



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 21 – March 20, 2018



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Mr. Fred Bradshaw, Chair
Carrot River Valley

Mr. Buckley Belanger, Deputy Chair
Athabasca

Mr. Ken Francis
Kindersley

Mr. Hugh Nerlien
Kelvington-Wadena

Mr. Eric Olauson
Saskatoon University

Ms. Laura Ross
Regina Rochdale

Mr. Corey Tochor
Saskatoon Eastview

[The committee met at 19:00.]

The Chair: — Well good evening, everybody. I'd like to welcome all the members of the committee. We have myself, Fred Bradshaw; I'm chairing this committee. We have Nicole Sarauer substituting for Buckley Belanger. We have Ken Francis, who is at his very first committee meeting, and promised to buy after. We have Hugh Nerlien; Eric Olauson; Doug Steele is substituting for Laura Ross; and Corey Tochor.

This evening we'll be considering four bills: Bill No. 108, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017*; Bill No. 109, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017 (No. 2)*, a bilingual bill; Bill No. 74, *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2017*, a bilingual bill; Bill No. 96, *The Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act*, a bilingual bill.

Bill No. 108 — *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017*

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will be considering Bill No. 108, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017*, clause 1, short title. Mr. Morgan, please introduce your officials and make your opening comments.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined this evening by a number of officials: Darcy McGovern, director of legislative services; Jane Chapco, senior Crown counsel; Neil Karkut, Crown counsel; and Glennis Bihun, executive director, court services; as well as my chief of staff, Clinton Fox.

Mr. Speaker, I would be ready to make some opening remarks with regard to this bill. The first bill that we have before us tonight is Bill No. 108, *The Statute Law Amendment Act*. This bill will make housekeeping updates to various Acts for purposes of modernizing their provisions. More specifically, the changes will standardize the reference to the Court of Queen's Bench. It will replace references to "Her Majesty" with "the Crown." It will replace the Latin phrase "*ex parte*" to "without notice." It will remove the phrase "as amended from time to time" from provisions that reference federal legislation, and it will make other housekeeping updates to individual Acts.

Mr. Chair, this bill fits with the government's policy of bringing forward statute revision pieces annually to ensure that statutory language is updated and modernized on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Chair, with those remarks I can only offer my deepest sympathy that we're losing Latin from the various pieces of legislation, but obviously it's in keeping with making our laws open and accessible and readily understandable for members of the public.

So with that, I would welcome your questions regarding Bill No. 108, *The Statute Law Amendment Act*.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Mr. Morgan, for those opening remarks. I think you're one of the very few

people that are sad to see Latin removed from statutes. But I do understand that it is the practice more recently to update legislation and update core processes to make it more accessible, and that includes creating more accessible language.

I'd also like to thank all of the Ministry of Justice officials for being here this evening as well.

I have a very few questions on this bill, but I do have a few questions, bearing in mind that it is largely a housekeeping bill.

This bill, as had been mentioned by Minister Morgan, seeks to remove some of the references to the Queen, bearing in mind the future succession of the Crown. We've seen a few of these changes happen recently in legislation to anticipate this future event. I'm just curious if the ministry is aware of whether or not there will be any more changes that need to happen to account for this, or does the ministry anticipate that this should be it?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — There is protocols that are in place across the Commonwealth that deal with the death of the Queen, so if the legislation wasn't updated or wasn't there, there are a number of things that happen automatically without legislative involvement. The Court of Queen's Bench instantly becomes the Court of King's Bench, and a number of other things like that. And actually a lot of the information is on the website. But I think to facilitate the general modernization, it's there, and I think the staff at the ministry are doing that. As bills are updated or dealt with otherwise, they're looking at them in the context of trying to do that. But I'll let Mr. Karkut give a more specific answer.

Mr. Karkut: — So there are some amendments to *The Interpretation Act* that are also going to address this, just to make sure that any outstanding references in legislation to, for example, the Queen when there's a King, would be interpreted appropriately given the current situation.

Just, I guess, we are also standardizing references to the Court of Queen's Bench, which is a defined term under *The Interpretation Act*. So presumably in the future if we were looking at a Court of King's Bench, we would have to update those references as well. But it's going to be a standardized term, so after these changes are made it'll be, I guess, a cleaner process to do that as well.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that. I anticipate there will be some probably minor but still financial implications to having . . . to any sort of succession of the monarchy. Off the top of my head I'm just thinking the signage at the Queen's Bench locations in Saskatchewan may have to be altered. Are there any anticipations or is there any future planning within the ministry for any of that?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I'm advised by the officials it will be absorbed. I know that as signage has been updated, they're . . . instead of saying Court of Queen's Bench they're just saying courthouse. I know that's done in the new one in Saskatoon, but no, it's not something that we've budgeted or planned for.

Ms. Sarauer: — So you're anticipating that any of those changes will be minimal in cost.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Yes.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I've also noticed that this legislation is removing the phrase "as amended from time to time." I always saw it as redundant, or not necessary, but is there a reason why it is being removed at this time?

Mr. Karkut: — Yes. Actually, *The Interpretation Act*, again — and it's subsection 29(2) — specifically clarifies this point that if you're referring to a piece of legislation, that includes that legislation as it might be amended from time to time. So it's just become a redundant phrase where it exists elsewhere in legislation, which is why we're removing it here.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that answer. I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Are there any more questions from the committee? Seeing none, we will continue on and this is going to take a while. It's going to take longer than the questions. Anyway, clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 66 inclusive agreed to.]

[Schedules 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.]

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

I would ask a member that we report Bill No. 108, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017* without amendment. Mr. Nerlien moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**Bill No. 109 — *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017*
(No. 2)/Loi n° 2 de 2017 modifiant le droit législatif**

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 109, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017* (No. 2), a bilingual bill. We will begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Mr. Morgan, you've already introduced your officials, but do you want to reintroduce them and make your opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I have the same cast of characters surrounding me and would point out to the committee that this is dealing with some bilingual legislation similar to Bill No. 108. So once again, we've thrown away thousands of years of Latin, and the last few years we did away with 500 years of the rule against perpetuities, so this is part of that same ongoing process. The reality of it is, Mr. Chair, it is updates that make our laws more open and accessible. So I will have just a very few opening remarks.

In accordance with the requirements of *The Language Act*, a separate bilingual bill is required to implement the bilingual changes that were found in Bill 108. In several instances the proposed changes are the same as those found in Bill No. 108.

[19:15]

However, there are a couple of unique changes that are found within this bill. For example, the proposed updates to *The Non-profit Corporations Act, 1995* will update the French language phrase that is used for extra-provincial corporations. Similarly, an update is required to the definition of "child" under *The Children's Law Act, 1997*, to correct the reference to the French term "enfant."

Mr. Chair, as with Bill No. 108, this bill's changes are entirely housekeeping in nature and will not have a substantive impact on the legislation it amends. With those opening remarks, I would welcome questions respecting Bill No. 109, *The Statute Law Amendment Act* (No. 2).

The Chair: — Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, and again I'd like to thank the minister. I believe the minister may have already answered my question. But just to clarify, I'm wondering if the minister or one of his officials can explain for the committee's sake why there would be two statute law amendment Acts being tabled at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — The usual practice is that where you're dealing with the French language, then it's usually done in a separate bill but . . .

Mr. Karkut: — Yes, that's . . . [inaudible].

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I have another question. It's a very specific question, but I'm hoping you can enlighten me as to why a change wasn't made. So section 11(1) of the bill makes an amendment to *The Jury Act*. Section 11(3) is what I'm looking at in particular. It amends section 6 of *The Jury Act* by repealing a portion of (d) and then substituting some new language.

When I was reviewing *The Jury Act*, I assumed that the change that was being made was because it was referencing specific sections in *The Education Act*. However, there is a subclause (iii) that talks about boards of trustees and references a specific section as well. So I'm just curious as to why the change was made for the first part of (d) and why it wasn't made for this third one as it references trustees. And I apologize for it being such a specific question.

Mr. Karkut: — So I apologize. I don't have *The Education Act* here to refer to, but just if my memory serves correctly, it's that under *The Education Act* the sections 61 and 62 that are referencing, those sections have been either repealed or replaced, and that those terms are specifically defined terms now. So that's why in those two instances we updated it to just the defined terms for a board of education and a conseil scolaire as opposed to referring to the sections that they were previously referred to, whereas that's not the case with boards of trustees.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that. I'm also curious to know, section . . . And I'm looking at section 12 now of the bill. There was a change made to section 14 of *The Justices of the Peace Act*. When I looked at it I couldn't actually see a change other than some wording had been moved around. I'm just curious to know if there was any change in that new language.

Mr. Karkut: — So there was just kind of two changes to that. The first was that that, as amended from time to time, wording was behind the reference to the Criminal Code. So we cleaned that up. And the current version of that provision is what we call a sandwich clause, where it has a starting point, then it lists a couple of points and then has kind of an ending part to the section. We're trying to get rid of that in legislation. So this has just reorganized it to clean that language up a little bit. So it's just very housekeeping in nature.

Ms. Sarauer: — Well I'm always excited to learn a new phrase. I didn't know that it was called a sandwich clause. Is there a reason why sandwich clauses are not kosher anymore?

Mr. Karkut: — I think it's just a preference in modern drafting standards now to try and eliminate them. It makes it cleaner to have the, I guess the primary section listed in the header and then with the listed points without continuing it on afterwards. It's a little bit less confusing that way.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Well thank you. Are there any more questions from the committee? If so, we will continue on with Bill No. 109.

The short title, clause 1, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — I've got to sign both sides. It's in French.

A Member: — Don't you have to read it in French?

The Chair: — No, I don't think I will.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 17 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017 (No. 2)*, a bilingual bill. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 109, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017 (No. 2)*, a bilingual bill without amendment. Mr. Steele so moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**Bill No. 74 — *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2017*
*Loi modificative de 2017 sur la preuve***

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 74, *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2017*, a bilingual bill. We will begin our consideration of clause 1, short title. Mr. Morgan, do you have any opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined at the table now by Jane Chapco and Glennis Bihun who I had introduced earlier when we started. I'd like to make some opening remarks concerning Bill No. 74, *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2018*.

Mr. Chair, these amendments will improve court processes by streamlining the court recording and court transcription procedures. Mr. Chair, the amendments will permit any court official to certify a court recording and will remove the requirement to certify recordings for brief and routine court proceedings such as adjournments. Currently only the court official who is present in court can certify a recording. For transcripts the requirement for court transcribers to complete an affidavit for each transcript will be changed to a requirement just to certify the transcript.

Mr. Chair, the amendments will also authorize electronic certification of records and transcripts, which will facilitate distribution and increase efficiency.

Finally, Mr. Chair, these amendments will make a series of housekeeping changes to reflect modern drafting standards with respect to adults in vulnerable circumstances. References to "mental capacity" and "mental disability" will be changed to "capacity" and "intellectual disability" throughout the Act.

Mr. Chair, these amendments will support this government's ongoing commitment to improving court processes and increasing efficiency.

Mr. Chair, with those remarks I would welcome questions respecting Bill 74, *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2018*.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister Morgan, for those opening comments and thank you again to the officials for being here this evening. I have a few minor questions with respect to this bill, the first one being, I'm curious to know what prompted some of these updates to the court transcribing process.

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — I think the process that was there was complex because they had to go back and find a court official to certify them, and it would have had to be the court official that was present in court on the day that it was completed. I think the recording systems now are somewhat more reliable than they might have been years ago, so now the proposal is that they would have any court official would complete the certification certificate.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that. I'm also curious to know the thought process behind some of the changes to the regulations portion of the bill. It appears to me that section 11 of the bill expands some of the regulation powers that currently exist under the current legislation, and in particular I'm looking at subsection (a) of the amendment. Could you please explain to the committee why this change is happening and what you foresee potential changes being made in the regulations?

Ms. Chapco: — Sure. Jane Chapco, legislative services, and I thank the member for the question. The Act right now doesn't have a section authorizing making regulations, so this is a brand new section to allow regulations to be made under the Act. And we added it really so that we'd be able to make regulations respecting this new certification procedure. And when we were doing that, we added those additional clauses.

You asked about clause (a). That's a very standard clause, regulation-making authority, and it's inserted in virtually every Act that authorizes making regulations. And it's used, as it says there, to define, enlarge, or restrict the meaning of any word or expression used in this Act. So that provides flexibility when you're drafting the regulations and you have a term that's being used in the Act and that you want to use in the regulations but isn't defined in the Act. And it allows you to define that term without having to open up the Act.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Well thank you. And are there any more questions from the committee? Seeing none, we'll start with clause 1, short title. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.]

[19:30]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2017*, a bilingual bill.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 74, *The Evidence Amendment Act, 2017*, a bilingual bill, without amendment. Mr. Francis so moves. Carried. Excuse me, is everybody in agreement?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

**Bill No. 96 — *The Choice of Court Agreements
(Hague Convention Implementation) Act***
***Loi sur les accords d'élection de for (mise en œuvre
de la Convention de La Haye)***

Clause 1

The Chair: — We will now be considering Bill No. 96, *The*

Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act, a bilingual bill. We will begin with our consideration of clause 1, short title. Minister Morgan, do you have any opening remarks?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm joined at the table by Darcy McGovern, director of legislative services. I'm pleased to be able to offer opening remarks concerning Bill No. 96, *The Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act*.

The proposed uniform bill provides for the implementation of the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements. This convention established rules for parties to an international contract from participating nations to choose the court jurisdiction where disputes under the contract are to be determined. Supporting choice of court provisions in international contracts will help prevent litigation in multiple jurisdictions where a dispute arises in an international contract.

Mr. Chair, the key provisions of the Hague Convention are as follows. Firstly, a choice of court agreement must be respected by the courts of a contracting state unless the contractor dispute is null and void under the laws of that contracting state. That is article 5. Any court not chosen must decline to hear the case or suspend or dismiss proceedings unless limited exemptions apply — article number 6. A judgment made by a designated court must be recognized and enforced in other contracting states except in very limited circumstances. That's article 8 and 9. And the parties to the contract retain contractual freedom regarding the application of the convention to their contract.

Mr. Chair, when I was speaking to article 6, I may have missed the word "not," so I'm just going to reread that paragraph: any court not chosen must decline to hear the case or suspend or dismiss proceedings unless limited exemptions apply. I'm not sure I read it right the first time.

Mr. Chair, the Government of Ontario has now introduced similar implementation legislation. The federal government is recommending the passage of implementing legislation by the provinces to facilitate Canada's accession to the convention. The Hague Convention aims to save time and expense both at the outset of proceedings when jurisdictional disputes commonly arise and after a judgment is given, when parties seek to enforce a judgment abroad.

As an exporting province, increased certainty in what court will be chosen to determine disputes between parties to an international contract will be of benefit to the Saskatchewan business community.

With those remarks I would welcome your questions respecting *The Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act*.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. Are there any questions? Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you, Minister Morgan, for those opening remarks. As you had mentioned, the federal government is recommending that this convention be implemented in legislation throughout the provinces of Canada

and that Ontario has already introduced the legislation. Do you know what the status is on implementing this amongst the other provinces?

Mr. McGovern: — Thank you to the member for the question. The Uniform Law Conference of Canada, as part of the process that the federal government co-operates with the provinces, has organized legislation that's uniform for the implementation for this particular convention and recommended to each of the attorney generals to move forward.

And so one of the things that will happen at the Uniform Law Conference this summer will be an update from the federal government in terms of what steps have been taken in the various provinces as they build their individual legislation lists. The fact that Ontario has already passed the bill is always considered quite influential in terms of building momentum for this, and I think in Saskatchewan we've long been a supporter of this convention and the certainty that it promotes. And so I think we're pleased to be able to bring it forward, as one of the earlier jurisdictions, to encourage other provinces to get on board.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. Is there an annual meeting that's occurring? And if so, will you receive an update on the other provinces at that time?

Mr. McGovern: — I would expect at the Uniform Law Conference meeting this summer in Quebec City that there would be an update with respect to each of the provinces on various uniform Acts, and this would be one of them as well.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you. You mentioned that the federal government has suggested uniform legislation that each province should be passing. Is there anything in Saskatchewan's legislation, in Bill 96, that's different from what is being suggested by the federal government?

Mr. McGovern: — Well, and I would refer to it as the uniform bill as opposed to the federal piece, keeping in mind that this is our jurisdiction, but no, there's nothing particularly unique with respect to this implementing bill. The member will be familiar with another bill that's coming forward on the UN [United Nations] convention under UNCITRAL [United Nations Commission on International Trade Law] with respect to electronic commerce. The implementing legislation is very similar in that case. That's true of the past few bills.

What has happened at the Uniform Law Conference is that there's been uniformity built in to how bills are best implemented and brought forward. And so there's a standard interpretation clause, force of law, a publication requirement locally, a statement that it has . . . if there's conflicting provisions that it'll govern, a statement then of coming into force, and then the schedule for the actual convention comes at the end. So in that regard it's very much standard.

Ms. Sarauer: — Okay. Thank you for that. I am curious, understanding that this is largely uniform legislation that we're talking about, what the plan is or the thought is behind section 4(b) under "Publication." It allows the minister to publish in the *Gazette* the day on which a declaration or a withdrawal of a declaration takes effect in Saskatchewan. I'm curious to know

whether there is already some consideration on whether there would ever be a withdrawal of a declaration?

Mr. McGovern: — So a declaration is a term of art within the convention under a Hague Convention. And the member will be aware that in many conventions, including this one, there's a series of types of declarations that can be made under a particular convention. For example, there can be a provision that says . . . And one of the discussions at the Hague on this convention and previously on the enforcement of judgments convention, was with respect to Quebec and asbestos judgments. And they have, as a matter of policy in the province of Quebec, determined that they won't enforce foreign judgments with respect to asbestos. So there would be an ability, for example, under this Act to make a declaration that in that territorial unit they won't enforce an out-of-country judgment. And so that would be one of their declarations. If they changed their approach or felt that the need for that became extent, they would be able to withdraw the declaration.

And this is a method by which the minister responsible for the piece — this of course being the Attorney General — is able to communicate through the *Gazette* that either there's a new declaration that's going to occur or that a declaration previously made will be withdrawn. And under the Act there's a particular period of months that occur afterwards. And I think in this one, it's six months after a declaration . . . sorry, three months; six months under the UN. So at the Hague, it's a three-month period of expiration afterward there's been a change for a declaration or a modification.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that. Who has the ministry consulted with respect to this bill?

Mr. McGovern: — In Saskatchewan the ministry has specifically contacted STEP [Saskatchewan Trade and Export Partnership] as an organization that's representative of interest groups that have this particular item in mind. They've indicated . . . And one of the key aspects that we would stress with respect to this convention is that it absolutely respects party autonomy, that this is a convention that members of the public who are in the business of international contracts can choose to take advantage of through an exclusive court contract. So they can choose to have the court of Delaware in the United States serve as the court of exclusive jurisdiction. If they don't do that, there's no traps, there's no surprises.

So in that regard, the initial indications and with my discussions with the CEO [chief executive officer] from STEP was that it's entirely positive from their perspective and they would be certainly willing to support it.

Ms. Sarauer: — Thank you for that, and no further questions.

The Chair: — Thank you, Ms. Sarauer. Are there any further questions? Okay, we shall continue on then. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.]

call of the Chair.

[Schedule agreed to.]

[The committee adjourned at 19:44.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act*, a bilingual bill.

I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 96, *The Choice of Court Agreements (Hague Convention Implementation) Act*, a bilingual bill without amendment.

Mr. Francis: — I'll make that motion.

The Chair: — Mr. Francis makes that motion. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Minister, do you have any closing comments?

Hon. Mr. Morgan: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank the committee members on both sides for their time and the effort that they took in preparing and answering the questions; also the Legislative Assembly staff that worked here tonight who are, as always, their polished, professional selves — even though they didn't bring supper tonight, we thank them anyway; and also the ministry officials that were in attendance this evening. I know that these people don't get paid extra for that, and they do a lot of work for these things. So we thank all of the parties that were involved. And to yourself, thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Do you have any closing remarks, Ms. Sarauer?

Ms. Sarauer: — Sure. I'd like to echo the minister's sentiments, thank all members of the committee for being here this evening, for their time and their attentiveness at committee tonight, as well as the Chair for his time. I'd like to thank the officials for their hard work, not just this evening at committee but the hard work that they always do, as well as the Legislative Assembly staff for their professionalism and their assistance, as well as Hansard as well for their work this evening. Thank you so much.

The Chair: — Yes, and I would like to thank everybody also for being out here this evening. And thank you for putting up with me, as this is my first kick at the cat — I'm sorry, cat lovers — for chairing the Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice Committee.

Well this concludes our business for the evening. Seeing that we have no further business this evening, I would ask a member to move a motion of adjournment.

Mr. Olauson . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Should have an easy name like Bradshaw. Anyway, Mr. Olauson has moved a motion to adjourn. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. This committee stands adjourned to the