YOUNG ANDERSON
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS

FEBRUARY 2014, VOLUME 25, NUMBER 1

NEWSLETTER

Do you have a Licence for That? Local Government Response to the Decriminalization of Prostitution

The prohibition of the world's oldest profession was struck down in December of last year. In Canada (Attorney General) v. Bedford, 2013 SCC 72*, the Supreme Court of Canada declared that three* Criminal Code *provisions that collectively criminalized prostitution violated the* Charter of Rights and Freedoms *and were therefore invalid.*

In Canada, the exchange of money for sex is not illegal, but the effect of those three *Criminal Code* offences – the keeping of or being in a bawdy house (or brothel), living on the avails of prostitution, and communicating in public for the purposes of prostitution – had essentially the same effect. The applicants who challenged the constitutionality of these three offences argued that the restrictions put the safety and lives of prostitutes at risk by preventing them from implementing certain safety measures – such as hiring security guards or "screening" potential clients – that could protect sex workers from violence.

The Court agreed and held that the three provisions unjustifiably infringed the section 7 Charter rights of prostitutes by depriving them of security of the person. In particular the provisions imposed dangerous conditions on prostitution that prevented people engaged in a risky – but legal – activity from taking steps to protect themselves from the risk.

The Court suspended the effect of its declaration of invalidity for one year, giving the Federal Government time to determine whether it will continue to criminalize and / or regulate sex trade activities, and if so, to devise a new regulatory scheme. The Government was recently reported to be drafting new legislation which it will introduce "well before" the one year deadline, although the details of the legislation are not currently public knowledge.

Depending on whether and how the Government responds, municipalities may find themselves with a greater role in the regulation of prostitution. However, in regulating prostitution-related activities, municipalities must be aware of an important jurisdictional issue: matters of a criminal nature are the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and an attempt by a municipality to regulate prostitution as a criminal matter encroaches on that exclusive jurisdiction and will be *ultra vires* the municipality. Nonetheless, local governments have a variety of tools at their disposal if they wish to regulate prostitution in their communities.

Planning and zoning powers are one of those tools. Although municipalities are usually entitled to prohibit a particular use in all zones,

such a prohibition would likely, as in *Bedford*, be unconstitutional. Planning and land use schemes however may be used to regulate certain aspects of the sex trade, provided that a municipality has legitimate planning purposes in doing so. For example, in regulating brothels, a municipality may limit the zones in which brothels are permitted, or distances of brothels from other land uses, or setback or screening requirements. In determining appropriate land use or zoning requirements, municipalities should rely on genuine planning principles or techniques.

A further tool that may be used by local governments is the business regulation power. A complete prohibition on brothels through business regulation would be *ultra vires* the municipality, but certain aspects of brothels may be regulated. For example, municipalities may potentially impose licencing requirements on brothels or the prostitutes who work in brothels, and regulate hours of operation.

Other local government powers may also be used to regulate prostitution-related activities, including street and traffic bylaws or sign regulation.

The *Bedford* decision has the potential to significantly change the regulation of the sex trade in Canada. For local governments, much of their role in controlling prostitution-related activities will depend on the regulatory scheme the federal government chooses to put in place. As with any bylaw, municipalities will need to ensure that bylaws regulating prostitution do not result in a direct conflict with Federal legislation. Until that legislation is enacted, or until the federal government decides not to regulate prostitution through criminal law, it is difficult to determine the specific role municipalities will have in the regulation of the sex trade. In the meantime, local governments may wish to consider whether they plan to regulate prostitution, and if so, the manner most appropriate to their community.

The Court ... held that the three provisions unjustifiably infringed the section 7 Charter rights of prostitutes by depriving them of security of the person.

Jay Lancaster

WWW.YOUNGANDERSON.CA

1616 - 808 Nelson Street, Box 12147, Nelson Square, Vancouver, BC V6Z 2H2
tel: 604.689.7400 I fax: 604.689.3444 I toll free: 1.800.665.3540

#201 - 1456 St. Paul Street, Kelowna, BC V1Y 2E6
tel: 250.712.1130 I fax: 250.712.1180

Controlling Councillor Conduct: Québec's Bill 10

In the course of last year's media feeding frenzy at Toronto City Hall, observers around the country expressed both surprise and chagrin that it would be possible for a municipal council member charged with a criminal offence to continue to perform their official duties pending disposition of the criminal charge. Not that the Council member who was drawing all the media attention in Toronto had been charged with anything; but there seemed to be hope in some quarters, and dread in others, that he would be, and that there would be consequences for City Hall. So what's the deal on criminal charges against sitting council members?

Some years back, BC's *Municipal Act* was amended to remove a provision that disqualified from holding or running for municipal office a person who had been convicted of an indictable offence (generally one that is punishable by imprisonment for 2 years or more). The thinking behind the amendment, presumably considered enlightened at the time, was that such a person had already been punished for their offence and piling on such a disqualification was a kind of double jeopardy. Perhaps the provision would also have infringed the political rights of the individual under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. Removing the disqualification provision was also consistent with the philosophical position that the Province has taken in relation to many such matters, that the electors of each municipality and regional district are fully capable of deciding, on the basis of their resumés and other criteria, which of the available candidates is best suited for local office. A provision survives in the *Community Charter* disqualifying a councillor who misses more than 60 consecutive days or 4 consecutive regularly scheduled meetings except for illness or injury or with leave of the council. A councillor serving a custodial sentence for a criminal offence could be caught by those provisions, and lose their seat. Note that all of this deals with a conviction for a criminal offence, and not a mere allegation of criminal conduct.

A few commentators on the Toronto situation referred a bit enviously to Québec's unique Bill 10, "An Act to provide for the provisional relief from office of an elected municipal officer". (The English title seems to suggest that the law is simply freeing the councillor from their official duties so that they can give their undivided attention to their criminal charges.) The Bill amended the "Act Respecting Elections and Referendums in Municipalities," and several other relevant statutes, to enable a Superior Court Justice to "declare provisionally incapable to perform any duty of office" a councillor against whom an offence has been alleged under any Act of Canada or Québec that is punishable by a term of imprisonment of two years or more. It is probably a good idea to keep in mind, when considering this rather extraordinary legislation, the equally extraordinary situation that has been coming to light in Québec as a result of the work of the Commission of Inquiry on the Awarding and Management of Public Contracts in the Construction Industry (the Charbonneau Commission). Several prominent mayors have resigned or failed to be re-elected after having allegedly been involved, in their official capacity, in corrupt procurement practices,

and such practices would appear to have been quite widespread in Québec over an extended period of time. In that context it is possible to see Bill 10 as a sort of triage strategy, addressing on an emergency basis a hemorrhage of public confidence in municipal administration pending completion of the Commission's work and disposition of any resulting charges in the criminal courts. While it would be surprising to see any of the other provincial legislatures copying the Bill, in the absence of indications of any comparable problem with municipal corruption, its provisions are still interesting to consider.

A Québec Superior Court declaration under Bill 10 is initiated by a motion brought by the municipality whose councillor has been charged with an offence, or by any of its electors. The Court may, after a hearing, provisionally suspend the councillor "if it considers it warranted in the public interest", having regard to any connection between the alleged offence and the council member's duties, and the extent to which the alleged offence is likely to "discredit the administration of the municipality".

A councillor may not be suspended as a result of charges brought before the polling day on which the councillor was elected, but may be suspended as a result of charges brought before Bill 10 came into force last year or as a result of charges brought in respect of events that occurred before the councillor was elected. A suspension under Bill 10 ends if the charges are stayed or withdrawn or the councillor is acquitted of the charges, and at the end of the councillor's term of office if they are convicted. The councillor is obliged to repay to the municipality any remuneration earned during the period of the suspension if they are convicted, and municipal pension legislation has also been amended such that the councillor is deemed not to have participated in the pension plan during this period. The municipality is required to fund the councillor's defence to the motion to suspend, but is entitled to require reimbursement if the councillor is convicted. No appeal is available from the Superior Court's judgment on a motion brought under Bill 10.

It seems that so far only one Québeçois councillor has been suspended under Bill 10. (The mayor of the Montréal suburb of Mascouche, facing fraud and bribery charges and angry groups of citizens at every council meeting, resigned a few days after the legislation was tabled late in 2012, perhaps avoiding the distinction of being the first.) Last August, in *Boyer v. Lavoie*, the mayor of the City of Saint-Rémi was suspended from office on account of charges brought under the fraud, conspiracy and municipal corruption provisions of the *Criminal Code* in relation to property dealings in the municipality. The relationship between these particular offences and the duties of a mayor was rather obvious, and more than sufficient to warrant a suspension under that aspect of Bill 10. Regarding the discrediting of the administration of the municipality, the Court noted that the outcome of a motion under Bill 10 ought not to depend on the personal popularity of the elected official concerned or the tolerance of its citizens, but on a more objective view of proper municipal administration, and accordingly a supportive petition signed by more than 800 citizens was of no assistance to Mayor Lavoie. The Court rejected arguments that Bill 10 contravened the mayor's rights under s. 7 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (life, liberty and security of the person) by its imprecise reference to the "public interest", and that it violated the presumption of innocence in s. 11 of the *Charter*. On the latter point, the Court applied previous authorities holding that the presumption of innocence has no application in relation to non-penal consequences, which would include the temporary relief from their public duties of a member of a municipal council.

Bill Buholzer ✍

Covering the Tracks: Local Governments' Role in Railway Safety

In the wake of several high-profile rail disasters in the past year, most notably an explosion in Lac-Megantic, Québec, and the derailment of a train off a bridge in Calgary, Alberta, during flood season, local governments in Canada have begun to make efforts to ensure that federal railway transportation safety is more closely monitored and held to higher standards, and that local governments are provided with more timely information about hazardous materials which may be passing through their jurisdictions.

In furtherance of this goal, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) has formed a National Municipal Rail Safety Working Group to undertake discussions with the federal government on local government interests and concerns regarding rail safety. The Working Group has met several times with Transport Canada personnel to work on finding solutions for this pressing issue.

In May 2013, the Railway Association of Canada (RAC) and the FCM together published a set of land use guidelines, "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations," and a website intended to promote best practices and awareness about the issues associated with developments, especially newer residential developments, near railway operations. Such concerns include noise, vibration and safety issues. These problems will continue to be front and centre as residential areas continue to expand into former industrial and agricultural areas with existing rail tracks, and local interests inevitably come into conflict with the appurtenants of rail transport. The FCM Working Group is also focused on ensuring that emergency response costs for rail disasters are not downloaded to local taxpayers due to the lack of existing federal response plans and other infrastructure.

In November 2013, the federal Ministry of Transportation responded to the issues raised by FCM's Working Group by announcing new measures which require railway companies to provide local governments with information regarding the types and timing of dangerous goods passing through their jurisdiction, in order to allow municipal emergency services to react in a safer and more timely fashion in the event of a rail emergency in their area. These new measures require all Canadian railway operators to provide an annual report to municipal emergency planners and first responders detailing the types and volume of dangerous goods being transported through their jurisdictions. Reports from larger railway companies such as Canadian National and Canadian Pacific must further detail the types and amounts of dangerous goods by each quarter. Smaller railway companies are exempt from this requirement but must inform municipalities of any significant changes from the annual report.

Local governments will not receive these reports unless they opt in by providing the name, title, organization, address, email address, fax number, telephone number and cell phone number of their designated Emergency Planning Official to the Canadian Transport Emergency Centre (CANUTEC) at Place de Ville, Tower C, 330 Sparks Street, 14th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A ON5. It is important for local governments to opt in as soon as possible in order to begin receiving information and updates.

On January 22, 2014, the FCM Working Group reported on another meeting with Transport Canada officials and announced that its next

priority is to push for the development of more comprehensive Emergency Response Assistance Plans (ERAP). ERAPs are currently not required for rail shipments of crude oil and ethanol. The Working Group also announced that it is working with the Transportation Safety Board and the American National Transportation Safety Board to address the risks posed by outdated tank-style rail cars that are not appropriate for shipping dangerous liquids such as highly flammable oil and gasoline. The Working Group reported that the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Advisory Council is in the process of making technical recommendations to the Minister of Transport on this issue, and a comprehensive plan for tank cars is expected to be implemented in response to these concerns and recommendations in the near future.

Proposed federal regulations for level or at-grade crossings are also in the works. These new regulations would be meant to facilitate deals between local governments and railway companies for the design and construction of new or improved rail crossings in mutually acceptable areas, but will not be accompanied by any additional federal infrastructure funds for such projects, furthering concerns that the federal government continues to seek to download funding responsibilities in relation to rail transit to the municipalities through which these railways pass.

Elizabeth Anderson

Information and Privacy Commissioner Recommends Improved Disclosure of Information Relating to Public Risks

The recent report from BC's Information and Privacy Commissioner regarding section 25 of FIPPA is recommended reading for all local government staff charged with risk management as well as the administration of that Act.

Section 25, which applies despite any other provision of FIPPA, requires local governments to disclose, without delay, information (a) about a "significant risk of harm to the environment or to the health or safety of the public or a group of people" or (b) the disclosure of which is "for any other reason" clearly in the public interest. While section 25 has been interpreted narrowly as requiring disclosure only where there is an "urgent and compelling" need for it, the section has nevertheless been notoriously difficult to apply, given the numerous hazards of which local governments are aware and the qualitative risk assessment upon which disclosure decisions under section 25 are based. The basic question of how immediate and severe a particular risk of harm must be before disclosure under section 25 is required is very difficult to answer.

In a report released on December 2, 2013, Commissioner Denham provides guidance regarding mandatory disclosure under section 25 and recommends changes to section 25 that would require mandatory disclosure of information of a non-urgent nature. The report was initiated in response to a report from the University of Victoria's Environmental Law Clinic suggesting a systematic failure by public bodies to comply with section 25.

In her report, Commissioner Denham reviews five case studies relating to:

(1) the collapse of the Testalinden Dam near Oliver;

(2) an air quality report by the Ministry of Environment regarding unsafe formaldehyde levels;

(3) a BC Centre for Disease Control study indicating a higher incidence of Lyme disease in BC than previously reported;

(4) well water tests in the Cowichan Valley Regional District showing elevated nitrate levels; and

(5) a study showing the occurrence of mould in an SFU student residence.

Interestingly, the Commissioner found a failure to comply with section 25 only in relation to the Testalinden Dam failure, concluding that there was an urgent and compelling need for the Ministry of Forests to disclose information in its possession regarding the condition of the dam and the potential hazard to people and property downstream. A full description of the Commissioner's assessment of section 25 and the case studies considered by her is beyond the scope of this newsletter comment, the purpose of which is simply to invite local governments to review the report and to advise of the Commissioner's recommendations.

The Commissioner made two recommendations in her report. First she recommends that all public bodies develop section 25 policies that clearly set out:

- criteria that define a risk of significant harm to the environment;
- criteria that define whether there is a risk of significant harm to the health or safety of the public;
- criteria that define when the disclosure of information is, for any other reason, clearly in the public interest;
- criteria to determine if there is an urgent and compelling need for disclosure of information;
- criteria to determine whether the head of the public body should notify the public or an affected group of people;
- procedures for communicating this information to the head of the public body;
- criteria to determine when to disclose the relevant information to the public or an affected group of people; and
- procedures to notify third parties and the Commissioner.

Second, the Commissioner recommends that all public bodies ensure that its officers and employees understand the public body's section 25 obligations generally and be provided with "adequate" training to ensure compliance with those obligations.

The Commissioner indicates in her report that she will be conducting selective audits of section 25 compliance "across a targeted number of public bodies in 2014/2015".

Finally, the Commissioner also considered the requirement in section 25(1)(b) requiring disclosure of other information which is in the public interest. She notes that to date her office has never ordered disclosure of information under section 25(1)(b) because of the reach of section 25(1)(a) and because of previous interpretation of the section limiting its reach to circumstances involving an "urgent" need for disclosure. However, the Commissioner has recommended a very significant amendment of section 25(1)(b) to require mandatory disclosure of any information the disclosure of which is in the public interest, whether or not there is any temporal urgency. Such an amendment would very significantly broaden local government's disclosure requirements under section 25. It remains to be seen whether the legislature will make the recommended amendment.

A copy of the Commissioner's report can be found on the OIPC website at https://www.oipc.bc.ca/news-releases/1589.

Gregg Cockrill

Practical Advice on Strata Conversions

The strata concept was first introduced into BC in the late 1960's, and strata property is now common throughout the province. The hallmark of strata property is that it is divided into individually-owned strata lots, with some common property – owned by all the strata lot owners. Strata property is often residential, but it can be any type of use and is also often mixed-use.

Existing occupied buildings – whether residential duplexes or apartment buildings, commercial strip malls, mixed-use structures or other types of occupied buildings – can be converted into strata property. This process is governed solely by section 242 of the *Strata Property Act*. Strata conversions are not subdivisions that are governed by the *Land Title Act*, and the law that applies to those subdivisions does not apply to strata conversions.

The next point to note is that strata conversions must be approved by the "Approving Authority" which is defined generally as the council of a municipality or the board of a regional district. The designation of elected officials (or their delegate), rather than the Approving Officer, as the authority for approval of strata conversions reflects the fact that these conversions can raise an inherently political issue – whether rental housing ought to be converted to ownership terms in circumstances where long-term occupants may be displaced.

This means that the Approving Officer cannot approve strata conversions unless the council or regional board has, by resolution, delegated approval power to the Approving Officer. This resolution cannot delegate strata conversion approval generally – only approval "with respect to a specified type of previously occupied building".

How conversion approval works in practice is that before a strata plan can be deposited in the Land Title Office, either the land surveyor must sign a certificate (a Form S) that the buildings have not been previously occupied or the Approving Authority (or its authorized signatory) must sign a Form T certificate that the strata conversion has been approved.

A local government will want to ensure that it establishes an adequate fee for consideration of strata conversions. These are "subdivisions" under section 872 of the Local Government Act *....*

In *Burton v. Harris* [2003] BCJ No. 887, the BC Supreme Court held that the Anmore municipal council exceeded its authority by signing a conversion certificate when the strata plan showed two buildings, but only one had been previously occupied. The council should have insisted that the strata plan include both a Form S (as to the newly constructed building) and a Form T (for the previously occupied building).

The City of Vancouver's "Strata Title Conversion Guidelines" list the information that an applicant must provide in support of his

application. It is not necessary to have such a policy, but such a document provides a useful list of the type of information an applicant will likely be required to submit.

When the Approving Authority receives an application for strata conversion, it has the following options:

(1) approve the strata plan;

(2) approve the strata plan subject to terms and conditions;

(3) refuse to approve the strata plan;

(4) refuse to approve the strata plan until terms and conditions imposed by the Approving Authority are met.

Where terms and conditions are imposed, the Approving Authority will need to consider whether they should function as preconditions to strata plan approval or whether they must be or can be met post-approval, in which case the Approving Authority will likely want those terms and conditions to be secured with a *Land Title Act* section 219 covenant, with monetary security, or in some other way.

Section 242 imposes two requirements on the Approving Authority. First, the Approving Authority must not approve the strata plan unless the building substantially complies with the applicable bylaws of the local government and the current BC Building Code (not the Code that was in effect when the building was constructed). The term "substantially complies" suggests that in some instances there is room for Approving Authority discretion. The Approving Authority can request an engineering report and any other relevant information to assist in making its decision. In some cases the concept of substantial compliance does not apply - in the *Burton and Harris* case, the second residence did not comply with the zoning bylaw, with the result that the municipal council exceeded its authority in approving the conversion.

The second requirement imposed on the Approving Authority is that it must take into consideration the following matters:

(i) the priority of rental accommodation over privately owned housing in the area;

(ii) any proposals for the relocation of persons occupying a residential building;

(iii) the life expectancy of the building; and

(iv) projected major increases in maintenance costs due to the condition of the building.

The Approving Authority can also take into consideration "any other matters that, in its opinion, are relevant".

A local government will want to ensure that it establishes an adequate fee for consideration of strata conversions. These are "subdivisions" under section 872 of the *Local Government Act* for which subdivision application fees can be imposed by bylaw under section 931 of that Act. The City of Vancouver's Guidelines state that applicants for strata conversion must pay a non-refundable processing fee of $4434 plus $10 for each unit proposed for conversion.

Section 242 provides that the decision of the Approving Authority is final and may not be appealed. However, in the *Burton and Harris* case, the BC Supreme Court considered the council's approval of the conversion and declared that the council had "exceeded the limits of its statutory power of decision as approving authority". The Court always has jurisdiction to review the decision of a statutory tribunal such as an Approving Authority where such errors have been made.

The BC Supreme Court, in *Rockwhite Holdings Ltd. v. O'Shea* [1995] BCJ No. 46 held that strata conversion is also triggered where a strata plan has to be cancelled and a new strata plan filed – in that case, in order to accommodate the remodeling and extension of a strata building.

Finally, under the *Real Estate Development Marketing Act*, a developer cannot market a co-op unit in a previously occupied building unless the municipal council or regional board approves the conversion.

Under the same statute, a developer cannot market a shared interest in land that includes a right of use or occupation of a previously occupied building unless the council or board gives approval, and some parts of section 242 of the *Strata Property Act* are incorporated into that approval process.

Patricia Kendall

OIPC Video Surveillance Guidelines

The Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner ("OIPC") has recently released Guidelines governing public sector video surveillance. These new guidelines replace the previous guidelines that had been in place since 2001.

The importance of personal privacy is emphasized in the Guidelines, as is the risk of harm resulting from unnecessary surveillance. The Guidelines aim to assist public bodies in determining whether proposed or existing surveillance systems are lawful.

The process of taking visual or audio recordings of an individual constitutes the collection of that individual's personal information and is, therefore, governed by the privacy protection provisions in Part 3 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

The OIPC is of the view that public bodies should only use surveillance where conventional means of achieving the same objectives are substantially less effective than surveillance, and the benefits of surveillance substantially outweigh any privacy intrusion. Cost savings alone will not justify the implementation of a surveillance system.

The Guidelines also set out best practices surrounding visual or audio surveillance including completion of a privacy impact assessment, consultation with stakeholders, possession of compelling evidence to justify the surveillance, layout of surveillance equipment, and for security arrangements for the collection, access, use, disclosure and disposal of records. Public bodies are also required to implement a comprehensive surveillance system policy and to regularly evaluate the system.

Local governments will want to review the Guidelines with respect to any existing and proposed surveillance systems to ensure compliance with FIPPA.

Carolyn MacEachern

Phasing Out E-Filing Exemptions: LTSA Adds New Class of Subscribers

Since the introduction of mandatory electronic filing in 2012, local governments wishing to paper-file their own documents could rely on an exemption from the mandatory e-filing requirements, so long as the local government was identified as the applicant for registration and was the owner of the charge or interest being applied for. The Land Title and Survey Authority is now phasing out that exemption and replacing it with a new class of subscribers in order to enable local governments to electronically issue and submit land title documents on their own behalf.

Before a document or plan can be submitted electronically to the Land Title Office for registration, it must be electronically signed by a "subscriber", who certifies the authenticity of the document. A BC lawyer or notary public can act as a subscriber for the majority of electronic forms, and a BC land surveyor can act as a subscriber for plans and a limited number of other documents.

Local governments now have the ability to request that an eligible employee become a member of the Authorized Subscriber Register (ASR). Eligible employees include statutory officers and BC commissioners who meet the criteria set by the Director of Land Titles. Membership in the ASR will enable the designated employee to acquire an electronic signature, which will then allow that employee to sign and submit land title documents on the local government's behalf. In order for the statutory officer or commissioner to electronically sign such documents, the local government must be the owner of the interest in land affected by the application. Interests in land include easements, leases, and statutory rights of way.

With the introduction of the ASR, there is no longer a need for local governments to rely on any exemption from the mandatory electronic filing requirements, and we can expect to see those exemptions phased out entirely in the coming months.

Joanna Track

News from the Firm

Young, Anderson is pleased to announce that **Elizabeth Anderson** has joined us as an associate lawyer. Like her father, Elizabeth will be carrying on a general local government law practice, including both litigation and solicitor's work. She was called to the bar in June 2011.

The Firm wishes the best to partner **Reece Harding** as he begins his sabbatical to gain his certification as a mediator from the Justice Institute of British Columbia. Reece will be back at the start of September with new skills and qualifications for the benefit of our clients, in conflict resolution.

Look for your Lawyers

On November 9, **Young, Anderson** was proud to serve as Premier Host Sponsor of the Planning Institute of BC's 2013 World Town Planning Day - Celebrating the Profession gala reception and dinner at the Hyatt Regency Vancouver Hotel.

Elizabeth Anderson presented a Caselaw Update session on November 21 at the Vancouver Island Chapter of the LGMA 2013 Annual Conference held in Qualicum Beach, November 20-22, 2013.

Reece Harding presented a session entitled "Elected Officials: Game Misconduct" at the Local Government Leadership Academy Forum held February 5-7, 2014 in Richmond.

In February, **Sukhbir Manhas** presented a session on "Controlling Councillor Conduct" at the Local Government Management Association CAO Forum in Vancouver.

Ray Young will be speaking in the City of Nanaimo on March 20 at an open meeting.

Sukhbir Manhas will be presenting on "Controlling Councillor Conduct" at the North Central Local Government Associaton Convention being held May 7-9, 2014 in Fort St John.

Don Howieson and **Elizabeth Anderson** will be presenting a session entitled "Stories from the Trenches (and Furrows and Fields): Legal Issues in the Agricultural Land Reserve" on the second day of the Lower Mainland Local Government Association 2014 AGM and Conference being held in Whistler May 7-9, 2014.

Carolyn MacEachern & **Francesca Marzari** will be presenting a session entitled "Aging populations, people with disabilities and homelessness: What Local Governments need to know about their regulatory powers and human rights" on the final day of the Lower Mainland Local Government Association 2014 AGM and Conference being held in Whistler May 7-9, 2014.

Barry Williamson will be presenting a session entitled "Buoys and Boats: Local Government regulation of navigable waters" on the final day of the Lower Mainland Local Government Association 2014 AGM and Conference being held in Whistler May 7-9, 2014.

Young, Anderson is a platinum sponsor of the BC Land Summit being held May 14-16, 2014. **Ray Young** will be speaking on a panel regarding innovative land use issues.

Don Howieson will be presenting on "Community Policing Initiatives and the BC Policing and Community Safety Plan" with Lee Elliott at the LIBOA Conference being held June 3-6, 2014 in Summerland.

Don Howieson and **Elizabeth Anderson** will be presenting on "Bylaw Enforcement Trends in the BC Courts" at the LIBOA Conference being held June 3-6, 2014 in Summerland.

Carolyn MacEachern will be presenting on "Personal Options for Dealing with Workplace Bullying" at the Local Government Management Association Annual Conference being held June 10-12, 2014 in Vancouver.