



STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 30 – May 16, 2018



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY

Ms. Colleen Young, Chair
Lloydminster

Ms. Vicki Mowat, Deputy Chair
Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. David Buckingham
Saskatoon Westview

Mr. Terry Dennis
Canora-Pelly

Mr. Delbert Kirsch
Batoche

Mr. Warren Michelson
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Doug Steele
Cypress Hills

[The committee met at 15:00.]

The Chair: — All right. Welcome, members, to the Standing Committee on the Economy and, Minister, and your officials. With us today sitting in on the committee is myself, Colleen Young, as Chair. We have sitting in for Vicki Mowat, Carla Beck; members David Buckingham, Terry Dennis, Delbert Kirsch, Warren Michelson, and Doug Steele.

This afternoon the committee will be considering Bill No. 110, *The Animal Protection Act, 2017* and Bill No. 83, *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017*.

Bill No. 110 — *The Animal Protection Act, 2017*

Clause 1

The Chair: — And we will now begin our consideration of Bill No. 110, *The Animal Protection Act, 2017*, clause 1, short title. Minister Stewart is here with his officials, and if you would like to introduce them and then begin with any opening comments you have.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Madam Chair, for the opportunity to present *The Animal Protection Act* to the committee. First off, the officials with me today are Ashley Anderson, chief of staff; Bill Greuel, assistant deputy minister; Grant Zalinko, back behind me here, executive director, livestock branch; and Betty Althouse, chief veterinarian officer for the province of Saskatchewan.

We are here today to review the proposed amendments to *The Animal Protection Act, 1999*. And the amendments to the Act will provide the ministry with the authority to approve organizations beyond humane societies to enforce provisions of the Act. This will provide greater flexibility and will expand investigation capacity within the province to revise the definition of distress, to broaden the scope of what is considered animal neglect or abuse. This will align our legislation with other Canadian jurisdictions and provide clarity for cases that advance to prosecution.

It will include a provision for mandatory veterinary reporting of animal neglect or abuse. The Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association supports this amendment.

It will amend the sale or gift of animal section to clarify that even if an owner pays all expenses related to a seizure, an animal would be returned to the owner only if officers are satisfied that it will not be subjected to further distress. It will allow animal protection officers to issue corrective action orders which will allow officers to take action if an owner is non-compliant with an order.

It will broaden inspection powers to allow officers to inspect additional sites such as transport trailers, slaughter plants, and boarding kennels. It'll add humane slaughter and euthanasia provisions to the Act. It will include a prohibition on transporting unfit animals and clarify that animals may be loaded and transported to obtain veterinary care.

It will increase fines for second offences. It will include the potential to prescribe peace officer status for any certain animal protection officers to improve their protection, training, and scope of duties.

Animal welfare stakeholders were consulted in June and July 2017 and provided a wide range of comments. In general, stakeholders support amendments to the Act. And I'd have to say that, apart from June and July 2017, over the last, you know, two or three years we've had less formal talks with stakeholders and have received advice through those as well. So that's I think all I have to say, Madam Chair.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. And I'll open the floor to questions from committee members. I recognize Ms. Beck.

Ms. Beck: — Thank you, Minister Stewart, and thank you to committee members and officials with you today. I have to admit that I'm having a little trouble hearing with the air conditioner, so I think I'm asking you a question that you already have at least partially answered, and that is when work commenced and consultation commenced with regard to this bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Well like I say, we've been receiving sometimes completely unsolicited advice from our stakeholders. And sometimes, you know, in casual conversations the matter comes up, since I've been the minister in 2012 and going forward. But formally, June and July, there were two specific rounds of consultations with stakeholders. That's 2017.

Ms. Beck: — '17. And I believe that you did provide some detail in your second reading comments, but if you could just describe the nature and scope of those consultations prior to this bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — I don't recall exactly the stakeholders that were involved, but ... [inaudible interjection] ... Sure, would you like to do that then?

Ms. Althouse: — Sure, I could do that. So as the minister mentioned, we've had informal consultations for quite some time. We've been working on an animal welfare strategy with a number of stakeholders across the province, so that includes animal protection agencies and livestock groups, people who operate shelters, just kind of the wide net of people involved in animal protection. We've had a couple of stakeholder meetings with them and reported on outcomes and sort of set priorities.

One of the priorities they identified was updating the legislation, working with the humane societies that have APOs, or animal protection officers, appointed. They identified some deficiencies they saw with the old legislation. We've been looking, for a number of years, comparing across jurisdictions as well to see what other places were doing.

During the actual formal consultation, we sent letters out to a broad range — from humane societies, animal and poultry sciences, vet med associations, all of the livestock groups, you know, other ministries — and we got feedback from most of them, including some individual kennel owners and operators, and people like that. So you know, we wanted written

comments back from as many of those as we could.

Ms. Beck: — How many stakeholders did you receive written comments back from? Even a ballpark number is fine.

Ms. Althouse: — This many. Probably between 20 and 30.

Ms. Beck: — 20 and 30?

Ms. Althouse: — Yes.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. And I was just, when I was preparing for this, I noted there was a report that came out where Saskatchewan didn't fare particularly well in terms of the ranking for animal protection laws in Canada. I believe this came out in 2016, the Canada animal protection law rankings. Are you confident that the changes made in this bill will see a better ranking for Saskatchewan with regard to that measure?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes. I think this puts us in a good place as compared to other Canadian provinces at least. And I think you may be thinking of the ALDF [Animal Legal Defense Fund]. They advocate for things like . . . This is a group of lawyers from California who are advocates for strong measures, the Animal Legal Defense Fund. They make such recommendations as search and enter without warrants and things of that nature that are not even allowable under the Canadian Charter of Rights.

And you know, although our penalties for first-time offenders were increased, we lose in the ALDF rankings because they're not higher penalties for second offences. But in Alberta the maximum fine is only 20,000, and ours is now 25,000. So I think in, you know, any reasonable set of standards, I think we fare pretty well in Canada at least.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Thank you for that. So some of the measures that they might be measuring are simply not applicable or well versed in the realities of Saskatchewan livestock, for example.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes, right.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. There was also one high-profile incident in Saskatoon — and I believe it's been talked about in the Assembly — and that was a situation with a kennel where a number of pets were left and unfortunately succumbed to the heat. I think that there's a specific provision in this bill that would address situations such as that. Was that one of the drivers as well behind these changes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Well yes. Well, we were already considering changes when that unfortunate incident occurred, but certainly it was informative for our changes. For this and other reasons, we allow APOs to search premises such as livestock trailers, slaughterhouses, and kennels, you know, to inspect conditions and treatment to see that animals are not in distress.

Ms. Beck: — And that is a change that is proposed with this legislation. Prior to this proposed amendment, what power would APOs have to search kennels and slaughterhouses or livestock trailers?

Ms. Althouse: — So currently, with the old bill, they could inspect if there was a complaint. So if they received a complaint from somebody who worked there or from the public, they would have the authority to go in and inspect. Now they can just inspect on a routine basis without receiving a complaint.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Thank you for the clarification. So I have read and had an opportunity to meet with, or to speak with some of the stakeholders that have been mentioned. I'm just wondering what type of feedback you have received from either members of the public or stakeholders since this bill has been introduced.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Maybe officials have other information that they want to volunteer, but everything that I've seen has been pretty positive from our own stakeholders in the province. And I think they're happy, generally speaking, that we've made these changes. And I think it was well due.

You know, it's a 1972 Act and it had some fairly minor improvements made to it in, I think it was '10, yes, 2010. And I think it had probably been changed a couple of times before that. But it was time, I think. And the public standards for animal care and welfare are higher than they have been in the past. And so this Act, I think, responds to what the general public expects in terms of animal protection.

Ms. Beck: — Okay, thank you. I wonder if you could describe, with regard to investigation and enforcement of this Act, could you describe the role that animal protection officers play and the SPCA [Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals] and the humane societies? How, if this bill is passed, who is responsible for implementing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — So I think I'm going to let Dr. Althouse . . . She's very much more familiar with the details.

Ms. Althouse: — So the process really is unchanged where humane societies right now are recognized by the minister and then they hire, train APOs and apply to have them appointed as animal protection officers. And they can enforce the Act. Police officers such as RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] or municipal police are also APOs, so they're de facto under the Act.

The one change is that right now the ministry approves all humane societies. And going forward we'll only be approving the enforcement humane societies, so the ones that are actually hiring APOs and enforcing the Act. If a humane society is fundraising and running a shelter but not enforcing the Act, we won't be licensing them or approving them anymore.

So the humane societies have the responsibility to train and hire the APOs to enforce the Act.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. How many of each of the types of humane societies would there be in the province? So those that do carry out that enforcement piece, and those that have more of a shelter, are exclusively shelter and fundraising.

[15:15]

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — There are four humane societies. That is

Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and Prince Albert, and . . .

A Member: — APSS, Animal Protection Services Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Animal Protection Services Saskatchewan which deals with the rest of the province. And was the number of APOs part of the question?

Ms. Beck: — Not yet. You're anticipating my next question. But how many fall into each . . .

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Thirteen humane societies.

Ms. Beck: — That don't have an enforcement capacity.

Ms. Althouse: — Total, total of 13.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. So those 13 humane societies currently receive funding and . . . Okay, they do not.

Ms. Althouse: — Currently those 13 just have to be approved by the ministry. So going forward, only the ones that hire APOs would be approved. And five of those 13 have APOs.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. So of those remaining that don't have the animal protection enforcement function, what does non-approval mean for them?

Ms. Althouse: — Really nothing. Right now they're approved because the Act says they have to be approved, but we have very limited oversight. You know, every year or two we go out and inspect them, but there really aren't inspection standards. So it just makes sense that we just worry about those that have APOs, and we're worried about the enforcement standards going forward.

Ms. Beck: — So the current legislation refers specifically to humane societies and currently there are two different types of humane societies. And what you're concerned with in this Act is just looking at that animal protection enforcement and investigation? Okay, good. Thank you. That's clear.

The number of animal protection officers working in the province, do you have a number? And is that number . . . Has it remained stable or increased or decreased over recent years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — There are currently 15 APOs appointed to enforce the Act in the province; two are currently in training. Police and RCMP are also APOs and enforce the Act in their communities when needed.

Ms. Beck: — So 15 in the province, two of which are provisional, are in training. How many animal protection calls would police and RCMP respond to in a given year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — There are between 6 and 700 cases annually.

Ms. Beck: — That police specifically respond to or overall?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Overall.

Ms. Beck: — Overall.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. And how many of those would be responded to by RCMP and police and how many would be responded to by the animal protection officers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — The vast majority would be animal protection officers. I don't know if we have a number on how many other police forces have responded to, but the vast majority would be APOs.

Ms. Beck: — And has that number, 15, has that remained stable, or has that been an increase or decrease over recent years?

Ms. Althouse: — Stable to slight increase.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes, It's mostly stable but increasing slightly.

Ms. Beck: — With the addition of the two?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Beg your pardon?

Ms. Beck: — With the addition of the two who are in training.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes.

Ms. Beck: — Okay.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes. We continue to train the ones in . . .

Ms. Beck: — How many animals in the province would these APOs be responsible for? I mean ballpark numbers would be reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — It's a complaint-based system, so the APOs are really only responsible for the animals that are subject of complaints. And they don't make a practice of, you know, patrolling the backyards for cats and dogs that are in distress without complaints, or livestock operations unless there's some complaints or evidence of neglect or abuse.

Ms. Beck: — Hmm, but the changes to the kennels and the livestock trailers and slaughterhouses have changed from a complaint-based system to allowing investigation or entering a premises without a complaint. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — That's right. If there were some reason for an APO to, you know, suspect that there may be some issues, or they may just decide that they have an opportunity to pop in and do that. It's entirely up to the APOs. Whatever they feel is the best use of their time, they have freedom to do that.

Ms. Beck: — So there's no requirement for any of these, say, shelters or kennels to have a regular inspection or anything like that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — No. No. There's nothing regular or

organized about it, and I think that's the good part of it. If there's a, you know, a surprise visit, it is a surprise and they'll see what happens day to day in those places.

Ms. Beck: — Is there any ability currently . . . I know that there's an expansion of ability to enter premises with this bill. Are there areas where APOs can currently enter without a complaint?

Ms. Althouse: — In the current?

Ms. Beck: — Currently.

Ms. Althouse: — So currently where animals are sold, exhibited, or hired they can inspect now. So they could always inspect a place like an auction market.

Ms. Beck: — Do we have numbers on how many pre-emptive inspections would be happening in the province right now before this legislation?

Ms. Althouse: — No. There has been actually limited collection of data from some of the . . . We have very good statistics from APSS but not so much from some of the other humane societies. So the enforcement . . . Humane societies will be looking for prescribed record keeping and reporting from them under the new regulations as well.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Are there numbers from APSS in terms of the pre-emptive investigations or entry into premises that currently happen?

Ms. Althouse: — Not that I know of, no.

Ms. Beck: — Minister Stewart, I believe that you noted that there were between 6 and 700 . . . Is that calls or complaints or investigations that are undertaken in a year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Cases reported to APSS, whether it's maybe a suggested investigation or a specific complaint. I think that it would include both.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. So that would include calls where an investigation happened but there weren't necessarily any concerns as well.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — The vast majority of the investigations don't result in charges or any action taken, but they're made just the same and that's good practice.

Ms. Beck: — Are they able to attend to all of the calls and complaints currently that they receive?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — I believe so.

Ms. Althouse: — Yes, so they have them prioritized by . . . like it's priority, right. It's by priority. So priority 1 calls, they want to be there within 24 hours. Priority 2, it's up to, you know, 5 to 10 days kind of thing. And so they're meeting the goals about 80 per cent of the time. So you know, the urgent calls are almost always responded to in that one to two-day time frame. The less urgent ones, again, could take 5 to 10 days and even longer at some times.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Is 100 per cent achieved after, you know, maybe it perhaps some time expanded beyond that 5 to 10 days? Or are there cases that they're not able to get to?

Ms. Althouse: — Not so much that they're not able to get to, but sometimes they're unable to close them so they remain open. There's been a complaint and they're unable to see the animals, access the animals. They've been moved or something like that, so they're unable to close them. So they stay open, but they've kind of gone as far they can with them.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Okay, thank you. I guess this may be obvious but what I'm getting at is just in terms of the adequacy, the caseload. I know that this bill prescribes some expanded powers, of course the provision that requires veterinarians to report suspected cases of animal abuse. Is there a number that's anticipated with regard to the number of complaints that you might see once this bill is passed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — I don't know that we necessarily anticipate more, but we have . . . The caseload is substantial for the APOs. And so we've . . . In the last budget we increased funding by 190,000 from 610,000 to 800,000. So we think with that, and currently there are two additional APOs being trained and I'm sure that we'll continue that process. I think it should prove adequate, hopefully lighten the caseload somewhat.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. So I understand and you've been able to provide numbers with regard to priority 1 and priority 2 cases. You'll be continuing to track that, the number of calls that have investigations that are happening and the response rate to those calls? Okay. Thank you.

And I just did mention one of the key features I think of this bill and that is the move to require, not only encourage and help veterinarians report cases of suspected animal abuse, but that it is now required by legislation that they do. Can you describe that process to getting to this provision in the bill? I know that it happens in other provinces. This is something that the veterinarians, the Saskatchewan veterinary medicine, is in favour of?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes, that's correct. Vets are very much in favour of this. Before the change in the Act, you know, some vets would do it but they might lose some business because they did it and that sort of thing. Now everybody does it. They'll all have to do it. So there's no picking and choosing vets on the basis of whether or not they're going to do that because they are going to do it. And so it makes life a lot easier for the veterinarians and for the animals too, I guess.

Ms. Beck: — And I certainly have read and, as I've said, been in correspondence, and that piece is appreciated. And I think you described some of the hesitancy that some vets were describing and coming forward that the decision was left with them and, you know, it was difficult to make the call. Now if there is any concerns, they bring them forward and the APOs will investigate. Is that the case?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes. I'm sure that even previously when the veterinarians weren't necessarily reporting all the cases that they saw, I'm sure that they encouraged the owners at the time to take remedial action and change the practice that was

offensive. But now they're required to report.

Ms. Beck: — I'm going to look specifically at some of the clauses in the bill. The first is section 2(1)(d). It's talking about the definition of an abandoned animal. Clause (d) notes that, one of the definitions, that the animal "... has been left in the care of the other person and has not been retrieved from the other person for more than 4 days after the agreed-on retrieval time."

How is that number, four days, arrived at? Have you heard any feedback about that particular clause?

Ms. Althouse: — So it was previously for some of the abandonments had been 48 hours, and there was some people suggesting that that should be as short as 48 hours. Other legislation across the country pretty much uses the four days as a reasonable amount of time if somebody was delayed and couldn't get in touch with you, that sort of thing. So four days was determined as kind of the standard that's used in other legislation.

So there were a few groups that were a little concerned that it was too long and it will add some costs. But it seemed to be a balance of, you know, appropriateness for the person who had left the animal and for the person who was keeping it. So this happens at vet clinics and at boarding kennels and things like that, where the animal gets left and nobody ever comes to get it again.

[15:30]

Ms. Beck: — And is there any provision or any avenue for, say, the veterinary clinic or the kennel to retrieve costs associated with that four-day time period?

Ms. Althouse: — No.

Ms. Beck: — No. Okay. Another feature of this bill is an expansion of the definition of an animal in distress. And I was just wondering — this is a similar definition that you would see across the country? Is this rather standard, some of this updating of language around an animal in distress?

Ms. Althouse: — Again it's consistent with other provinces' definitions, yes.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. The section 2(a)(i):

(a) deprived of:

(i) food or water sufficient to maintain the animal in a state of good health.

How is good health defined? More out of curiosity.

Ms. Althouse: — That is going to be defined by animal care professionals, so it will be based on either an animal science nutritionist or a veterinarian that it's been sufficient to keep them in health.

It used to just say adequate feed and water. And this gives a little bit more to help assess what is adequate. Sometimes

there's been cases where, well there's food there, but it's not nutritionally appropriate food or it's not enough volume of food. So this helps, you know, put an outcome on it that it's enough to keep the animal in good health.

Ms. Beck: — It goes a step further. There's also, if I remember correctly, there are some standards of care that will be prescribed in the regulations. Is that ...

Ms. Althouse: — Yes. So there's codes of practice, for most of the livestock farm species, that have been developed nationally and they lay out requirements and recommendations for care. So those codes are referenced, and if people are following the codes they will be considered to be meeting the requirements of care.

Ms. Beck: — So those are national standards, and once they're updated at the national level, they're updated in the regulations.

Ms. Althouse: — Yes. So we don't do it each time. What is done ... They're on a cycle. So I think we have about four or five right now that were updated since we last updated the regulations, and we'll incorporate those new codes. So every two to three years as the codes are updated, we'll update them in the regulations.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Thank you. I think that you just answered my question. And we talked about the formerly titled humane societies and the reasons for that. I think we've canvassed that.

The prescribed animal protection officers as peace officers — this is subsection 10 — is that a new provision? I can't remember.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes. Yes it is.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Can you just walk me through the reasons behind that change?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Previously the APOs would have to call in a peace officer to lay charges or anything of that nature. And now the APOs have the capacity to do that themselves, and so it saves time and expense. It's just much more streamlined.

Fortunately it's very rare that charges are ever laid. Usually an APO, if they see a situation that isn't proper, they point that out and give the animal owner an opportunity to get in compliance, and they'll go back a time or two to make sure that they're staying in compliance. And that's usually what happens, but occasionally charges are laid. And those are unfortunate circumstances but they do happen for one reason or another.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. So there might still be situations where they might still call a peace officer for safety, for example.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — That would be a judgment call. Sure, yes, they could do that.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. During your consultations — and I do appreciate the consultation period that was undertaken and, as I said, reported by some of those stakeholders in the media — were there any other measures that were called for or considered that haven't made their way into this bill? Like any

pieces that were called for, but there was a decision made not to include them in this bill?

Ms. Althouse: — Well there's been requests from a number of people to have very prescriptive things banned, and we think that our broad definition of distress covers all of those instances that they've been able to bring up. And we would rather have something that is broader and not start listing each individual thing that might cause distress. Rather in general, if it causes distress, they can be prosecuted.

So some of those were, you know, like shock collars or things like that were brought up as a specific thing to ban. Dog fighting was another one that some people have asked, and the ALDF mentioned that. We have no indication that dog fighting is an issue in the province at all. We haven't had reports to APOs investigating dog fighting. And again if somebody was fighting dogs, that would be causing distress to the animal and it would still be covered.

Ms. Beck: — Okay. Yes, thank you very much. Those in fact were two of the specific concerns that had been brought to us as the opposition. So is there any impact on the use of shock collars with the application of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Well shock collars would be considered to cause discomfort, and so APOs would be able to deal with shock collars, particularly if ones that were used improperly. I don't know if there's a proper way to use a shock collar, but an APO would know that. So they can deal with it and we stay away from being too prescriptive in the Act so that they can use their discretion.

Ms. Beck: — Okay, so that would be at the investigation of the APO. And I heard you say specifically that, were there dog fighting happening in the province, that that would be completely disallowed and something that would be investigated and disallowed by this bill. Okay.

And, Minister Stewart, you did talk about some increased funding that was allocated, I believe — was it two years ago? — for animal protection officers. Is there any plan to increase funding for the education of producers or pet owners or the public about these new measures, or any increased funding for those who are tasked with implementing and investigating?

Ms. Althouse: — So we are developing a communications plan that will help educate and inform people. Already have been reaching out to, you know, the protection societies and APOs. We do want to make sure that the general public is aware of who to report and how to report, and that sort of thing.

As far as improvements to welfare, we've done a lot of promotion of the codes of practice in the livestock industry. And under the new Canada agriculture partnership, the on-farm assurance programming will include some funding for animal welfare improvements on farm.

Ms. Beck: — Okay, great. Thank you very much. I think partly because of the clarity of your answers and the fact that you've anticipated some of my questions ahead of time, I think I am prepared to conclude my questions on Bill No. 110. And I thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Ms. Beck. We will now begin to vote on Bill No. 110, *The Animal Protection Act, 2017*. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 22 inclusive agreed to.]

Clause 23

The Chair: — I recognize Mr. Buckingham.

Mr. Buckingham: — I propose an amendment to clause 23 of the printed bill:

Clause 23 of the printed Bill

Amend subsection (5) of Clause 23 of the printed Bill by striking out “pursuant to subsection (3)” and substituting “pursuant to subsection (4).”

The Chair: — Okay. Mr. Buckingham has moved an amendment to clause 3. Do committee members agree with the amendment as read?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Is clause 23 as amended agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 23 as amended agreed to.]

[Clauses 24 to 41 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Animal Protection Act, 2017*.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill 110, *The Animal Protection Act, 2017* with amendment. Mr. Steele moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Thank you, Minister. If you would like to make any closing comments, you may so wish to at this time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: — Yes, only that there is increasing public concern for animal welfare in society in general, and our government is committed to improving animal health and welfare in this province. And amendments, we believe, to this Act will strengthen protection measures in the province.

And so I'd like to thank Ms. Beck for her usual pertinent and probing questions, asked in a congenial fashion. And to you, Madam Chair, and committee members, and officials from the

Ministry of Agriculture for their help today.

[16:00]

The Chair: — Thank you. Ms. Beck, any comments you'd like to make?

Ms. Beck: — Just to echo my thanks to the minister and your officials and everyone who makes this late afternoon committee happen. It's appreciated.

And I again do appreciate the clear answers to the questions. And thank you for the improvements to animal welfare in our province.

The Chair: — Thank you. We'll just recess now until our next officials and minister comes in for the next bill.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Bill No. 83 — *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017*

Clause 1

The Chair: — All right. Good afternoon, Standing Committee on the Economy. We will continue on with our meeting this afternoon, and we will now move on to consideration of Bill No. 83, *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017*, clause 1, short title. Minister Duncan is here with his officials, and you can begin with your introductions and any opening remarks you may have.

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And to the members of the committee, good afternoon. We're here to discuss, as the Chair has mentioned, *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017* or, as I'll refer in my remarks and most likely in the questions and answers, EMPA 2017.

So joining me today, to my right is Lin Gallagher, the deputy minister; and to my left is Wes Kotyk, the assistant deputy minister of the environmental protection division.

These amendments to EMPA [*The Environmental Management and Protection Act*] provide legal clarity and enhance government's ability to ensure that our environmental resources are sustainably managed and that our environment remains protected. The amended legislation is consistent with other provincial resource management legislation, and it is also in line with Saskatchewan's results-based approach to environmental regulation.

The amendments will expand the definition of "person" to allow the ministry to issue permits to certain associations or organizations that carry out activities regulated by the Act or associated regulations.

In addition, members of the Saskatchewan Environmental Code advisory committee change frequently due to the changes within organizations and associations. These amendments will transfer powers from the Lieutenant Governor in Council to the minister, allowing for more timely appointments of new and replacement members to the committee.

To provide you with a better understanding of the Saskatchewan Environmental Code advisory committee and its work, this group replaced the code development committee in 2016 after the first set of code chapters was implemented in 2015. The committee has met eight times as of May 2018. The code reduces government red tape by replacing some permits with notifications and allows timely authorization of various activities such as water and sewage main construction, hydrostatic testing, and spill reporting.

The ministry, upon the recommendation of the code advisory committee, is moving forward with the development of technical content for the next set of code chapters. These amendments will strengthen the group's ability to carry out this important work for the province. The amendments also strengthen the province's ability to enforce legislation around out-of-province beverage containers that are inappropriately brought into Saskatchewan to take advantage of our recycling program.

The government's former litter control Act, which housed Saskatchewan's beverage container recycling program, was repealed when *The Environmental Management and Protection Act, 2010* was proclaimed. At that time, it was believed that the new Act provided adequate authority to charge any individuals and/or organizations purposely redeeming out-of-province beverage containers at Sarcen depots.

After operating under the Act since June of 2015 and having experienced some enforcement challenges in this area, the Ministry of Justice has advised that an additional enforcement provision in the Act be created similar to former litter control Act provisions. The new provision will identify the delivery of out-of-province containers to Sarcen and the submission of false information to depot operators as offences pursuant to EMPA 2010.

The amendments will provide new enforcement tools for cross-border beverage containers that are returned for refunds where there was no Saskatchewan-paid deposit. These amendments aim to keep this beverage recycling program strong, successful, and sustainable into the future.

In addition, the amendments provide the minister the ability to appoint a program operator for waste stewardship programs where public interest is threatened by the imminent discontinuation of a stewardship program. This has been raised with the ministry in the past.

The amendments will also clarify language in several sections of the Act including the following: in regards to precautionary drinking water advisories, the Act includes a reference to the environment with respect to causing an adverse effect, but does not reference human health. Drinking water is tied directly to potential harm to human health, so for clarity amendments will include reference to harm to human health and the environment. This is consistent with the wording from the 2002 Act.

With respect to the abandonment of waste, the amendment changes the wording from an "allowance" to a "prohibition" to ensure issuing charges for disposal of waste is clear and

consistent with other prohibition wording in the Act. The current wording makes it difficult for officers to lay charges. This section has been reworded to a prohibition that states, no person shall discard waste other than at an approved location.

The amendments will also clarify language for audits, inspections, and investigations to ensure environment officers have the appropriate powers to carry out their duties. Inspection powers were lacking in EMPA 2010 and are now similar to the powers provided for conducting audits. The amendments make it clear what authorities an environment officer has when conducting an inspection or audit such as requiring the use of machinery and taking samples and copies of records.

With respect to the investigation and enforcement powers, there's greater clarity around when a court judge may issue a warrant and when environment officers may seize items. These amendments also provide the authority for the court to dispose of items forfeited to the Crown. The amendments are consistent with other enforcement powers provided in other Acts such as *The Saskatchewan Employment Act* and *The Wildlife Act* of 1998.

A further amendment will include provision for a person to request that information of a commercial, financial, scientific, or technical nature that may reveal proprietary business, competitive, or trade secret information be kept confidential beyond the original five-year time period. Every five years a person may reapply to have the information kept confidential. This will be done through the original application process.

Further, the code only applies to waterworks and sewage water mains. Therefore permits are required for collection and distribution systems. The list of activities for which permits are required for waterworks and sewage works will be updated for clarity to better align with existing legislation.

Other housekeeping amendments will ensure the Act is responsive to current legislative needs. This includes expanding the definition of "person" to capture associations, partnerships, and other organizations not otherwise captured, and ensuring environmental protection orders can be issued for all adverse effects caused by a chemical, physical, or biological alteration.

The amendments represent a step forward for sustainable environmental management in the province and demonstrate our commitment to protect the environment and to fully implement a results-based approach to environmental regulation. Our government will continue to work with stakeholders to identify additional opportunities to refine the province's environmental legislative framework, including the Act, regulations, and the Saskatchewan Environmental Code.

And with that, we'd be pleased to take your questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. I'll now open the floor to committee members. Mr. Forbes.

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much. I appreciate the opening comments. They frame the bill before us quite appropriately. And I appreciate the officials being here again today. And we covered much of this last, a bit of it last night, but now we get right into the specific Act. So we'll kind of work our way

through this.

And at first I'll talk about section 2 being amended and talking about a person including an unincorporated association and partnership and other organization. And I have the bill with, the Act with me here as well. But is there a part in the existing legislation where a corporation falls ... Where does a corporation fall into this?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So under the existing Act, corporations are captured by the existing Act.

Mr. Forbes: — So the intention is, when there is an infraction, that you have the ability to charge a corporation and you have an ability to charge a person. But now you're making the definition of a person larger. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Yes, that's correct. So as an example, currently absent from the Act is, in the event that you and I form a partnership and we are found in violation of EMPA 2010, it wasn't clear whether or not that we could successfully prosecute under the Act because we technically may not be a corporation, we may have a partnership. Which this will now capture other examples of what may be defined as a person under the Act.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay. Now I should just step backwards. Now Saskatchewan was the first in Canada to do this kind of process to have a code. It's been several years now. Are other provinces following the code model?

Mr. Kotyk: — Saskatchewan is still unique with having the Environmental Code format. However, a number of jurisdictions have been looking to us, looking at results-based regulatory programs and are moving in that area.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay, fair enough. Good. I want to talk a little bit about the new section 4, when you talk about the advisory committee. And you gave a bit of a history of how this has evolved. And now this lies pretty specifically with the minister to make those appointments. Will the information about who is on the advisory committee be a public document, or will it be listed somewhere where we know who those people are?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Thank you for the question. So absolutely we will continue to make known and make public the members of the advisory committee. Just as by way of an example, so we'll have a number of organizations that will designate from their organization who they want to represent them on the committee so, for example, the mining association or SUMA [Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association] or SARM [Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities], and then we go through a process, through an order in council of essentially agreeing or ratifying their selections.

So in the event that ... That obviously takes some time through the process of doing an OC [order in council] and taking that forward to cabinet. Organizations though will have different timings in terms of when they may want to change their own members; say, for example, SUMA and SARM elections come up, they have different membership that they want to draw from. The same would be true for an association like the SMA [Saskatchewan Mining Association].

So it just allows for a more timely change to the advisory committee in the event that we're notified that the rep that is from SARM, let's say, is no longer going to be the SARM rep. Rather than going through the process of updating an OC, and again never knowing how many OCs we may have to update in a year based on the decisions that those groups are going to make about their own membership, we just felt that it's a more timely way rather than going through the OC process, moving just through a minister's order. But we certainly will continue to make public the people that are on the committee.

Mr. Forbes: — I hope so. I mean, it's really important in terms of confidence and credibility, and this Act really speaks to the trust that the people of Saskatchewan have. I would think this is one of the foremost cornerstones of Environment, the Ministry of Environment. And I think it's hugely important so that that transparency and accountability, I mean you don't have to get into great detail on who is on that committee, but I think it's a name and some information.

I know there has been a move, whether it's due to privacy or some other issues, that names have been redacted, or it's just the committee, and we don't know who the committee is. And that's really unfortunate because I think there's a public trust that says if someone has difficulty with sharing their name publicly like we all do here, that's part of the job and it's really important.

To get back, I just want to clarify . . . Now you've identified some very major and important stakeholders who have roles within this. But do they have specific seats that are named for them, or this is just the group of stakeholders that you will draw from?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Thank you for the question. So we do provide for board membership or the committee membership to have representation from certain groups. So for example, SMA. We will have a person put forward by the SMA, as we would request from SARM and SUMA. We also will ensure that we have a position on the committee for a person of First Nations or Métis background.

And just to give you an example of the frequency in which the committee has changed: from the first meeting in June of 2016 to January of 2017, we had more than 10 changes within that time frame, largely because the organizations that were putting forward members, they were making changes. So they were requesting from us that, you know, this person is no longer going to be our rep; we need to pull him off of the committee. Here's the person we want to put on. And each time we had to do that, we had to bring an OC to cabinet. And I think, as you will know, the process for an OC is more timely, more time considerations than just a more simple minister's order.

Mr. Forbes: — So will the regulations reflect that? I'm wondering because . . . I'm sort of torn because the groups you named are all very good and capable and I think obviously very worthwhile to be on the board, but I also know that times change and some organizations fade and others, new ones, emerge. And I know that's quite a thing actually in the business world.

And we often struggle with that. So as opposed to saying, we

need somebody from industry, or we need somebody from mining, we need somebody from the rural perspective, and we need somebody from an urban perspective, and all of those . . . We kind of know urban perspective kind of means SUMA. Or a rural perspective, SARM is a natural fit. All of that.

[16:15]

But I'm curious, in the regulations or anything else, where will this be documented? Or is this one of those policies that's within the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So in the regulations, the only specification is it's up to a maximum of 11 that can be appointed. It's more of an internal policy decision in terms of which organizations that we reach out to, to provide a rep, and I think that gives us a flexibility.

As you said, times change and organizations change. And so it provides flexibility to make adjustments to the makeup of the board in the event that, you know, a particular organization that today may have a great deal of interest and expertise, you know, 10 years from now we don't know what the state of that organization may be, as an organization. And so it's not locked into the regulations that it says we must pick one member from this group, that group, that group. It's more of an internal decision.

Mr. Forbes: — And will they have to be residents of the province of Saskatchewan or some connection with Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So there's nothing in the regulations that stipulate that the individual has to reside in Saskatchewan. But what we look for are individuals that are representing organizations or associations that have active work in the province of Saskatchewan, are engaged in the economy in Saskatchewan.

So for instance, in the past it might have been an oil and gas association rep or a forestry rep that certainly understands the nature of that business in the province, but their association may not be headquartered in the province or they themselves may be resident of another province but certainly have an understanding and a relationship with the industry here in the province.

Mr. Forbes: — Sure, and I know that's happened before. It's happened several times in the past. Fair enough.

And then the other question is, you're not really setting a time limit so sometimes that's a, you know, it's both a positive and a negative. In terms of if you don't have a time limit, you get to keep people on that are serving well and making a contribution. Positive is when there's a time limit that it's, you know, can be a gentle nudge that we need to reconsider other people.

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So we currently do. The makeup of the Saskatchewan Environmental Code advisory committee does serve a term not to exceed April 21st of 2019. So at that point, I mean we may still have, depending on what organizations do in terms of the people that they're putting forward, we still may have between now and then, opportunities to appoint new

individuals. But the term itself is until April of 2019.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay, thank you. I'll move quickly to the next section, section 36, human health, and it seems like a pretty logical process. Has there been a situation where that has been a problem before, or can you just maybe review the reason why human health is added in as well as environmental?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So this amendment has been included at the request of the Water Security Agency. They wanted us to include a reference to human health for clarity and to ensure that harm to human health is captured as water supplies by waterworks are directly tied to human health issues. And this makes it consistent with wording that was in place under EMPA 2002.

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you. Now to section 44, and you alluded to out-of-province beverage containers being claimed. A couple of questions here. What do you do . . . and I know the Chair is from Lloydminster. Do you ever have issues with situations like Lloydminster or Yorkton, where you're so close to the border? What happens now in those circumstances?

Mr. Kotyk: — So yes, there are challenges on border communities, and that's been an historical challenge all along for the program. I think the greatest area where there is the challenge, that we're aware of, is in the southeast portion of the province right now, because Manitoba doesn't have a deposit system so they tend to want to bring into Saskatchewan. So that is the reason that we're wanting to ensure that the appropriate authorities are there so that we can better enforce that.

Mr. Forbes: — Have you had conversations with your Manitoba counterparts? I don't know what their returns are like, you know, in terms of their processes around beverage containers.

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — They do have a different system in Manitoba. They don't have a deposit system like we do in Saskatchewan. Their recyclable containers just go into the multi-material recycling program that they have established in the province. So we're really talking about two different systems and two different ways that they operate.

I would say, just in terms of a bit of levity for the committee, it was my hope that for those of you that are *Seinfeld* fans and that remember the episode, I wanted this to be called the *Seinfeld* clause. But apparently that's not appropriate. But some of you, I think, remember that particular bottle deposit episode.

Mr. Forbes: — But I am curious, I don't . . . You know, are there conversations? I don't know what the returns percentages are in Manitoba. Are they . . . Do you know? I mean, is this . . . When you have your national meetings, does this ever come up?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So there are conversations on this recycling program, as well as other waste stewardship programs that we have across the provinces. The difficulty in trying to compare the two systems is that, you know, Sarcen; we can get, you know, pretty good numbers in terms of the number of containers that are returned each and every year.

Because Manitoba, their recycling just goes to the multi-material recycling programs in the province, they would really calculate it more on like a tonnage of, you know, aluminium that they collect in a year. They wouldn't be able to break it down into, you know, say . . . Where Sarcen can say it's, you know, four billion containers of this type of container a year. Manitoba wouldn't measure it the same way because their program operates a different way.

But certainly, the ministries do talk a fair bit about the different programs.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay. And what about Alberta? Do they have . . . How different are we, or how similar are we with them?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Alberta is a little bit different as well. They do have a deposit system but it's run through . . . They don't have a network, a single network like we do with the Sarcen facilities. It's all private operators, an independent network of private operators. So not the same type of system and certainly don't I think have the same benefits that the Sarcen system does in terms of the employment opportunities as well.

Mr. Forbes: — Do you know — and I've always been curious about this — but Loraas in Saskatoon does multi-material waste management and Emterra here in the city here. And I don't know what's happening in the other cities but I imagine they get a fair amount of beverage containers. How do they deal with theirs?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So actually I can speak a little bit to this because I have toured the Emterra facility here outside of the city of Regina at the Global Transportation Hub. So they do divert through the multi-material waste stream that is delivered to the Emterra site. They do pull out the recyclable containers and they do return those to Sarcen. It is a revenue stream for Emterra to support their operations.

Mr. Forbes: — Do they have to disclose that or is there any kind of counting of that? Or is that just a private stream of funds?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So beverage containers that are returned back to Sarcen by Emterra, that would be counted both by Emterra because they're collecting revenue off of that; as well it is accounted for in the Sarcen numbers. So the Sarcen numbers that they report on an annual basis, in terms of the amount of beverage containers that are returned, would include from an organization like Emterra.

We don't know the specifics of . . . Because I just imagine the volume of containers in a given week that Emterra could deliver, considering that they are the collection site for the city of Regina's recycling program. So we're not aware but I assume they have some arrangements with Sarcen so that they're not just, you know, showing up on a Tuesday with, you know, a couple semi loads of pop cans. But we're not aware of what that arrangement looks like. But they would have a relationship with Sarcen.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay. And the same . . . I'm wondering, you know, with the . . . There used to be the old beer bottle return at

the bottle association or whatever. I know in Regina, it was on Winnipeg Street that we used to take all our bottles to. Now is that functioning at all? Do all liquor bottles . . . Is there anywhere else to take your beverage containers but to Sarcan?

Mr. Kotyk: — Yes, the beer bottles have a little bit of a different scenario because they are refillable bottles. So the beer bottles, if they go back to the brewers or the group that collects them or through the Liquor Board stores, you would get your full refund for those amounts. Sarcan will allow you to take beer bottles but they'll give you a reduced rate because of the handling. So you have the choice for refillable bottles, like beer bottles, to either take it to Sarcan or directly to the liquor store or the brewery.

Mr. Forbes: — So does a beer bottle have an environmental handling charge on it then?

Mr. Kotyk: — Yes, it does.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay, but if you take it back to the beer store or to the bottling place, you get your full deposit back.

Mr. Kotyk: — That's right.

Mr. Forbes: — But if you take it to Sarcan, you get a reduced rate? Now why would that be?

Mr. Kotyk: — Well the reason for a reduced rate is because Sarcan has the expense of, you know, handling those materials. And it's the time for counting. It's the time for managing that. And so that's why the rate is reduced.

Mr. Forbes: — Now will that be looked at now that they're going to be getting more support through the increased environmental handling charge?

[16:30]

Mr. Kotyk: — So at this point, there is no plans to relook at that arrangement.

Mr. Forbes: — Okay. Now that we're on comedy, it sounds like maybe the McKenzie brothers would have something to say about this.

But I want to go to 78, obtaining information. And you've expanded the definitions of computer software and files recovered. That brings to mind just the world we are living in, in terms of investigations and audits and all of that. Are you bound to do only your work in the province of Saskatchewan? Or can you go outside the province if the infraction or if the project is here but the headquarters is out of the province?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So in a situation like that, we would work with the other jurisdictions to do the work that we need to take place, perhaps through warrants, other means. But we would work in collaboration with other jurisdictions to make sure that we can uphold what we're required to do under the legislation even if, say, a head office of an organization is not within the boundaries of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Forbes: — I'm having sort of a difficult time imagining

what the problem could exist in terms of the environmental infraction when you're dealing with hardware or software. But in this world now where things are controlled from other parts of the country and we, you know . . . Issues may happen locally but have tentacles that are widespread, and even with software or hardware if it's licensed in some other place. So this might be something to follow up with because I think that we're seeing so much in terms of, you know, the software, hardware world that this is an important issue.

I would want to now go to I think, yes, public information. I want to go to section 83. Yes. And I think this one is considerably important. I have a couple of questions about this. And I don't know what the old section 83 looked like, so did the old section 83 have a time period of five years, and why five years?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So the existing Act did have the five-year provision in it. It didn't though provide for a mechanism or an avenue for the proponent to request an additional length of time beyond that initial five years.

So this does provide for the ability for the proponent to request an amount of time beyond the five-year period. In the event that they make no request, when the five-year period ends then it is automatically deemed to be public information.

Mr. Forbes: — And so when we talk about public information, how do you determine what the public interest is in knowing, and what's the balance here in terms of the public interest right to know and the propriety rights of the person or the corporation?

Mr. Kotyk: — So we are also including an appeal mechanism here in the event that a proponent is not satisfied with the decision on whether or not information could be made public or not.

Mr. Forbes: — Where is that in this? What section is this? Was it the section 9?

Mr. Kotyk: — Yes. Section 8 through 11.

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — So the new section 8, going all the way through to section 11.

Mr. Forbes: — Now could you . . . I may be having a hard time understanding section 11, but now is this the appeal to the minister or the appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench that that refers to?

Mr. Kotyk: — All right. In section 83(10), it does mention that on hearing an appeal pursuant to this section, it would be the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench may issue an order. So they may issue an order confirming the minister's decision or directing any portion or potentially overruling that decision. So that's the appeal mechanism through the Court of Queen's Bench.

Mr. Forbes: — Now we're in an odd situation where we don't have a single lawyer in this room. But I'm wondering how many times, how long, or what is the process of the Court of Queen's Bench? How many times can you appeal? Is it just

once? I think it is and you have the . . .

Mr. Kotyk: — Sure. So we don't anticipate this to be a frequent occurrence. In our experience — within the last five years from my recollection — there's only been one situation where a company wasn't happy with our decision and actually went through the process to challenge the decision on whether or not it was public information.

Mr. Forbes: — And can you tell us the name of that company?

Mr. Kotyk: — It is a public record. It was Federated Co-operatives Ltd.

Mr. Forbes: — Fair enough. And then the other one that I was thinking of is Husky oil and the Husky oil spill and what's happening all with that. And well, I can't give you details, but it's one that's been in the news and is in the news currently. And so at some point we need to, you know, have a full disclosure of what happened. And we understand that there's a court process and that needs to be as fair as possible, but there is a point where, for the public to know, I think that's important.

So with that, Madam Chair, I have concluded my remarks and I want to thank the officials for their answers and the minister for providing this time. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Forbes. We will now begin to vote on Bill No. 83, *The Environmental Management and Protection Act*, 2017. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 17 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Did I call carried on Clause 3 . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Carried.

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017*.

Thank you. I would now ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 83, *The Environmental Management and Protection Amendment Act, 2017* without amendment. Mr. Buckingham moves. Is that agreed? Carried.

Minister, if you would like any closing remarks?

Hon. Mr. Duncan: — Just very quickly, Madam Chair, to you and the committee members, Mr. Forbes for your questions, thank you very much, as well as to the deputy minister and ADM [assistant deputy minister] for being here today and all the officials that have helped to prepare these amendments over the last number of months. So thank you.

The Chair: — Any remarks, Mr. Forbes?

Mr. Forbes: — No, I'm fine. Thank you.

The Chair: — Awesome. Thank you. I would now ask a member to move a motion of adjournment.

Mr. Dennis: — I so move.

The Chair: — Mr. Dennis has moved. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. This committee now stands adjourned until Tuesday, May the 22nd, 2018 at 3 o'clock p.m.

[The committee adjourned at 16:42.]