

Mr. Chairman: — The Clerk will distribute some information that has been provided by Mr. Dedman in response to a question. Is there any matters you want to raise before we bring Mr. Dedman back in?

Shall we bring Mr. Dedman in then? Okay.

Public Hearing: Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation (continued)

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

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

Mr. Chairman: — We left off where we had Mr. Anguish, unless there's some items you want to relate to us before Mr. Anguish gets into questioning.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I was asked a number of questions and I think I have most of the information. I perhaps would like to give it, if that would be . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Dedman: — Okay. The one thing I have given the Clerk is the copies of the job description for the position that was seconded to Executive Council.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to thank the Clerk's office. We were able to get a copy of the verbatim early on Tuesday afternoon, and that was most helpful.

With respect to the position that was provided to Executive Council, the position was not advertised due to the specialized nature or the specialized requirements. There were a number of individuals that were identified as having appropriate skills and experience, and some of these were approached by SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation).

A short list was developed of three individuals, including Mr. Azzopardi. The other two members were serving members of the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police), as I believe Mr. Azzopardi was at the time. Of the three individuals listed, one advised that he was not interested in being considered and so the other two individuals were both introduced to the Premier. Mr. Azzopardi was offered the position in September of 1988.

Mr. Anguish: — When? I'm sorry . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Dedman: — September of 1988. The position title was executive security officer. It was a professional level 5. Salary range on a monthly basis, 2,667 to 3,810 per month, and the actual salary was \$3,625 per month.

The position was probationary for one year. And Mr. Azzopardi accepted the offer of employment and commenced work on September 19 of 1988, and there was no contract between Mr. Azzopardi and SPMC.

The decision to hire Mr. Azzopardi was made within SPMC. It's my understanding that either candidate that had met with the Premier would have been acceptable. The concept of having an individual with VIP security

experience work or to have an individual with this experience work in Executive Council was developed within SPMC, and the concept as presented was accepted by Executive Council. As I mentioned before, I provided the job description, and Mr. Azzopardi's termination date was either April 30 of 1990 or May 1 of 1990.

I've had SPMC personnel check the recorded contacts that were made by Executive Council staff during the two years under review. When we had a formal request for information or we were advised formally of any concerns, we would prepare something called an incident report.

Our records show that there were 24 such reports recorded in the time period. All the contacts dealt with VIP security issues. There were no requests dealing with companies or economic development matters, that kind of thing. And Mr. Azzopardi made one of the 24 contacts directly with us.

And of the numbers, there were . . . six of those contacts were made in fiscal, I guess, calendar '87 and 13 were made in calendar '88 and four were made in calendar '89 up till the end of fiscal '88-89.

Mr. Lyons: — I'm sorry I missed the first number in '87. How many was that? Six?

Mr. Dedman: — We're just trying to add that up. I'm not sure.

Mr. Lyons: — 24.

Mr. Dedman: — Is it 24? I thought I was one short.

Mr. Lyons: — 6, 14, and 4?

Mr. Anguish: — 6, 13, and 4 . . .

Mr. Lyons: — 13 then.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Dedman, is it 6, 13, and 4?

Mr. Dedman: — It should be 6, 14, and 4 but I'm not sure if . . . yes, it's 14.

With respect to the question on GigaText, the date that I gave last week of May 16 is correct. The request to do the inquiry came to the individual doing the work from Mr. Harry Stienwand who was in charge of the area at the time. The assumption is that it was requested by government officials working with the project. However, the file doesn't show that.

Mr. Porter who was handling the file was only a couple of weeks on the job and he says it's not in the file but it's his recollection that it was to do with a proposal before government. So I'm trying to confirm who actually asked for it but it isn't in the file.

I'd also like to add to one of the answers that I gave the other day. I was asked if we were connected to any other computer banks and I replied that I didn't think that was the case. But I am advised that we do have access directly with on-line inquiry to Dun & Bradstreet and to the

corporations branch.

As best anyone in our security area is able to identify, members of the Legislative Assembly or members of parliament — they inform me that we've never been asked or ever carried out any checks on members of either House.

And I had some questions asked with respect to legislative security and those I can only answer to the best of our ability. Obviously they're independent of us. It's our understanding that the Sergeant-at-Arms has access to CPIC (Canadian Police Information Centre) but our people are not familiar with the process that's used by legislative security about who gets the information or how it's handled there.

When we do work for other departments, we charge back both out-of-pocket expenses and the cost of our employees involved, provided that is, in some kind of a special request. In most cases when it's to do with buildings, building security, any of that kind of thing, we deal with that as part of our rent and part of the service that we provide.

With respect to the question on liaison people and other government agencies, there are no set or designated liaison people who contact us or whom we contact. We do receive calls from all levels of government, depending on the nature of the concern.

I guess there are some programs that involve specific departmental representation that we obviously don't direct but are involved in. That would be things like the Emergency Measures Organization, and there is also a security trade group. I don't know if that's the right designation, but called the Canadian Society for Industrial Security, which has members in both government and out of government, and we do have some employees who are members of that group. I don't know if that's what was meant by the question, but there are quite a number of people that are in that area.

I'm not able at this time to give the names of the individuals that met with a representative of SPMC in the leader of the Opposition's office but it's my understanding there was a meeting that did take place in 1990-91 fiscal year.

And there were three things mentioned: Joytec, Technigen, I believe, and the Yorkton court-house, and there is no record or recollection by anyone in the security area that we were ever approached on anything related to those areas.

With respect to departments who are . . . or agencies that have contacted us, I have a list. As best I have it, it's fairly exhaustive. But we do get calls from people on rather mundane things and, you know, we just may direct them to what to do, and on those, they may not be recorded. But basically the list that I have: Executive Council, legislative security, Department of Justice, SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), Ag Credit, Sask Liquor Board, Department of Finance, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Department of Health, Department of Social Services, SaskPower, Trade and

Investments, Sask Education, Energy and Mines, Economic Development and Tourism, and the Department of Highways.

Now I believe, Mr. Chairman, I hope, that that covers most of the questions that were asked last day. But we still have people working on the verbatim to see if there's anything that we've not covered.

Mr. Anguish: — If you know, out of the inquiries that were made by Executive Council, how many of the people who were checked out pose some type of serious threat to a person or a property of the government?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, what I've given you are the contacts we have. This could just be telling us to, you know . . . that the Premier's going to be in a certain place, or asking if we could be at an out-of-town meeting, or whatever.

With respect to whether someone is an actual threat or not, I don't know really how to answer that. I guess what we try to do is to interpret, make sure that we pass along any information to the police. Or we also would pass information along to legislative security just to make people aware, depending on what's come forward, whether it's really a threat or . . . because there is some interpretation about that too.

Mr. Anguish: — So there's no follow-up done. You don't . . . I'm not talking about contacts so much, as you mentioned the contacts you were listing to us had to do with . . . could be contacts informing that a cabinet minister be here or there, the Premier would be here or there. What's of more interest in terms of the contacts made to you is to want to access more information on a person, either through CPIC or investigation you might conduct within the security service of Property Management Corporation.

And what I was wanting to know is if you have any kind of thought to know whether or not some of these individuals that were checked on did pose some kind of a threat, either to physical being or property.

Mr. Dedman: — I guess I have trouble, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, defining what a threat is. I think our job in this is to try and make sure we pass on the concerns, if we agree that there is a concern, to whoever the appropriate policing agency is or to the legislative security people.

The use of CPIC can be used in some circumstances to see if an individual has a past conviction for this kind of thing. But it's my understanding that to a large degree there are a number of people that on an ongoing basis send letters and phone calls and so on to public officials over many years, and those individuals are known to the people that are in the security area.

Mr. Swan: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we've been talking about the people that you do security checks on, I would like you to give a list of the categories of people that you have done security checks on and what the reason behind the checks might be for this particular category of employee.

Mr. Dedman: — I think there's two types. There are certain positions of trust where it might be appropriate to know if there's some background or criminal record that would make it very inappropriate that they hold that particular position.

Mr. Swan: — I didn't ask you for names of individuals. I said people that are doing certain job types, what types of jobs do you have checked and for what reason?

Mr. Dedman: — Well okay the position-of-trust type of job, and that would be done very rarely.

Mr. Swan: — Can you spell it out more definitively than just positions of trust?

Mr. Dedman: — Well if I could use one example of an area that is within SPMC as a position like the director of purchasing which is a . . . you know the keeper of the rules and the process around tendering and those kinds of things, so that within SPMC that's a very sensitive position and an important position.

The other type would be people working in sensitive areas where our customers, if you like, have concerns about the people that may be on the premises after hours when there is not direct supervision from the work area. And one example there would be the court-houses where there are evidence lockers and whatever that are very critical to the process. There's concern with the people that are there. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Swan: — Well partly. Do you do a security check on the people who do the cleaning in government office buildings? The people are there, say T.C. Douglas Building, and they're working all night. The lights are never off in that building so somebody must be working all night long. Do you do a check to be sure that those people are trustworthy?

Mr. Dedman: — It's my understanding we only do checks on people in sensitive areas. And we've done checks in the past, in the years under review, on contract cleaners that were working in sensitive areas, more than on employees of the government because sometimes you have quite a bit of turnover. And we've asked that the names of the people doing the work be submitted where contract cleaners are used, which would be in buildings that we rent as opposed to own.

Mr. Swan: — What about people in the commissionaires service that would likely have a key to every office in the building that they are watching? Are they checked?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't believe that as a general rule that they're checked, but we have a close liaison with the Corps of Commissionaires and are aware of their rules and have requirements that we discuss with them for the people that will be in those buildings.

Mr. Swan: — All right. It was mentioned in a previous question I think, by Mr. Anguish about criminal investigation. Do you do criminal investigation?

Mr. Dedman: — No, we don't do criminal investigation. We end up in a consulting role. Well in SPMC and other

areas people run up, employees of government, people come up against situations that they have no experience with around things that could be criminal activity, and so we're often asked to explain what the options and how people can handle these kinds of situations.

And as I think I've mentioned before, sometimes it's obvious — you just say to them to contact the police because the situation is there. But if they are suspicious that something is going on or they're concerned about situations they find themselves in, we tend to just explain how we understand the . . . or what we understand their options to be and help them out in that way.

Mr. Swan: — Through CPIC, if you were seeking information on an individual, you would get a read-out from the computer that said this person had some criminal problem in the past but that's about as far as you go, is to identify that there had been criminal activity by this person before. But if it's an actual criminal investigation, you turn it over to the police always.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes, we have no capability to do any kind of an investigation like that, and anything we do, the outcome isn't of much value to anybody anyway.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dedman, I want to thank you for providing the job description under which Mr. Azzopardi, Ken Azzopardi was hired. And I note that under this job description there is a . . . under section 4, it says: "The Executive Security Officer will be privy to sensitive information both of a political and private nature." And I was wondering, have you any reason to believe that Mr. Azzopardi received information of both a political and private nature?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lyons, I think what that means is that in doing the job as outlined here, the individual would come to know information about the people that he's dealing with. It might be personal. Or obviously if you're with an elected politician, you might become aware of information that is of a political nature. And that is obviously something that has nothing to do with the security part of the job. And just because you've become aware of it, it's something that has to be kept in confidence. I think that is a requirement of anyone working in VIP security, that they have discretion about information that happens to come into their hands because of the job they're doing.

Mr. Lyons: — Right, but just based on the job description, it's obvious, I mean, I think it's just common sense and obviously anybody that was working for the Premier would have access to information which is both private and political in nature, that the job description would be correct in that form.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — I want to ask you, under section 2 of this job description: "liaising with appropriate law enforcement authorities and security groups in the co-ordination of this function." Is the security groups referred to in that section referring to the SPMC security or is it beyond just the SPMC security group?

Mr. Dedman: — As best I understand it, that would be whatever is appropriate. If you were travelling to some location, I think it would be appropriate that you . . . that under this they might let the local law enforcement people know that they're going to be in a particular area at a particular time.

Mr. Lyons: — Right. What other security groups would that be referring to?

Mr. Dedman: — I think it could be, you know, if you were going to Ottawa, you might let the people involved on Parliament Hill know that you were going to be there. There are people responsible for security that are not part of police forces and whatever.

Mr. Lyons: — But wouldn't that come under "ensuring advance security requirements are met before proceeding on travel status"? I mean I can see. I just want to know what the other security groups . . . what that would involve. Do you know the names of any of the security groups or not?

Mr. Dedman: — I think that's just a blanket cover. I don't have anything specific that I can identify as what was meant by that.

Mr. Lyons: — You mentioned that . . . I want to get this quite straight in my mind. You mentioned that there were 24 incident reports in regards to VIP security. Now these incident reports, how are they triggered? Who does . . . no, I mean, how are they triggered? What is an incident report? Maybe that's a better question.

Mr. Dedman: — We would get a call where someone would ask us to do something, or would provide us with information where there was a concern.

Mr. Lyons: — Who would phone? I refer back to one of your previous answers, Mr. Dedman, when you said that there was approximately a hundred requests to access the CPIC computer per year, and that's been the record. Would those requests to access CPIC come from outside the security service?

Mr. Dedman: — No, I think I can say that the decision to access CPIC is a decision that's made by the SPMC security people. What we receive are concerns; we don't receive requests to access police information or whatever. So the decision whether to use that capability rests with the SPMC people.

Mr. Lyons: — Let's just make this perfectly clear. Are you saying that the SPMC security people initiate the searches on their own accord?

Mr. Dedman: — No. What I'm saying is that no one phones and says, please do a CPIC check on this person. What we get is someone says I have a concern because we have a letter that says such-and-such received from this individual. How do we handle it.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay.

Mr. Dedman: — Whether there is a CPIC is used in that circumstance or not is decided on by the SPMC security

people.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. But see here's where the numbers just aren't jibing. In 1988, for example, that's the highest year, you had 14 reported incidents. Yet in 1988 there was a hundred, approximately — based on your testimony — there was a hundred checks of the CPIC computer or a hundred people were run through the CPIC computer. Why is there the difference between the 14 and the hundred? Where would the initiation of the CPIC check come from?

Like, I'm working with the Department of Health, right, as an example. There's a problem, received a letter regarding the drug plan — right? — that had security implications to it. I call up the security services. It may be as part of the security services check on the person that wrote that letter that they would access the CPIC computer. What you're saying is that that check then would not be recorded as an incident report, that letter, the communications between the Department of Health and the security services. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Dedman: — No, that would be included as an incident.

Mr. Lyons: — That would be included as an incident.

Mr. Dedman: — Perhaps if I . . . the number 24 I gave was in response to a question about how many requests or concerns were put to us from Executive Council.

Mr. Lyons: — Those were the incident reports that came directly as requests from Executive Council. Who else on Executive Council, then, who would — Mr. Azzopardi was the executive security officer with Executive Council — who else can initiate the incidents?

Mr. Dedman: — Anyone.

Mr. Lyons: — Anyone on Executive Council. Is any citizen in the province able to request SPMC conduct a search on somebody?

Mr. Dedman: — No. I don't think anyone can ask SPMC to do a search. What any employee of the Government of Saskatchewan can do is raise a concern with us about something that's happening in their area. And we would record that as an incident.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder if you could provide us — and I know you won't have it today or maybe you don't have it today — how many incident reports are produced each year by the security service of SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't have the number.

Mr. Lyons: — Could you provide it for the committee?

Mr. Dedman: — Sure.

Mr. Lyons: — Now in regards to the incident reports from Executive Council, you say they all relate to VIP security. What does that mean? I want to ask you what's the nature of some of those incident . . . the incidents themselves.

Mr. Dedman: — I think that to cover the areas that you are concerned about is you're concerned about threats. They can sometimes be delivered in person, over the telephone, or by letter. I think another area would be areas of harassment where they're not necessarily a threat. I mean there is a definition of what a threat is as opposed to harassment. So you can have people that make large numbers of phone calls and so on.

A Member: — . . . (inaudible) . . . only Anne Murray's case.

Mr. Dedman: — Sure. I guess there can be many examples like that but it can show up in different forms.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I know they can show up in different forms, but do you have any idea what forms they did show up in out of those 24 reports? What are they? — threats on the life of the Premier, threats on the life of the cabinet ministers?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Lyons, I'm really reluctant to get into details of these kinds of situations. I think all the people on the committee are individuals in public life. I don't know if discussing those kind of incidents is a very productive thing to do.

Mr. Lyons: — That, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to Mr. Dedman, that's I guess for the committee to decide. I'm asking you, sir, did the 24 reports involve threats on people's lives? Let's put it that way.

Mr. Dedman: — There would be some that would include that, yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. I just want to turn to a couple of other issues before I return back to this, Mr. Dedman.

I noticed under your list, security services agency list of employees 1988-1989, there is a Mr. H. — I shouldn't presume it's a mister — a H. Stienwand, assistant vice-president. Is Mr. Stienwand . . . can you tell us something about Mr. Stienwand.

Mr. Dedman: — I beg your pardon?

Mr. Lyons: — Could you tell us something about Mr. Stienwand's background.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Stienwand was a long-serving member of the RCMP before he came to work for Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

Mr. Lyons: — What's his areas of expertise? What qualified Mr. Stienwand to be executive vice-president of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation . . . assistant vice-president, excuse me.

Mr. Dedman: — Well it's my understanding at the time that it was decided to establish a security group in SPMC, that there was a process. And I'm not sure if it was a public process or how the recruiting went, but it's my understanding a large number of individuals were in a competition, and Mr. Stienwand was selected.

Mr. Lyons: — Right. And why was he selected? What

gave him that special edge?

Mr. Dedman: — Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lyons, I wasn't involved in that process but I must assume that his qualifications and experience made him the best choice of the candidates.

Mr. Lyons: — But you don't know?

Mr. Dedman: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. Do you know . . . when you assumed your present position, did you peruse Mr. Stienwand's personal file?

Mr. Dedman: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — So you don't know what his background is in the RCMP? What was his area of expertise?

Mr. Dedman: — I know that in the time, I think just before I came to SPMC, or maybe it was a little earlier than that, he was a witness at a trial and that he was involved in the intelligence gathering on a drug case. But I don't know really the specific areas that he was involved in.

Mr. Lyons: — Wasn't it electronic surveillance? That's what he was involved in.

Mr. Dedman: — Sure, that could have been part of his . . . I think he was in the RCMP a long time.

Mr. Lyons: — What about D. Olafson? I'd better stop saying Mr. I don't know if they are Mr. or Mrs.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — D. Olafson. What's D. Olafson's background?

Mr. Dedman: — Again Mr. Olafson was as I understand it, a long-time member of the RCMP. Within SPMC in the period under review he was the director of physical security, which is the area around buildings, and involvement I believe with the Corps of Commissionaires, security guards, that kind of thing.

Mr. Lyons: — All right. And what was Mr. Olafson's . . . Did he have a particular area of expertise when he served with the RCMP?

Mr. Dedman: — Again my understanding he was a long-serving member. I don't have his background . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Lyons: — And you didn't review his personal file after you . . .

Mr. Dedman: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — What about P. Shaw?

Mr. Dedman: — Again an individual with RCMP background.

Mr. Lyons: — And again you're not aware of any

particular areas of expertise?

Mr. Dedman: — Well I think he has wide experience within the RCMP.

Mr. Lyons: — And what about Doug Porter?

Mr. Dedman: — The same. A former member of the RCMP.

Mr. Lyons: — And have you reviewed Mr. Porter's . . .

Mr. Dedman: — No, I haven't.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. What about Colleen Galenzoski?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't believe she was an employee of SPMC in the years under review. I think she came in the fiscal year '89-90. Her experience is with the city police.

Mr. Lyons: — Regina city police?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — You had mentioned, you said that, I believe it was Mr. Olafson was, in the year under review, director of physical security. Is he not the present director of physical security?

Mr. Dedman: — No. At the present time he is in our customer services division as an area manager, Saskatoon.

Mr. Lyons: — What about Mr. Stienwand.

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Stienwand is no longer an employee of SPMC.

Mr. Lyons: — Did he leave employment in the years under review?

Mr. Dedman: — No, it was after that.

Mr. Lyons: — Now I want to return to Mr. Azzopardi here for a moment. I notice that we've got here on the list that you gave us that Mr. Azzopardi was seconded staff, executive assistant to Premier Devine, and you informed us that executive security officer was his title.

During the terms of his secondment, was Mr. Azzopardi paid, was his salary paid for by SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Right. So in fact he was an employee of SPMC, and he operated under the directives of the director of physical security of SPMC.

Mr. Dedman: — I'm not sure if that was the case through the whole period, but that certainly was who the supervisor was.

Mr. Lyons: — And that was . . .

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Olafson.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Olafson, right. Now you say you're not sure that he was . . .

Mr. Dedman: — I'm not sure, through the whole of that period, what the structure was. I believe he reported to Mr. Olafson through the whole of that period, but I'm not certain of that.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, so he took his marching orders from Mr. Olafson. That's to the best of your ability.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, and during that period of time again he was, according to the thing that you filed here from the Public Service Commission, that he would be privy to sensitive information, both of a political and private nature.

Now, Mr. Dedman, I asked you last time to review Mr. Azzopardi's file. Did you have an opportunity to do that?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Right. I wonder, sir, if you could tell us, when Mr. Azzopardi was employed by SPMC, is there any record in that file of Mr. Azzopardi's own conduct being investigated by the RCMP.

Mr. Dedman: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — There's no mention of that.

Mr. Dedman: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — Do you know who undertook the investigation of Mr. Azzopardi's background?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't know that. I assume Mr. Stienwand would be involved in that. My understanding of the process was that, and as laid down in the job description, was that the type of individual they were looking for was someone with experience in VIP security and someone that would be able to handle the unusual work hours that the Premier has to deal with. And so that people with police backgrounds or serving members of the police that had that kind of background were identified.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, in the personnel file, Mr. Azzopardi's personnel file, does it mention any areas of expertise? What did he do in the RCMP prior to being employed by SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — He had wide experience in a large number of areas, but I think the particular thing that was identified in his resume was that he had had a lot of VIP security experience and he had been involved in royal visits, the visit by the Pope. He'd been involved in security around national political figures, and I also believe he was involved in the visit of the President of France.

Mr. Lyons: — When you say that he was involved in, do you mean he was involved in as somebody that was assigned as part of the contingent? Or did he have any

hand in directing the operations of the . . .

Mr. Dedman: — I don't know that. The information is that he just was part of those events.

Mr. Lyons: — Was he involved in any commercial crime division for the RCMP?

Mr. Dedman: — He could have been. I've read through the resume and I think that might be the case.

Mr. Lyons: — Did he happen to be involved in commercial crime just prior to his employment with SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — I'm not sure of the timing of that but . . .

Mr. Lyons: — Did you bring the file with you?

Mr. Dedman: — Pardon me?

Mr. Lyons: — Did you bring the file with you?

Mr. Dedman: — Yes, I have some of that information.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder if you'd take a few moments to peruse the file and to . . .

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, I should raise a concern. I'm not certain about the practice of discussing matters in personnel files in this committee. I don't know whether that has been . . .

Mr. Lyons: — Well I've got some questions as to background . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll deal with his background.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Dedman raises a valid concern. The committee will have to judge itself as to what kinds of information from the personnel files would be of assistance to the committee. It may well be that some questions regarding personnel matters are appropriate, but it may well be that others elicit information which is confidential, personal nature, may or may not be useful to the proceedings here. It might be detrimental to the individual involved.

So I guess I'm saying that proceed with caution on this and I'll have to . . . as you tread into these sensitive matters, you'll have to evaluate each one as to whether or not it's a legitimate question and therefore a legitimate answer should be forthcoming, or whether you feel the answer to a question might be unnecessarily treading into privacy — which information was provided.

Mr. Lyons: — I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to proceed very cautiously into this. We don't want to . . . we certainly wouldn't want to bring any disrepute to somebody of Mr. Azzopardi's stature.

Mr. Chairman: — I wonder if at this point we might take a break. It's 10 o'clock. We could proceed again after the break. We'll recess for 5 minutes or so.

The committee recessed for a short period of time.

Mr. Chairman: — I will call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dedman, we had a few minutes to review the file. Maybe you could tell us what was Mr. Azzopardi's assignment just prior to his employment with SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — He was involved in commercial crime area of RCMP.

Mr. Lyons: — He was involved in a commercial crime deal.

Mr. Anguish: — Did you say he was or wasn't? I'm sorry.

Mr. Dedman: — Was.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Dedman, I'm going to ask you a question as to Mr. Azzopardi's involvement in a certain situation which arose immediately prior to his employment by SPMC.

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

Mr. Chairman: — Point of order.

Mr. Swan: — I don't believe that this committee has any right to explore the work of RCMP officers at random. His question directly relates to a period before he was employed by SPMC, and I don't think it's fair to ask officials of SPMC to answer that kind of question.

Mr. Chairman: — I think you raise a good point, that the matter would be . . . let me put it this way, that it would not necessarily be expected that Mr. Dedman would be familiar with the details of the work that an employee of the corporation was involved in prior to assuming employment with the corporation.

If there is some relationship to the job that he was doing under the year in review, that's important and you can make some tie in. You know, let the committee judge that but . . .

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm raising this issue is because it relates specifically to the suitability of employment of Mr. Azzopardi within the confines of the . . . within the perimeters of the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission's out-of-scope job description that Mr. Dedman gave us in number 4. And that is, the executive security officer will be privy to sensitive information both of a political and private nature. And the reason I want to ask that question is because it raises the whole question of the appropriateness of that particular appointment and the background to that particular appointment.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you will allow me to put the question, and then maybe the committee can decide whether or not that that's an appropriate question to place before the committee.

Mr. Hopfner: — I'd just like to speak on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman: — There's no point of order right now.

Mr. Hopfner: — Didn't you raise a point of order?

Mr. Swan: — I did raise a point of order.

Mr. Hopfner: — You didn't give a ruling to the point of order, so there's still a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: — Well, no, I responded and I indicated that, if I remember correctly, that certain questions related to this person's employment prior to coming to SPMC would not necessarily be questions that Mr. Dedman might want to respond to because they had nothing to do with his employment at SPMC. I asked Mr. Lyons to indicate why there might be some relevance to his employment, and he's given his case.

And again I think that you're getting into matters that . . . again we have to put it in the context that we have a witness here, the witness who's here to answer questions about the affairs of, in this case, of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation for a specific year, '88-89. And to get into great details about the personnel file and personnel matters of an employee prior to their undertaking employment with SPMC might be stretching a little bit far.

In very, very general terms you've stated that . . . well you've dealt with private confidential matters. So therefore I want to get into an area of questioning about what he did before coming to work with SPMC. I'm not convinced that those are questions that Mr. Dedman would necessarily want to answer or should be in a position of answering. I guess I for one would want some more direct and stated reason as to why we should get into that area of inquiry, and then if we do . . . well anyway, I would want some more direct and demonstrable reason for doing that. The problem . . .

Mr. Muller: — Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes?

Mr. Muller: — I would move that we go *in camera* for this discussion. I don't think it's necessary that the witness be involved in this until we get it decided how we're going to deal with the witness. I think that should be done *in camera*.

Mr. Chairman: — You're moving that the committee move *in camera* to decide what questions it wants to ask? Or to move *in camera* to ask questions?

Mr. Muller: — Whether we allow the question.

Mr. Chairman: — Whether we allow the question. Well the motion is in . . .

A Member: — Make a motion.

Mr. Chairman: — And that's without recording it or transcription.

A Member: — Yes.

Mr. Muller: — Do you want me to write that out?

Mr. Chairman: — But you're not hearing Mr. Dedman *in camera*, right?

Mr. Muller: — No.

Mr. Chairman: — That motion is in order.

Mr. Lyons: — Is it appropriate that Mr. Dedman be here? I suspect that he may . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Well that's another question. If you want to ask the witness questions *in camera*, the committee has the . . .

Mr. Muller: — No, I move that we go . . .

Mr. Chairman: — But Mr. Muller at this point wants to deal with the question that you've raised and whether or not those kinds of questions should be put. He wants to deal with that *in camera*. And that's a legitimate motion.

Mr. Lyons: — And *in camera* means the exclusion of Mr. Dedman, the witness.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, of everybody. And there be no transcription or . . .

A Member: — Or no media or anybody, just the committee.

Mr. Chairman: — So it's been moved by Mr. Muller that the committee proceed *in camera* without recording and without transcription. Is the committee ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Agreed

The committee met *in camera* for a short period of time.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Dedman, I want to ask you some questions about screening procedures of hiring people at SPMC, with particular reference to the security service. Will you tell the committee: when an application such as the one that Mr. Azzopardi applied for — and you mentioned another; somebody else had applied for it as well — what procedures are in place at SPMC to check the backgrounds of the individuals?

Mr. Dedman: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lyons, the process of checking applicants for jobs is generally almost exclusively handled by the human resources people, that depending on the job and the requirements of the job may check all of the references, some of the references, and whatever.

With respect to the involvement of the security area, the area that has . . . where screening has been done primarily has been in the area of contract cleaners in sensitive areas, and principally those have been court-house . . .

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, with particular reference to the position of executive security officer, do you happen to know what kind of pre-hiring screening was carried out?

Mr. Dedman: — No, I'm not aware of the contacts that were made with that. As I mentioned earlier, the process was not an open competition but rather an attempt to identify some people that might fit the bill, given the wish to have someone with VIP security.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. Again in this particular case, how was that identification carried out? Had Mr. Azzopardi and the other people who had applied for the position, had they indicated by way of letter or indicated earlier that they wanted to become employed by SPMC?

Mr. Dedman: — No, it's my understanding that the people that were considered were identified and approached by SPMC.

Mr. Lyons: — So these . . . and I believe there were three individuals that you mentioned?

Mr. Dedman: — Well it's my understanding there were several identified and then that there was a short list of three.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. And I presume that in this particular instance, given the nature of the application or the nature of the position, that that identification process took place through Mr. Stienwand?

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

Mr. Lyons: — Right. And that no doubt would . . . based on his experience with these individuals in the RCMP. Do you know if there was in that screening process, was there some kind of . . . Let's put it this way: do you have some kind of committee to oversee that screening process, or was it solely in the hands of Mr. Stienwand?

Mr. Dedman: — It's my belief, but I don't know, that it was primarily handled by the security people, and that the human resources people were involved closer to the end of the process.

Mr. Lyons: — When you say that they were involved closer to the end of the process, what type of involvement was that?

Mr. Dedman: — I think that they were actually involved in terms of the offer of employment and the collection of employment data, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. Who would be involved in the checking of the applicant's previous employment record?

Mr. Dedman: — I assume Mr. Stienwand, again on the basis that SPMC approached the individuals to see if they had an interest in this position. I suspect that before they approached anyone, they had a pretty good idea of what their background was and what their capabilities were.

Mr. Lyons: — And in the case of this particular position, do you know if Mr. Stienwand contacted anybody within the RCMP to see if there would be anything in the applicant's backgrounds, either Mr. Azzopardi or the other individual, that would make them unsuitable for the position?

Mr. Dedman: — I'm not aware if he did or if he didn't.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. And that's not in the file, the check.

Mr. Dedman: — That's not in our records.

Mr. Lyons: — So in this particular instance, the actual hiring procedure was done . . . I'm taking it from your answers that in terms of initiating the contact with Mr. Azzopardi and checking Mr. Azzopardi's background, that Mr. Stienwand was basically the person in charge of that.

Mr. Dedman: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — That's a fair characterization.

And there's no system in place that would . . . a back-up system to deal with that kind of procedure?

Mr. Dedman: — I think a couple of things. Number one, for Mr. Azzopardi and for anyone that we hire, they're on probation for a year, so if you make a mistake or have a problem then you do have the opportunity to deal with it during the probationary period.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, that's . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I have Mr. Hopfner, then . . . Yes, Mr. Hopfner. I had Mr. Rolfes but I guess he's . . .

Mr. Hopfner: — No, I'll pass.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Hopfner passes. Are there any further questions of Mr. Dedman? No? Well that's it.

Mr. Lyons: — Excuse me. I'm sorry, if there's nobody else on the list after, I did have one or two questions concerning that list of contract investigators that you provided to the committee. If I can find . . . You provided a list of people that . . . investigations firms . . . You're not referring to Dun & Bradstreet or any of the commercial investigating firms.

You tell us . . . There was one in particular; I don't know if I can find it. There's DFK Security & Investigations. Do you know who . . . Is this a private individual or is it a . . . What do you know about this firm?

Mr. Dedman: — I don't know anything in particular about that firm but it would be, as all these are, firms that provide contract security personnel.

Mr. Lyons: — Do you know if this is a Regina firm?

Mr. Dedman: — No, I don't. I can find that out.

Mr. Lyons: — Could you find out who the firm is, where is it located, and who the principals of that firm are, please?

There is a term you used, Mr. Dedman, in the second paragraph:

The terms of these firms range from a permanent basis to a specific emergent type situations for limited terms.

And you're here referring to a number of security personnel from commercial and security firms. Can you tell us what you mean by "specific emergent type situations" ?

Mr. Dedman: — The kind of thing that would be is if you have a building with card-access system and the card-access system goes down, then you end up having to replace that with someone in the building 24 hours a day to let people in and record who's coming in and that kind of thing, as opposed to the Corps of Commissionaires, which we've had a long-term relationship with, and they basically provide people on a long-term basis.

Mr. Lyons: — Right. And in the case of the card system you mentioned, that would be in Telecom?

Mr. Dedman: — No. The card system would be our system. It would be a case of if the card system didn't work, then you would need someone to sit in the lobby of a building and, you know, let people in and that kind of thing.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, so you're not referring to the card system now of the security firms that installed the card system then?

Mr. Dedman: — No. This is just to provide someone like a commissionaire to sit in the lobby.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. That's it.

Mr. Anguish: — I just have one question or a couple of questions. I was wondering, Mr. Dedman — I'm sure you wouldn't have it here with you today but you could provide in writing to the committee at some other time would be all right — I'm wondering if you could tell me who SPMC rent space for in Yorkton for the Yorkton court-house?

Mr. Dedman: — You mean rent the space from, in Yorkton, for the court-house?

Mr. Anguish: — Well I understand that the private individual company owns the building that the court-house is housed in in Yorkton. What I'm asking you is, who is it that you lease that building from, and in turn provide it to the Department of Justice as a court-house facility?

Mr. Dedman: — I understand.

Mr. Anguish: — And if you could tell me what the term of the lease is, you know, when it runs from, the date that it started and the date that it ends, and who the principals that are involved in that particular building.

Mr. Chairman: — Is that it? Thank you very much, Mr. Dedman.

As I recall, we were entering into a discussion on the auditor's reservation of opinion that he alluded to in his first chapter of the report.

And as much as I would like to get into it in the next five

minutes or so, I'm suggesting that perhaps we may want to adjourn now and pick up the discussion on the reservation of opinion next Tuesday. And both Mr. Kraus and Mr. Strelloff will still be prepared to deal with it at that point. I know they've been patiently waiting to get into the issue.

A Member: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman: — Is that agreed, that we adjourn now?

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.