



# **Special Committee on Regulations**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 6 – June 5, 2001**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-fourth Legislature**

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS  
2001**

Don Toth, Chair  
Moosomin

Kevin Yates, Vice-Chair  
Regina Dewdney

Denis Allchurch  
Shellbrook-Spiritwood

Brenda Bakken  
Weyburn-Big Muddy

Ron Harper  
Regina Northeast

Glen Hart  
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Debbie Higgins  
Moose Jaw Wakamow

Carolyn Jones  
Saskatoon Meewasin

Andrew Thomson  
Regina South

The committee met at 09:30.

**The Chair:** — I believe we have a quorum. And the first item of business. At our last meeting we had a discussion about whether or not we could find a means of streamlining the work of committee. And the question arose as a result of a number of regulations that were brought to our attention, which I think committee members became somewhat a little frustrated in the fact that the Law Clerk is asking us for our approval in order that he might contact either ministers or departments for clarification on certain regulations.

And the sense I had around the table was the fact that maybe we've got the cart before the horse and we can make some readjustments. And at that time we had some discussion about a motion that would give Legislative Counsel the opportunity to proceed prior to Regulations meetings, do some follow-up through correspondence, and then come back to the committee with some real concerns that may arise as a result of follow-up, and therefore streamlining the work of the committee. Give us something that we would feel we were really accomplishing or have the ability to get our teeth into something because we'd have more information available to us.

So you've received from the Clerk's office yesterday a couple of motions that we'd asked the Clerk and the Law Counsel to sit down and come up with after we had debated the issue a bit the other day. And so what I would like us to do this morning is move forward, discuss these motions, and make a decision.

And then if we pass the motions as was suggested, then we will actually move through it. There's about nine regulations and we will just . . . won't worry about discussing. Our legal counsel will then have the authority to proceed and do some follow-up, make some inquiries, and then we'll go from there.

We do have a few follow-up regulations though to discuss after we've gone through the motions.

And what you have in front of you are two proposed motions, and the one motion giving the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk the opportunity to correspond on the committee's behalf with government departments, agencies, and professional associations.

And the second one is basically adding a timeline of response that we had discussed as well.

So what I'd like to do, first of all, is open the floor and seek some direction from committee members.

**Mr. Yates:** — I move:

That the Special Committee on Regulations authorizes the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk to initiate correspondence on the committee's behalf with government departments, agencies, and professional associations; and that the correspondence shall identify any concerns noted in a regulation or a bylaw and shall request clarification or response from the departments, agencies, and professional associations; and further, that the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk shall bring both his concerns and the response

received before the committee at its next meeting.

And in cases where it is not clear what actions the committee might want, the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk shall consult with the Chair and Vice-Chair who may direct that correspondence be initiated on any matter enumerated or the matter be brought to the attention of the whole committee for consideration before further action is taken.

**The Chair:** — Okay, the motion has been put forward by Mr. Yates. Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you. I'm just not sure about the process on making regulations. Are there some professional associations who are responsible for creating and drafting their own regulations?

**Mr. Ring:** — Yes, every professional association or group that's covered by an Act of the legislature passes bylaws which are similar and if . . . they're bylaws for their own association regulating their members, and those are tabled each session in the Legislative Assembly and are reviewed and come before this committee if there's an issue with them.

**Ms. Jones:** — So, as a for instance, the Law Society or the Professional Engineers or somebody like that, I was questioning the necessity of having professional associations included in your ability to correspond. However with that explanation I'm satisfied.

**The Chair:** — Any further questions to the motion? Is the committee prepared then to pass this motion? Is the committee agreed?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — It's agreed, and it's passed and carried. Thank you.

Now there was a second motion as well and it deals with the time period. We had discussed a time frame that we felt the Law Clerk should be able to expect a response rather than waiting and waiting and waiting, and then another follow-up saying I've sent a letter on a certain date and I'm still waiting for your response.

And the feeling of the committee members, I believe, was that we would move a motion that would set that time period in place. So if I could have one of the committee members come forward with that motion I'd appreciate it.

**Mr. Yates:** — I move:

That the Special Committee on Regulations request government departments, agencies, and professional associations to respond to correspondence sent on behalf of the committee by the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk within 60 days whenever possible; and where a response has not been received within this period the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk shall bring this fact to the attention of the Chair and Vice-Chair for further direction.

**The Chair:** — Just one question, Mr. Yates. Did you say 60?

**Mr. Yates:** — Yes I did.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Any questions?

**Ms. Bakken:** — I guess I just might ask of the Law Clerk, is that a reasonable time frame — 60 days?

**Mr. Ring:** — It's two months. It could be. Sometimes it may be a bit short for the response but that would just be an initial period. That's not sort of a drop-dead deadline.

**Mr. Yates:** — You said whenever possible, and I think if you say 90 days, they'll wait 90 days. So if you say 60 days, by 90 days we should have them in.

**The Chair:** — Any further questions to the motion? Is the committee then prepared to pass this motion? Is the committee agreed to that? It's agreed. Carried. Thank you.

Thank you very much. As a result of the two motions that have been passed we will then go to regulations review. And as you will note in committee meetings of last week we, I believe, completed our discussion on The Dedicated Lands Amendment Regulations and we're proceeding to health standards amendment regulations.

And there are about nine other regulations that are before the committee, but in reality, with our new motion, can be addressed through our legal counsel. And then at a later date, the committee will respond to these regulations if the correspondence back from the specific departments does not quite confer with the views of legal counsel at that time.

So it means that we can move on to . . . I'm trying to find my blue sheet here. We can move on to the follow-up reports beginning with . . . and there should be a blue sheet just separating some of the regulations in your folder. And follow-up reports dealing with The Crown Oil and Gas Royalty Amendment Regulations, 1999; The Employment Supplement Regulations, (1998); The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Regulations 1999; and The Open Seasons Game Amendment Regulations, 2000.

So if you've been able to locate that, we'll move on to number one, the follow-up to The Crown Oil and Gas Royalty Amendment Regulations, and I'll call on Mr. Ring.

**Mr. Ring:** — This regulation came before the committee at the February 6 meeting. There were two concerns. On February 28, the Minister of Energy and Mines responded. The correspondence addressed both of the concerns that were raised by the committee.

The recommendation would be to consider the concerns resolved, but write the minister responsible to encourage the department to republish the regulations, or to publish a notice of the regulations with the actual coming into force date now that it is known, because you can ascertain it. This was done with respect to the Provincial Court amendment regulations that were published in the *Gazette* earlier.

And also to encourage the department not to re-enact portions of regulations that are not . . . that were not retroactive. These were the set of regulations where an entire table was repealed and replaced and only the last line was retroactive. And it looked as though they were trying to make it retroactive back past the time that it was actually there, and it was just the way in which the amendment was processed.

**The Chair:** — Any questions regarding the recommendations to this regulation?

**Mr. Yates:** — I move we accept the recommendation.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Yates. Is the committee agreed?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Agreed. Thank you.

### **The Employment Supplement Regulations (1998)**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to these regulations, this was the set of regulations discussed at the last meeting where the contact with the department with respect to the applications was to be done by telephone only.

I wrote the Minister of Social Services, and the Minister of Social Services responded — you'll find a copy of his letter there — and he indicated that initially when the regulations were coming forward that was a concern that the department had as well.

And as a result of that, they worked with SaskTel in order to provide for phone service for people who may not otherwise have had phone service available to them. And so the program's working well. They've done a client survey and it seems to be working.

**The Chair:** — So any further questions from committee members? If not . . . Yes, Ms. Higgins?

**Ms. Higgins:** — I move that we accept the recommendations.

**The Chair:** — Okay. The committee agreed that we accept the recommendations?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Agreed. Carried. Thank you.

### **The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Regulations, 1999 (No. 2)**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to the Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Amendment Regulations, 1999 (No. 2), the regulation came before the committee on February 6. There were two concerns. They were similar to the regulation . . . the first set of regulations we dealt with.

My recommendation would be to consider the concerns resolved, but again encourage the department to republish the regulations or a notice of them now that the date is actually . . . you can ascertain it and it would be found in the *Gazette*. So

that users of the *Gazette* would be able to . . . will know the date of the regulations, as they did with the Provincial Court amendment regulations.

**The Chair:** — Any questions? If not, would the committee consider that recommendation as agreed to?

**Ms. Jones:** — I move we accept the recommendation.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Agreed?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Thank you.

#### **The Open Seasons Game Amendment Regulations, 2000**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to The Open Seasons Game Amendment Regulations, 2000, this was a regulation made by way of minister's order, that I wrote to the department with respect to what appears to be a typographical error in the regulations. There's two different overlapping periods of open season in one area.

And I've sent the letter out but I have not yet received a response back from the department. And I believe the situation should be resolved before the fall of 2001 so that there's one open season for that designated area and not two overlap . . . Well there wouldn't be an open season in that designated area in 2001. There would be two overlapping seasons in the 2002 year.

So with respect to this particular set of regulations, I just request the committee's guidance with respect to follow-up correspondence.

**The Chair:** — Any questions from committee members?

**Mr. Yates:** — Yes. I would move:

That the Law Clerk write a second letter expressing the very serious concerns we have about the failure to respond to this within a nine-month period, and due to the time frame, encourage them to reply in short order.

**The Chair:** — We have a motion by Mr. Yates. However, my apologies; I should have acknowledged Mr. Harper first.

**Mr. Harper:** — No problem, Mr. Chair. Perhaps . . . and I agree with the motion put forward but I just think perhaps we should also draw the attention of the department to the motion that we passed earlier this day, that the responses from now on are expected to be received by the committee within 60 days.

**The Chair:** — That's a good point and it could be put into the motion. Any further discussion on this motion? It's agreed to. Carried. Thank you.

We'll move on to then the next set of follow-up reports. We have three: Justices of the Peace, '99; Provincial Court, and Urban Municipalities Rural Revenue Sharing Amendment Regulations.

And I'll call on Mr. Ring.

#### **The Justices of the Peace Amendment Regulations, 1999**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to the Justices of the Peace Amendment Regulations, these were the set of regulations that indicated that there were no criteria set out for the leaves of absences for . . . the enumeration of a few examples following "including" would not limit the type of criteria that could be considered.

The Minister of Justice was written and responded that he would have, quote:

I'll have my officials raise this issue with the Chief Judge of the Provincial Court with a view to compiling a list of criteria which could be inserted into the regulations.

The recommendation there then would be to consider the matter resolved. And I would monitor the regulations for when that criteria was there. I could bring it back to the committee's attention indicating that's been done if the committee wanted that type of follow-up.

**The Chair:** — Any comments from the committee members?

**Mr. Hart:** — I would move:

That we accept the Law Clerk's recommendations.

However, I would suggest that when those criteria are listed that he brings them to the committee so that we can have a review of them.

**The Chair:** — Is that agreed to? It's agreed to. Carried. Thank you.

#### **The Provincial Court General Regulations**

**Mr. Ring:** — The Provincial Court General Regulations were also discussed at the last meeting. This was the issue regarding the listing of the clauses as to whether or not sick leave and special leave should be on the same line or whether they should be included in a separate clause, rather than grouping them together.

The Minister of Justice responded, indicating that there was also . . . another clause contains a grouping of three types of expenses. One was travel and sustenance and moving expenses and indicated that travel and sustenance are for routine, daily trips and that moving expenses would be not in the same category and those are grouped in the same clause.

I wasn't looking at that clause because there wasn't an issue there. And the response there would be that that clause could be separated out as well, having the travel and sustenance and moving expenses in a separate clause, although that issue was not before the committee and has subsequently been raised by the minister.

**The Chair:** — Questions from committee members?

**Ms. Jones:** — I'd like a little direction on just what possible effect there could be if we don't accept the recommendation and if there's some, you know, really bad outcome that could come?

It seems to me that recommending an amendment and going through the gazetting and the notification and all of the things that go along with amendments to regulations, I mean, is it really an issue large enough to go to that effort? What possible problems could we encounter if we don't do this?

**Mr. Ring:** — There are no practical problems behind that. I think, the fact . . . and it may be that the fact the issue has been raised and discussed may be sufficient to make sure that this type of . . . you know, that it wouldn't happen again. They'll be watching for that type of a provision. But certainly it's not going to mean that people would be disintitled or anything like that.

**Ms. Jones:** — So would it be perhaps more practical to correspond saying that if future amendments are required, that they consider amending this particular clause at the same time? It just seems to me that if there isn't likely to be any difficulty arising from our identified problem, that it's a bit extreme to ask them to bring in an amendment just for that.

**Mr. Ring:** — That's a possibility. I would think that, given the tone of the minister's letter, that that may be a consideration that would be there when and if they open up The Provincial Court Act for amendment. Because that was an Act that took a considerable amount of work to bring together and get passed and work through. So that may be in the future, if it is done. So that would be possible.

**Ms. Jones:** — Could I then make a motion:

That the Law Clerk correspond with the minister suggesting that if future amendments to the regulations are being made, that they consider his advice in those future regulation changes.

**The Chair:** — Is there any discussion following Ms. Jones's motion?

**Mr. Yates:** — Just a point of clarification. Is it possible they were put on the same line to reinforce the fact that they would come out of the same pool of available days — the same as any other government or public employee — versus separating where the argument could be made that it should be two separate pools of days?

Because especially for anybody in the public service, would come out of their pool of available sick days and it would be noticed in their collective agreements they're also on the same line, so that in fact it cannot be interpreted that there should be two pools of days or that they do come out of the same pool days.

So I'm just wondering if those same arguments or thought processes didn't go into developing this with judges, didn't get a benefit that . . . an extra benefit that they can interpret in a particular way, and it would be the same as other public employees.

**Mr. Ring:** — I suppose that might be possible, not having looked at the collective agreement or what they have in there, although the clause begins with "including", so that's a possibility. I don't think we can rule that out as a possibility.

**The Chair:** — Any further discussion prior to moving the . . . or voting on the motion brought forward by Ms. Jones?

Thank you. Just to bring to the committee's attention that the motion before us is the motion by Ms. Jones that we have the Law Clerk respond . . . or correspond with the minister and that in future dates that the item we were just discussing before us, that we have these split up in separate clauses. Is that what I understand? Is that agreed to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right. As I understand the motion. Is that agreed to? Agreed. Carried.

### **The Urban Municipalities Revenue Sharing Amendment Regulations, 1999**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to these regulations, it was the minister being able to determine the population rather than using Statistics Canada reports. There was an exchange of correspondence. I wrote to the minister. The minister responded on March 8, indicating that the department is taking . . . is undertaking a review of the revenue-sharing program at this time and will advise the committee of any changes to the . . . or looking at making changes to the regulations.

The recommendation therefore would be to monitor the regulations for any changes that may be upcoming and indicate to the committee when the changes occur.

**The Chair:** — Any questions from committee members?

**Mr. Harper:** — Mr. Chair, I move acceptance of the recommendation.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Harper has moved that we accept the recommendation. Is the committee agreed?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Agreed. Carried.

And then I believe we have a couple of final follow-up reports. One to do with the electronic procedures regulations and secondly, The Swimming Pool Regulations, 1999.

### **The Electronic Meeting Procedures Regulations**

**Mr. Ring:** — With respect to these regulations, this was a set of regulations that Mr. Michael Littlewood from the Department of Education appeared on; and when he came to the committee he had a suggested amendment to the regulations addressing the concern that the committee had with them, and they are in the process of making changes to the regulations in that regard.

So the recommendation would be to consider the issue resolved as there is an undertaking by the department to address the concern of the committee, and I could advise the committee when the amendments to the regulations are made.

**Mr. Hart:** — I would move that we accept the Law Clerk's recommendations on this matter.

**The Chair:** — Is the committee agreed to that?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Agreed. Carried. Thank you.

### **The Swimming Pool Regulations, 1999**

**Mr. Ring:** — These regulations first came before the committee in October of 2000 and then came back again on February 21 after the department's initial response. The Minister of Health has further corresponded from the last correspondence sent and at this time he indicated that the Act would be . . . the consideration to amending the Act would be done at the earliest possible time, rather than yes, we'll amend it.

So the recommendation there would be to consider the matter resolved and that . . . given the new undertaking.

**Mr. Harper:** — Mr. Chair, I move acceptance.

**The Chair:** — Okay, we do have the question . . . I do have one question I'd like to raise on this and that's will we consider it resolved, the fact that the minister has indicated consideration will be given and will be done at the earliest possible convenience.

I'm wondering if we should actually just have the follow-up to make sure that it is completed versus . . . Like we can accept the minister's suggestion that it will be . . . the process will be acted on as quickly as possible, but who knows when that might . . . that earliest possible time may be a little time down the road. And I think we want to make sure that it's . . . it might be tomorrow, it might be a few months from now. And I think it . . . and just my thoughts on this matter, I'm wondering if we should maybe just have a little addition to that to make sure that it is . . . the follow-up is indeed addressing that concern.

I'll go back to Mr. Harper. Would you, Mr. Harper, would you consider the fact that while we would consider this resolved, that we just do have an addendum for the Law Clerk to indicate that yes it has been addressed down the road some time?

**Mr. Harper:** — A question, Mr. Chair. Are you looking for an indication from the minister of the time frame in which this would be addressed?

**The Chair:** — Well not the time frame as much as I'm just concerned about when I see something — earliest possible time — I think it would have been much easier if the minister had said that in the next session or by the end of this session or something that it would be there. The wording, earliest possible time, may mean it may not be addressed.

**Mr. Harper:** — Pretty vague, yes.

**The Chair:** — If it happens that the minister changes and the follow-up isn't done by a preceding minister you may end up with the situation just sitting in limbo. And that's the only

reason I raise that.

**Mr. Harper:** — Well I would amend my motion to read something like:

That we accept the recommendations and also ask the Law Clerk to contact the minister to give us an approximate time frame in which we could expect this to be addressed.

**The Chair:** — Any further discussion? Committee agreed to that motion then? Thank you, Mr. Harper. Agreed. Carried.

I believe we have come to the . . . We have come to the end of the follow-up regulations however Mr. Ring has . . . On the following page you'll notice a headline entitled, resolved. And we do have a number of regulations that were addressed February 6 and 7 at the meetings and there's some follow-up.

And I'm going to just invite Mr. Ring just to carry us through whether we have to do them individually or just to let us know exactly what has happened following our last committee meeting and how these issues have been dealt with, please.

**Mr. Ring:** — Yes, this is the . . . it's just the white sheet and it says, resolved, at the top. And it just was an indication for the committee to indicate . . . to show you that the committee has transacted some business — these issues were raised, there has been correspondence, they were resolved. And so we've made a list of the items that were dealt with and resolved at the last meeting for your information.

With respect to the last one, the victims of domestic violence, a file had been opened for some number of years with respect to having a form changed. And after I spoke with people at the department, they've indicated the form indeed has been changed. And you'll see there's a correspondence there from Susan Amrud of the Department of Justice with, first of all a copy of the old form and then secondly, a copy of the new form that's been printed up that replaces that one that they're currently using.

**The Chair:** — Do we have any questions from committee members? I think I would have to say I want to thank Mr. Ring, our legal counsel, for just informing us that some of the work we do, at the end of the day, actually gets acknowledged and appropriate follow-up is undertaken.

So while at times we may think we don't accomplish a lot, there are always little issues that come to the forefront; we know that departments and the ministers respond to this and we appreciate that.

I would just like to ask of committee members one thing. Now that we've passed the motion and Mr. Ring as our legal counsel will have the authority to proceed and do some follow-up when he sees some irregularities in regulations rather than coming to the committee, asking our permission, going and writing his letter, when the Law Clerk or legal counsel receives a correspondence and he's had some major concerns with the way the correspondence comes back in regards to the observations he's made, you'll note that the motions before you have indicated that he would contact, bring issues of concern to the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

And I just felt maybe we should this morning before we leave, just discuss the issue. If a major concern is brought to the Chair and the Vice-Chair and the feeling is that committee members may want to receive more information such as, for example, back in November we had about four issues that when we were sitting around the table we just didn't have the authorities here to really answer the questions. And as a result we met in February and we had four groups. The Department of Education came and we were able to sit down with them to get a better understanding of the concerns that were raised.

And rather than coming to a committee meeting to sit down and find that we're just not comfortable in making any recommendations because we don't feel we have enough information in front of us, would it be appropriate to have departmental officials come?

I'm wondering if the committee would feel . . . if they would give the Chair and the Co-Chair some authority, if you will, if the Chair and Co-Chair — whoever they were at the time — felt that this might be an issue where it would be appropriate right off the bat to have officials come before the committee, that they would do that and therefore save ourselves having to call another meeting to then call the officials forward.

Is that something that committee members might see as an advantage to speeding up the process of dealing with some of the concerns? Or would you prefer just to meet together as committee members doing the follow-up from legal counsel, and then if we still feel we don't have enough information then the committee recommending we next sit and meet with representatives from the different departments?

I just throw this out for some feedback from committee members. Any thoughts?

**Ms. Higgins:** — Mr. Chair, I don't . . . I would feel that if, upon correspondence being returned from the departments, that if the committee as a whole feels that it's not explanation enough, that the committee should make the decision as to whether we have officials come.

I think having officials come too frequently or if unneeded, it's time consuming for the committee and also for the departments to arrange, and I would think for Mr. Ring to arrange or you as Chair to arrange having departments here. So I would prefer that the committee made the decision upon receiving correspondence.

**The Chair:** — Any further comments?

**Mr. Hart:** — I think that perhaps there may be some obvious cases where, where we would need to have department officials here to explain the implications of the matter that would be presented to us. And perhaps . . . I think it's one of these areas where there is no, there is no set rules. And I would suggest that perhaps where it's a very obvious case, that we may need further explanation, that perhaps the Chair and the Co-Chair would have the authority. As I said, there's no hard and fast rules in this area and I think we just have to depend on the good judgment of the Chair and Co-Chair.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well I think that our motion says that the Law

Clerk shall bring his concerns and the response received before the committee. So I think we've gone far enough in terms of trying to do some pre-emptive work rather than meeting here and saying okay, go and correspond. We've said correspond and bring it back to us. And I think that's far enough at this point.

I don't think we want to lump the whole responsibility for the regulation review onto the Law Clerk and the Chair and Vice-Chair. I think that the committee is charged with responsibility and I believe that we should accept it and take it. So that would be my view.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Any further discussion? I thank the committee for their thoughts and I appreciate it. And we will just continue to operate as we have in the past and if there, from a meeting, the feeling of the committee is that we need further clarification and we need some department officials, the committee will then make that recommendation. Thank you so much.

Mr. Ring, you had a couple more things you wanted to bring to our attention.

**Mr. Ring:** — I just had one item with respect to . . . to bring to committee members' attention. When the minutes go out for the meeting, there will be a list of regulations that were reviewed with respect to which there were no concerns noted. And that list will be appended to the minutes, so you may want to watch for that in case you've had any questions with respect to those.

And now the committee, with respect to the last two years, I've reported everything that I've noted up to the end of June 2000. So we're starting to close in on the gap between the time they're actually made and the time they come before the committee. And there's a few other follow-up files that we have that I'll bring forward at various meetings.

But I wanted to let the committee know that there is a list of . . . because we only seem to bring forward the ones where there's problems with. It's usually good in the complaints department to also sort of have the — these are the list of ones we looked through and we didn't find any problems with. And that list will be attached to the minutes.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Ring. And I would like to, first of all, thank legal counsel, Mr. Ring and Margaret and Allison for their work in preparing the information for us to enable us to proceed in our meetings. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude for their work. Without the efforts that they have undertaken, it would just make our workload that much heavier. So we thank you very much.

In regards to a follow-up meeting, I seek direction from the committee whether or not we should set a date. And I seek Mr. Ring's guidance that there are issues that may be coming forward that could be discussed in the near future or whether the next meeting be set at the call of the Chair.

**Mr. Ring:** — My thoughts would be we could either set a meeting date now for some time in the fall or do it at the call of the Chair.



But perhaps before the committee rises today, have an understanding as to when the next meeting might be so that people would be aware of it and they could make plans or not, so that we're sort of on the agenda when other committees start meeting and just to give committee members an idea of when the next meeting might be.

**Mr. Harper:** — Mr. Chair, I'd make a motion:

That we leave the sitting of the next meeting at the call of the Chair — suggested this fall. That would give time then for responses for the inquiries and so on and so forth that is being made.

That would be my motion — it be left at the call of the Chair this fall.

**The Chair:** — Any further discussion? Maybe I should just . . . I wonder if committee feels maybe narrowing it down. Rather than the fall, would you give a time? Forget September. Yes.

Would it be possible to maybe just narrow it down to a time period so committee members would be a little more aware of where it may . . . the time period that they should be mindful of that there's a potential committee meeting.

Ms. Higgins, you have a thought.

**Ms. Higgins:** — I would prefer that it's . . . and we have to take into consideration harvest and the availability of members.

But also, I would say end of September early October so we can keep on top of these things and be a little more timely dealing with these regulations. And it's nice to hear Mr. Ring's comments that we are closing that gap and getting a little more current, so it would be nice if we could remain that way.

**The Chair:** — Any further discussion? So the motion as put forward then would be at the call of the Chair, suggesting end of September to the early part of October. Is that agreed to?

**Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — That's carried.

Any further discussion that should be brought up this morning? If not, I'd entertain a motion for adjournment.

So moved by Ms. Higgins. Is that agreed? Carried. Thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 10:21.