

**Mr. Chairman:** — Call the meeting to order. I just want to refer members to last week's meeting. Mr. Baker raised a point of order on Thursday, April 25, 1991. Mr. Baker raised a point of order regarding a reference by Mr. Lyons to an individual whose name appears on a list of security service agency employees, 1988-89, tabled by Mr. Dedman in the committee.

I've carefully examined the transcript of Mr. Lyons's words and must find that they do not constitute a point of order as raised by Mr. Baker. I nevertheless caution and remind members to use judiciously the parliamentary privilege which they enjoy, and to guard against the use of words which could appear to be prejudicial to that privilege, especially in reference to individuals outside these precincts.

I might add to that, that one of the rules that we operate under in this committee is the rule that suggests that we refrain from political partisan debate while witnesses are in the room. I would certainly again caution members and urge members not to engage in debate. Having said that, if questions are raised about executive branch influence on other aspects of government, that's fair grist for the mill.

**Mr. Britton:** — Very well said.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Secondly, I believe Mr. Hopfner has a motion for us to consider at this point.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Are you going to do this now or later on? Okay. I'll move then:

That this committee authorize, under section 50(3)(k), 54 of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, the attendance of two members of the committee and the committee Clerk at the 13th annual meeting of the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees to be held in Winnipeg, Manitoba, August 11-14, 1991.

**Mr. Chairman:** — It has been moved by Mr. Hopfner. Is the committee ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Agreed

**Mr. Chairman:** — Next we have, tabled by Mr. Dedman, what the Clerk . . . response to a question, I believe, put to him by Mr. Anguish concerning Morrison Chrysler. I assume that you all have copies of that.

**A Member:** — Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'll send around a copy of the agenda that was agreed to by Mr. Hopfner and myself, that is, the agenda for the rest of our meetings. If there is any question on that, raise that, but I think these have been checked out.

We may find an opportunity when we're finished with Mr. Dedman, if you want to put that into motion form or some other . . . Note it for the record that we've agreed to an agenda for the meetings to come.

**Mr. Lyons:** — I'm surprised that, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Hopfner wouldn't want to examine the operations of the Board of Internal Economy, given some of its decisions in the past while.

**Mr. Baker:** — Just a comment on it. I have no problem with it other than that my preference would be that we left Saskatchewan Transportation alone until the court proceedings have been . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Well that's something that members may want to discuss when we get to that.

**Mr. Baker:** — That's the only objection I have with it is that it kind of ties the hands of the committee because of the situation that's taken place. You know, we've got some litigation going on, criminal charges laid.

**Mr. Chairman:** — We certainly do. But I think what we want to deal with is the comment that the auditor has had to make which is . . . he feels of course quite safe in making, has made it. I don't think that there's any enjoined or against us from discussing the comments that he's made concerning STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company). And certainly that if I thought that members were . . . in their remarks might tend to prejudice court proceedings and so on, then I would certainly rule against getting involved in that kind of discussion, as I've done in the past. But we should not be precluded from dealing with it.

**Mr. Baker:** — I think that we could probably get deeper into it if it wasn't before the courts. It would give us more freedom.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Undoubtedly. Are the members agreed then that we will follow this agenda or do you want some formal motion?

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Well as long as it's flexible.

**Mr. Chairman:** — What we're suggesting is that we deal with all the chapters in numerical sequence with the exception of those marked X. And once we finish with those chapters, we may want to go back to those chapters we excluded or add others as we see fit.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Chairman, I agree with what you're saying. I just want to make absolutely certain that there's some flexibility, for example, if let's say, for example, I can't be here when the Department of Education is on, I'd like to have some flexibility in that we can call something else.

**Mr. Swan:** — I think there are times when you have a department that can't come. So that's reasonable.

**Mr. Chairman:** — It's agreed we proceed in that fashion, that manner? Agreed.

We're ready then to resume our questioning of Mr. Dedman unless members have some other matter before we do that. Bring Mr. Dedman in please.

**Public Hearing: Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation (continued)**

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

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I believe when we left that Mr. Anguish had the chair . . . or Mr. Anguish had the floor and was asking some questions and I'd like to continue with that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to go back to the auditor on a question I had asked earlier in regard to the questions being placed to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. It was one of whether or not the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation had authority for the expenditure of public funds to set up a security service and from there conduct investigations.

I just think there is some role in terms of the auditor making sure that those funds that are appropriated by the legislature are being accounted for, and I don't see any place where the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation had the authority to conduct investigations to a separate security branch.

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Mr. Chairman, our office has looked at the authority that it had given to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) and in general terms they do have the authority to operate a security division. It's derived from section 12(1) of the corporation Act.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Of the corporation Act that set up the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation?

**Mr. Strelieff:** — Yes, The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Act, section 12(1).

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Strelieff.

Mr. Dedman, I'm wondering if, in reflection on some of the questions that have been asked already, whether you'd be willing to provide us today with the names of your employees who have access to CPIC (Canadian Police Information Centre).

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, in the year under review, or in the two years under review, it was Doug Porter was the director.

**Mr. Anguish:** — You mentioned there were two individuals when we talked to you before.

**Mr. Dedman:** — And that . . . the two people, Colleen Galenzoski, who didn't join the area until after the year under review.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I see. And Mr. Porter has performed that role for the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation since he became an employee of the corporation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And he's the only one who can access

information from the CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No. I think the area is authorized access, but in practice it's been these two individuals that have . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Is Mr. Porter in charge of the one particular unit of the security branch?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Anguish:** — What unit is that?

**Mr. Dedman:** — It's the investigations unit.

**Mr. Anguish:** — How many different units do you have within the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation security service?

**Mr. Dedman:** — There's three areas: one that looks after the awareness, security awareness, security training, that kind of thing; and then the largest area we have looks after the building access, so that would include commissionaires and it would also include the access systems and alarm systems.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So the three units under the security service would be investigations, security awareness, and building access.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — How many people do you have employed in the investigations branch?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Two.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Those two people that you mentioned?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — In security awareness, how many people do you have employed?

**Mr. Dedman:** — There's really only two, I believe, as opposed to clerical support and whatever, which is common for everybody.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm sorry, I don't follow you. I don't know what you mean by that.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well the clerical support and the . . . sort of put people in the three boxes, there is some sort of general support. So there's two in the security awareness area, independent of the general support that's there.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And in the building access?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think that — I don't have the number right here with me — but there would be, I think 15 or 16 would be there.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Plus support staff?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, the support staff is common.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Oh, there's a support staff that's common to all three units?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — What was the role of Ken Azzopardi in the Property Management Corporation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — He was seconded to be an assistant to the Premier.

**Mr. Anguish:** — What was his role in the Property Management Corporation though? He was an employee of Property Management Corporation, was he not?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. I think that at the time of his employment it was thought it would be useful to have someone that travelled with the Premier that did have some idea of security matters. That's apparently common in most other provinces.

**Mr. Anguish:** — But what did he do in the Property Management Corporation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — It's my understanding he was really hired to do that job.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Why wouldn't the Executive Council hire him?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Sergeant . . . pardon me, Ken Azzopardi must have had some contact. I don't understand why his job description would be seconded to the Premier. Who did Mr. Azzopardi answer to?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well if I can try and explain to the best of my ability, I think the idea at the time was that the security service would find someone that could travel with the Premier, as in other provinces. And that basically he would fulfil an executive assistant staff, but would have an executive assistant job, but have that kind of background.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Was he a good driver? Is that why he was hired? Did he drive the Premier around?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't really know.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well he worked for your corporation. He was hired by the security service.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. But I don't know the background as to why he was selected.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well what did he . . . Okay, let's go at it another way. What did he do? Did he drive the car? Is that why he was hired — to drive the car for the Premier?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think that . . . or I'm told that the practice in a number of other provinces is just to have someone with experience in security matters that would travel with the Premier, or with premiers, and would carry out executive assistant duties, but would have that

understanding.

**Mr. Anguish:** — What experience did he have in security?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I believe he had background in the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) but I'm not sure that I know what that background was.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Was the position advertised?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well can you find that out for us?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Sure.

**Mr. Anguish:** — We'd like to know how many people were involved in the competition if it was advertised. And while you're finding that out we'd like to know, if it was not advertised, how many people were interviewed for the job and we'd like to know whether or not the security service recommended that the Premier should have someone to provide security for him. I believe that's why he was there. I don't think he was hired as a chauffeur, you said because he had security experience.

I want to know whether or not the security service recommended that the Premier have such an individual, or whether or not the Executive Council requested that specific individual.

We'd also like to know, Mr. Dedman, what the job description was of Mr. Azzopardi. Did Mr. Azzopardi come back to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation security service after he did whatever he did with the Premier?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, no, he did not.

**Mr. Anguish:** — How long a period of time was Mr. Azzopardi driving the Premier around?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that with me, but I believe it was sometime in 1990-91. I can find that exact date.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Did he perform this job for a very short period of time then?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, I don't think so. I have his starting date which was September of '88.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Pardon?

**Mr. Dedman:** — September of '88.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have the termination date?

**Mr. Dedman:** — What my note says is to March of '89, but this was just for 1989 so I don't know if he was in . . . I think he was still in fiscal '90.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Who went from the security service to the Executive Council to replace Mr. Azzopardi?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No one went. It was . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — What was . . . I'm sorry for interrupting.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. It was, I assume, decided not to replace that position. So the role of the security service of SPMC does not now include providing that service to Executive Council.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well was there a risk; that the Premier felt there was a risk at one time that you needed such an individual and then you don't need that type of individual anymore?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well to the best of my knowledge, this was put forward by SPMC security service at the time as something that would be good practice, and was put forward because it was done in other provinces and felt that it was a worthwhile thing in other provinces, that it was put forward by the security service that it would be a good idea in Saskatchewan as well.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Did you terminate Mr. Azzopardi then when you discovered the position was no longer necessary?

**Mr. Dedman:** — It's my understanding that when Mr. Azzopardi left, it was decided not to continue to provide that service from SPMC.

**Mr. Anguish:** — That's not what I asked you. I asked you if Mr. Azzopardi was terminated because the position was no longer required, or did he quit? Did he still get paid by SPMC after he had concluded performing the function that you had provided him for — security of the Premier?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well it's my understanding that when Mr. Azzopardi resigned from SPMC, that it was at that time . . . it was decided not to replace the position in SPMC and to provide that service to Executive Council.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And that was your decision at SPMC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, I believe that it was.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So Mr. Azzopardi resigned; is that correct?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Can I just ask one follow-up question here, if I might. I know that when government agencies rent office space from you, you then bill them for the space that you've provided. Was that the case here with Mr. Azzopardi, where you're paying for his salary? You've seconded him to the Premier's office. Did you then bill the Premier's office, Executive Council, for the services that you were providing, such as where you provide office space? Did you do that?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I would have to confirm that, Mr. Chairman, but I don't believe that we did.

**Mr. Chairman:** — You didn't?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No. That's my belief.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Is there some reason why you wouldn't do that? I mean like you're in the business of supplying services and goods to other government departments, right? And you bill them for that. That was a big part of your mandate, right? But in this case you've made an exception and you didn't bill them.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well as part of what our security services people have been involved in is the VIP security program, and I'm of the belief that they felt that that is part of the process — providing an individual with security background was a reasonable thing to do as part of that VIP security process.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Were there others then that you provided the service for?

**Mr. Dedman:** — The VIP security service, or to have an individual . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Yes. I mean like with the VIP security service where members of your staff were seconded for years at a time to provide . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Chairman:** — No one else.

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Dedman, certainly Mr. Azzopardi would have had access to CPIC. Is that correct?

**Mr. Dedman:** — It's my understanding that Mr. Azzopardi did not access CPIC. Based on last week's questioning, I asked that specific question and was advised that in his time with SPMC he did not access CPIC.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And not during any of that time did Mr. Azzopardi liaise with other people that had access to CPIC? It would seem to me, Mr. Dedman . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — Certainly.

**Mr. Anguish:** — . . . he would have liaised with other people that had access to CPIC.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I would think that would be reasonable since he was taking care of security of the top man in the land in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So this liaison work that's done . . . we talked about the one particular case with Mr. Azzopardi. What about with other government departments and agencies? Is there a liaison person with each department and agency to the security branch?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I'm not sure if . . . do you mean that we only go through one person in a department?

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm asking if you have liaison people in

each department and agency that would be your regular point of contact with the security service.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think in some areas that we would have regular contact. One area that we would liaise with would be the legislative security. But depending on what the matter is, we sort of . . . people could contact us at any level.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you keep records of those contacts? For example . . . let me give you an example. Each time there'd be a contact with Mr. Azzopardi in the security service, would there be a record of that?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I would think not.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Why would you think not if the security of the Premier is at stake, and you have a person seconded to the Premier from the security service that was hired totally for that role? Why wouldn't you take the security of the Premier to be important enough to record the liaisons between the bodyguard or the security person to the Premier and the security service? It seems to me to be a reasonable thing to do that you would keep a log. Certainly in other police forces, other security branches, those types of things are very, very important. And it just seems to me that it would be strange that there wouldn't be a record or a log of some kind of the contacts Mr. Azzopardi made back with the security service within SPMC.

**Mr. Dedman:** — As I say, I don't believe there's a log of contacts that come in. I'm sure a lot of the contact would be quite casual in terms of perhaps discussing that . . . things like there's going to be a cabinet meeting out of Regina at such-and-such a location. One of the things that we've provided would be we would have somebody at the cabinet meeting, and we would . . . someone would in effect provide a commissionaire role so that when people left the room they could leave their material and that kind of thing.

So I think there could be lots of casual contact that would not be about any specific problem.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well the security of the Premier isn't a casual problem. I mean if it was felt important enough that you hand-picked this individual out of the RCM Police for no other function other than to provide security for the Premier, and you put him into the Premier's car . . . and I'm sure he wasn't there as a chauffeur; there's many people who have capability to drive a car and drive it well. Mr. Azzopardi had some other skills. And I'm shocked that there wouldn't be a regular ongoing log of the security provided and the inquiries made on behalf of the Premier, with the authority of the Premier, for the bodyguard that you had placed with the Premier.

Can you explain that? Or what was the job description then? The job description just said, go to the Premier. We'll pay you.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think that in making arrangements for travel and working through itinerary and so on that Mr. Azzopardi brought an understanding of security matters and if there were concerns, that he could raise them back

with the security people or he could raise them directly with the police.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I think I asked you earlier — if not I'll ask you again — I'd like to know who hired Mr. Azzopardi? Did you have that down as one of your questions?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, but I will take it as a . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'd like to know whether it was a request from the Premier's office or whether it was at the sole discretion of the Saskatchewan Property Management security service?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I'm of the belief that this was SPMC's idea. I don't know but I'll find that out.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I don't want to know whose idea it was; I'm quite clear with you on whose idea it was.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I want to know whose choice it was to hire Mr. Azzopardi.

Can you tell me what Mr. Azzopardi earned as an income with the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't have that with me, but I could find that out.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Was there a salary range?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I have no salary information on the security people with me.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well, that's the next question. I'd like to know the annual salary of Mr. Azzopardi, and what that classification was. I'd like to know whether there was a personal service contract, like many presidents of the corporations that Saskatchewan have and many of the deputy ministers and upper-level management people have. So classification, salary, was there a salary scale?

When Mr. Azzopardi left, was it at the end of a fiscal year, or what was the circumstances surrounding that that you cut his position? Or did you in fact cut his position?

**Mr. Dedman:** — It's my believe that he resigned from the position. But as I don't have the date, I said I would confirm exactly when he left.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay, so when he resigned you decided not to replace that individual to provide security to the Premier.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, that's my understanding of the sequence.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I want to leave that for a minute. I want to go on to some of the other questions we'd been pursuing last day, Mr. Dedman.

And I wonder if you have with you now the number of times that the security service in the Property

Management Corporation has accessed CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — As was provided earlier, Mr. Chairman, the maximum that we have accessed in any fiscal year is around a hundred times.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have the names with you today that you've accessed through CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Pardon me?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have the list of names with you today that you have accessed through CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Are you going today to provide that list of names to the committee?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think, as I said last day, if the committee were to direct me to provide it, I would provide it.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well I'm asking for it. I see no objection to it.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — I believe you said to put that in the form of a motion the other day. Do you remember?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you want to go *in camera* for that information then? Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. Hopfner:** — No, you said you were going to put it in a form of a motion, asking for that. So we all debated.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I thought the motion had to do with going *in camera*.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — No. Well put the motion any which way you want. That's what you said you were going to do. Do as you said you would.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Dedman, one of the things that the opposition has brought up I believe in this committee and also in the Legislative Chamber, is the idea of a watch-dog over the security service. And such things like CSIS (Canadian Security Intelligence Service), for example, have an all-parliamentary committee, all parties are represented. And they oversee the functioning of the CSIS organization.

In the past your predecessor was not willing to set up any kind of a watch-dog committee. And although there's no aspersions cast on anyone in the Property Management Corporation, it tends that security services, when they're doing such things as investigations, criminal or otherwise, can tend to get out of control unless there's some checks and balances there.

And the other thing, I think the perception to the public would be better over time and the public better served if there was some type of a watch-dog over the security service of the Property Management Corporation.

I'm wondering if you as president of the corporation would see any problem with that or whether you would recommend, since you can recommend security to the

Premier, you could maybe also recommend to the minister in charge that there is a watch-dog organization set up that would have impartiality and a very high level, possibly of senior legislators, to watch over them. I wonder if you would make that kind of a recommendation.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, we haven't made that kind of recommendation. I guess that's a policy matter, and if it was decided that that group should exist, then that would be fine with us.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well you'd be making that recommendation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, I said we haven't made that recommendation. I guess from my perspective, I'm comfortable with the people we have and the work that they're doing. But if it was decided that there was going to be some group to oversee the operations, I'm sure we could deal with that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I want to go back to the list for a moment, the list of names that you have that you've accessed through CPIC. Can you tell me if any individuals appear on there that were involved in GigaText?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well the one thing that I can say . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm not asking for a name. I asked are there . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Mr. Dedman is trying to answer a question put to him by Mr. Anguish. Let's give him the opportunity to do that.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think, or when I was here in the fall, I was asked if we had done any investigation and checks around GigaText, and I said that we had.

**Mr. Anguish:** — But that's not what I asked you now. What I asked you is that the list of names that you have with you today, are there individuals who appear on there that would have had association with GigaText, which is different than the other question.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, I guess if I'm going to talk about one name that's on the list, I would . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm not asking you to talk about a name, Mr. Dedman. I asked you if there were individuals or an individual on that list that had any association with GigaText. I'm not asking you for any name.

**Mr. Dedman:** — As part of the review of GigaText, I'm aware that at least one name was checked.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Could you give us the date that that check was made on that individual.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know if I have that with me, but I believe it was in May 1988.

**Mr. Anguish:** — During the break, do you think you'd get us an exact date for us, Mr. Dedman?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Sure.

**Mr. Anguish:** — When the government makes a major expenditure decision that involves the private sector, is it common practice then for the security service to use CPIC to investigate these people?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, I don't think that it is. The most useful way to gather information is to gather it through the business information . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Why in the case of GigaText would you access CPIC and not another? Like I don't understand what the guide-lines are as to why you use CPIC.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I guess I can't answer on the specific case, but the reasons why you might use it is if there was conflicting information or not much information through the normal business information collection agencies.

**Mr. Anguish:** — But there must be some guide-line. You don't just take it lightly to access somebody's file in the CPIC system. There must be some kind of a guide-line there. There must be some rules about that. If there's no rules, that's even stressing further the need for some watch-dog organization or the security service. But surely to goodness there must be some rules that you have. Like why GigaText, for example, why GigaText and not the people involved with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company involving bus purchases?

**Mr. Dedman:** — As I've tried to say, Mr. Chairman, the first line of gathering information is to gather it through Dun & Bradstreet and similar information systems. If there is a considerable amount of information there and if people are happy with that information, then I think that is what they would go with.

Sometimes, depending on the companies and whatever, there may not be a long history and that could be one reason why someone having gone through the business checks would come to us and say, can you find us any information about this individual or this company.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Who would come and ask you that?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well it would be . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — The business?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, the Economic Development people that would be normally dealing with them.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So Economic Development people have access to CPIC files too?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — They can come to you and ask you for information because of an economic development venture and you'll access CPIC for people in Economic Development?

**Mr. Dedman:** — If a company is dealing with the province in a matter as you've described where there

might be a large investment or whatever, the Economic Development departments themselves have access to the business information services that are around, and they would attempt to gather that information. If they had problems with that level of information or some of the information they received was in conflict, they might raise that matter with us.

**Mr. Anguish:** — But it's their decision to make.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So they can sit down and if Mr. Lyons and I happen to work for Economic Development in the province, we could have a conversation and we could search Dun & Bradstreet, and on our opinion if something looks suspicious to us or we didn't like the way somebody wore their hat, we could come to you and build our case and you'd access CPIC for us through security service, right?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well what are the guide-lines?

**Mr. Dedman:** — What they would bring to us is their concern, and we have access to business information areas and whatever. And we would try to take their concern and interpret that to them.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm talking about CPIC.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well that might be part of what we check. But we don't take the CPIC information and provide it back to anyone.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have a policy manual on this? Is there a policy manual?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — There's no policy manual on how you access CPIC.

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I think that's an atrocity. It's too judgemental, Mr. Dedman. It's not very objective that somebody can sit down with no policy manual and decide whether or not they're going to access CPIC based on some vague kinds of information that are provided. And I say they're vague because there's no policy manual going into you and there's no policy manual coming out of you. Don't you see that as a problem?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I appreciate the concern that you've raised. I guess our reliance is on the people and their experience and discretion around the processes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — But sometime, Mr. Dedman, you don't get the right people. That's why we have things like GigaText and buses that are questionable and things like that. That's why you should have a policy manual. I mean, these things are happening and there's nobody to watch that that's independent of your agency.

I mean, there are states around the world — thank goodness that Saskatchewan people and Canadian people are stable — there are states around the world where they would fear the kind of operation that you have. No policy; they can access CPIC. They get criminal records. They can do investigations.

I'd ask you: who made the request to you to get information from CPIC in regard to GigaText? Who made that request to you?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know. I'd have to . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well if you could find out; when you find out the exact date during coffee-break, maybe you could tell us who the individual was that made the request. And maybe you could tell us a little bit about the process, how that happens. So in lack of a policy manual, maybe you can shed some light to this committee on how it is that this uncertain search through CPIC occurs.

Maybe the other thing that you could tell us is whether or not there are any individuals or individual on your list that you have with you here today that would have been involved with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

**Mr. Dedman:** — The list I have, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Anguish, is for the years under review, '87-88 and '88-89. I'm not aware of any of the names on the list that would have any relationship to Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

**Mr. Anguish:** — You're not aware in those three years of any names that would be associated with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company?

**Mr. Dedman:** — That's correct.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Did you say you had '89-90 with you as well.

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, '87-88 and '88-89.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well maybe you could show us . . . not show us, but maybe during coffee-break you could gather a list from '89-90 and maybe on that list you could tell me whether or not there is anyone who appears on there, any individual or individuals that appear on there that would have had any dealings with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

**Mr. Swan:** — We're still dealing with the older accounts, like *Public Accounts* from past years. I don't believe that Mr. Dedman was brought in at this time to deal with '89-90. And I think this is sort of a fishing trip across the world, and we'll never get anywhere if we're going to do that. I believe that we have to stay with the issue that we brought him here for. And when the time comes if we're going to deal with '89-90, that's the proper time for additional questions.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I agree with you that the witness was brought back to answer questions respecting the fiscal year 1988-89. He was not brought before us to answer any questions related to the '89-90 fiscal year. Certainly if

the committee wishes, that it wants to get into the '89-90 year, then it can do so. But at this point we're doing a follow-up on questions that were put to Mr. Dedman with respect to the '88-89 fiscal year. So I thank Mr. Swan for his attention to this matter.

I see that it's 10 o'clock. Might I suggest that we have a brief recess and then reconvene after that.

The committee recessed for a short period of time.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Dedman, were you able to get answers to those questions?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Anguish, Mr. Porter is out of the city today and I wasn't able to contact him, but I believe the date of the inquiry that was made with respect to GigaText was May 16, 1988.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Who made the request?

**Mr. Dedman:** — That was made by Mr. Porter.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Who requested Mr. Porter to . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — I can't from the check that was done, I think I have to ask Mr. Porter. That wasn't apparent in the quick check from the . . . that I had the lady do at the other end on that file. But I can get that; he will know that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — We'd like to know who made the request.

Do you have the further answers as well?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. You asked me about the process of how we would handle those kind of inquiries. I guess one way to explain it is that for matters like this we need to have someone with a problem. They bring the problem to us, tell us the nature of the concern they have, and then we would use our resources to try and see if they have a concern or not.

Again we use the business things that they have access to, and I'm advised that the CPIC might be used if you wanted to check for a criminal record, but it also might be used in that you need a date of birth of an individual in some of the business information checks.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So your investigations go beyond CPIC? Like you would in some cases conduct as full an investigation as an investigative service could conduct.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, we would try and find information that would be helpful to the customer. The information that is given back to the customer, in respect to CPIC, is never the CPIC information.

**Mr. Anguish:** — We understand that. But you would have to provide in some cases, fairly detailed information. Otherwise if they didn't have that detailed information coming back the other direction from you, it would be virtually useless to them. So you must have to get fairly specific on the investigations that you do. Even though I know you don't show them a hard copy of the CPIC file, you would certainly have to give them a very detailed



report, otherwise the information would be meaningless to them.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well that's right. Either they have to accept the point that we would raise with them that there are real concerns with an individual and where we find those concerns. Again in a business case, you might find through business information type companies in the United States some connection that confirms concerns that are raised.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Are you into some other computer banks besides the data bank of CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, I don't think so.

**Mr. Anguish:** — How do you access that other information?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well you go to companies like Dun & Bradstreet and Equifax that are in that business. And I believe there are some American companies that are in that business too.

**Mr. Anguish:** — When you're getting this other information for us, we would like a list, and we don't need to know who the information is being requested about, but we would like the list of the individuals that have asked you to conduct investigations, if you could provide that to correspond with the lists that you have for those people that were actually investigated.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, I have a concern about that list as well. If an individual says I think that there is a problem and raises it with us, if it's a security issue around individuals or whatever, I'm not sure that . . . or I'd be worried about making those names public. And these are people that are doing their job as employees for the government.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have such a list already?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, but we would have to go back and look at situations where we'd been asked to provide . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — How many government departments have requested access to CPIC or asked you to conduct investigations?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't have that number. The number would not be very high. I have no problem talking about departments and whatever, but . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — You have no problem talking about . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — I have no problem talking about departments.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay. Well how many times has Executive Council asked you to conduct investigations?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know. I would think not very many times, but I will check that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well you could also provide us with the departments and agencies that have requested your

services in the security branch?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — What about the Premier's office? Has the Premier's office ever requested access to your investigative expertise?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I will find that out. Not many times if they have. But I can give you an exact number.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Can you provide dates for us as to when those requests were made?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think that we probably would have that.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Just in follow-up to that, Mr. Dedman, is there any rule that you have that says that, say for example the Department of Economic Development and Trade or whatever it's called these days were to have a question for your security unit because they want to do a background check on some individual or whatever, are there designated individuals within that department through whom all requests must come? Or is it just anybody from that department could pick up the phone? How does that work?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think generally that we may have contact through an individual, but I think because they have their own resources, with a lot of this in general we would come at the direction of the deputy minister.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Why aren't all members informed that they have the access to your investigation services?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I guess that in the past the director of SPMC security services has talked to individuals in the offices of the party leaders and advised them that SPMC exists and if there were problems that they could bring them to us.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well who's that contact person say, for example, in the NDP caucus office upstairs?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know the names of the people that it was discussed with, but I believe it was discussed with a couple of people during the calendar 1990. I think I can provide those names.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Can you tell us how many of the other ventures similar to GigaText were investigated by the security branch?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, because these agencies have their own resources, I would think over the time that the security agency has been involved, probably not more than 10 or 12 companies or individuals associated with companies would have been checked by SPMC security people.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Would you say that again, please.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well I would think because Economic Development has access to business information of their own that they come to us very rarely. So I would think the

range of companies checked in the last three or four years or individuals around companies would have only been 10 or 12, somewhere in that range.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Can you check . . . could you provide to us the reason for the check, like aside from the names and the confidentiality of the request or the person who's the subject of the investigation. Have you got the ability to categorize those for us in terms of why it was done?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think generally that the reason that we would be asked with respect to business information would be because there was not enough information or there was some discrepancy in the information. I put those as two categories. Perhaps you can maybe explain to me what you . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Because there wasn't enough information or there was conflicting information. That would be the usual reason the request is made?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — The person who was checked out in regard to GigaText, was that before GigaText came into being as an entity, or was it after the fact?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know the timing sequence of it. I can try and find that out.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well you've got the list there. I can find that information out; I have extensive files on GigaText. Who was the request made by in the case of GigaText? Which department?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I'm not sure. I said I would try and find that for you from Mr. Porter.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay. What about Joytec, the individuals that were involved in Joytec in Saskatchewan? Was there ever any investigation of the company Technigan?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I don't know. Just so you understand, the list has names on it of individuals. There's really no way to check a company, so I will ask.

**Mr. Anguish:** — That's why I'd like to see the list of names actually.

I want to go back now, Mr. Dedman, to clarifying Mr. Azzopardi's access to the investigations conducted by the security service. I would have to assume by what we've gone through over the past hour or so, that Mr. Azzopardi must have had full access to the investigative powers of the security service within the Property Management Corporation.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well I think Mr. Azzopardi would be a customer, I guess, as any other individual the companies could . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — In whose employ?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well in terms of coming to or dealing with us for assistance, it's my understanding, you know,

he did not have an office in our building and that his contact was . . . if he had a concern or whatever, he would raise it the same as someone in another part of government would raise it.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I thought you told me earlier though most of his contacts would have been informal so there would have been no log book or anything kept. Like when I was trying to get at this earlier, you said there wouldn't be a record of Mr. Azzopardi's contacts. And now you're saying that he has to go through the same process as anyone else.

**Mr. Dedman:** — No, well then I may have misinterpreted your question. I would think that he could have . . . that a number of things around the work that Mr. Azzopardi did would be just advising and whatever, without anything to do with investigations. I interpreted your last question to mean, was he part of investigations or was there some kind of casual connection.

**Mr. Anguish:** — No, during the time he never did work directly in the security service of Property Management Corporation.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, that's my understanding.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Your understanding. He was seconded immediately over to the Premier. But I was almost under the impression initially that there were no records of Mr. Azzopardi's contacts. I would think it would have been very important if he's assigned the security of the Premier. But now what you tell me, if he came there as a customer, that he would have to go through the same process so it would all be logged in. And I think any time that the person in charge of security, that stays with the Premier, wherever he moves to, there'd be a record of that made every time back to the files in the security services of Property Management Corporation.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Could you say that once again?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Every time that Mr. Azzopardi would've made a contact with the security branch would've . . . it had to do with the Premier, otherwise he would . . . what would his informal ties coming there, I guess is what I'm trying to say.

Mr. Azzopardi never stopped at Property Management Corporation. He was hired and ended up with the Premier. So he would have no reason to make informal contacts. So any contact that Mr. Azzopardi made with the security service of the Property Management Corporation must have been in his official capacity. He would have had no other reason to contact the security service of Property Management Corporation. Is that not correct?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, I agree with that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — So you would have a list then of all the contacts Mr. Azzopardi made with the security service, right?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well if I can separate . . . and I will check this — but in terms of advising us that the Premier would

be in a number of different places or of things of a routine nature with a short life, I don't know that there would be a record of those contacts. I'm sure if he asked us to, if there was a concern raised or whatever, and we took some action based on that concern that was raised, then there would be a record.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Will you provide us with the dates that Mr. Azzopardi made contact with the security service?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well I will certainly check and see what record exists there.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I'm wondering if you can recall from your names there whether or not there are any investigations requested of you, either through CPIC or other or a combination, regarding the Yorkton court-house?

**Mr. Dedman:** — There's nothing that I know of the Yorkton court-house that has anything to do with the list, but that doesn't . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — We seem to be getting caught in a bit of a confidentiality. How would we have access, as members of the legislature, to provide you with names and ask you if those names had been checked through CPIC in regard to a certain incident? Do we have access to that kind of information?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, I guess what my minister has said is that he would be prepared to deal with any individual that thinks he or she might have been checked through CPIC by SPMC and would provide that . . . I think what I can do for you is perhaps to say if there was anything . . . if we did any kind of a check with regard to Yorkton court-house, I can ask that of the people in SPMC.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well you could ask that, but turning that back around, I'm still trying to get at the process a little bit here. If I wanted to know, in my role as a member of the legislature, whether or not you had done an investigation into the Yorkton court-house and the affairs that surrounded that, and I provided you with the names that would be the logical names to have been investigated, would you tell me as a member of the legislature what happened at the investigation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I guess I would have concerns about . . . if there is a problem, or if we're involved in a problem and it is a police matter, then it goes to the police. If we're involved in a matter and nothing comes of it, then it drops.

Again, I think that in this process that there is an expectation that SPMC is involved in things that are much different from the ones that we are actually involved in. The things that our people are involved in are pretty mundane day-to-day type things. But if there was an issue around the Yorkton court-house, I can ask I guess if we had an inquiry around some matter on the Yorkton court-house .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Yes, but you might not be able to identify it by the Yorkton court-house. What I am saying to you is

if I provided you with the names and told you about the issue, would you tell me as a member of the legislature, the information I wanted to know?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I would think that as a member of the legislature, normally an inquiry like that would go from you to my minister.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well let's put this another way then. If your minister asked you that same thing, would your minister get that information? Does your taskmaster have access to that information on request, from you?

**Mr. Dedman:** — If the minister asks, was there ever a review or were we asked to do a review of the Yorkton court-house or something of that nature, or some problem, we would tell him, yes.

**Mr. Anguish:** — No, no. I'm establishing here that there's different information for different people. And I'm not suspect of what you're doing within the Property Management Corporation. I believe your people have integrity. I'm suspect of the potential manipulation of the system.

If I provided to you names of people that I thought were involved in a particular incident, say the Yorkton court-house, and asked you if those people had been investigated or what your involvement was, could you provide me that information?

You said to me, no, that request would usually go through the minister. You see, when it gets there, it gets political because I'm one politician talking to another politician of this investigative branch that should be above reproach. But at the same time, if your minister asks you for that information, you would be obligated to deliver that information to your minister.

**Mr. Dedman:** — My minister is the chairman of the board of Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and has the responsibility as that, in that role. But I can say, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Anguish, that my minister doesn't ask those questions. And I mean, my role is that . . . my position is that we provide that service and I'm not in the middle of what the security people do with the people that come to us with problems.

If I may have misinterpreted what you're . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — Well I'm trying to establish that there are some people who can get access to that information that have no more right to it than anyone else. I give you the example of me provided with that information, whether or not I can get back the information; no, I have to go through the minister to do that.

But it should be something in your security branch that the investigative powers should be beyond that. And I go back again to the need of having some kind of a watch-dog over the security service because of that. Any time you have a security service that does investigations, you want it to be removed from politics as absolutely far as possible.

RCMP, city police forces, CSIS, they all have the checks

and balances there, but the checks and balances don't exist in your organization. You don't even have a policy and procedures manual on such things. I don't know how you justify not having those checks and balances there and providing it in a procedural manual or a policy manual.

Can you tell me on the list, have you ever been asked to investigate a member of the legislature, for example?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Not that I'm aware of.

**Mr. Anguish:** — How about a Member of Parliament? Have you ever been asked to investigate a Member of Parliament?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Not that I'm aware of, no.

**Mr. Anguish:** — You'd check that, though, and let us know, wouldn't you?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Sure, I can do that.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Can I ask a question while they're conferring?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Dedman, are you the only people in the province that have access to CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No. There are other people that have access, I understand.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Like, do you know of . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — Legislative security area would have access.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — So the Sergeant-at-Arms would have access to CPIC?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — So then if the Sergeant-at-Arms has access to CPIC, who controls the Sergeant-at-Arms? And if they're not internally . . .

**Mr. Dedman:** — I would assume that to be the case.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Then that would be an all-party committee that could actually . . . well, it's just another . . . then the information that is gathered through CPIC is . . . The Sergeant-at-Arms does not have to go through you?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No.

**Mr. Anguish:** — In regard to any political figures being investigated, you don't know that information or you can't say that information? I wasn't quite clear, Mr. Dedman, on your answer.

**Mr. Dedman:** — As far as any political figures that I recognize, there's none on the list that was provided. And when I've asked, I've been told that no one that our people identify as political figures are on any list.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay. The list that you have with you, it's my understanding that you're willing to provide those *in camera*?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I've raised concerns. I would do it reluctantly if I was directed by the committee. I've concerns about providing that list, but . . .

**Mr. Anguish:** — What are the concerns that you have with this, provided *in camera*?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well, the fact that we check the list, or check someone's name, has no tie to whether they ever did anything wrong or whatever. People are checked for a number of reasons, as was covered last week. If there is no outcome out of a check, then I've concerns about those individuals and providing their names.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Wouldn't in most cases, the departments have evidence there was something wrong before you do a check on an individual?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, as we discussed last week, we've also done checks with regard to . . . it's with regard to employment clearances and so on.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you do all the employment clearances then for the government?

**Mr. Dedman:** — No. We would just have . . . mainly it would be to do with people that we employ either directly or indirectly.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay, so you check your own staff?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Or contract cleaners in sensitive areas.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I guess before we leave this topic, did you give us your undertaking to provide us with the exact date that Mr. Azzopardi was employed by SPMC, the arrival and departure date?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes, I think I gave the arrival date but I would get the departure date.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I thought you'd want to check that.

**Mr. Dedman:** — I think the date as given on the information that I've provided earlier is correct.

**Mr. Anguish:** — September '88?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. But I'm not sure if that . . . well I believe that time extended into the next fiscal year. On the information that I provided for '88-89 on the listing of employees, it's shown there September '88 to March '89 which is the end of that period. But I believe it extends into the next fiscal year. And I would check that and get back to you.

**Mr. Anguish:** — We'd like the exact date.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Okay. September such and such.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Yes, September, whatever date in September it was. Can you provide us with most of these answers for the next day, Thursday?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I will try my best.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you have policy and procedure manuals in other branches of Property Management Corporation?

**Mr. Dedman:** — If you talk about in the old tradition of having a large policy manual where people go and look in an index and turn to some page to find how they're supposed to do a particular item, we don't have those. There is a body of information of practice and how you do things that exists across the company, that gives direction to people.

**Mr. Anguish:** — I don't see anywhere in terms of the *Public Accounts* where you would bill back to a department or agency for an investigation you've done. Is that just all lumped in together?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I believe that we can charge back to the departments.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Do you charge back to the departments for investigations that you conduct?

**Mr. Dedman:** — Yes. That may just be for out-of-pocket expenses. So if you access a business information company then there's charges involved in that.

**Mr. Anguish:** — You do it on cost recovery on the actual out-of-pocket expenses?

**Mr. Dedman:** — I would just have to confirm that. I'm not sure if we charge for our people in those charge packs or not, or whether it's just costs that we've incurred.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Yes, if you could just tell us that please.

I'm also interested in the next time you appear here, Mr. Dedman, about the liaison people that you would have with government departments and agencies. You know, if there's a regular person in each department or agency that you would do business with.

I'd also appreciate it if — sort of a general request — if you could bring back with you, the next time you appear here, more information on the investigations so that we can pursue some of this without getting into the names. Obviously there's some reluctance to do that. And so if you're equipped with more information, Mr. Dedman, then we can ask you some questions without exposing any confidentiality and I think still arrive at the same level of comfort when we've concluded our discussions with you.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Can I just ask a question to get some information to be brought back?

**Mr. Anguish:** — Is that okay with you?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Sure.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — I'd just like some information regarding your similarities and the Sergeant-at-Arms and similarities to investigations because you people have the same rights. Could you find out for me whether that same information is held in abeyance equally by the Sergeant-at-Arms as well, and who is actually allowed to obtain any information that the Sergeant-at-Arms is entitled to through CPIC or any other organization.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Dedman, I wonder if you would bring with you, or make yourself fully conversant with the personnel file of Ken Azzopardi. I intend to ask you some questions next day on Mr. Azzopardi, and I'd like you to have that information available so that you can answer before the committee, please.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I call 11 o'clock, and we'll see you again next Tuesday, Mr. Dedman.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Next Tuesday?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Thursday, sorry.

**Mr. Dedman:** — Mr. Chairman, if next Tuesday was possible. I will only get the verbatim tomorrow morning. It will be difficult to get all these answers, or may be difficult to get them by Thursday.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Do what you can.

The committee adjourned at 11 a.m.