

MINUTES

CORPORATE SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

04 JUN 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: P. Clark

Members: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Loney, W. Stewart

REGRETS

M. Bellemare, B. McGarry, R. van den Ham

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee confirm the Regular and Confidential Minutes of the 21 May 1996 meeting.

CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING

1. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (RDC) POLICY REPORT - RECOMMENDED APPROACH
 - Co-ordinator, Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee report dated 23 May 96
 - Finance Commissioner's report dated 1 May 96
 - Letter from Ms. Amy Kempster, Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Citizen's Association
 - Letter from Mr. Chris Jalkotzy
 - Letter from Mr. George Drew and Mr. Dayle Gowan
 - Letters from Mr. Daniel Paquette, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 12 Jun 1996 in Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee Report Numbers 36 and 37.

- Letter from Mr. Gibson Patterson, Emerald Links Golf and Country Club
- Letter from Mr. Kenneth Gordon and Mr. William Tomlinson, Rideau Forest Development Ltd.

In response to a question from Councillor Holmes regarding the possible re-instatement of development charges for the downtown area, T. Marc, Solicitor, confirmed this would require the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing approval. Mr. Marc suggested, if Recommendation No. 4 which re-instated these charges was approved, that separate by-laws be forwarded to Council for approval in order to not delay the proposed reduction of rates shown in Annex C of the report.

The following public delegations spoke to the Committee on the item:

Mr. Joe Oneid, Real Estate Board of Ottawa-Carleton, requested the Committee to consider the exemption of development charges on residential projects for one year and on commercial projects for two years. He believed this proposal would benefit landlords, developers, builders, trades, local economy and the consumer. Mr. Oneid stated development charges were used to finance growth related purposes. However, he pointed out the general market conditions did not indicate growth at this time and suspected the need for a longer relief period to improve. Mr. Oneid reviewed the benefits of development to the local economy, such as fees, moving costs, appliances, renovations, and emphasized the industry's need for assistance after difficult years. Mr. Oneid suggested the elimination of development charges would reduce the cost of housing, thereby, encourage more movement in the industry. In closing, Mr. Oneid requested the Committee to consider the proposed exemptions.

In reference to Mr. Oneid's comments on the reduction in price for newly constructed homes that benefited from the exemption, Councillor Hunter inquired if he expected the price for resale homes to also be reduced in order to be competitive. Mr. Oneid confirmed the price was determined by many things, but in particular by the market. He believed the Region would recover their loss from the one year of exemption through future years of increased development, growth and taxes. Councillor Hunter suggested it was unfair that those who purchased homes without the exemption and subsequently had higher taxes, would pay the consequences of this exemption.

Chair Clark explained an exemption for one year would be difficult due to the long and complicated by-law process and the requirement for Provincial approval. He stated the real question at hand was to decide if the Region was going to be in the development charge "business" and ensure long term services, or not.

Councillor Cullen pointed out that even though exemptions were in place, the required infrastructure and services for the growth would still be needed. As a result, the Councillor believed this represented subsidizing on behalf of the taxpayer in order to assist the development industry.

Ms. Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizen's Association, stated any change to the development charges at this time was ill advised and premature. She recommended waiting until the completion of the new Regional Development Strategy. She also noted that it would be more difficult to increase the charges at a later date due to the requirement for Provincial approval. Ms. Kempster stated the charges should reflect the actual cost of servicing the new development and not be imposed on the tax base of existing residents. In closing, Ms. Kempster recommended the Committee extend the by-law until the completion of the Regional Development Strategy, but at the current rates. With regard to the re-instatement of charges in the downtown core, Ms. Kempster did not recommend the deletion of the exemption at this time as the servicing costs were low and minimal in the area. In addition, she believed this exemption was in line with the Region's vision for a vibrant and attractive mix of economic and cultural activity and celebration in the downtown area.

Mr. Chris Jalkotsky referenced the Official Plan Review and its relation to the Regional Development Charges. Mr. Jalkotsky did not believe it was appropriate to adjust the current charges, in particular, in view of Council's decision in the past to wait until the Regional Development Strategy was complete. Mr. Jalkotsky expressed concern with Regional staff spending a great deal of time in preparing reports and by-laws when the Regional Development Strategy was not yet complete. In addition, he believed if the charges were going to be decreased, they would have to be decreased far more substantially to have any great effect on the market. Mr. Jalkotsky pointed out there was a great deal of infrastructure already complete that was currently under-utilized. In closing, he suggested the need to review other options as outlined in his written submission.

Councillor Stewart referenced a letter from the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association in which they state their endorsement for the staff report. The Councillor pointed out the Home Builders' Association welcomed the 12% reduction, rather than feeling it was a minimal reduction with little result. Mr. Jalkotzy expressed concern with the attempts to "nickel and dime" away a process previously committed to by Council just because the Regional Development Strategy was delayed.

Mr. Paul Van Steen, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association, explained the situation existed that within a street townhouse development, because of the street geometrics of outside curves of crescents or on cul-de-sacs, it made more sense to take a townhouse block, divide it and spread the units around the outside of the circle. As a result, Mr. Van Steen stated that in certain situation they had the appearance of being semi-detached units. However, he noted that for all intense purposes they remain to be street townhouses as they were part of a block, were physically connected underground and were sold as street townhouses. Mr. Van Steen requested the Regional Development Charges by-law be clarified so that in this situation, merely due to street geometrics, this type of unit be treated and charged as a street townhouse and not a semi-detached unit.

Councillor Loney inquired what the control would be to ensure this was not a larger, more substantial home. Mr. Van Steen suggested the main control could be at the local municipality through the site plan agreement. With regard to any possible increase in profit for these types of units, Mr. Van Steen confirmed there was very marginal, if any profit due to additional construction costs and the fact they were advertised on the market as townhouse units. He also emphasized this would only be necessary in situations where street geometrics result in a more sensible streetscape.

In response to a question from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Marc explained it was the opinion of staff that this request was consistent with the underlying policy of development charges, that it was a minor amendment, and staff were prepared to support it. He pointed out, however, it was with the understanding the development consisted of at least 90% of the units being townhouses, multiples or apartments.

Mr. Lloyd Cranston, Mayor, Township of Osgoode, stated that the rural areas did not benefit from transit, water, sewers, or many of the services provided for in the centre core. Mayor Cranston requested the need for a more level playing field in the rural areas with regard to the development fees. He suggested some form of alleviation if there was no projected use of the service. In referencing 1995, Mayor Cranston stated there was minimal construction activity, thereby creating little funds transferred to the Region for development charges. He reported Osgoode Council had temporarily removed municipal development charges, which resulted in numerous housing starts and building permit applications. As a result, the Mayor pointed out the need for a decision in the near future so the permits could be issued on the basis of the proposed reductions. Mayor Cranston noted it had been proven that where fees were suspended or reduced, development had increased, which represented long term taxes.

Councillor Cullen inquired how the Region was supposed to provide infrastructure to the new development, other than being subsidized by the tax base. Mayor Cranston suggested there was very little services required and believed the benefit of development was greater.

Mr. Robert Merkley, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association, referenced employment statistics for the local construction industry, and the need to address this situation. Mr. Merkley urged the Committee to support the staff recommendation of reducing the charges by the proposed 12%. He did not support, however, the proposed re-instatement of charges in the centre core, and believed the exemption must be continued to ensure the development in downtown. Mr. Merkley referenced their relationship with the City of Nepean in its review of development charges, and hoped a similar relationship could be established when the Region commenced their review. Mr. Merkley explained steps were required to restore the industry, local economy and consumer confidence, and promote jobs. He emphasized the need to keep Regional Development Charges as low as possible. With regard to the competition for economic growth, Mr. Merkley pointed out that over the past ten years, the new home market area in the Outaouais had grown from 22% to 45% due to housing affordability.

Councillor Cullen pointed out the reduction in development charge represented a subsidy required from the taxpayer to cover the costs of the services required. Mr. Merkley stated the Association was requesting the stimulation required to continue the market and create jobs.

Mr. Paul Rothwell, Claridge Homes, requested the Committee consider maintaining the exemption in the centretown area. In referencing the Regional Development Strategy, the Official Plan Review and future Provincial legislation amendments, Mr. Rothwell believed it was necessary to extend the by-law until the reviews were complete. He stated that since the exemption was introduced in September 1994, the industry had overcome specifically inherit pricing disadvantages in the centretown area. In closing, he suggested the benefits of the exemption were only beginning to emerge and would take time.

Upon conclusion of the public delegations, the Committee commenced discussion on the report.

In response to Mr. Van Steen's presentation, Councillor Stewart moved the following motion.

Moved by W. Stewart

That the Regional Development Charges By-law be amended to provide that where in a townhouse development (i.e. at least 90% of the units are townhouses, multiples or apartments), the curvilinear pattern of the street requires, in accordance with the principles of proper design of the development, that semi-detached dwelling units be constructed, such semi-detached dwelling units be subject to the townhouse regional development rate.

CARRIED as amended
(G. Hunter dissented)

Councillor Hill stated she did not believe a level playing field existed for the rural townships and did not agree with the concept that one size fits all. The Councillor emphasized the rural areas did not benefit from the sewer, water and transit services, and suggested the need for a lower charge. Councillor Hill referenced the commercial assessment figures and emphasized the variety in size between the rural townships and urban areas. She stated they did not have the access to development and growth the urban components received and consideration should be given accordingly. Councillor Hill referenced the *Ontario Municipalities Adjacent to Ottawa-Carleton* report and stated the development was moving beyond the boundaries of the Region, due to the initiatives of lower taxes and less expensive homes. In closing, Councillor Hill requested the Committee to recognize the unbalance and the decreased need and demand for Regional services.

Councillor Holmes inquired if the approval of Recommendation No. 4 would delete the exemption for centretown. Mr. Kirkpatrick confirmed it would, and would be effective the date the amending by-law was approved by the Minister. With regard to Recommendation No. 3, Mr. Kirkpatrick explained there was still a need to hire the consultant as their involvement was necessary to consider area specific development charges for all growth areas in the Region, in addition to a uniform region wide methodology. Councillor Holmes urged the Committee not to support the deletion of the centretown exemption. The Councillor stated the benefits of this exemption was only beginning to surface as it took time for a project to be planned and commence. Councillor Holmes believed the significant loss of Provincial funding was going to create a major reduction in the capital program. In closing, the Councillor referenced the downtown population that welcomed intensification, and the statement located in the Official Plan which stated the need to make downtown a vibrant and healthy community.

Chair Clark pointed out it was necessary to review the issue at this time as a motion was required to extend or replace the current by-law. The Chair stated the decrease in Provincial funding for capital projects actually represented pressure to increase development charges. However, he believed there was some room to reduce the charges for the interim period until the Regional Development Strategy and Transportation Master Plan were complete, and the new Act was introduced.

With regard to the centretown exemption, Chair Clark did not believe adequate new development had commenced, contrary to what developers had promised during the debate of this exemption. He suggested the construction was not happening because of the market, and he believed the exemption was not a stimulus, but represented the Region giving up revenue.

Speaking to the issue of the unbalance in the rural areas, Chair Clark referenced new road construction, maintenance, and resurfacing that occurred. In addition, he referenced the funds spent on the water and sewer for Carp Village, the Carp Airport project, and social assistance. The Chair emphasized that the total amount of money received from the municipalities for development charges was far less than the money spent on infrastructure in those areas. Chair Clark stated the need for a uniform approach, as it was a Regional issue. In closing, the Chair referenced the long term situation of reduced provincial support to zero, and the need to ensure the long term services for Ottawa-Carleton would remain at its high quality. The Chair did not believe it was appropriate to suggest eliminating development charges, in particular at this time, unless the services were also eliminated.

Councillor Cullen suggested the Committee amend Recommendation No. 2, to simply extend the current by-law and maintain the current schedule of rates, thereby not supporting the proposed reduction for the interim period. The Councillor suggested the appointment of the consultant was necessary to ensure the research and rationale was presented on area specific charges and would allow Council to properly debate the issue. Councillor Cullen stated that for the time being, he could not support the deletion of the centretown exemption.

Councillor Hill pointed out the issue was on Regional Development Charges and noted the Carp Airport and Carp sewer and water project were not funded through development charges, but through the infrastructure program, the Ministry and residents. The Councillor expressed disappointment in the lack of support given to the rural townships. In addition, she noted that employment was required in all areas, in particular the construction industry.

Moved by B. Hill

That the rural townships be exempt from Regional Development Charges for the interim period.

LOST

YEAS: B. Hill 1

NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart, Chair Clark 4

Moved by B. Hill

That the interim development charges in the rural townships be reduced by 50% instead of the 12.5% as recommended in the staff report.

LOST

YEAS: B. Hill 1

NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart, Chair Clark 4

The Committee then considered the report recommendations as amended:

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the following:

- 1. The schedule for completion of the RDC policy report and Bylaw as indicated on Annex B;**
- 2. Amending Bylaw 210 of 1991 to delete the expiry date and introduce the schedule of rates identified on Annex C effective 26 June 1996;**
- 3. The appointment of C.N. Watson and Associates, Mississauga, Ont., to complete the RDC policy report at a cost of \$55,000 including all applicable taxes;**
- 4. The new schedule of rates in Annex C apply uniformly on a service area basis across the Region;**

- 5. That the Regional Development Charges By-law be amended to provide that where in a townhouse development (i.e. at least 90% of the units are townhouses, multiples or apartments), the curvilinear pattern of the street requires, in accordance with the principles of proper design of the development, that semi-detached dwelling units be constructed, such semi-detached dwelling units be subject to the townhouse regional development rate.**

CARRIED as amended

(B. Hill dissented on
Recommendation No. 4

G. Hunter dissented on
Recommendation No. 5)

Councillor Hill pointed out the staff report would be forwarded to the Council meeting of 12 Jun 96, however, the amending by-laws would not be before Council until the 26 Jun 96 meeting. She requested the by-laws also be brought forward to the 12 Jun meeting, in order to expedite those building applications with the area municipalities that had been placed on hold until Regional Council reviewed the issue. Chair Clark stated he would review this option with staff.

REGULAR ITEMS

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

2. REGIONAL GRANTS REVIEW - FINAL REPORT
- Chief Administrative Officer's report dated 22 May 96

Councillor Hunter expressed his support for the change in the application date to October 1 for all Regional grants. However, he suggested there may be a problem with new or one time projects arising after the October 1 deadline and therefore, prohibited them from applying. He proposed that for organizations which were not aware of the process and did not currently receive regional funding in a particular year, that there be a differential deadline date such as January 1. Councillor Hunter also stated the funding for those applications should still come from the granting envelope, through an amount that was set aside.

In addition, Councillor Hunter referenced Annex A of the report and the recommendation as approved by Council that grants and purchase of service agreements only be considered if they were for programs that were a clearly defined Regional responsibility. The Councillor referenced the concern received from ARC Magazine during the public consultation process regarding the requirement for incorporation to receive a purchase of service or operating funding. Councillor Hunter reviewed ARC Magazine's mandate and suggested it did not fulfil the criteria of a clearly defined Regional responsibility, as their literary publication was national. Councillor Hunter stated there was a need for the review committees to follow the guidelines as approved by Council on 25 October 95.

Chair Clark supported the need for establishing limits on the Regional mandate in allocating purchases of service and grants. He suggested Councillor Hunter think through his proposal and should he wish to pursue the matter, to bring something forward at Council.

In response to a question from Councillor Hunter regarding the change in the deadline date to October 1, C. Sage, Arts Manager, indicated the October 1 date represented the "middle" of all the existing granting program deadline dates. She stated the change would eliminate duplication and ensure co-ordination of the grant applications among the departments.

With regard to the option of a differential date for new applications, Ms. Sage suggested these grants could be accommodated through the process followed for Grant Requests Received Outside the Budget Process, with funding allocated from the Provision for Unforeseen. She believed this process had worked well in responding to the extraordinary requests received to date. Councillor Hunter indicated the Provision for Unforeseen should also be for emergencies and not be considered continued funding for grants. He suggested the funding for the grants approved outside of the budget process should be funded through a Provision for Unforeseen in the granting envelope.

Chair Clark stated there were other sources of funds to cover emergency situations. He stated the annual Provision for Unforeseen budget was for smaller items such as grant requests outside of the normal budget process.

Councillor Stewart requested clarification on the two organizations which expressed difficulty with the incorporation requirement and the deadline date, and the statement that the groups would remain eligible for Regional funding. Ms. Sage confirmed the groups were not "grandfathered" but would be required to submit applications under project funding, rather than operating funding.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve:

- 1. The use of a Regional grants information brochure, a consistent application format, an application date of October 1 and standard grant requirements for all Regional grant programs;**
- 2. That an optional Right of Reconsideration process be used for Regional grant programs and that the reconsideration be heard by the original Allocation Panel.**

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/LEGAL

3. ADMINISTRATION - APPLICATION BY THE TOWNSHIP OF CUMBERLAND FOR CITY STATUS
- Joint Chief Administrative Officer and A/Regional Solicitor's report dated 21 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council support the application of the Corporation of the Township of Cumberland for city status.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

4. HEMLOCK SEWAGE PUMPING STATION
AND FORCEMAIN ENGINEERING SERVICES
CONTRACT NO: CC-5054

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report 08 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the next phase to Contract CC-5054 with Cumming Cockburn Limited, Ottawa, for provision of an environmental assessment and flow monitoring for the Hemlock Sewage Pumping Station in the amount of \$144,000, bringing the revised total contract provision to \$298,187.

CARRIED

5. VILLAGE OF VARS COMMUNAL WATER SUPPLY
WELL PLUGGING - CONTRACT CW-5205 - CONTRACT AWARD

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 08 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the award of Contract No. CW-5205 to C.A.C.E. Construction, Gloucester, for the Village of Vars Well Plugging Programme, for a total contract provision of \$73,830.

CARRIED

6. WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION DIVISION (WEPD) -
PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES
CONTRACT NO.: CS-6827 - CONSULTANT APPOINTMENT

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 15 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve:

1. **The appointment of Raftelis Environmental Consulting Incorporated, North Carolina, in partnership with Robinson Consultants Inc., Ottawa to assist staff of the Water Environment Protection Division in the private sector involvement opportunities project for a fee of \$301,350;**

2. **To reduce the operating base budget by transferring \$126,000 from Account No. 252-42433-2330 into the Sewer Reserve Fund;**
3. **To increase the budget authority in Project No. 932-43414-3949 through a transfer of funds in the amount of \$126,000 from the Sewer Reserve Fund.**

WITHDRAWN

TRANSPORTATION

7. **CYCLING FACILITIES ON BLAIR ROAD
SCOPE CHANGE**

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 25 Apr 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve a scope change in the amount of \$126,188.97 to reimburse the City of Gloucester for costs to construct bicycle facilities on Blair Road during the summer of 1995, bringing the revised total cost of this project to \$276,188.97.

CARRIED
(B. Hill dissented)

8. **REGIONAL RADIO SYSTEM - CONTRACT AWARD**

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report dated 28 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the contract award for the supply, installation and maintenance of a voice radio communications system to Ericsson Communications Canada, Ottawa, for a total contract provision of \$14,274,810.00.

CARRIED

FINANCE

9. OC TRANSPOR TEMPORARY
BORROWING REQUIREMENTS
- Finance Commissioner's report dated 24 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council approve a by-law be enacted authorizing the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission to make arrangements for temporary loans not to exceed \$54,000,000 at any one time.

CARRIED

PLANNING AND PROPERTY

10. OFFICE ACCOMMODATION LEASE
SOCIAL SERVICE DISTRICT OFFICE
161 GREENBANK ROAD, NEPEAN
- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 1 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve a five-year renewal lease agreement with Metcalfe Realty Company Limited for 17,033 square feet of office accommodation located at 161 Greenbank Road in the City of Nepean at an annual cost of approximately \$328,201 including GST.

CARRIED

11. PROPERTY DISPOSAL
WALKLEY ROAD EXTENSION
PURCHASER: CN/CP
- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 29 Apr 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council:

1. **Declare the land shown as Part 10, Plan 4R-8319 being 0.779 hectares as surplus to Regional needs;**

2. **Approve the conveyance of the land to Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies for \$1.00 plus GST.**

CARRIED

12. LAND ACQUISITION - HUNT CLUB EXTENSION - PHASE 1
(MERIVALE ROAD TO WOODROFFE AVENUE)
OWNER: ONTARIO HYDRO
- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 2 May 96

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the acquisition of 2.552 acres, shown as Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 10 and 12, Plan 4R-8527 and Part 1, Plan 4R-9998 from Ontario Hydro for the Hunt Club Extension Project for a consideration of \$270,760 plus GST.

CARRIED

REGIONAL CLERK

13. ATTENDANCE AT 1996 ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES
OF ONTARIO (AMO) CONFERENCE
- Regional Clerk's report dated 28 May 96

Chair Clark stated he believed it was appropriate to send all three Councillors to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario Conference.

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approve the attendance of the following Councillors: Alex Cullen, Peter Hume and Wendy Stewart, at the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) 1996 Conference, to be held 18-21 August 1996 in Toronto, Ontario.

CARRIED as amended

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

FINANCE

1. Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton
Credit Rating
- Finance Commissioner's memorandum dated 21 May 96

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED

LEGAL

1. Village of Vars Communal Water Supply Well Plugging
Contract CW-5205 - Contract Award
(Reference Item No. 5 on Regular Agenda)
- A\Regional Solicitor's legal opinion dated 28 May 96

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

LEGAL

1. Litigation: Tarcon Ltd. v. CPM Paving Co. Ltd. and RMOC
Contract 94-549
Cycling Facilities on Moodie Drive, Fallowfield Road and Bearbrook Road
- Regional Solicitor's report dated 28 May 96

The Committee waived discussion on the following confidential report and approved the staff recommendation without an In Camera session.

The Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee approved the recommendations contained in the staff report, to be forwarded to Council for consideration on 12 Jun 96 in Committee Report No. 37.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Hill requested an update on the Carp Airport acquisition and the construction contract tender. Chair Clark reported Transport Canada had expressed a concern that the *RMOC Act* did not specifically enable the Region to operate an airport, and was, therefore, requesting some indication from the Province that there would be a legislative amendment to the *Act*. Chair Clark stated a Private Member's Bill shall be placed on the Order Paper in the near future which should resolve this issue. The Chair explained they were trying to avoid having this delay the tender, however, was unable to confirm at this time.

OTHER BUSINESS

1996 Summer Meeting Schedule

Chair Clark suggested the 6 August 96 meeting be cancelled, with the understanding a meeting could be called should an emergency situation arise. The Committee concurred.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR