

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY



Speaker: Hon. Colin LaVie

Published by Order of the Legislature

Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability

DATE OF HEARING: 29 AUGUST 2019

MEETING STATUS: PUBLIC

LOCATION: LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER, HON. GEORGE COLES BUILDING, CHARLOTTETOWN

SUBJECT: WORK PLAN

COMMITTEE:

Cory Deagle, MLA Montague-Kilmuir [Chair]
Hon. Darlene Compton, Minister of Finance and Status of Women
Robert Henderson, MLA O'Leary-Inverness
Stephen Howard, MLA Summerside-South Drive
Lynne Lund, MLA Summerside-Wilmot
Gordon McNeilly, MLA Charlottetown-West Royalty (replaces Hal Perry, MLA Tignish-Palmer Road)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Hal Perry, MLA Tignish-Palmer Road

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

none

GUESTS:

none

STAFF:

Ryan Reddin, Clerk Assistant (Research and Committees)

Edited by Hansard

The Committee met at 10:00 a.m.

Chair (Deagle): All right, good morning everyone and welcome to the first meeting on the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability.

Just a quick note: I will recognize you before you speak, just for the mic and camera operators, so we can have that all straight. Looking forward to a productive meeting this meeting and probably, I'm sure, many meetings to follow.

Has everyone had a chance to look at the agenda? Do we have a motion to adopt the agenda as drafted?

Ms. Lund: (Indistinct)

Chair: Lynne.

Shall it carry? Carried.

All right, the consideration of the committee's work plan; we have a number of requests in, the first one being from Maritime Electric. They're looking to present to the committee. They sent this correspondence back early in July: present to the committee on company solutions to meet customer load growth.

Then we have a request from Michele Beaton, on the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* She sent this letter back on August 14th and she is – does it, perhaps Lynne or Steve, do you – I know she's concerned and I think we all would be over recent developments that we've seen in the news and whatnot. I think it is an important issue and I know Rob, you have a kind of a similar request in that's probably quite similar, you're looking to have IRAC come in.

The next one is from Robert to have IRAC come in; is that what you're looking for, Robert?

Mr. Henderson: I just think we have to get a bit better sense of how that transpired, that changing from a corporation not having to go through the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* and then who the actual owners are of the particular company and are they residents of Prince Edward Island; those are all questions that I'm kind of wondering.

Chair: Okay. Our next request – well, Ryan could probably speak to this – is on the land bank and land development corporation. Tim Carroll from UPEI had – he hasn't really sent an official letter to the committee, but Ryan had spoke to him, so if you want to –

Clerk Assistant: Sure. I had a phone call from Mr. Carroll; he's a business professor at UPEI. He was under the impression that there would be a committee established to look at the possibility of creating a land bank for the Island, but there is no legislative committee established specifically for that.

I don't know if government has plans to do so or not, but land, obviously, does fall under this committee's mandate. He seems interested; if the committee wishes to receive a presentation from him on the land bank or his experience with the land development corporation from some decades ago, I think he'll be willing to do that if the committee wants to.

Chair: Robert.

Mr. Henderson: I think it's from my perspective where the land bank concept, I mean, it sounds like a very worthy concept and it was part of the platform, those questions that I raised in the Legislature as well. I think the dynamic may have changed a lot since then, I mean, we're dealing with issues around Indigenous rights and things of that nature and what impacts that might have on land.

I think the other issue is: how much money is the province willing to put into this to make a significant dent and how would it roll out? If you're talking a million dollars, \$10 million, \$100 million, you're not going to buy a lot of land on Prince Edward Island for a million dollars anymore.

I think the concept may be worthy, but its effectiveness may not be. I know when I was minister of agriculture, we looked at different concepts around that and it becomes rather problematic.

Chair: All right, do we have any other matters for the work plan, anything that anyone would like to add to it?

Ms. Compton: I would like (Indistinct) –

Chair: Darlene.

Ms. Compton: I would like to bring up Northern Pulp again. It's something we've talked about on a number of occasions and the latest, I think, from the federal government was when Minister McKenna was here this month and basically said they had no plans of intervening to make it a federal issue; but I think Islanders and all Maritimers are expecting government to continue to beat the drum on that.

I think it's important that we bring it forward and I'm not quite sure the best way to do that. Maybe we can have a discussion for a meeting, but it's definitely on the radar in my district and I heard a lot this summer: Where are we at with Northern Pulp and are they going to change legislation to kick it down the road or are they going to make an exception? So just, I think, something we need to keep to the forefront.

Chair: Lynne.

Ms. Lund: I would love to add a discussion on the sustainability of agriculture to our work plan. Talking about things like soil organic matter, making sure we have good profit margins, the viability of farming into the future.

Chair: Steve?

Mr. Howard: Smart grids and holistic energy plan that aligns us with our climate goals and gets the utility model updated to help us.

Chair: Okay, so we have a – sorry, Robert.

Mr. Henderson: I've got a few to at least throw out for discussion here; I'm not saying we're going to have to then prioritize these, but I just wanted to kind of throw all of these out too, as I've been giving some thought to it.

One, is obviously what government's policy is going to be moving forward around the issue around high capacity wells; I think that's something that's front and centre with Islanders.

Another one I thought about and was in the media yesterday, labour workforce when it comes to Class 3 drivers licenses in the agricultural sector. Maybe there's something we can bring in the ag sector council to give us an update on what they see is the trend line.

If obviously, SkillsPEI missed that this was going to be an issue coming forward, how do we be ahead of the curve in addressing that?

Coming back to the power issue a little bit is three phase power in rural communities. I'm running into that front and centre in my district. We've had some areas of the province have – we've gotten some three phase power to those communities, but there was a big change in the infrastructure funding and now three phase power is not considered part of the eligible infrastructure fund. In my opinion, that's as important as high speed Internet is in some rural communities.

I've got a business H.F Stewart that our caucus had a tour of recently and the impacts that that's having on them. I would like to hopefully – the goal would be to try to have it be an eligible expense under infrastructure where municipalities could then apply for funding to get that.

Another one I want to raise here is there's a *Species at Risk Act* with the federal government and how – the impacts of that can be pretty impactful on a province if we don't have our own provincial endangered species act and how we deal with those types of issues.

The concern I have tends to be around the issue around right whales and what impact that that could have on our marine sustainability, could we possibly shut down parts of our lobster fishery because a whale swam through? How do we make that work? We don't want to lose whales, I'm not saying that; but there are some concerns I have on that one.

The other one would be the advance payment program. I'm told there has been some changes that have been made to that particular program and that's where farmers can get advance funding for a product or a commodity that they're selling and now I'm

told that they have to get some short term financing. Maybe the minister of finance could sort of help us out a little bit on that one, to bridge the gap between the way they used to do it before where they would get there – it was just kind of a quick, immediate transaction, they'd make one payment and then make another application for their advance payment almost in the same day.

Now, they have to go get short term financing, for maybe a month, and that sometimes, it's another step and it can be a bit of an impediment to that.

The only other one I had was, it might be more of a local issue, but it was around the high power lines at Howlan Road; I still have an issue with that.

So there's my long list of things to throw onto the agenda. Maybe Gord has some too, here.

Chair: Gord.

Mr. McNeilly: I just have a couple.

In the news this summer there was discussion about the quality of our rivers as the temperature – we had hot weather, and the quality of our rivers and streams in Prince Edward Island, maybe get somebody in to talk about is there anything that the provincial government can do to help sustain our rivers.

With the dry summer, our primary industry – our potato farmers maybe struggled not to get – there was a little bit of dryer conditions. This is something that's going to be prevalent in the future, so to talk about how we can be environmentally sustainable, but ensure that we're getting enough resources for our farmers.

Chair: We might have to make a separate committee just to deal with all of those requests.

An Hon. Member: (Indistinct)

Chair: So now we kind of have to look at our list here and kind of prioritize and which ones we're going to deal with first.

Sorry, Lynne?

Ms. Lund: Sorry, I did not realize that we were going to present our whole lists all at once.

Some Hon. Members: [Laughter]

Ms. Lund: Now that I'm aware of that, there are a couple of other things I would love for us to talk about.

Watershed groups and funding for them: They're doing incredible work, but the money they get is not always predictable. It would be great to have a discussion around that.

Also, bee importation is something I've been hearing from farmers, and I'd love to have that discussion too.

Do you have any other issues you wanted to bring up?

Chair: Sorry, Steve.

Some Hon. Members: (Indistinct)

Mr. Howard: Opening up the discussion on net metering and commit changes to that is something that we can do, but it kind of relates to what I've already mentioned, so I think we could probably do that all at once.

Ms. Lund: Perhaps those would be good – sorry, Chair?

Chair: Sorry, Lynne.

Ms. Lund: Those might be good discussions to have when Maritime Electric is here.

Mr. Howard: Absolutely, for sure.

Chair: That's it?

So how do we want to proceed? Do we want to have Maritime Electric in first? Since they wrote the committee back in July? Is that a – Robert?

Mr. Henderson: I think what I would suggest you do and obviously you've got three issues – well really, you can break that down to three issues, I guess. Two are really on the same issue.

So I mean you want to start to focus on them because we have requests for it to go further. I think if we could break down issues from environment. So the watersheds could include a number of other components, like high capacity wells and rivers and streams. You know what I'm saying? Same with endangered species, there may be something around that we can lump a bunch of them into as well.

Electricity with power lines can include in the request to present by Maritime Electric, that we'd have more questions for them on different subjects like three phase power and high voltage power lines and things of that nature.

That way we can kind of narrow it down and broaden that subject. It may mean we only have three or four meetings, but they can be quite extensive on those particular subjects.

Chair: Steve.

Mr. Howard: Instead of jumping around I'd prefer some focused time on each subject and then move on.

Chair: All right, so we'll start with Maritime Electric and then we will – I think it's fair if we go to Michele – probably Robert and Michele's requests are kind of similar, so we can go to the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* after that.

Darlene.

Ms. Compton: I'm just wondering how we're going to go about this? It's something that's been batted around for a number of times about land use and land protection and the previous government looked at it.

So as a committee what do we want to focus on, who do we want to have in, what are we going to discuss? Those are my questions and I think they're pretty much everyone's questions as to how – the issue we're talking about was there was a loop hole, so are we closing that loop hole? Are we looking at – I guess just to focus on where we want to go as a committee on land protection and how we look at it.

Chair: Robert.

Mr. Henderson: My thoughts would be is that, you know, the whole issue around the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.*, has been quite extensively debated. I know it was a front and centre issue when I was minister as well.

I mean, once we can say we're going to have a discussion around the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* then we can put a list of potential topics and people who we'd want to call in and we have a day that that's the subject and it's probably going to be an extensively long day maybe on that particular issue.

I don't want to hear everybody. I just think we need to get some views of who's kind of more front and centre on the subject and look at ways that we can – and I'll say, you mentioned the common loophole; I think my issue is still about fairness. I just want to be fair to all people who are considering purchasing land in Prince Edward Island.

If we're saying that corporations can't purchase land, I'm okay with that. Or corporations – we have to make sure that we're making it fair that a corporation is purchasing land the same as a family farm that's not incorporated, it's a sole proprietorship. That's all I'm trying to get at, that they go through the same steps, or whatever those steps would be, and that would be determined by ultimately government that makes the legislation or the regulations pertaining to that.

It would seem like something went awry from what I was aware of as far as the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* and how a purchase occurred that was circumvented by not having to go to IRAC. If IRAC can explain how that happened and maybe we can get some experts in on land transactions, the real estate association, things like that, that might have a better sense of this stuff.

Chair: Lynne?

Ms. Lund: I agree, those would be a good list of people that we could have come in to answer some questions. I think IRAC is a great place to start. I would also love to see us invite in a representative from the National Farmers Union. I know they have a lot of input on this subject. I think that could be very useful for us as well.

Chair: I guess we can all agree to invite IRAC. Was your request specifically Scott MacKay, the chair?

Mr. Henderson: My request was simply around the fact that a purchase occurred that IRAC wasn't involved with, so how did that happen from that perspective that they didn't have a say in this particular issue? From that perspective, I'd like to hear what their view is on that.

But I would also suggest that on that particular section, or that day that we're having to discuss about the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.*, that we have a list of speakers, and pros and cons and all the –

But that's something our committee is going to have to prioritize. I don't want a list that goes on forever here. I think we can, as a committee, designate three or four hours or whatever it might be and get enough speakers in that we feel is appropriate in this.

When you're saying the NFU – so then the question becomes: do you get the NFU and the Federation of Agriculture? I don't know.

That's something we have to kind of figure that out, I guess, on how many speakers you get on a certain subject. I'm okay if you want to make it a two-day thing, or a three-day, it's whatever. We just got to, as committee, get a sense of trying to make it fair and then what do we feel is fair when it comes to the presenters. Then we'll probably have a multitude of suggestions, but once again, once we get that, how do we narrow that down?

Chair: Okay, I guess we all have agreement that we'll ask IRAC to come in, the National Farmers Union, the Federation of Agriculture. Is there anyone else that –

Mr. Henderson: I guess before we narrow it down, can we maybe – I haven't really gave a pile of thought here to say who would be the different organizations that we would want to have in here, but I think we need to get a little bit of time on that or thought on that. Is that fair?

Chair: Darlene.

Ms. Compton: So before on committees, we try and pick a topic, or pick four or five issues, and then depending on availability who can come in first or when it works for people – if we're going to do it by topic, you know, if we're talking land use, well, with the letter that you sent, Robert, who would you like to see come in? Because that was your letter, right? I guess is one thing we look at.

Then if we say: Okay, a week from today is land day, or you know a month from today is land day, who can we get in for that time.

But the other experience that I've had in committee is, you get two speakers in for a morning and that's pushing it. So we have to look at time, but also, what part of that issue we want to cover, I guess, is the way to put it.

I don't know if you – as far as your letter –

Chair: Robert.

Mr. Henderson: (Indistinct) more suggesting that we maybe start off with just IRAC and sort of hear what they have to say and then pick a day later than that to kind of go through the subject. I mean, I'm okay with that, too.

Chair: Darlene.

Ms. Compton: It's whatever works the best I guess as far as time-wise. This is the hurdle we've come up with before in committee, is to try and – somebody is not available a week from Tuesday but somebody else is; but then if we're going to have a land day, who else can we get in? Then time-wise, how many can we fit in that day?

I don't know. I'm just putting it out there that's my observation from committee work before, is it's tough to get more than two people in for a day.

Ms. Lund: Chair?

Chair: Lynne.

Ms. Lund: I take your point on that, and I think that we know this issue is incredibly important to Islanders. Our committee has two letters before it on this very topic.

Even if we start with having IRAC come in as soon as they're available and we can make it work, that's a great place for us to start. Leaving that discussion, we may all have a list of further witnesses that we want to call forward, but at least it starts the process on it. Does that seem sensible?

Chair: Yeah.

Gord.

Mr. McNeilly: I think we're talking about two different things here. We're talking about the act that was just put in place and a specific case as well. You potentially might need a couple of different days to discuss the act and discuss the specific case that was going on in the summer. Maybe on that list should be the minister of justice should come in and discuss how and what his roles are and what he can do. So that's all I have to say.

Chair: Okay. So we have agreement that we'll have Maritime Electric in first; and then I think it's fair to say that we can move to land and invite IRAC in to present; and maybe we'll just stick with IRAC for first because we don't – like as Darlene said, we don't know how long. That could take up three hours, right?

And then that kind of – and I think that kind of looks after Michele's and Robert's request together.

Robert.

Mr. Henderson: How about we suggest this: maybe for our next meeting we have IRAC, Maritime Electric and Tim Carroll in. That covers the three main topics on our agenda right off the bat. Then that will give us time to put together who a list of speakers would be at our next meeting for moving forward on the subject of land, power and some other subjects.

Chair: Are you saying have them all in?

Mr. Henderson: Well, I don't know how long these presentations are going to be. If we said it was an hour each or something, there's three hours that we could designate for those three subjects right there. That would give us some framework and background on where we go from here, and

then, it would also give us some time to think about who our suggested speakers would be on a number of these different topics that we've identified here.

If you want, we can, at this meeting, prioritize some of those topics. Maybe after the Maritime Electric and IRAC were in, then that would give us which one we go with next? Is it power or is it issues around land? I'd throw that out as a suggestion.

Chair: My only worry would be is that we might find it rushed if everyone is asking questions and –

Mr. Henderson: Yeah, I know and –

Chair: We only have – usually we tend to go sometimes two to three hours for those. If you're trying to cram them all in and then people might feel like they're rushed if they have questions.

Darlene.

Ms. Compton: (Indistinct) two speakers in, in a session is hard. I mean, that's been the experience before. I'm open to anything.

Mr. Henderson: (Indistinct) I'm open to anything. I was just suggesting that's one option you could go with.

Ms. Compton: (Indistinct) cut it off at in an hour and move to the next one.

Chair: Okay, we kind of have Robert's idea of have both in at once at the first meeting? Or, do we want to separate them to two different meetings? What's our consensus?

Lynne.

Ms. Lund: I'm comfortable with the idea of having two presentations in the same day; I think that would be fine.

Chair: We'll just have to make sure they know beforehand that if you want to present for 45 minutes and then take questions – or a half an hour and take questions for another half an hour.

Ms. Lund: I wouldn't want to rush at it. I think it's important that we make it clear to our presenters that if we end up having a lot of questions on a topic, the next presentation

may start a little later than we were originally anticipating; but if they're comfortable with that, it would be a good opportunity for us to dive deep into the topics before we make our further lists of what we need to discuss.

Chair: Okay, so we'll invite both into our first meeting whenever we schedule that for. So that would take care of Maritime Electric and kind of Michele and Robert's request together. So that's – sorry, Lynne.

Ms. Lund: I would say that starts Michele's request.

Chair: Yeah, starts it. Probably starts both really; we're not going to finish it in one meeting, of course.

Steve.

Mr. Howard: So we're having IRAC and Maritime Electric in on the same day?

Chair: Yes.

Mr. Howard: So there are a few questions related to energy that I'd like to have IRAC ready for as well. If they're going to be in the same day, then it just makes a lot of sense.

Chair: I'm assuming if they're coming in though, they're going to be presenting on land, not – it might – I'm just thinking if we have them in – if we have two groups in and we're trying to – are we going to have time to ask IRAC questions on energy and (Indistinct)

Mr. Howard: You mean have them back another time?

Chair: Perhaps another meeting might be –

Mr. Howard: Okay, I just figured since they were going to be here.

Chair: – (Indistinct) unless anyone else has any suggestions?

Lynne.

Ms. Lund: I was wondering if you could provide any advice on that, clerk. What do you, from your experience –

Clerk Assistant: I would say it's important that the committee be very clear to the witnesses what they want the witnesses to present on and that also gives them an indication of generally the topic of questions.

Also, I think IRAC may well have different people responsible for the *Lands Protection Act, P.E.I.* as compared to electrical regulations. They would need to know ahead of time if they're to bring both groups or just the one, or what have you. Again, it's a question of time. You know, if there's a lot to cover on one subject, is there time for another? That's something to consider.

Ms. Lund: Thank you, clerk.

Chair: Do you think, Steve, perhaps we could have them in again at a different meeting –

Mr. Howard: That would be fine.

Chair: – to present on, perhaps some of those other issues that you brought up; some of the other, such as like net metering, or is that more Maritime Electric?

Mr. Howard: That's more Maritime Electric.

Chair: We have a request from Tim Carroll. Well, I guess not really a request, right Ryan, a phone call?

Clerk Assistant: Yeah, it's just, I think he's interested if the committee is interested but you're not under any obligation to say yes just because there's been an interest expressed. It could be something that could be held for the work plan further along, or however. It's entirely up to the committee what it wants – who it wants to hear from and on what topic.

Chair: Robert.

Mr. Henderson: I'd suggest we decide after we hear IRAC and the issues around land protection. That would be a later – we'll decide whether we would want to bring him something to – his views of land banks. I mean I've heard him talk about this in the past; we used to have a land development corporation at one time.

I would say that's probably – let's focus on IRAC and Maritime Electric. Let's see where that leads and then when we do get into another day or whatever on land, then decide whether Tim Carroll would be one of our people we'd want to ask to come to our committee.

Chair: That looks after the – what we had come in, in terms of correspondence, and then we do have the list of everyone's ideas here.

Do we want to start with perhaps Maritime Electric and the land and then kind of look at this list after that? Or I know – or does everyone kind of have perhaps one that's kind of a burning issue? Like Darlene, you have Northern Pulp. Does everyone have one that they would kind of say that they would like to put at the top of their agenda?

Ms. Compton: (Indistinct)

Chair: Sorry, Darlene.

Ms. Compton: Start with Maritime Electric and IRAC and we'll go from there. Depending on who is scheduled, maybe that will determine what comes up next.

Chair: Yeah, okay, all right. Sounds good.

Review of correspondence, we just did that.

Discussion of scheduling: Did we come up with a –

Clerk Assistant: A day?

Chair: Yeah.

Clerk Assistant: Well, if it works for this committee, Thursday mornings could be this committee's regular time. It's a complicated schedule with all the committees and caucus meetings and cabinet meetings as well and other commitments. So we do try to generally keep one particular slot for each committee. Thursday mornings is what you have at present, but if you want to try to move that around, that's possible.

I also heard some discussion of the length of the meeting, about three hours. Some other committees have said three hours works for them. If the committee is good with that,

that's what I'll block off when I send you appointments.

Chair: Is Thursday morning good with – Robert?

Mr. Henderson: I want to put a little bit on the Chair, here: Does it work for you? You're the first issue, and then I'll probably –

Chair: (Indistinct) it works for me.

Mr. Henderson: – I'd take into account the minister –

Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Henderson: – just from my experiences in the past, would say if those schedules work for you, I think it would be up to us to try to accommodate you, so Thursday morning works for me fine.

Chair: Thursday's fine with me.

Darlene?

Ms. Compton: Next Thursday I'm out of the province for Atlantic Lottery meetings, but –

Chair: In general (Indistinct) –

Ms. Compton: – Thursday in general should work, yeah.

Chair: Okay.

Lynne? Steve? Is that –

Some Hon. Members: (Indistinct)

Chair: I guess you can't speak for Hal.

So do you want to do – because they could be three hours, I was just thinking maybe (Indistinct) – you have a bit of a drive, Robbie, but –

Mr. Henderson: Well, Hal's even further (Indistinct) –

Chair: Hal's further.

Mr. Henderson: – (Indistinct) or you know –

Chair: 10:00 a.m. is good?

Mr. Henderson: Oh, yeah.

Chair: Would 9:00 a.m. be too early?

Mr. Henderson: No, 9:00 a.m. is fine, too.

Chair: I'm just thinking like (Indistinct) –

Mr. Henderson: Before 9:00 a.m. is always a little bit –

Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Henderson: – tougher for –

Chair: I was just thinking 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon and then we're kind of done by dinner time.

Mr. Henderson: That would seem –

Chair: Is that fine with –

Mr. Howard: That can be an issue for me.

Chair: Okay.

Mr. Howard: As we get into the school year here, I'm going to have kids with me in the morning. My wife works early, so getting here earlier than 10:00 a.m. can be a challenge.

Chair: Okay. We can leave it at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Henderson: But later is fine.

Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Henderson: I'm just saying when you're going from my end and Hal's end – and I am speaking a bit for him here – but just knowing the distance and stuff like that and what we have to do in the mornings and (Indistinct) –

Chair: Okay, we'll leave it at 10:00 a.m., and if we decide in the future we want to change it, we can.

Ms. Lund: Chair?

Chair: Lynne?

Ms. Lund: Do we intend to meet weekly at this point? Biweekly? What would you all like?

Chair: Well, I guess next – you said Darlene, next Thursday you're –

Ms. Compton: That day doesn't work for me.

Chair: Do we want to do the Thursday after, so in two weeks from today? Is that –

Mr. Henderson: I would suggest biweekly, but, you know, every two weeks, but just to try to give some reasonable sense of urgency, but that would also in two weeks' time accommodate the Minister of Finance, too, so –

Chair: All right, so we'll go with Thursday. I think it's the 12th.

Clerk Assistant: Yeah.

Chair: Yeah. Okay.

New business?

Mr. Henderson: (Indistinct)

Chair: Okay.

Mr. Henderson: (Indistinct)

Some Hon. Members: [Laughter]

Mr. Henderson: (Indistinct) they come in, I'm not sure.

Chair: Motion to adjourn?

Mr. Henderson: So moved.

Chair: Robert.

Thanks.

Shall it carry? Carried.

The Committee adjourned