



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 28th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Bitumen Royalty in Kind Program

Wednesday, October 31, 2012
6:19 p.m.

Transcript No. 28-1-2

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 28th Legislature
First Session**

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC), Chair
Bikman, Gary, Cardston-Taber-Warner (W), Deputy Chair

Bhardwaj, Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL)
Donovan, Ian, Little Bow (W)
Dorward, David C., Edmonton-Gold Bar (PC)
Eggen, David, Edmonton-Calder (ND)
Fenske, Jacquie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC)
Goudreau, Hector G., Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (PC)
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Luan, Jason, Calgary-Hawkwood (PC)
McDonald, Everett, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC)
Olesen, Cathy, Sherwood Park (PC)
Quadri, Sohail, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)
Quest, Dave, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (PC)
Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont (PC)
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)
Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (AL)
Smith, Danielle, Highwood (W)
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)
Towle, Kerry, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (W)
Xiao, David, Edmonton-McClung (PC)*
Young, Steve, Edmonton-Riverview (PC)
Vacant

* substitution for Dr. Richard Starke

Also in Attendance

Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)

Support Staff

W.J. David McNeil	Clerk
Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Law Clerk/Director of Interparliamentary Relations
Shannon Dean	Senior Parliamentary Counsel/ Director of House Services
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research Services
Stephanie LeBlanc	Legal Research Officer
Nancy Zhang	Legislative Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Christopher Tyrell	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications and Broadcast Services
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Liz Sim	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

6:19 p.m.

Wednesday, October 31, 2012

[Mr. Amery in the chair]

The Chair: Good evening, everyone. I would like to call this meeting to order. First of all, I'd like to thank each and every one of you for being here tonight on such a beautiful Halloween night. I noticed that my deputy chair and my assistant brought in a lot of candy, so please help yourselves. Happy Halloween to each and every one of you.

I'd like to welcome all the members and all the staff joining us tonight. I'd like us to go around the table introducing ourselves. I will start with myself. Moe Amery, MLA, Calgary-East and chair of this committee.

Mr. Bikman: Gary Bikman, deputy chair.

Mr. Hehr: Kent Hehr, MLA, Calgary-Buffalo.

Mr. Rogers: George Rogers, MLA, Leduc-Beaumont.

Mr. Dorward: David Dorward, MLA, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Naresh Bhardwaj, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Mr. McDonald: Everett McDonald, Grand Prairie-Smoky.

Ms Fenske: Hello. Jacquie Fenske, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

Mr. Fraser: Rick Fraser, Calgary-South East.

Ms Jansen: Sandra Jansen, Calgary-North West.

Mr. Quadri: Sohail Quadri, Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Ms Olesen: Cathy Olesen, MLA, Sherwood Park.

Mr. Luan: Jason Luan, MLA, Calgary-Hawkwood.

Mr. Donovan: Good evening. Ian Donovan, Little Bow.

Mrs. Towle: Kerry Towle, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Ms Smith: Danielle Smith, Highwood.

Mr. Eggen: Good evening. David Eggen, Edmonton-Calder.

Mr. Strankman: Rick Strankman, Drumheller-Stettler.

Mr. Xiao: David Xiao, Edmonton-McClung. By the way, I'm substituting for Richard Starke.

Mr. Sandhu: Good evening. Peter Sandhu, Edmonton-Manning.

Dr. Massolin: Good evening. Philip Massolin, manager, research services.

Ms Sorensen: Rhonda Sorensen, manager of corporate communications.

Mrs. Dacyshyn: Corinne Dacyshyn, committee clerk.

The Chair: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

The meeting materials were posted on the internal committee website on Monday, but before we start, a few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. As you all know, the microphone consoles are operated by the *Hansard* staff, and when we mention *Hansard*, that means everything we say here and do here is recorded.

Please keep all cellphones, iPhones, and BlackBerrys off the table as these may interfere with the audio feed.

Audio of committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*. Audio access and meeting transcripts are obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

Our first item of business tonight is the approval of the agenda.

Mr. Rogers: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Moved by Mr. Rogers. All in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Good.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the July 24, 2012, meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note? If not, can I have a motion? Mr. Sandhu. All in favour? Any objection? Carried. That's good.

We move now to item 4, which is the committee priorities report on the issues that were put forward, but before we do that, I'd like to make a few comments. Colleagues, during the July meeting we agreed here as a committee in this room to create a working group made up of the chair, the vice-chair, a representative of the Liberal caucus, and a representative of the NDP caucus. During the summer months each member of the working group was gathering ideas and submissions for discussions from our respective caucuses. A deadline for these ideas and submissions was set for September 15.

We as a working group committee were fortunate to receive seven submissions, and I must admit that these submissions were loaded submissions. If we were to analyze them and dissect them, they would amount to about 70 different issues. They are so large in scope and so important that it was really tough to pick one over the other, but as you all know, we can't deal with all of them at the same time. As a working group we met twice. We reviewed the submissions, and we had to make some very tough decisions and choices. As a result, the working group reached an agreement on a particular issue, which was circulated. It will be tabled today.

Before we do that, I want to assure all of the members who submitted issues for discussion that your submissions were important. Your ideas are great, and your hard work and participation are greatly appreciated. Your efforts will not go unnoticed.

From today on the clock is ticking. As soon as we table a motion and vote on it, we have six months to reach a decision and submit a report. The six-month period is the maximum time that we have for each issue, but I don't think that six months is a time that's carved in stone. I think that if we can do it in four months, that would be better, and we will move on to the next issue.

6:25

Colleagues, these committees are new. It's a new experience for all of us, so let's consider the issues before us very carefully. These committees could become public forums, and through them strong and solid legislation will be developed. Stakeholders' consultations will be a cornerstone of policy development.

Before we go on to the issues at hand, I have to make a clarification to Mr. Hehr in regard to his submission on behalf of the Liberal caucus. That submission was to study, examine, and investigate the possibility to re-create the Alberta Energy Company. We weren't really sure, Mr. Hehr, where this issue would land, with this committee or with the Resource Stewardship Committee. I know you made an inquiry during the last meeting of the Resource Stewardship Committee on that very same issue. Since that time, the chair of the Resource Stewardship Committee and I met and decided that your motion impacts both committees positively, though.

The economic benefit that would result from the re-creation of the AEC would fall within the mandate of Alberta's Economic Future, and the mandate of the AEC would fall under Resource Stewardship, and we will deal with them as such. Therefore, more discussion and expert analysis are needed.

The second point – and it is the last point that I would like to make today – is to Mr. Bikman, the vice-chair. During the last working group meeting I undertook to find out for you as to the status of the task force that was studying red tape reduction. I did, and I even brought you a copy for your reading pleasure. So on this side of the House, sir: promises made; promises kept.

Mr. Bikman: Thank you. Hopefully, that's just the first of many.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Let's get to the issue that we have before us. It is the issue that we as a working group decided to put before you here today. That was the draft motion on a review of the BRIK program, which was posted on the internal website addresses, the issue and the proposed scope of the review.

I would like a discussion, or should we put the motion on the floor before we start a discussion? Ms Olesen.

Ms Olesen: Thank you. I would move the motion. I'm really happy to see it here. Originally I was wanting this big, big world, but this is really, really good. I know we'll do some really good work here, and I'm pleased to put this on the floor. I'll look forward to the next phase.

The Chair: Okay. Can you read it into the record, please?

Ms Olesen: Okay. I move that

in the interest of encouraging economic development in the province, the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future undertake a study of the BRIK, bitumen royalty in kind, program and that the scope of the study shall include the following:

- risks and rewards and the effectiveness of the BRIK program;
- barriers to increased bitumen upgrading;
- economic costs and benefits of increased bitumen upgrading in Alberta as compared to other jurisdictions;
- amount of bitumen that can be safely and profitably upgraded in Alberta over the next 20 years given the limitations of infrastructure and water supply;
- environmental advantages and disadvantages of increased bitumen upgrading in Alberta;
- possible regulatory measures that could be introduced to encourage bitumen upgrading capacity in Alberta; and
- economic trade-off of increased investment in bitumen upgrading in Alberta compared to investment in other sectors

but shall seek to avoid the study of incentives to encourage increased bitumen upgrading in Alberta and those issues within the mandate of the Royalty Review Panel and the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship in order to avoid a duplication of efforts.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Olesen.

Any discussion? Any questions? Mr. Goudreau.

Mr. Goudreau: Thank you. My proposal included labour, and I'm just wondering if I could propose an amendment to add to the fourth bullet: given the limitations of infrastructure, water supply, and labour availability. I think it's a huge impediment in this

province. As we move forward, I think we need to keep that in the back of our minds. So I would propose that we add labour availability to that fourth bullet.

The Chair: Would you like to move it as an amendment?

Mr. Goudreau: I will do so. Thank you.

The Chair: Any discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Eggen: Yes. I think it's a great idea. We did discuss this, and we were trying to keep the parameters as narrow as possible but choosing topics that ran as a thread through all of the submissions. I think that's an excellent idea, Hec, and I would certainly support that.

The Chair: Mr. Hehr.

Mr. Hehr: No. I want to speak to another issue, not this motion.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would speak in favour of the amendment. I think we are all very much aware of the challenges that currently exist in all the incentives, not incentives, the opportunities that are before us in this province and, certainly, the challenge that labour is placing on current initiatives – that's the word I was looking for – that are ongoing across the province. I couldn't imagine that we would undertake a study like this, looking at the possibilities, without taking into account labour and everything that relates to that: availability, quality, training, et cetera.

Very well put, hon. Member for Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hehr: I believe that the last point that was brought up on the list before the labour was added was the economic determinants. I want to understand the economics of this. Will that be part of the knowledge we garner out of having this list of objectives? Like, have a person tell you whether the economics work. You know, I've read things from various sources. Some say they do; some say they don't. I'm more inclined to actually say that it's a risky endeavour, especially with the investment we would have to put in to see it succeed. This committee is for those hard questions to be asked and have that information presented. Will someone be able to give us an economic analysis, maybe from the ministry who has already done it, to see the economics of what we're actually dealing with?

The Chair: I'd ask Dr. Massolin to address this point.

Dr. Massolin: Well, I think you have an agenda item later on, Mr. Chair, on research requirements, and perhaps I can address it at that point.

The Chair: Sure.

Any other questions or discussion?

If not, can we have a vote on the amendment? All in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

Can we have a vote on the motion?

Oh, sorry. Mr. Dorward.

Mr. Dorward: Yeah. Thank you. I'm in favour of this motion, but

I have a little bit of concern in the sense that we have a limited amount of time, and we have a committee which is Alberta's Economic Future. I think it's great to be able to do this. I think we'll learn some things. I think we might guess that we like it, the BRIK program. I'm going to guess that we will certainly learn a whole lot more about it through this process. I think that we will even be excited about doing more, but I don't know that looking at a program that is there is going to truly allow us to make some significant steps towards Alberta's economic future, in a broad sense of things, from a 60,000-foot level.

I applaud the motion. It's fantastic; it's great; it's interesting. Maybe what I would say in a constructive way is that maybe the second part of our mandate or the next part not run in a series but parallel with this. In other words, maybe we could take part of our meetings in the future, and while this might be our main meat on the table, we would also stop and say: what's our next one, or what should we do in this province so that it looks like this in the future? This could be part of it. I understand that. But there's a broad range of things that we could also dive into and find out how we can ensure Alberta's economic future. Everybody had an opportunity, I'm sure, to look at the notes that I made in that regard.

So I'm in favour of the motion. I think it might be a little bit too small right now, but it's something for us to get into.

6:35

The Chair: As you know and as I have mentioned, Mr. Dorward, this is a new committee, a new experience for us. Let us deal with this motion as it is right now, and we will figure out how to do it in the future.

Mr. Dorward: I'm in support of that.

Ms Fenske: Actually, I was going to follow up somewhere along your lines, Mr. Chairman, because I think we need to get a success under our belt as far as being able to study a topic. This gives us, certainly, some great parameters and something to work towards. I don't disagree with Mr. Dorward that we could certainly look at other things as time goes on, but we do need to get through one issue to make sure that we understand and create the appropriate process.

The Chair: Great. Thank you.

Can we have a vote on the motion as amended?

An Hon. Member: We voted on it when we did the amendment.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very, very much.

With the passage of this motion the committee has commenced its review and must table its findings no later than April 30, 2013, in accordance with Standing Order 52.07(4), which states that an inquiry must be conducted and the committee's report on the matter tabled in the Assembly "no later than 6 months after the commencement of the inquiry."

As I said earlier, before we move on to our next item, I would like to suggest that members continue to submit issues for consideration by the working group on an ongoing basis. I will commit to reporting to the committee on a regular basis on the issues that have been raised, if any.

Now, the next item on the agenda is the identification of stakeholders. I would like to suggest that our committee's research section prepare a stakeholder list identifying both those who have expertise in and those who may be affected by bitumen upgrading in Alberta. Members could also utilize their caucus research capabilities and submit any suggestions for addition to the list,

which could then be reviewed by the working group prior to the consideration by the committee at its next meeting.

Do members have any comments or suggestions? Ms Smith.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to propose to the committee that we bring forward a group of people who have had some experience with the BRIK program, who have gone through it and were unsuccessful at being able to get their project approved. I think we might be able to learn something from their experience for going forward with other projects.

I did take the liberty of calling Ken Horn, the president, and Glenn McGinnis, the COO, of Teedrum Inc. They've indicated that both of them as well as Vineet Aggarwal, who is the deputy general manager, and Rajiv Malhotra, who is with RJN engineers, would be delighted to attend as representatives for Engineers India Limited to discuss the First Nations Energy Centre project, that was, I think, \$30 million along the way of being approved towards the BRIK program. I think there was some favourable review given by the public service on that, and then there was an unfavourable review given by the public service on that. I understand Mr. Aggarwal would be quite willing to fly in from India to speak with our group so that we can learn from that. He would need just a little bit of advance notice about when he might be needed to give a stakeholder presentation.

That would be my recommendation, that we pursue those who have had some experience with the program.

The Chair: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Goudreau.

Mr. Goudreau: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. I would agree with that. It think it's important that we listen and hear some of the issues that have created some frustrations in the past. Maybe before we do that, I think it's important for us to familiarize ourselves with the BRIK program itself. I would suggest that we do talk to, maybe, some of our energy folks and talk to those people who are presently involved in that particular program so we can have a broad understanding of the BRIK program. Then, following that, we can have probably better questions for others that may follow down the line. I'm suggesting North West Upgrading, for instance; have them involved.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Bhardwaj.

Mr. Bhardwaj: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to speak along the same lines as Mr. Goudreau. I think understanding the BRIK project ourselves, to begin with, is extremely important before we start talking to EIL and some of their representatives who are coming from India or some of them who are on the ground here. I think it's absolutely critical for us to use our local identified groups, as was indicated earlier, through our research department have them identified, and utilize them before we start flying people from EIL or any of their people who are on the ground in Alberta already.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to comment. I certainly would agree with the previous speaker, Mr. Goudreau, in terms of some opportunity for this committee as a whole to get more familiar with the BRIK program as it exists today.

I think it's also important, Mr. Chairman – and this may just be, if I may, a little bit of advice for your working committee as you

grapple with some of the legwork before items come back to this full table. I think it's very important that we be careful on a go-forward basis that as we have stakeholders at the table, we approach this in a manner that looks at opportunities for the future and not use this table as a way to critique, maybe, decisions that have already been made in this program, be they someone that was very successful, not successful, or what have you in any dealings with the program. I think it's just a caution.

There may have been, obviously, decisions made in the past that had varying impacts on different individuals or organizations, but I think it's important in this forum that we not rehash any of those decisions at this table and focus our work on looking at opportunities for the future.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Hehr: I agree completely with Hector's request: understanding the BRIK program, the risks, the incentives that the government has to do to get this project up and understanding whether it's really that lucrative of a business for us to be in. You know, to my understanding I don't know if the margins are really that great. Understanding that is important to me. I think that was an excellent suggestion.

The Chair: Thanks, Mr. Hehr.

Mr. Bikman: I like the idea of taking advantage of knowledge that we already have from those that have it. I think it's important that we learn from the mistakes of others so that they're not repeated in terms of any recommendations or conclusions we may come to. I think there's a lot to be learned from others that have entered the fray and, perhaps, been rebuffed for some reason or another, not to critique the decision but to see what it was that may have been inadequate there and what they have perhaps learned from that and have done to rectify it.

I also think that we want to seek as much outside input as we can. Now, sometimes, at the risk of being misunderstood, there can be a little bit of incestuousness. We don't want that intermarriage, that intermingling. We need fresh new ideas and outside influence, and I think that we would be doing ourselves and our province a disservice if we didn't look outside of the House, so to speak.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bikman.

6:45

Mrs. Towle: Thank you, Gary. I agree with you. That's exactly where I was going to come from.

I appreciate Mr. Goudreau's comments as well because as a new MLA and a new member to these committees I do think it is important that I understand exactly what BRIK has to offer, exactly what those processes are. I can appreciate the caution that you've given us, Mr. Rogers, and I get that. The thing that I've also learned going through life is that if we're open to the mistakes of the past – and that doesn't necessarily mean we're rehashing – that's the only way we learn. Equally important is that we need to speak to people who've actually gone through this experience. I don't necessarily know that that's always a negative. It just means that that was the experience they went through, that this was the process, and this is how we can make it better and streamline it.

While I'm appreciative that we need to learn about the BRIK program – and I really appreciate that, especially coming in new – I don't want to limit ourselves to providing only that knowledge.

Around the table there are many of us who are new here, and I don't think we want to taint how we think about the BRIK program because we've only sought out our own people, our own research, and then by the time that person comes in from the outside to provide us with a different perspective, we've sort of made up our minds, as is human nature. I don't think it's a negative. It just is human nature.

I strongly recommend that we take both avenues. We can set out a timeline that we can learn about BRIK. We can start to engage with our local people to educate us on their experiences. I think that at the same time we could reach out to these external people that have gone through this process and bring them to the table because maybe the process is quite different for those coming from it externally than from internally. I would appreciate knowing that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Towle.

Mr. Luan.

Mr. Luan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I state my opinion, I want to say that I really enjoy these diverse views on the issue so that we can take the best of all and move forward. I'm trying to think if perhaps we have an opportunity to connect to what Mr. Dorward mentioned earlier about thinking to the future and thinking big and so forth. My way of thinking is that I'd like to hear the ones that succeeded, I'd like to hear the ones that failed, I'd like to hear the ones that are poised for the future, and I'd like to hear the ones happening in Alberta and also internationally so that we don't get boxed in. Here's my thought on a recommendation basis. Can we ask our researchers as the neutral body to provide the best knowledge to brief us as a committee, just for the sake of that knowledge?

Following that, then we can decide, perhaps select some samples: those are considered in the circles to be successful ones, those are the ones that aren't, and those are the future-oriented ones, perhaps international ones. Then I can sit here and feel confident that I have the knowledge, that I have state-of-the-art tools in front of me in making a decision that is meaningful so that in the next four months or six months we're spending time really, really informed in that way.

I'll stop there. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Luan. I agree with what you're saying, and I know Dr. Massolin will address this issue in just a few minutes.

Now Mr. Strankman.

Mr. Strankman: Yes. Well, I just want to reiterate what Mrs. Towle brought forward about a timeline. I think I understood that you said that we're going to have a quiz in six months, so I'm thinking that we should have a timeline to prepare for that. Maybe the doctor already has that timeline set up for us. If we don't, we're going to run down to five months, and then we're going to be cramming, and that's never worked for me.

Mr. Goudreau: Well, hearing everybody's comments, I would move the motion as circulated, certainly, considering the input that was received tonight from all the members. I think it was a tremendous input and good direction. On the basis of that particular input that was provided here, I would move draft motion 4(c), the research requirements.

The Chair: Would you like to read it into the record?

Mr. Goudreau: I can do that. I move that committee research services complete a draft stakeholders list identifying organizations with expertise in or potentially affected by bitumen upgrading in Alberta and submit the draft list to the chair and that committee members also submit their recommendations for stakeholders to the chair to be included on the list by November 7, 2012, for review by the working group of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future and submission to the committee for its approval at its next meeting.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Goudreau.

Mr. Dorward: Just a friendly amendment. I don't think I'm going to do a fancy-dancy thing, but identifying "persons or" organizations. Is that fair? Is that okay?

The Chair: Okay. We'll accept that as a friendly amendment. Any other questions or suggestions?

Mr. Rogers: A quick comment, Mr. Chairman. I'll speak to the motion, and I speak in favour of it. I think it's broad enough and it covers a lot of what was heard around the table, the importance of reaching out and getting a good cross-section of input into this topic. I don't think it takes away at all from the caution that I gave earlier, the idea that we would reach out – obviously, time will be a factor, et cetera – and try to get that broad spectrum of input. I think we'll be well covered by this motion and that it will meet the comments from other members.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

Mrs. Towle: Just because I'm new – and I apologize if this is a silly question – I just want to get a point of clarification. Are we able to submit to committee research if we know of a person that is directly affected? Is that okay?

The Chair: Yes, you can. You can do it through the committee clerk.

Mrs. Towle: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Great. Can we have a vote on the motion? All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Now we move to item 5, which is research requirements. I will ask Dr. Massolin to address the research that can be completed to assist the committee in its review.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I just want to reiterate to the committee, of course, that the LAO has research services which are available throughout this committee's review and subsequent reviews. I also want to mention that the committee has tools at its disposal to gather information, one of which you've already identified in terms of the stakeholders. As has been mentioned, those individuals could be brought before the committee to garner that information.

Another tool you have at your disposal, of course, is our services, where we could provide that. I would propose that a potential research task for us to do is to give some background information on the BRIK program: what it's all about, the policies that surround it, its genesis, and its current operation and functioning. We could provide that to provide members some insight as to what the program is all about. I would say that that's one thing we could do. We're open to other ideas, of course.

Thank you.

The Chair: Great. Thank you, Dr. Massolin. Any questions for Dr. Massolin?

Mr. Goudreau: I'm just wondering. You know, as we ask people to participate and get involved and do more research, we may call people before the committee. I cannot remember if we've got a budget to be able to accommodate those things. Is budget a challenge?

Mr. Donovan: We can pass the hat.

Mr. Goudreau: Fill up the basket there.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you again, Mr. Chair. The committee has a budget of about \$150,000, I believe. My sense is that the committee, obviously, can call who it wishes to speak to in order to inform it and ask questions and that sort of thing. I think in some cases the individuals whom the committee calls may just willingly participate. There's no need for any reimbursement. But, of course, that tool is available as well in terms of, you know, the committee passing a motion to reimburse a specialist or an expert in the field. You could have a couple of hours with that expert to talk about energy economics or anything of the kind.

Mr. Goudreau: Thank you.

6:55

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin. Any other discussion? Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just before I move the motion, if I may, I have a question for Dr. Massolin. Will we or the working committee need to at some point go through the fine-tuning? Having sat around this table before, it's advertising, how we reach stakeholders, and so on. Is that phase 2?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, that's entirely a committee decision as to how it wants to consult. I mean, you've got your stakeholders, and you have initiated that process, but it's entirely up to you if you want to broaden that and consult further.

The Chair: I think that's for the committee to discuss in the future.

Mr. Rogers: Maybe as we finesse this. Okay. Thank you.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I would move that

committee research services complete a background briefing on the bitumen royalty in kind, or BRIK, program and provide that information to the chair for distribution to the members of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future in advance of the next meeting date.

So the members will have some bedtime reading. Sorry, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Any discussion on the motion? Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you. Only that I just want to reconfirm that, you know, for any change or nuance to the direction of the research I presume and hope we are discussing that on an ongoing basis. You've sort of set the parameters. You've helped to define them for here and now, and then any other change of direction or focus of the research always comes back to this group, I presume.

The Chair: It will be discussed in this committee for sure.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. And voted on.

Mr. Rogers: If I may, Mr. Chairman. This motion is specific to the provision of the briefing to the members that was asked for at the beginning.

Mr. Eggen: Perfect.

The Chair: Can we have a vote on this motion, please. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

We're at other business. Any other business to be discussed or brought forward before the committee?

The date of the next meeting. I think we are suggesting November 21 as the date for our next meeting.

Well, if there is no other business, I would ask for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Bhardwaj. Thank you.

Have a great evening. Happy Halloween.

[The committee adjourned at 6:58 p.m.]

