was the fact that we were doing a check — raises some questions advancing, or making known the fact that we were doing a check, may imply some things about the individual.

It was also put to me that CPIC is really a working-level system that should be kept highly confidential, and that the individuals who use the system are very much aware that improper use of CPIC information has, or can result in — and I guess it has resulted in — prosecution for breach of trust of the information. That's my understanding. That wasn't information at the level we have but it was . . . So I apologize that I didn't qualify my answer. Obviously I

didn't provide the information.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Dedman, just on this question. When I had asked you earlier whether you had a list of people that you had checked through the CPIC computer, those people or organizations, indications were that you did have it. I presume that that list is kept at Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, or the record of that. Why did you feel it necessary — and I don't know whether it was you — or why did somebody at SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) feel it necessary to check with the superintendent of the RCMP? Are you paid by RCMP?

Mr. Dedman: — It isn't our system and we have access to their system. So we really are a user of their system and I guess under their terms.

Mr. Anguish: — See, I don't understand what was the motivation for you to contact the RCMP. We weren't asking for — and the question was quite clear and I think you understood the question very well — that we weren't asking for the file on the individual organizations. We just wanted a list of the individuals and organizations which you had checked through the computer. Why would you check with the RCMP to see whether or not you had that list? I mean you have that list as property of SPMC.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lyons, we obviously have the record of the people that we check on the CPIC system. The reason we checked with the RCMP is that I guess I went back and talked to the security people and said we'd had this question and put it to them. And that raised the concern with them about our access to CPIC and what responsibilities we had as a user of that system. So that the discussion with the RCMP wasn't about the names that we had put to them; it was about the process with the system.

Mr. Lyons: — How many people, approximately, at SPMC would have access to some person or some individual who would be checked through the CPIC computer? Who makes the decision on who gets checked and to whom the results go to?

Mr. Dedman: — The use of our CPIC access is really in the hands of two individuals that really work in this area of SPMC.

Mr. Lyons: — Who gets the results of those investigations?

Mr. Dedman: — They do, the two individuals.

Mr. Lyons: — Do you?

Mr. Dedman: — No. Perhaps it would be worthwhile if I explain what CPIC information we have access to.

What our level of access provides us with is vehicle ownership data, licence, operator's licence data, and past criminal convictions. That's the only thing we get from CPIC.

Mr. Lyons: — I just want to make this clear. You're saying that the access is restricted to vehicle registration?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Driver's registration and data?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — I presume that includes a record of driving violations.

Mr. Dedman: — I think only if it would be a criminal conviction; .08 would be criminal.

Mr. Lyons: — Yes, criminal code .08.

Mr. Dedman: — I think what it means by drivers licence data is age and address and . . .

Mr. Lyons: — What was the third part?

Mr. Dedman: — Past criminal convictions.

Mr. Lyons: — Past criminal convictions. Now I understand that there's a . . . on the computer, that there is a section that if things of interest, a special interest section, if somebody's name pops up and is accessed — right? — and that the code is accessed, or the computer is accessed with the proper security code, that other items of interest will also appear on the screen. Is that correct?

Mr. Dedman: — It could well be correct. I guess the system has a number of different access levels, and I think the system, depending on what level you can access, it has progressively more information.

Mr. Lyons: — My understanding also is, is that when the access to SPMC was granted, that there was a greater level of access granted than just those three information. Has there been a change in the status of access?

Mr. Dedman: — Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Lyons: — I guess the reason why I ask these questions about CPIC, Mr. Dedman, is there's a great deal of concern in the public about their right to privacy and also the government's intrusion into their files and history. And one of the things that's become a major concern is your SPMC, its ability to run files on individuals, to access CPIC for, let's say, political purposes. To be quite blunt about it, we have a former chief of . . . or a major person involved in security, Mr. Ken Azzopardi, who now sits as the director of the Conservative party's re-election campaign team, who was seconded to the principal . . . or to the Premier's office.

Mr. Chairman: — A point of order.

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Chairman, members, reading into a record, leading points of view, personal view, which Mr. Dedman would not be able to comment on in the first place because it's of a political nature. He's here to answer questions from the department's point of view not answer for the member's accusations regarding whether it may be political or may not be political. If he wants to get in that kind of a debate, then we should excuse Mr. Dedman, if he hasn't got any more questions to ask of him

...

Mr. Lyons: — I've got lots of questions, Mikey.

Mr. Hopfner: — And then we will get into that particular debate between members of the opposition and members of the government side, then.

Mr. Chairman: — Strictly speaking, it's not a point of order as such. But again the purpose of the committee is to ask questions of officials who are before us. We do not have the ministers before us. And we are here to elicit information, not necessarily to engender debate on policy issues. Having said that, we know that Mr. Lyons will bear that in mind as we proceed along.

Mr. Lyons: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm referring, of course, to the list that Mr. Dedman had in fact provided me — was security service agency listing of employees, and then we have under here seconded staff, K. Azzopardi, executive assistant to Premier Devine, seconded to Executive Council, September '88 to March '89. And it's common knowledge that he's now director for the Conservative Party. I mean, certainly Mr. Hopfner is not going to try to deny that.

The point I am making, Mr. Dedman, is we're asking these questions. There is — recognizing the public's right to privacy — there is great deal of public concern regarding the SPMC security service. Quite frankly, I know I've had calls in my office from individuals who protested some of the activities of picture taking, of following of surveillance by automobiles belonging to the security service at SPMC. Their people have opportunities to check vehicle registrations. And there is a major, major concern brewing here.

I guess the reason we asked you for a list of names — and partly to assuage that if in fact individuals who may not agree with the present government are being put under surveillance by your security service — I as a representative of the people of Saskatchewan want to know that. And I want to put an end to it. And that's why... One of the members asked why would we want the list of names. That's why we want that list of names, or I want that list of names, to find out whether or not you have in fact put individuals under surveillance by the security service of SPMC in a manner which would be unauthorized and probably illegal.

I can accept your explanation in terms of the chief superintendent of the RCMP. The RCMP and the Parliament of Canada has a long history of trying to control the RCMP in terms of its own internal security services and had to establish to review committee, in fact had to disband one branch of the RCMP and create the CSIS (Canadian Security Intelligence Service), and put it under civilian review in order to precisely deal with these kinds of questions.

It appears to me that given the concern in the public, that there has got to be some kind of review structure, civilian review structure for the operations of the security service of SPMC as well, given the concerns that have been raised.

So again I'm going to ask you to give to the committee and, Mr. Chairman, I presume it would be done *in camera*, but I want you to produce for the committee the list of names of those people who have in fact been brought under surveillance.

Mr. Dedman: — I guess the list that we have and the people that we've brought under surveillance, or that we've checked through the CPIC system, certainly exists... (inaudible interjection)... If we're directed to do that, I guess we can do it.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess probably I have a concern as well. Mr. Lyons had indicated that he wishes to make sure that... or there is a concern of individuals out there that they have a real concern for the right of privacy. And here we have an official, a head of this committee, that's trying to protect that very thing — the right of privacy — by not showing Mr. Lyons or myself or Mr. Anguish or anyone else of this committee any of that particular information. It seems to me that that is a degree of professionalism right there by protecting an individual's right of privacy.

I guess probably the first question I would have is — I'm not asking you to give me the names of any individuals — but could you give me an example probably of individuals that you may check on and possibly maybe that could help me.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hopfner, there are a number of reasons that we might check an individual in this system. I guess one class would be personal security-type things where there's threats against an individual associated with the government, whether it's in person or by mail or by phone. Could be abusive behaviour, that kind of thing. We also do checks as part of a security clearance thing.

Mr. Hopfner: — Security clearance, did you say? Can you speak...

Mr. Dedman: — Sorry, sorry. As a security clearance, there are some of our facilities that are... customers, if you like, have concerns about. One example would be the court-house buildings where they have concerns about, say, contract cleaners that may be working after hours. And in the court-house building where there is evidence kept and whatever, that issue is raised with us by members of the judiciary. And in that area too would be certain jobs that were being filled, there might be a check on an individual.

And the third area would be around companies. Now on this system you don't check companies, you check individuals. But if the normal business checks on someone doing business with government do not mesh or whatever, then there have been occasions where individuals have been checked on the system.

Obviously the normal business companies that provide financial data and whatever are the best places to check companies, because it's obviously in the company's interest to have financial data available for creditors and banks and whatever.

Mr. Hopfner: — So really CPIC is more of a privilege for you people just as a shortcoming to be able to access some fairly quick information, and that's all you're really looking for is to . . . Is that what you're saying? And then you don't have to have a whole bureaucracy of your own or go through . . . Is that what you're trying to put?

This must work then similar to what Department of Health, I would take it, like with people that handle health records and everything else. That's confidential records that are being held, and there's just a few employees that have access to those records and that's it, right?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I would assume that that's right.

Mr. Hopfner: — There'd be a similarity there then because like we definitely wouldn't want individuals' health records all of a sudden ending up in this room either, in an *in camera* meeting, showing different members of this committee, health records of certain individuals that may be falsely accused of not agreeing with the government. I just had to throw that one in. Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Anguish: — I think we should take a break, Mr. Chairman. You know, we're past the hour where we'd normally take a break. If Mr. Hopfner wants to collect his thoughts and get back onto his question while we take our 10-minute break . . .

Mr. Chairman: — All right, we'll recess for five minutes and then we'll come back.

The committee recessed for a short period of time.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess what I heard from you then, Mr. Dedman, was that through those examples that it's more for security purposes that some of the people would be checked in various different areas. It doesn't mean that everyone is necessarily checked. It's just in the vital, important areas, where there may be important documentation or things like this that have to be . . . or may be considered as confidential to other public, not just . . . like through court-houses and police stations, etc., etc. etc. Is that right? Is that the kind of thing?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. I guess, Mr. Chairman, then that the only question I would have is that of maybe to Mr. Lyons then is to what advantage would it be to this committee, or to you, sir, for having those names being showed to you, their records being showed to you? If we were going to hold that in confidence, then there would be nothing to gain from it — absolutely nothing. Why would you want to know anything about any individual at all that you're promising this committee that you wouldn't say anything about?

I'd like that as a question answered, Mr. Chairman, because I have a hard time comprehending why we've brought Mr. Dedman here to even ask him for this kind of information.

Mr. Chairman: — The reason is is that . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — No, I'd like it from Mr. Lyons.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Lyons is not obligated to answer.

Mr. Hopfner: — If he wants to answer.

Mr. Chairman: — I'll certainly give him the floor at this point to briefly address your point, and then we'll get back to the speaking order.

Mr. Lyons: — No, I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Hopfner's missed the point of the question.

First of all, requested a list of the names of the individuals, not the files, who had been checked through the CPIC computer.

Mr. Hopfner: — Why?

Mr. Lyons: — The reason there is very simply this: there is some question as to — in the public — as to the activities of the security services of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. I think that those questions will be raised a little further on in terms of . . . and it'll become quite clear.

But let's put it this way. There is no, there is no control over an agency which has been established by the government which has the access to individuals' records in a broad area. And Mr. Anguish, I think, will deal with the areas of access to that information. There is no control over the security services of SPMC.

There is the right of individuals in this province to have confidentiality and privacy. But I guess it's a question of civilian control over the activities of . . . well I can't say it's a police organization, but it's an investigation organization which has power to look into the records of individuals for what reasons not known to either members of the legislature or to the public at large.

There is a question of accountability of those who have access to the information. Put it this way, by asking for a list of individuals we can also ask Mr. Dedman or representatives of the SPMC for what reasons were these individuals investigated. There may be good reasons but there may not be good reasons. The problem is that we don't know what SPMC security services are doing. There is no accountability of the security services to the public of Saskatchewan.

I'll just leave it at that and I think that as the questioning goes along it will become very clear to Mr. Hopfner precisely what those concerns are and how we've got to address those concerns.

Mr. Baker: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Point of order.

Mr. Baker: — I think this is quite urgent that it be brought to the floor. A few minutes ago the member from Rosemont made some very serious allegations,

allegations that could have criminal content to it, and that it's incumbent upon him to move as quickly as possible to reveal that information to the proper authorities and that's the place to do it. As a member of the legislature, he better do it. He has basically accused a member of the government — Premier's staff, director of our party — that he was involved in criminal activity through this organization. And if you have this kind of information, sir, you better get it down there to the proper authorities right now or you are just as guilty as anybody else that may have done something wrong.

Mr. Chairman: — There is no point of order here.

Mr. Baker: — I beg to differ with you. You talked about a one Ken Azzopardi using it for other purposes — not at this moment, but before the break — if you go back to your verbatim it will be very clear to you that . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I'll check the verbatim on that and if I feel that there is an appropriate . . .

Mr. Baker: — . . . that he insinuated that the misuse of it was being quite clear and that that sort of evidence is out there to support your line of questioning. You better not be here. You better be reporting that to the proper authorities. It's incumbent upon you to deal with it immediately.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Baker, we'll check the verbatim and if I feel that there's a legitimate point of order, then we'll deal with it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Hopfner, you still have questions and I would encourage members to use the opportunity while Mr. Dedman is here to put questions to Mr. Dedman and to get answers from him and to save any comments you might have in the way of any debate for any subsequent motions or any subsequent discussions after Mr. Dedman is finished with the hearing.

Mr. Hopfner: — Well I'm not going to belabour this too much longer. I don't agree with Mr. Lyons and his impression as to why he should be shown some names. As I indicated earlier, Mr. Dedman had indicated that . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Do you have a question for Mr. Dedman?

Mr. Hopfner: — No, I'm making a statement first. And I have a right, I have that right.

Mr. Chairman: — Again I want to encourage you and all members that if they have questions for Mr. Dedman to put those questions to him. Having said that, if there's some brief introductory comment to a question so that it might be better understood by Mr. Dedman and the committee, fine. But we should not at this point misuse the opportunity of Mr. Dedman being here . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — I won't misuse that, I promise.

Mr. Chairman: — . . . and enter into debate.

Mr. Hopfner: — As I was indicating before, with the concern of the right to privacy, I believe Mr. Dedman had

indicated to this committee that they're not prepared to expand that right, or that right of privacy to allow certain members of this committee or all members of this committee to see individuals' names. So that maybe one or two members of the committee may run around and bandy these names out in the public somewhere.

I think that is probably a good thing that they are protective of these people's files. I also indicate that I cannot accept the fact that . . . I guess this is a question to you, Mr. Dedman. The security services of SPM Corporation — is not what I heard you say correct — that CPIC is not your security service. Is that not what I heard?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Hopfner, we have access to . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — You have access to it, it's not yours. Mr. Lyons keeps indicating that it's SPMC's security service. It's not yours. It's RCMP, ran by the RCMP? Is that what it is?

Mr. Dedman: — I believe it is. CPIC is Canadian Police Information Centre, so I think it may be jointly operated, but I think it is under the control of the RCMP.

Mr. Hopfner: — All right. Then my question to you is, do you know whether CPIC has to answer to individual civilian, say for instance, a civilian-type board? Is there anything set up that CPIC has to answer to or is that a fairly elite group all on its own?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman. I'm not familiar with how it works above our level of access.

Mr. Hopfner: — But when you're given this information, are you given it in confidence?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Hopfner: — So then do you believe CPIC would continue giving you this information if you were to start accessing it to other individuals other than yourselves?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that, but there have been concerns expressed to us.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. So it's not your security service; CPIC is an organization, the RCMP. Do you believe CPIC can be trusted?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't know as I have the . . . (inaudible) . . . your question.

Mr. Hopfner: — Do you believe it? Do you believe they could be trusted? The only reason I'm asking it is because if the organization, if the people that are bringing this information forward, right, if they can't be trusted, then who can?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I guess, as I understand, this CPIC is really a data base.

Mr. Hopfner: — I know that. But I'm saying is the people that are feeding CPIC, feeding the information, can they be trusted?

Mr. Dedman: — I assume, yes.

Mr. Hopfner: — You're trusting them, aren't you? Because you are accepting what they're telling you. You trust them, right?

That's what I'm saying, is like . . . I mean if . . . and so you're taking it upon themselves that the information that they're giving you is the right information, it's the information that you're holding in confidence, and these are the people you would duly employ in certain specific areas that are high degree of . . . well I guess where there is a high degree of confidentiality held within the walls of those particular facilities.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say again that what we have access to is really quite limited information — driver's licence and vehicle registration and past criminal records, which as I understand it, criminal records are public documents. All that CPIC does is bring it together in one place.

Mr. Hopfner: — Yes. Yes, it's a data base. How would that, say, bank up to as far as . . . I think it's . . . the national one is CSIS, isn't it, or something like that?

Mr. Anguish: — CPIC is used by all the Canadian investigation police services. CPIC is used by city police, RCMP, CSIS, Property Management. They all use CPIC.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay.

Mr. Lyons: — Computer.

Mr. Hopfner: — Yes, I know. I know. It's a data bank. I know that. But I mean like it's . . . but so is CSIS a data bank, isn't it? Like in a sense . . .

Mr. Anguish: — No, no. CSIS is an agency.

Mr. Hopfner: — It's an agency, but there is a national data bank. Right?

Mr. Anguish: — They use CPIC.

Mr. Hopfner: — They use CPIC as well. Okay.

A Member: — They're the undercover . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. I thought maybe that was . . .

Mr. Lyons: — They're the spooks, eh.

Mr. Anguish: — They're the federal counterpart to your provincial counterpart.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. All right. So then there's . . . I guess pretty well that's about it, other than the fact is that . . . did Mr. Azzopardi work for this organization?

Mr. Dedman: — My understanding, he was seconded from SPMC to Executive Council.

Mr. Hopfner: — Where was he seconded from?

Mr. Dedman: — From the security area.

Mr. Hopfner: — Of?

Mr. Dedman: — SPMC.

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. And what was his prior employment to this?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't know.

Mr. Anguish: — Sergeant . . . (inaudible) . . . RCMP.

Mr. Dedman: — At some point he was . . . I'm aware that he was in the RCMP, but I don't know if that was directly before he . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — Okay. Thank you. I now pass.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dedman, you indicated that SPMC had three levels of access to the CPIC system. Is that correct?

Mr. Dedman: — One level of access and three things that that gave us.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I have in my possession here a departmental notice dated March 15, 1989, and it's signed by Mr. Savage, chief of police in the city of Regina. And I quote from it:

Subject: Access to Information by Provincial Agencies

1. The Saskatchewan Deputy Minister of Justice has revised the list of agencies authorized to receive C.P.I.C information as follows:

Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation (Security); information type specified: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.

That refers to types of information, those numbers. Types of information can be on persons, criminal records, vehicles, driver's licences, and vehicle registration.

What's more interesting though, Mr. Dedman, is that the information purpose is also itemized on this letter from the chief of police. The information purposes are categorized as A or B. There's only two information purposes in terms of CPIC.

Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, security branch, is authorized for both types of information purpose. Type A information purpose is: "Investigation, law enforcement or administration of justice". Type B, to which you are also authorized to receive, is for: "Screening applicants for licenses or employment (confirmation of criminal records requires fingerprint comparison)" under that latter category.

Now you have access to complete information according to this document from the CPIC system. What I find interesting in this letter is that under information purpose A it states: "Investigation, law enforcement or administration of justice". I would ask you, Mr. Dedman, are you involved in law enforcement or administration of

justice?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, no. I'm not sure of the document that you have, but just for my information, is the information that's listed in those five categories, is that different than I provided earlier?

Mr. Anguish: — No, the information type is fairly accurate. You listed, I believe, Mr. Dedman, three categories. I'm not accusing you of any inaccuracy in the information that you've given us. There are, however, five types of information that you have access to, but I think the statement that you made when you itemized in those three, I think is encompassing enough that you were not misleading the committee at all.

I'm getting into a new area because it's not only the type of information, it's the information purpose to which you are allowed. And so I'm asking you, under category A, which you're allowed to delve into in people's files in CPIC, I'm asking you, are you involved in law enforcement? I assume the answer to that would be no. I'm asking you, are you involved in the administration of justice and I assume the answer would be no to that as well, is that correct?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — Therefore, I would have to assume that you're authorized for information purpose A because of investigation. Do you do investigations?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes we do.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. You don't do screening of applicants for licences or employment, do you?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — You screen applicants for licences?

Mr. Dedman: — Well, not for licences but for employment.

Mr. Anguish: — So you screen for employment. So the reason that you would have access for information purposes A and B would be under A: to conduct investigations; and under B: to screen applicants. Is that correct?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Dedman, the investigation part of it is the great concern that we have. There seems to be very little control over this. And I'm wondering where the legislative authority exists — and the auditor may be even interested in this — where does the legislative authority exist for the security branch of the Property Management Corporation to conduct investigations? Where is that in your legislative mandate? What gives you the authority to be able to conduct investigations?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, I'm not sure I can answer that.

Mr. Anguish: — Could the auditor answer that? Where's

the legislative authority that allows a security branch of the provincial government to conduct investigations through the Property Management Corporation?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, our examinations of compliance with legislative authorities are restricted to financial-type transactions — revenue raising, expenditures, investing and borrowing.

Mr. Anguish: — I understand that. But there is an allocation in the budget that goes to the security branch of the Property Management Corporation. They conduct investigations. The president of the Property Management Corporation just said that to the committee. They conduct investigations. There's a line item in the budget to the security branch in there. At least there's money allocated to the Property Management Corporation in the budget documents.

Part of that money would be used to somewhere fund the security branch. They make capital purchases in the security branch. In fact in the questions that Mr. Dedman was so good to provide us with written copies of, it shows the purchases that they've made in terms of capital purchases.

So I'm wondering where is the legislative authority that allows them to do that. There are expenditures of money involved. Where is the legislative authority that it gives them to do investigations? And maybe it's not in your area but I thought it would be because it does involve the expenditure of funds and I don't know where the legislative authority comes from to do that.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, if I could perhaps explain. I guess we are charged with responsibility for a large amount of the assets of the province of Saskatchewan and looking after those assets in a number of ways. I guess investigation is also a pretty broad term. I guess our personnel division, our human resources division, would conduct investigations. If an employee has a problem or concern, we review that concern.

Mr. Anguish: — Our concern isn't in terms of the investigative side. Many people in the public, and in fact some members of this committee, would have a greater level of comfort if the RCMP or the city police, someone who is removed from government, would do those investigations. So we find that it's not accountable to anyone, anywhere, other than the good faith we would have with you in this committee that the purposes for which they're conducting these investigations are legitimate purposes.

There's no way of us finding out that information; therefore we asked you for a list — we would move to go *in camera* — of the people that you have investigated, in particular the people you have investigated through CPIC over the course of time that the security branch has been in Property Management Corporation.

Mr. Hopfner points out that maybe members will go bandying about names of these people who have been checked through CPIC. Well then that member would be liable to a civil action against whoever's name they're bandying about, so be it on the member's head if they

release that information from an *in camera* session of this committee.

And so I go back to your reluctance of releasing the information to an *in camera* session of this committee and why you would check with — and I stand to be corrected, but I thought you said you checked with the RCMP. It would seem to me that you have your access, according to this memo, and I can give you a copy of it. It's signed by the Regina chief of police. It seems to me that you would get your access through the city police, and that's who you would check with if you're uncertain about releasing information. Or is it because almost all security branch are former RCMP that they would feel more comfortable in going to friends within the RCMP to get that type of information?

So I hope that you can see that we have concerns about why and how and when and what for, this information is being used. And I ask you if you would be willing, in an *in camera* session of this committee, to release those names to us, so the names aren't bandied about in the press, so that confidence is kept, but we have some level of comfort as to what you're doing within the security service of the Property Management Corporation.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, if I could just clarify one point first. We get our access or our permission to have access through the Department of Justice, and they control everyone that has access to CPIC in the province. With our access, we can access at our level I think through any police agency in the province. Historically I think the access has been through the city police, the Regina city police and through the RCMP. That's the two places that we've mainly used.

Mr. Anguish: — That's logical.

Mr. Dedman: — But we do get permission to have access through the Department of Justice. That is not from us directly.

Mr. Anguish: — Can we hold that just there. That brings up a bit of a different item. You're not saying to me that when your people in security want to check into CPIC, they don't go to Justice and get Justice to check. Justice checks and gets back to you.

Your authority for access comes from the Department of Justice, but your access is done directly by members of your security branch, correct?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes, that's correct. Once we have that access then we can go to the, I believe, any police agency in the province.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. So coming back to my original question then, if there is no information attached to it, we're not asking for the files from CPIC. We want access to your file as to the names of the individuals who you have checked through CPIC. Can you provide that to this committee on an *in camera* session?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, obviously the list does exist, and I've put my concerns in front of the committee. I'm not an expert in this area, but I suppose if

the committee directs me, then I have to provide that to them.

Mr. Anguish: — Why would the committee have to direct you. I asked the question as a member of this committee. If the committee goes *in camera* will you provide us with a copy of the list?

Mr. Baker: — Well I for one don't want the responsibility of seeing it.

Mr. Anguish: — Are you on the list?

Mr. Baker: — I don't know whether I'm on the list or not.

Mr. Anguish: — No, no, the list of speakers list; otherwise stay out of it.

Mr. Chairman: — I've got him on the speakers list, but I just might state that the normal practice for the committee is for members to ask witnesses questions, for those witnesses to answer. If the witness raises concerns about the answer that is to be given, then it's certainly within the realm of the overall committee to determine whether or not the question is an appropriate one and should be put to the witness and whether the witness should in fact be answering that.

So it's not . . . Individuals enjoy rights as part of a collective committee, and it's the collective committee that has the right to decide whether a certain question should be put and should be answered, although for the sake of convenience we allow members to ask questions unless they are objected to. So I just wanted to make that clear here.

Mr. Anguish: — So will you provide us with a list of those names that have been checked through CPIC?

Mr. Hopfner: — A point of order there, Mr. Chairman. On the point that I had previously made as a member of this committee and have previously asked the questions of Mr. Dedman, I had specifically had concern as a member of this committee for the right of privacy for those individuals. And I don't . . . and I specifically made the point of saying that I did not believe that it should be incumbent upon Mr. Dedman to provide one or any members of this committee with those particular names because there has been no reason shown as to why anyone's name should come forward to this committee. No reason whatsoever. And I for one would not . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Point of order?

Mr. Hopfner: — Yes, I'm talking on a point of order.

Mr. Anguish: — There is no point of order.

Mr. Hopfner: — I'm asking you to then ask the member, if he wants to put that question, to put it in the form of a motion so that we can deal with that question as a motion. He's asking Mr. Dedman a direct question about putting that information in front of this committee and . . .

Mr. Anguish: — I agree with that Mr. Hopfner. We'll do that. I agree.

Mr. Chairman: — I just have a follow-up question here on this business of investigations. Without giving us the details or the names of any individuals, can you give us some examples of cases where the security service of SPMC has conducted investigations into individuals? Why would they do that? What would be the purpose of investigations?

Mr. Dedman: — Well I think, Mr. Chairman, there's a broad spectrum of issues that occur in an organization as large as the Government of Saskatchewan. We get asked to be almost like a consultant, if you like, on some of these issues. When some of them are brought to us, it's obvious that you can say to the people that's an issue to take to the police, go to the police right now. That's at one end of the spectrum.

At the other end of the spectrum, there's issues though where we can't . . . where we have to tell people that there is no easy solution to the problem they have. If they're getting anonymous letters or whatever, if they feel that there's something happening to them that they're uncomfortable with, we try to provide them with some advice as to what good security practice is and whatever.

In the middle, between those two extremes, there's some other issues. So there can be issues around someone that has a particular problem; they're losing something or there's . . . they have an employee that's being harassed or whatever, and we try to help them to deal with that.

In certain circumstances, you may want to check on a particular person. They say, you know, so and so is threatening me. Given the time sequence, you may want to check on that particular individual to see if there's something in the background or in the past criminal conviction record that gives you more reason to be concerned.

I think those situations though are very rare. The bulk of the reasons that we would check on an individual have to do with the clearance part where people have concerns, you know, who's in the building working at night when there is important information around, and whatever.

Mr. Chairman: — I sense that there's not any grave concern about the latter. The concern is one about investigation. Could you give us an example of a case where people have been threatened and you would go out to do then an investigation of the person who's made the threats? These would be threats of what nature? Would these not be matters that would normally go to the police?

Mr. Dedman: — If it's a clear case and you know who is threatening the individual, then it's easy to turn it over to the police, but you may have an example of someone, and there are examples where an office may have . . . someone continually phones and harasses the people in the office. And the question is, is there anything that can be done about that? And is this person a dangerous person? Obviously if someone's got 50 or 60 telephone calls, they may well think they're being threatened, and they may be sure they know who it is. But it's sometimes not an easy matter to just say, well, your solution is to talk

to the police and they can do something. Because in many cases, there's nothing that really can be done.

Mr. Anguish: — You mentioned earlier in an answer to Mr. Lyons that two people within the security branch utilized the access to CPIC. Can you tell me who those two individuals are?

Mr. Dedman: — Could I tell the committee *in camera*?

Mr. Anguish: — No, no. I want to know who of your employees. You have two people that access CPIC and no one else is?

Mr. Dedman: — No. Well I just am concerned about identifying those two people in public.

Mr. Anguish: — Well they're employees of the government. It's obviously part of their job description. I don't know what possible reason there could be for not telling us who the two people are that access CPIC on behalf of Property Management.

Mr. Swan: — . . . (inaudible) . . . *in camera*. We could move *in camera*.

Mr. Hopfner: — Do you want to move to *in camera* on that?

Mr. Anguish: — Well, we'll leave that question for now. If you want to provide *in camera*, we'll be putting forward a motion to go *in camera*.

Mr. Chairman: — It's 11 and we can come back to this next Tuesday.

The committee adjourned at 11 a.m.