Federal Court ~ Aboriginal Law Bar Liaison Committee
June 6, 2018
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory

Minutes

Attendance: Justice Lafrenière (Chair), Justice Shore, Justice Strickland, Justice McDonald, Justice Grammond, Justice Mandamin, Prothonotary Ring; Sheldon Massie & Paul Shenher (Department of Justice representatives); Robert Janes, Q.C. (CBA representative); Gaylene Schellenberg, Kathryn Deo, Pam Large Moran, Eden Alexander and Karen Cuddy. **By teleconference:** Chief Justice Crampton, Andrew Baumberg (Secretary), Scott Robertson (IBA representative), Peter Grant.

1. Review Agenda

No suggestions.

2. Adoption of Minutes of October 19, 2017

The minutes were adopted.

3. Long-term Committee Agenda

Justice Lafrenière noted the Committee's past work, and importance of assessing priorities for the long-term agenda. [Discussion on this issue moved to end of agenda.]

4. Scope and Cost of Aboriginal Litigation [Robert Janes & Prothonotary Ring]

Robert Janes noted the Committee's good work on the Guidelines, and recent efforts to explore use of the assessor rule. However, the primary problem faced by litigants is the rising cost and the ever increasing scope of Aboriginal litigation. Many cases initially appear as relatively manageable proceedings, but then become more and more complicated. In part this is related to procedural issues, in part to substantive law issues, and in part to the relationship between counsel. The net result is that Indigenous peoples generally see the courts as being fairly inaccessible for resolving difficult questions. Therefore, a discussion is warranted.

An opening question: *which areas of Indigenous law are particularly challenging?* There is a wide range of issues and levels of complexity, and very differing perspectives throughout the bar, and particularly across the public and private sectors. As a first step, some data gathering would be useful (e.g., via data monkey, google forms, etc.) via the different organizations:

- *Is there agreement that this is an issue?*
- *What part of the practice is of concern?* – e.g., with feedback on a scale of 1 to 5

Although there may be substantive issues that cannot be altered, we might identify procedural issues that are amenable to discussion and progress.

Prothonotary Ring agreed that there is a mutual interest in identifying the problems and solutions. Although there may be some differences of perspective, there are likely some areas where there will be agreement (e.g., document discovery). It would be useful to survey individuals concerning their experience not just in the Federal Court but also other courts.

Scott Robertson responded that there is a definitely a need to focus on this topic, which is an access to justice issue. Any progress we can make will help the most disenfranchised group in accessing the justice system. His firm has been involved in bringing a title case to court within two years, which was initially seen as unfeasible, but made possible through creative approaches to the rules.

Justice Lafrenière noted recent efforts to re-frame litigation in other practice areas, where some trials that had previously taken up to 100 days now being restricted to 10 trial days, similar to similar trials in other jurisdictions. In Aboriginal law, this shows what may be possible, without determining the ultimate outcome – it is both a cost issue and an access to justice issue. He referred participants to the PMNOC Guidelines [see court web site], which ensures that these complex proceedings be completed within 2 years.

Paul Shenher agreed with the proposed course of action, though noting that this is a larger issue for the profession. It is useful to look at other areas of the law for possible solutions.

Sheldon Massie agreed with the suggestion to get data regarding perceived issues, whether via a survey or otherwise. He asked whether there might also be data from the Courts Administration Services, and whether it had past experience with surveys.

Justice Lafrenière noted that the Court has statistical data regarding its caseload.

Andrew Baumberg referred to a 2011 client satisfaction survey by the Courts Administration Service.

Justice Lafrenière suggested that the survey should probably target the Aboriginal law Bar, and requested Robert Janes and Prothonotary Ring to prepare an initial list of survey questions. If other members of the committee have suggestions, please send them to Robert Janes or Prothonotary Ring.

Justice Shore noted his experience from rogatory commissions for war crimes tribunals: one needs to get as much information before the trial. Someone from the Court could be assigned to hear as much information as possible regarding evidence that will be presented at the trial. This has been a remarkable time-saver at the Haque for war crimes trials. The rules might need to be amended.

Prothonotary Ring suggested a sub-committee with members from each organization to develop a 1st draft survey.

Robert Janes added that a working group is a critical element. The reality is that different perspectives are important – someone from the Department of Justice and from the Indigenous Bar is needed. However, mechanical question needs to be addressed: privacy is important. It is easy to share the survey via the CBA, IBA, DOJ, and Court email distribution lists.

Gaylene Schellenberg: the CBA has a policy framework for distribution of such a survey.

Sheldon Massie agreed to review this issue, and to identify a person from the Department.

Robert Janes noted that the insolvency bar has developed standard templates for various steps, but in Aboriginal law, there are many wheels that are often re-invented. There should be model Orders.

Scott Robertson will identify a person from the IBA.

There was a suggestion to have some litigants participate in the survey process.

Robert Janes suggested two phases: first a survey, and then a second step to integrate additional individuals.

Action:

- each organization to name a representative by end of June and a first call by end of July.
- Andrew Baumberg to compile statistics from the Court regarding proceedings.

5. Framework for Receiving Oral History evidence

Robert Janes noted that there are different protocols for disclosure and discovery of oral history evidence. Some courts have very intensive protocols that require full discovery; in some, undertakings were provided regarding answers on discovery; in others, descriptions of the proposed oral history evidence were required. One valuable piece of work would be to develop a model practice direction, setting out a policy framework. This would avoid the presiding judge from having to reinvent this each time. There is a debate as to whether oral history should be

reduced to writing, and whether this should be used to cross-examine an Elder. These issues are being addressed inconsistently. This is a substantive procedural project. It is proposed that someone on the Committee take this on.

Justice Lafrenière agreed that a standard protocol would be useful, even if there are occasionally some deviations. We would assist the parties and court by developing a protocol.

Prothonotary Ring suggested, as a starting point, the existing Practice Guidelines, which include a section on oral history evidence and discovery. There was considerable discussion on this issue.

Justice Mandamin noted the Committee's earlier exploration of this issue. There is considerable variety across the country with communities' approaches to oral history. Flexibility is key. There are principles in the guidelines to ground the review, especially that:

- the Aboriginal perspective must be considered (this is different from the debate as to whether the history is 'authentic' or not);
- there must be respect for Elders, whose perspective is to be taken seriously;
- if the Court's decision is to be accepted, it must be seen to hear the parties (the debate about the veracity of the oral history gets in the way of this principle).

As for standard form orders, a standard sheet / process is useful as a starting point, focussing the debate on contentious points. It is important to hear the Elders once, in the ideal environment where they understand the questions being put to them, rather than multiple times (e.g., in discovery and then again in trial, etc.). He referred to a paper that he prepared for the NJI on oral history testimony, as well as an older article regarding Elders in Court.

Action: Justice Mandamin to circulate these papers via Andrew Baumberg.

Paul Shenher agreed with the proposal to standardize practice. If there is a survey of practices prepared by Robert Janes, this would be a good starting point.

Action: Robert Janes to circulate this material once complete.

Peter Grant agreed that there was useful discussion in the earlier work of the Committee on the Guidelines.

Justice Shore referred back, again, to the work of war crimes tribunals, which maintained an audio bank of recordings. A similar initiative would be useful for testimony by Elders.

Justice Lafrenière noted the records retention initiative, which would establish a 15 year retention period for proceedings heard on the merits, but allowing notice to counsel to allow certain files to be identified for longer-term archiving. He then asked for volunteers from the Committee.

Paul Shenher offered to take a lead role, and Justice Lafrenière offered to assist.

Action: working group to report back at the next meeting on its work, which will include both Federal Court and other courts.

6. Update – Subcommittee studying the Identification and Appointment of Indigenous Law Experts to Assist the Court (Rule 52 of the *Federal Courts Rules*)

Justice Strickland noted that the CBA first raised this proposal within the Committee in 2008, but it was not pursued, and it was recently put back on the agenda, with a discussion paper by Krista Robertson. The proposal included a suggested 'roster' of assessors, but in sub-committee discussion, it was concluded that the variety of indigenous cultures and legal contexts would make the roster idea difficult to implement on a practical level. Instead, it was proposed to set up an advisory process whereby a short-list of assessors might be recommended on a case by case process. She noted that Robert Janes drafted the current outline, which is presented to the

committee for preliminary comment.

Robert Janes added that the sub-committee received support from indigenous scholars and Elders, though not all have provided feedback on the current draft. Further discussion is needed.

Sheldon Massie noted that the department had the same view regarding the ‘roster’ proposal, and was pleased to see the sub-committee’s conclusion on this point. He added that the framework should include consultation by the Court with the parties regarding the utility of having an assessor (e.g., a party may already plan to bring in an expert on the same topic).

Justice Lafrenière added that the assessor option should be available for either parties or the Court to propose.

Robert Janes noted the framework is grounded in the language of the Rule, under which “the Court may call in an assessor.” However, consultation regarding advisability of the proposal could be formally included, though it was assumed that the Court would have raised the idea after discussion with the parties.

Justice Mandamin noted a Manitoba case in which a process similar to an assessor was adopted.

Justice Strickland agreed that parties should be able to raise the issue.

Justice Lafrenière suggested that the option for parties to raise the proposal be added to the draft framework.

Sheldon Massie asked for clarification on the following restriction:

> In nominating an assessor the subcommittee will … Not nominate a person who is a member of the band of any of the parties, if applicable; and Not nominate a person who is a close personal relation of any of the parties.

Robert Janes responded that most First Nations comprise many bands. Perhaps a term “unless the parties agree otherwise” could be added.

Justice Mandamin suggested that in some cases, someone within the community might be the best candidate (e.g., a band election).

Justice Lafrenière added that the assessor rule, implemented initially for the field of maritime law, is not used very often. Also, if the court decides that it needs an assessor, and so orders, the costs are to be paid by the Courts Administration Service.

Justice Strickland noted that this reflects the neutrality of the assessor.

In response to a question from the committee, Robert Janes responded that the assessor can communicate in writing or orally, but all communications must be in open court.

Paul Shenher raised some small drafting issues. Points 7-9 are predicated on the assumption that a recommendation will be made.

Robert Janes confirmed that the Advisory Committee is expected to make a recommendation.

Justice Lafrenière raised a further issue as to how often this proposal will be used, given that few cases get to trial. Most aboriginal law matters are raised in judicial review.

Robert Janes proposed that the working draft be put back to the sub-committee.

Sheldon Massie offered to have a departmental representative on the sub-Committee.

> **Action:** Sheldon Massie to provide the name of a representative.

7. Approach to deal with chronic disputes

Justice Lafrenière noted that this issue had been raised within the Court. There are certain disputes, often in the

governance area, that return to the Court on a regular basis. In many cases, they result in a short-term result but no long-term resolution. Ideally, the same judge would hear each case, but this is not always feasible. In case-management, the history of the dispute in previous court proceedings is noted, and an appropriate judicial officer recommended for the hearing on the merits. The court has some scope for intervention, but there may be other suggestions from members of the bar.

Robert Janes: the parties often have no incentive to resolve the issue other than through an adversarial process. Another issue is that sometimes the dispute revolves in part around who will get the legal retainer for the First Nation. In some cases, on-going supervision orders might be appropriate. This is not just an Aboriginal law issue – there are some very regular parties in intellectual property, for example. A variation on the vexatious litigant framework may be appropriate here – perhaps a 'frequent' litigator rule. The system depends on parties and counsel 'playing nice' – which is not always what happens.

Justice Lafrenière added that not all litigants can afford this type of litigation. However, in certain cases, costs come out of band funds, though the court sometimes considers them public interest cases for costs purposes. He asked again whether the bar had any suggestions.

Justice Mandamin raised a question whether counsel could be assigned costs personally. Also, there could at least be some publicity regarding the costs consequences.

Justice Strickland: the costs award is usually a small part of the actual costs.

Robert Janes: it is usually only about 10% of actual costs.

Justice Lafrenière: there is no category under the Rules of 'vexatious counsel.'

Robert Janes: in these cases, there could be more recourse to mediation and court involvement.

Justice Grammond: the current regime does not put incentives in the right place – there is no inducement in the litigation framework towards long-term good governance. This is an issue for the First Nation itself. A broader reflection may be necessary that goes beyond the reach of this Committee. This is an issue for First Nations leadership. When there is a dispute that arises, it is often too late to raise the underlying framework.

Justice Shore agreed, noting the analogy from family law. The U.N. is dealing with larger conflicts, often sending the same people over and over to help resolve them. The Court may need to have an equivalent process in governance disputes that arise. He referred to Justice Sheila Ray and the Ontario courts, which bring in a range of professions to help resolve complex issues. The Federal Court may want to consider a similar approach.

Robert Janes noted that there are many poorly-written election codes – it must be proportional to the size of the band. Oftentimes, the codes create unforeseen problems. First Nations should retain firms with expertise in drafting codes. First Nations may not be receptive to an outside counsel criticizing its election code. Ideally, the Court would signal structural problems in election codes.

Justice Strickland questioned whether a standardized election code might be developed.

Kathryn Deo responded that given the variation in communities, it would be difficult to standardize. There are also many variations on land codes, some of which are very badly written. It may be a matter for professional oversight – these should be done by specialists rather than general practitioners.

Robert Janes referred to the Law Society of Upper Canada's specialization framework. There are best practices, but the Court cannot really regulate the election codes, though it would be helpful for the court to signal problems.

Justice Lafrenière has done many dispute resolution processes, though considers that many of these should be resolved internally. If the matter does not settle, another judge must hear it on the merits. He has tried to be creative to find ways to continue the settlement process, sometimes bringing in third parties while he remains seized of the case, with encouragement for progress on the underlying election framework.

There was input from a member of the bar regarding attendance at a recent family law seminar, which focused on longer-term dispute resolution outcomes.

Another member of the bar referred to restorative / transformative dispute resolution, which aims to sustain long-term relationships.

Prothonotary Ring referred to the potential for on-going supervision. One problem is that prothonotaries are assigned to case management, but much of this work relates to injunctive relief, which must go before a judge. Each new issue may then come before a different judge. We should give consideration to a judge being assigned as case management judge.

The Chief Justice observed that, unlike other courts, the itinerant nature of the Federal Court makes it more difficult for judges to case manage matters, particularly those that need to move along fairly quickly. However, a special effort is sometimes made to ensure that a matter stays with the same judge, for example, in intellectual property law, to have the same judge hear matters related to a single patent.

> **Action:** case management assignment process to be reviewed by the Chief Justice and the Judicial Administrator.

Justice Lafrenière suggested that a local mediator / resource, with long-term involvement, might be helpful.

Justice Shore: in the US, they use experts and therapeutic jurisprudence. He has written a paper on this topic.

Robert Janes: the Court sees only a small proportion of election disputes. Many communities do not have the funds to address governance disputes.

One member of the Bar noted that INAC made a call-out for mediators, and created a roster.

Justice Lafrenière asked that contact information be sent to members of the Committee.

> **Action:** INAC mediation roster to be circulated within the Committee.

Chief Justice Crampton suggested that with some senior members of the Court retiring in the coming years, some could be approached to take on mediation roles. Furthermore, the Court is exploring more flexible options for triggering its jurisdiction – this might be an option. Finally, the triage process might be able to identify some of these underlying structural issues and recommend a mediator to assist.

Item 3. Long-term Committee Agenda [Discussion moved to end of agenda.]

How To Make Space for Indigenous Legal Traditions

Justice Grammond noted his academic background on this topic, and initial discussions with Justice Favel. They both believe that there should be more space for indigenous legal traditions, which include any law developed by indigenous peoples, including election laws. These are the result of choices by indigenous peoples, which should not be questioned by judges. He cited the paper by Justice Finch, referring to a 'duty to learn.' Recognition might arise in election or land codes. In these areas, the Crown is not involved, and so there should be agreement between the litigants that First Nations law should apply.

In the short-term, we may need to be modest and cautious, as it is a Court made up mostly of non-Indigenous judges, and intervention may not always be seen as positive. However, there are avenues that can be explored, such as the assessor rule. We need to consider the role of the Court, of the lawyers, and of the community. Each stake-holder should have the option of proposing that indigenous law have a role to play. There are various ways to proceed.

One example is purposive interpretation. With a legal document, the rules of interpretation involve a purposive approach, which might lead to the underlying indigenous law. For example, an election code may refer an appeal to a panel of Elders, but there might be an underlying purpose, or intention, that the people will consider their

knowledge of indigenous law when resolving the dispute. This is something that the judge could consider when interpreting the code. Lawyers could make these kinds of arguments so that indigenous law is, to some extent, on the table. This does not require the court to operationalize the indigenous law, but simply take it into account when interpreting a document. This is more in line with what judges do by training.

Some codes try to blend indigenous traditions with rules and systems of a Western origin. It would be useful for parties to explain the indigenous values that were intended to be integrated into a legal document. He referred to the decision in *Ratt v Matchewan,* 2010 FC 160, by Justice Mainville.

In sum, there are ways to begin, in a modest way, without the Court taking control of interpretation of indigenous law. This might be an initial short to mid-term goal to try to achieve what Justice Finch termed the duty to learn.

In the longer-term, there are limits to what the courts can do with respect to adopting indigenous law. Is a non-Indigenous court the right forum? There should be Indigenous bodies that do this, and there already are some (e.g., election appeal boards). However, these have their own limits. One solution is to have bodies that are wider in scope that have jurisdiction over several first nations, such as the inter-tribal courts in the U.S.A. Although there are many differences amongst first nations, there are sufficient similarities, particularly those from the same language group or those with close cultural connections. Such bodies would have structural strength, and greater ease in applying substantive indigenous law, than a non-indigenous judicial body. These are not suggestions that can be addressed directly in the short-term, but warrant further discussion. Each participant in the dispute spectrum has a role to play.

Further training is required. For instance, there will be an indigenous law program at the University of Victoria. We need to think about the structures through which these resources can be channelled, though we also need to consider the existing members of the courts and bar, with further discussion regarding possible structures.

Justice Shore highlighted the need for more specialized indigenous judges on the court – people who have first-hand experience. What has worked in other cases: *bringing in Elders to assist the judge to walk in their tradition.*

Chief Justice Crampton agreed, suggesting that the Minister of Justice would likely be very supportive, but there are few candidates like Justice Favel applying for judicial appointment. Regarding the suggestions by Justice Grammond – if parties agree to embrace indigenous law, this holds good potential to bear fruit and so should be pursued. We are exploring this option now for the Quebec Code of Civil Procedure, and a similar approach is being considered with the competition bar. The underlying principle is found at Rule 3: “These Rules shall be interpreted and applied so as to secure the just, most expeditious and least expensive determination of every proceeding on its merits.”

Justice Lafrenière noted that the suggestions made by Justice Grammond may result in the Court losing some jurisdiction. This is the reality – there is a push to move towards parties taking over control of their own disputes.

Robert Janes referred to a recent case (*Wesley v Canada*, 2017 FC 275) in which the Court questioned whether it had jurisdiction over the substantive legal issue. There needs to be more academic consideration of how the courts treat Indigenous law. This is a live issue coming up more frequently. If the federal and provincial courts all develop case-law that conclude they have no jurisdiction on matters of substantive indigenous law, disputes are left to the band level. He added that there is a developing cohort of Indigenous lawyers on the West coast. It would be comforting for practitioners to know that if they applied for appointment to the Federal Court, they could focus on special practice areas. However, language may be an obstacle.

Justice Grammond responded that it is not a requirement to be bilingual before being appointed to the Federal Court. Many colleagues are not bilingual. As for the wide range of practice areas at the Federal Court, they are not as difficult as might be perceived from outside the court. However, these do not represent as large a proportion of judicial work as might be suggested.

Chief Justice Crampton agreed. Over half the Court is not bilingual. As for the volume of Aboriginal work –

members of the Court must share the existing specialized case-load. Everyone must work in multiple areas of practice, and it can be quite rewarding to contribute to other areas of law. This has not proven to be difficult for most persons who get appointed to the Court.

Scott Robertson noted that regarding indigenous appointments, there is a spot on the Judicial Appointments Committee for a representative of the CBA, but none for the IBA. This could easily be rectified. As for the French component, this remains a contentious issue, given the historic treatment of indigenous languages. He added that there is a great deal of mistrust amongst the indigenous community. There is a sentiment amongst indigenous practitioners that becoming a judge will not make things better – there is a sense of apathy towards tribunals. There are also few indigenous appointments to tribunals, which itself discourages individuals from applying. In the short-term, there are some very practical suggestions to get people with experience, and interest, in positions.

Chief Justice Crampton thanked Scott Robertson for his comments. He then referred to Justice Mandamin's significant contribution to the Court and its practice. If more people from the indigenous community applied and were appointed, they could potentially have a similarly important role. He would like to pursue this conversation with the IBA.

Robert Janes highlighted the need for this message to be extended to the wider community of practitioners. There are few role models in the Courts like Justice Mandamin and Justice Laforme, but particularly as these judges near retirement, more are needed.

Chief Justice Crampton encouraged a communications plan to ensure that these messages are conveyed to the wider bar. This is similar to the previous communications challenge related to awareness of the Court's triage framework.

Action: development of communication plan regarding judicial appointments.

Justice Shore noted that the Committee has heard experts speak to indigenous law, but it might be useful to bring in Elders to comment as well, and provide training. This would also bode well for them to bring information back to their communities.

Justice Mandamin reminded the Committee of the Elders' invitation for members of the Court to come to Turtle Lodge. They offered to continue to assist with judicial education.

A member of the Bar noted that she often tries to include members of the community in development of community protocols.

Regarding the long-term committee agenda, the Chief Justice referred to the previous discussion regarding the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and whether there is a role for the committee and Court.

Justice Lafrenière noted that there appear to be many government initiatives under development. This should remain a watching brief as matters progress, with the matter put on the agenda for the next meeting. If there are any updates in the interim, members of the Committee are encouraged to share information as soon as possible.

Paul Shenher agreed.

Action: Truth and Reconciliation Commission to be included in next agenda.

Sheldon Massie invited comments from the committee regarding the framework under which adaptation and incorporation of indigenous rules might be considered.

Justice Lafrenière referred again to the proposed use of the Quebec Code of Civil Procedure. There are no strict restrictions at a procedural level if parties agree.

Justice Shore agreed, referring to the *Windsor Bridge* decision.

Chief Justice Crampton added that as soon as something moves to case management, there is immediately a

significant increase in flexibility. In the long run, he asked whether it might be helpful to invite further speakers to offer additional perspective.

Justice Lafrenière acknowledged the support from members of the Committee. Suggestions are welcome.

8. Varia

a) Confidentiality Orders

Justice Lafrenière noted that although this may not regularly arise in Aboriginal law practice, it is an issue in intellectual property law and immigration law practice. There is a Court working group exploring the matter, and an update will be provided in due course.

b) New and anticipated Judicial Appointments to the Court

Chief Justice Crampton noted upcoming vacancies in the next two years and encouraged members of the bar to apply. He noted the significant recent increase in the Court's bench strength in Aboriginal law (given the appointments of Justices Favel, Grammond and Lafreniere, as well as Prothonotary Ring), along with his commitment to continue.

c) Associate Chief Justice position

Chief Justice Crampton noted that this position is being formalized via statutory amendments, with a possibility that it will be filled over the Summer.

d) Posting of Interlocutory Decisions on CanLII

Chief Justice Crampton noted that some sections of the bar have requested that more court decisions be published. Although selected interlocutory decisions were previously published on the Court web site, all interlocutory decisions with reasons, and interlocutory decision on motions for a stay of removal, will also now be provided to CANLII for wider public access.

e) New Court Offices in Québec City and Hamilton

Chief Justice Crampton noted that the Quebec City office recently moved, with the new office now including a modern electronic courtroom, similar to the courtroom in Toronto, which allows for efficient electronic trials. An office was also recently opened in Hamilton, and the Court is exploring the possibility of opening an office in Saskatchewan that would be fitted with a round aboriginal courtroom.

f) Professional Development of Judges and Prothonotaries – Canadian Judicial Council Policy

Justice Lafrenière noted that the CJC has directed members of the judiciary to complete ten days of education per year. Proper courses are required to support the needs of the judiciary.

g) Guide for Lawyers Working with Indigenous Peoples - The Advocates' Society

Justice Lafrenière noted that the Advocates' Society has recently published a Guide for Lawyers Working with Indigenous Peoples.

Varia

Justice Shore referred to the recent Supreme Court case finding that the courts do not have jurisdiction to review private bodies' decisions on religious custom or law, which cannot be overturned by a secular court.

Prothonotary Ring suggested, for the long-term agenda, an information exchange session regarding electronic trials, including discussion regarding trials in the provincial courts.

Robert Janes recommended contact with Kate Gower, including her video on e-trials.

Action: information exchange regarding electronic trials.

h) Fall 2018 Meeting

The 30th Annual Indigenous Bar Association Fall Conference is scheduled for November 1 – 3, 2018, at the Delta Bessborough Hotel, Saskatoon, SK. The next Committee meeting will be Thursday, November 1, 2018.