



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 28th Legislature  
Second Session

Standing Committee  
on  
Alberta's Economic Future

Wednesday, May 21, 2014  
10:02 a.m.

Transcript No. 28-2-10

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

**Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future**

Amery, Moe, Calgary-East (PC), Chair  
Fox, Rodney M., Lacombe-Ponoka (W), Deputy Chair  
  
Eggen, David, Edmonton-Calder (ND)  
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)  
Kennedy-Glans, Donna, QC, Calgary-Varsity (Ind)  
Kubinec, Maureen, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (PC)  
Lemke, Ken, Stony Plain (PC)  
Luan, Jason, Calgary-Hawkwood (PC)  
McDonald, Everett, Grande Prairie-Smoky (PC)  
Pastoor, Bridget Brennan, Lethbridge-East (PC)  
Quadri, Sohail, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)  
Rogers, George, Leduc-Beaumont (PC)  
Rowe, Bruce, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W)  
Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC)  
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)  
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)\*

\* substitution for Kent Hehr

**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
Sarah Leonard	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
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

**10:02 a.m.**

**Wednesday, May 21, 2014**

[Mr. Amery in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call this meeting to order and ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. We have a number of members joining us via teleconferencing. I would call on each of you to introduce yourselves as well: Ms Pastoor; Dr. Swann, substituting for Mr. Hehr; Mr. Luan; Mr. Lemke; Mr. Stier; and Mr. McDonald.

I will start. I am Moe Amery, MLA for Calgary-East and chair of this committee.

**Mr. Fox:** I'm Rod Fox, MLA for Lacombe-Ponoka and deputy chair of this committee.

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

**Mr. Eggen:** Dave Eggen, Edmonton-Calder.

**Ms Kubinec:** Maureen Kubinec, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

**Ms Dotimas:** Jeanette Dotimas, communications with LAO.

**Ms Sales:** Tracey Sales, also with communications at the LAO.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Good morning and welcome. Janice Sarich, MLA, Edmonton-Decore.

**Mr. Rowe:** Bruce Rowe, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

**Ms Dean:** Shannon Dean, Parliamentary Counsel, director of House services.

**Ms Robert:** Good morning. Nancy Robert, research officer.

**Dr. Massolin:** Good morning. Philip Massolin, manager of research services.

**Ms Rempel:** Jody Rempel, committee clerk.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Members on the phone, please introduce yourselves for the record.

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

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Luan.

**Ms Pastoor:** Bridget Pastoor . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** Everett McDonald, MLA, Grande Prairie-Smoky.

**Ms Pastoor:** Oops. How are we going to know how to go here?

**The Chair:** Just go.

**Ms Pastoor:** Just go? Okay. Bridget Pastoor, MLA, Lethbridge-East.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Next.

**Mr. Lemke:** Ken Lemke, MLA, Stony Plain.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Lemke.

**Mr. Stier:** Pat Stier, MLA, Livingstone-Macleod.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Stier.

Anybody else? Good.

Members should have copies of the meeting's agenda, letters from the President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance, proposed timeline document, proposed list of . . .

**Dr. Swann:** David Swann.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Swann.

. . . expert and stakeholder panels, and the draft communication plan and advertisements. These documents were posted to the internal committee website yesterday. If any member requires copies, please let the committee clerk know.

Just a few housekeeping items before we turn to the business at hand. The microphone consoles are operated by the *Hansard* staff. Please keep cellphones, iPhones, BlackBerrys off the table as these may interfere with the audiofeed.

Item 2 on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Can I have a motion? Mr. Quadri.

**Mr. Quadri:** I move the motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

**The Chair:** Mr. Quadri has moved that the agenda for the May 21, 2014, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 3 on the agenda is the referrals by the Legislative Assembly: Bill 9, Public Sector Pension Plans Amendment Act, 2014, and Bill 10, Employment Pension (Private Sector) Plans Amendment Act, 2014. As members are aware, bills 9 and 10 were referred to this committee by the Assembly on Monday, May 5. In order to provide the committee with the information necessary to make a number of time-sensitive decisions today, committee support staff were requested to draft certain documents for discussion purposes. Before we look at the proposed timeline document, I would like to ask Ms Shannon Dean to provide an overview of the process for bills referred after second reading.

Please go ahead, Ms Dean.

**Ms Dean:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bills 9 and 10 were referred to this committee pursuant to Standing Order 78.1 following second reading. This is the first time bills have been referred under this standing order in quite some time. The last time we followed this process was back in 2007 with three bills: the Lobbyists Act, an amending bill with respect to the conflict-of-interest legislation, and also an amending bill with respect to the Mental Health Act.

Just to briefly go through the process, Mr. Chair, once the bill is referred to this committee, the committee can undertake its review in the manner it so chooses. This may entail public meetings and solicitation of written and oral submissions from experts, interested stakeholders, and the public. Once the committee completes its review, then under Standing Order 78.3 the committee deliberates and reports to the House.

The committee has three options when it reports back to the Assembly: either that the bill proceed, proceed with amendment, or not proceed. If the committee reports that the bill proceed or proceed with amendment, then the bill automatically goes to Committee of the Whole. If the committee's report states that the bill not proceed, then the Assembly must vote on whether it's going to concur in that report. If the Assembly concurs in the report, then the bill does not proceed. If the Assembly votes down and does not concur in the report, then the bill goes to Committee of the Whole. The relevant standing order on that point is 78.4.

Finally, one point concerning the timeline for the committee's review. You may recall that when the minister moved his motion in the Assembly, he referred to the committee coming back with its report the first sitting in October, which is scheduled to take place the week of October 27. His letters make mention of the first week in October, but of course the House doesn't come back, at this point, until the week of October 27.

That's it, Mr. Chair, unless committee members have questions.

**The Chair:** Any questions for Ms Dean?

On the phones?

Yes, Mr. Eggen.

**Mr. Eggen:** Thank you. These questions are just in relation to the standing orders and so forth. Are we obliged by the letter to submit a report at that time, or can we adjust that? The timeline is all pretty much fixed, yeah?

**Ms Dean:** You're governed by the resolution passed in the House, which in the comments made referred to the October time frame in terms of that.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yes.

**Ms Dean:** I mean, the committee could always report that it needs more time with respect to its review if that wasn't enough time.

**The Chair:** That's if we need more time.

**Mr. Eggen:** Of course. Yeah.

**Ms Dean:** But right now the resolution passed in the House is directing the committee to report back when the House reconvenes in October.

**Mr. Eggen:** Okay. Then you're going to report on the process as well, or is that the sum of your report?

**Ms Dean:** The process in terms of . . .

**Mr. Eggen:** Of building this document that you gave to us yesterday.

**Ms Dean:** If I can, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Go ahead.

**Ms Dean:** Well, basically, we had preliminary discussions at the working group level just to put together some timeline documents for the committee to consider. Again, we're not driving the process; we just wanted to provide some points for discussion. I mean, what's laid out in the document – and we can get into it a little bit further – are proposals for expert panels to come forward at the beginning of the review, some interested stakeholders, and then going out to the public later on in June. Then there's the month of September, of course, when the committee can come back and review the submissions that it's heard and decide whether it needs to hear from more parties.

**10:10**

**Mr. Eggen:** Okay. That's fine. I guess my questions are more specifically to the choices that were put forward for the expert panels and so forth, right? Should we discuss that here? Chair, did you want to have a spot for that?

**The Chair:** Let's follow the order on the agenda.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. I just wanted, you know, to make a point that I wanted to talk about that, right?

**The Chair:** Good. Thank you.

Thank you, Ms Dean.

Mr. Rogers, would you like to introduce yourself for the record, please?

**Mr. Rogers:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My apologies. I had to step out. George Rogers, MLA, Leduc-Beaumont.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any other questions? Mr. Stier, go ahead.

**Mr. Stier:** Yes. Thanks. I just wanted to inquire if what Ms Dean had just outlined could be available in some written form for reference later on. It's hard to take notes from the teleconference here and keep up with her. That might be something helpful later, as we proceed, once we have to look at some of those options.

**The Chair:** You can get it through *Hansard*. You can read *Hansard*. Everything is on *Hansard*.

**Mr. Stier:** Yeah. I was just hoping for something in writing, on paper to put in my paper file.

**The Chair:** Okay. Ms Dean will make a comment.

**Ms Dean:** If you look at your standing orders, there are standing orders 78.1, 78.2, and 78.3, and the committee clerk can e-mail you the text of those standing orders.

**Mr. Stier:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the proposed timeline document for discussion purposes. The committee support staff were provided with a few parameters for completing the timeline document, which addresses proposed advertising, oral presentations, public meetings, and deliberations, avoids the peak summer season but still allows for the review to be complete. The committee's report is to be available for tabling when session convenes in the fall. As noted in the timeline document and subject to the committee's approval today, public meetings would be scheduled in mid- to late June, and written submissions would be invited with a proposed closing date of Friday, August 1, 2014. The timeline also addresses dates for meetings to hear from government representatives, experts, and stakeholders.

The proposed schedule for oral presentations by the government of Alberta, experts, and stakeholders. Now I'd like to ask Dr. Massolin to speak to a proposed schedule for oral presentations.

Go ahead, please, Dr. Massolin.

**Dr. Massolin:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much. At this point I'll be brief and just simply indicate that on this proposed schedule you will see the week of June 2. Two days of presentations are proposed for the committee to hear from Treasury Board and Finance as well as experts on both bills 9 and 10 and then stakeholders on the bills as well. I'll also go into the list that was put together for the committee a little bit later on.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any questions? Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm just wondering. It's a proposal of two days, but are we focused on particular days or

specific days that we have in mind? Are we moving into that level of discussion, or is that coming somewhere else?

**The Chair:** It's the week of June 2.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Yes. I heard that. But what day of the week?

**The Chair:** We haven't decided that yet.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Oh, we haven't decided? I'm just wondering. When is that?

**The Chair:** Yeah. I think it will be decided soon by polling the members and checking into the availability of members.

**Mrs. Sarich:** I see. Thank you for the clarification.

**The Chair:** Okay.  
Mr. Eggen.

**Mr. Eggen:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thanks for your work on this. It's all a very tight time frame. I just noticed that on the last page of the timeline document you had additional scheduling for a panel of experts or proceeding directly to deliberations. Do you need us to make that decision today, whether we need to have, you know, a kind of a meeting at the end of this whole process, another public meeting? Is that what I'm reading?

**The Chair:** Well, that's going to be based on the discussion. I'll ask Dr. Massolin to comment on that.

**Dr. Massolin:** No. I think that was exactly the answer based on the committee's decision as to what it wants to do. Ms Dean also mentioned that if upon hearing from this first set of meetings, the written submissions, the public meetings as well, the committee wants to hear additional stakeholders/experts, that time in September is available for that.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. I certainly want to encourage that opinion there, and whether we decide that now or we leave it at least that opportunity to be open, I would like that because I just don't want that door to be closed. Having that final meeting might really help to serve to clarify everything, bring it to a head, and then perhaps pursue new avenues that we hadn't thought of before.

**The Chair:** Okay.  
Any other questions or discussion? Ms Kubinec.

**Ms Kubinec:** Yes. Just on when we're going out to the public across Alberta, the process of having the whole group at all of those meetings: is that what the expectations are?

**The Chair:** Having the whole group: you mean all of us?

**Ms Kubinec:** This whole committee.

**The Chair:** Well, if every member wanted to attend those meetings, we can't say, "No; you cannot attend," but, I mean . . .

**Ms Kubinec:** I'm just wondering what the plan was, who is going to be attending those meetings.

**The Chair:** It's our committee.

**Ms Kubinec:** Okay. That was kind of my question.

**The Chair:** It's our committee along with the staff, along with the *Hansard* staff, along with the securities, so all of us unless somebody can't attend.

**Ms Kubinec:** Okay. Good.

**Mr. Eggen:** I guess further to the seven-city tour – they're described as public meetings – do we set up the parameters for that now, or have you, Dr. Massolin, thought about how we might do that? Is it like an invitation or a booking, or is it just a come one, come all kind of thing?

**The Chair:** I think this is the next item on the agenda. It's the proposed public meetings you're talking about?

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** I will ask the committee clerk, Mrs. Sawchuk, to address this point.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. When we were looking at a schedule, we were also looking at the format for the public meetings. The committee, of course, makes the decision on how it chooses to conduct these meetings. It could be that you invite oral presentations from the public, five minutes plus five minutes for questions from the committee. You know, we have in the past done 10 minutes, but that is an excessive amount of time, and actually with the high-speed rail review very seldom were the full 10 minutes used by a presenter, so the suggestion would be that it could be five minutes and five minutes for questions.

Let's see. What else?

**Mr. Eggen:** Registering ahead of time or a come as you are kind of thing?

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Oh, that will be addressed as part of the advertising and communications plan. But the intent is in the same fashion that we did with high-speed rail, that there would be a reference of people wanting to participate to register with the committee offices, with the committee clerk, and we'd give a deadline date. Then, of course, it's time permitting at the end. It's whoever the committee wants to hear from.

**Mr. Eggen:** Thank you. [interjection]

**The Chair:** What is that?

**Mr. Eggen:** That's gotta be Jason Luan.

**The Chair:** Mr. Luan.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. Okay. Good. That's fine. I think that's the end of my question there.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on the public meetings and schedules and locations? Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just on a clarification, looking at some of these locations and just wondering, you know, three days, four days, the week of June 16, Edmonton, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, then the week of June 23, the four days, Calgary, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Red Deer: just from a scheduling perspective has anyone looked at the logistics for flying to these places, and is the timetabling . . .

**The Chair:** Yes. That's coming up.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Oh, I see. It's coming up. Thank you.

10:20

**The Chair:** We have a very able staff here, you know? Okay. Any other questions?

Great. We'll move to the next item, the deadline for written submissions. Is the committee in agreement with the proposal to invite written submissions with the suggested closing date of Friday, August 1? I'll open the floor for discussion on this.

**Mr. Eggen:** I guess I would need some clarification why we would pick August 1. I'd prefer to move it down a bit because all of this is quite rushed, quite frankly, so I think this is a place where we can allow some more space for people to make submissions.

**The Chair:** Move it down to when?

**Mr. Eggen:** I don't know. September 1, something like that.

**Ms Dean:** We're anticipating a lot of response to this. Admittedly, we might not need four weeks, but we probably need one to two weeks to amalgamate the responses as per our usual practice. It's just in keeping with what we've done. I mean, if you want to move it to August 15 . . .

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. Split the difference.

**Ms Dean:** Yeah.

**The Chair:** Compromise, compromise.

**Mr. Eggen:** Do people tend to just hand it in at the last day, whatever the deadline is? Is that kind of the trend as well? It's not like you have anything to work with before then, and then it all comes at once.

**Ms Dean:** It does tend to come in in the last few days, yeah.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. I mean, I understand that. So maybe if you don't mind splitting the difference, if that doesn't put . . .

**Mr. Rogers:** But we won't accept any late submissions.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah, but August 15 instead of August 1 – I don't know. It's just an idea, right?

**The Chair:** Mr. Rogers.

**Mr. Rogers:** Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. I think, obviously, we have to be sensitive to the ability of the staff to massage and work through and dissect something out of these presentations to put before us, so if they're comfortable that they can work with an August 15 deadline, I'd be okay with that. But I think we're going to have to be firm because quite often we get something, you know, a couple of days late. "Gosh, you know, something happened," what have you. "I was out of town. I couldn't."

**The Chair:** And it has been.

**Mr. Rogers:** Yeah. I think if we do that, we'll have to be firm because these folks need the time to sift through this stuff so they can put something that we can work with here.

Those would be my thoughts. Thank you.

**Dr. Massolin:** I just want to say that a two-week time frame would be nice.

**The Chair:** Acceptable?

**Dr. Massolin:** Yes. You know, at this rate we'd have two and a half months for interested parties to make written submissions, and I think that's not too bad either given past practices.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rogers.

**Mr. Rogers:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may, to our communications folks: I don't think it would hurt if we put something in the releases or whatever we post that encourages people to submit as early as possible because quite often, as we've heard, people wait till the end, so they get a flood of them at the end. You know, something to the effect that

submissions will be accepted up to August 15

but proponents, or what have you, are encouraged to submit throughout or as early as possible. I think it would be just a reminder so that we don't get all the stuff dumped on these folks at the last minute.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any other discussion on Mr. Eggen's proposal? He did not put it as a motion. It's just a suggestion.

**Mr. Eggen:** I can move it if you like. I mean, if it's okay with the staff.

**The Chair:** Yeah, if it's okay with the staff to move to August 15 instead of August 1.

**Mr. Eggen:** Then I would like to move that. We can just make it as a friendly agreement. Sure.

**The Chair:** A friendly suggestion.

**Mr. Eggen:** A friendly suggestion, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Committee, all in favour? Great. So August 15 instead August 1.

Any other questions or suggestions or discussions? Great.

Well, at this point I'd like to advise that in keeping with our past practice, written submissions will be posted to the external committee website after the August 15 deadline. I'd also suggest that written materials received during stakeholder presentations be posted to the external committee website after the meeting at which they are received. Is the committee in agreement with this process? On the phone?

**Mr. Luan:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Agreed. Good.

**Mr. Luan:** Sorry; I took a phone call.

**The Chair:** Yeah. We heard that, Jason.

**Mr. Luan:** I thought I muted it, but apparently not.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Jason.

Okay. Next is the proposed list of expert and stakeholder panels. I'll ask Dr. Massolin to speak to this document. Go ahead, please.

**Dr. Massolin:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to turn the committee's attention the document entitled Proposed List of Expert and Stakeholder Panels, Bill 9 and Bill 10, For Discussion Purposes, which was posted to the committee's website yesterday afternoon. I'd just like to mention, to start off with, that this list was derived in consultation with representatives from Treasury Board and Finance, as was referenced in the letters on bills 9 and 10 from the minister that the committee should, if possible, consult with experts on these bills.

As I mentioned just a little while ago, the proposal here is that the committee would have two days in which to hear from, first of all, experts on pensions generally and then specifically on Bill 9 and Bill 10, and the second day would be from interested parties or stakeholders.

To flesh that out a bit, I would like to refer the committee to the second page of the document. There you can see, on day 1, the morning of, from 9 to 10:30 it's proposed that Alberta Treasury Board and Finance appear before the committee for an hour and a half to give their perspective on pensions in Alberta, and then for the second presentation that morning it's proposed that the Auditor General of Alberta make a presentation as well.

In the afternoon the committee would hear, first of all, from experts on Bill 9 from 1 till 3:30. You can see the listing of six experts. If you turn the page over to page 3, you'll see that there's a panel of Bill 9 expert alternates. The reason for this is that, first of all, there were more experts than could be accommodated in the time allocated, and second of all, as was the practice for the high-speed rail review, in case one of the experts that's on the initial part of that list cannot make it, the committee could go to an alternate. The past practice for that, as you recall, Mr. Chair, is just for the chair in consultation with either the deputy chair or the working group to work out the logistics of that.

If the committee would just continue on this and turn to page 5, you'll see day 1, afternoon continued. Here you have panel 3, and this is the Bill 10 experts, from 3:30 till 4:30. You've got four experts listed there as well as the alternates. So that's day 1.

Day 2 starts on the following page, halfway down on page 6, and you can see that the committee will now hear from stakeholders on Bill 9, first of all, from 8:30 till 10. These are grouped according to the municipalities or municipal organizations. The second panel, panel 5, if you flip to page 7: that's the representatives from the Alberta labour coalition on pensions, from 10 a.m. to 11:30.

In the afternoon of day 2 – that should be panel 6, not panel 5 – you have stakeholders on Bill 9 continued from 12:30 till 2. You can see those listed. If you flip over to page 8 – and that should be panel 7, not panel 6 – you have the stakeholders on Bill 10 from 2 till 4:30 p.m. on day 2 of your review.

So that's the list, in a nutshell, and some of the parameters there, Mr. Chair. I'm happy to answer questions if I can.

**10:30**

**The Chair:** Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you very much. I appreciate that this is a working draft, but it does not indicate by the time allocations the change-out of presenters. For example, when you go from panel 1 on page 2 to the 10:30 time slot for the Auditor General of Alberta, changing out presenters takes time. Plus, this committee may need a coffee break – there is no consideration for that in here – which takes away time from the actual presentation. I don't think we really mean 12 noon when you consider what I've just mentioned. I think you're meaning maybe 12:15, possibly 12:30 – I don't know – because it takes time to change presenters, to get settled and ready to go.

**The Chair:** A good point, and the committee clerk will work on it.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Okay. The other thing is that I recognize that we have alternates, alternate experts. In the absence of perhaps one of the experts – I'm just looking at, as an example, page 2 – if one of the Bill 9 experts cannot make it, what is our ability or flexibility to extend the time for experts on any of the bills if we believe as a committee that it's important to hear from them and they're

available to present to the committee? I appreciate that we have two days allocated for experts, but maybe we need a half day more. I'm not sure. We need to have some flexibility and a provision for that.

**The Chair:** That's when September comes in handy.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Yes, the September window. Or, Mr. Chair, it might be of really great value – these experts are going to provide a lot of information for us as the committee – and maybe it's an advantage for the standing committee to hear that first before waiting all the way to September. I'm just offering an observation.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any thoughts on this?

**Dr. Massolin:** Well, all I would have to say, Mr. Chair, is that, of course, the committee can add time to this proposed plan and additional experts and stakeholders as they wish.

**The Chair:** And a day or so of meetings. If the committee sees fit that we need to accommodate more presenters, I think we can make that decision.

Mr. Eggen.

**Mr. Eggen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair and Dr. Massolin and your staff, for building this tentative schedule and for MLA Sarich's comments, too, about just how packed the whole thing is.

I guess that in my comments I first would like to go back to sort of the principles of why we are here and what we're trying to accomplish. As our legal counsel has mentioned, this doesn't happen very often, where a bill comes from second reading to an outside, all-party committee. I guess my first guiding principle is that we want to make sure that we do this right and to make sure that we are consulting from perhaps a more divergent pool of experts on pension matters.

I was quite concerned that we drew most of these experts – and I'm sure that it's a very eminent list of people that we have coming to speak to us – from the Ministry of Finance and Treasury Board suggestions. I'm very concerned that we not head down exactly the same path that led us to Bill 9 and Bill 10 kind of being suspended, like they were in this past spring session, and to the subsequent concern by the public on what was happening with pensions. I want to be constructive about this, but I think it's very important for us to break out our list of experts so that we bring in some different people to talk about Bill 9 and Bill 10.

I've prepared a couple of lists, that Karen has there, just to pass out to people. I know that you've built a list of people and then some backups, essentially, on your thing. I would suggest that some of the people that I have here – there are two sheets of paper. One of them is a list of pension experts from across the country that I think have some interesting perspectives on this issue. Then the other one is my specific concern about Bill 10. The non-unionized defined benefit plan holders or unionized defined benefit plan holders: I think it's in our best interests to ensure that we include some representation from this group as well.

I've had some discussions this past weekend with pension experts on both of these bills, and some of them are even on this list, I notice, which is great. It just brought to my attention what a wider universe of issues we're bringing up. The list I have: on one hand, there are pension experts and then both Unifor and UFCW and so forth. I think it would be useful to help enrich our discussion on this important consultation and make sure we get it right so that we don't head down that same path and run into a similar impasse that we did here this past spring.

**The Chair:** Mr. Eggen, are you submitting these names? Are you asking the committee to accept them all to make presentations or just to pick and choose? You know, you're talking about another two extra days at least.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. My suggestion, you know, for the purpose of practicality, is that we might explore some of these ones to fold into our expert days that we're doing, the panel days, and then, like I say, we have that fall meeting option as well. We could perhaps employ a day in September that could help us to finish the job.

No, this is not a list that I'm standing by in its entirety but, rather, to be folded into the good work that the staff has already done on identifying experts. Remember that we haven't booked these people yet, right? Am I correct on that? This is just a list of people that we could approach. Then we can mix in some of these other ones. I mean, it's not just my list. I worked hard on this to canvass people from across the province.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thanks.

**Ms Dean:** I do know that some of the organizations identified here are on the list; for example, AUPE, AFL.

**Mr. Eggen:** That's for Bill 10, I think, though.

**Ms Dean:** Oh, you want to add them?

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. For Bill 10.

Could I get a copy? I think I failed to keep a copy for myself.

**The Chair:** Of your list?

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. Sorry. I gave them all to you.

I think those guys were on the second sheet of paper, and that would be in regard to Bill 10, Shannon. Thank you.

Considering how we are doing this all in a very compressed time frame, some people from all of our lists won't be available – right? – so if we kind of fold it in and do our best. I just don't want to consult the same people and then, you know, be perceived as just going through the same process.

**The Chair:** The next item for discussion, Mr. Eggen, suggests that if you want to make any additions to the list, please submit them to the chair or the committee clerk. Now we've got them, and I'm wondering if you can take a look and see if there are any names on our list that you can take off your list and maybe downsize your list a little bit.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yes. I'm pretty sure I did that already.

**The Chair:** You know, this might require two extra days of meetings if we're going to accommodate every single individual on this list.

**Mr. Eggen:** You know, I would suggest that not all of them would come. Neither would all of the ones come that Dr. Massolin's list has as well. The redundancies, Mr. Chair, are not actually redundant because they are people that I would think are important to talk to about Bill 10, right? The AUPE, for example, and the AFL are on the Bill 9 consulting panel, as presently stated, and I would suggest that they should go for Bill 10.

10:40

I mean, I'm trying to do this in the most constructive way possible. Not only do we need to be properly informed about the spectrum of opinion out there on pensions, but we need to be

perceived as taking in that information, too, right? There's a lot riding on this process that we're going through here right now.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Fox.

**Mr. Fox:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Eggen. There were a few names we had in common on our lists, too, because we're going to submit additional names to be reached out to as well. In addition to what Mr. Eggen put forth, we also have Tim Jones, chief executive officer at National Employment Savings Trust; Rob Reynolds, president and chief executive officer, Putnam Investments and Great-West Lifeco Inc.; Henri-Paul Rousseau, vice-chairman of Power Corporation of Canada; Leo de Bever, CEO of AIMCo – I imagine that since they're doing a lot of management of Alberta's money, it would probably be incumbent to bring them in front of the committee to present as well – Murray Taylor, president and chief executive officer of Investors Group; Richard Williams, president of World Financial Group Insurance Agency of Canada and Transamerica Securities Inc.

There are also three names that we'd like to see upgraded to expert from alternate because they've had to deal with this recently: Murray Gold; Bernard Morency, executive vice-president, depositors, strategy and chief operations officer for Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec – my French isn't the greatest – Angela Mazerolle, superintendent of pensions for the province of New Brunswick, this one specifically because they just went through this process in the last year.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rowe.

**Mr. Rowe:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Fox, for doing that. I was going to do exactly that. There's a lot of crossover between the two sets of lists here. It seems to me, as MLA Sarich had pointed out, that those two days are jammed full. I'm questioning why we're limiting ourselves to just two days of this process. This is an extremely important endeavour we're embarking on here, and it affects virtually every Albertan, not just public-sector workers, and so on, but every Albertan, because Albertans are going to be on the hook if we end up with an unfunded liability again. So we need to really do our due diligence here, and if it takes three days or even four days, let's do that and get it right the first time.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm wondering if these additional names to be added to the list of experts and some of the alternates to be upgraded and the proposals could be consolidated through the working group so it's just a little bit easier to comprehend.

**The Chair:** That's coming next.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Okay. Then the other suggestion I would have. I'm wondering, with the members that have put forward these extra names – I am looking at the working document that we have in front of us – if any advice pieces for consideration have alternates, any of these proposals. It would be helpful for the committee to understand that.

The chair has asked for that consideration so that we can comprehensively look at: do we need to actually add another day, or is it another two days? Is it at the front end, or does it happen in September? I believe that these experts and the stakeholders that

would come forward to our standing committee would set the stage before you go out to the public, so my preference would be to do that level of work at the very beginning. Then after we have gone to the seven places across Alberta to hear from Albertans and others that may come forward in those active sessions, if we choose to add another day, at least we've had a very good look right at the beginning and throughout the process.

I'm hoping that these suggestions work into the plan somehow, and if they don't, then I'm also sensitive to that. This is a very rigorous plan, and I'm hearing very clearly that we need the time. Albertans need the time.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. You know, that's very . . .

**The Chair:** On this point?

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. It's on this point. You can trust me. We've been together a long time.

This should be all premised on, I think, a very firm notion that we all want to make this work, right? We want it to be seen to be transparent and functioning in the best possible way. I mean, we just got this last night, at 4 o'clock or whatever. A lot of people put a lot of effort into trying to buttress it and make sure that we are not moving forward without an exhaustive list of names that, I mean, have a tendency of naturally sorting themselves out in terms of availability and so forth anyway. You know, it's not like we're going to have everybody. We can all just bite the bullet and get all the experts that we can.

I'd like that Murray Gold be upgraded to an expert. That's a great idea, by the way.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Eggen.  
Mr. Rogers.

**Mr. Rogers:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly want to thank the members that went to the extra effort to bring some more names forward. I, too, would agree that this is a very important topic that's been put in front of us, a task, so to speak. It behooves us to give it as much effort and to try to get the best advice to put into some kind of a report back to the House, ultimately.

The reality, though, is that we have a very large, exhaustive group here, and we have a summer where – granted, some of these people may not be available – we as individuals have other commitments that we've already been committed to. For example, in the times that we've suggested for some of these travelling meetings, I've got a wedding. My daughter is getting married. I am not missing that for anything. I also have another major event that I'm hosting. I suspect others around the table will have some of the same challenges.

I guess I'm just struggling with how much we're going to be able to really cover and get the job done in the time because, obviously, we're not going to get everybody out to all of these presentations. I know we're going to try our best. Hopefully, I guess, if we get a reasonable representation at as many of these as we can, then we can somehow get back on the same page when this is done. I'm just a little concerned, frankly. I've been involved with some of these before, but this is huge, so I'm just a little concerned about our abilities as a group to give justice to this.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Rogers, but we all know that this committee is our priority.

**Mr. Rogers:** Sure. I'll tell my daughter that.

**The Chair:** However, I think we were planning for this. That's why we want any members who have any suggestions for additions to the list to please submit them to the chair or the committee clerk no later than this Friday, May 23. You're two days in advance. You're ahead of yourself and ahead of the committee.

Anyway, we have a motion to that effect. The motion would read that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the proposed list of expert and stakeholder panels, Bill 9 and Bill 10, as distributed and that the chair and the working group be authorized to finalize the schedule of panel presentations in conjunction with committee staff or as revised.

**Mr. Eggen:** As revised.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** With the submissions, too.

**The Chair:** Yeah. As revised. Any discussion?

**Ms Kubinec:** I'll make the motion. Do you need a mover?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms Kubinec:** I'll move that.

**The Chair:** Ms Kubinec moved that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the proposed list of expert and stakeholder panels, Bill 9 and Bill 10, as revised and that the chair and the working group be authorized to finalize the schedule of panel presentations in conjunction with committee staff.

Yes?

**10:50**

**Mr. Eggen:** I just want to make sure. So that includes the lists that Mr. Fox and I put in?

**The Chair:** Yes. We'll add that. That includes the lists received.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

**The Chair:** Okay. Read it again, Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** You can go ahead and read it again, and then I'll ask my question.

**The Chair:** It's moved by Ms Kubinec that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the proposed list of expert and stakeholder panels, Bill 9 and Bill 10, as revised and that the chair and the working group be authorized to finalize the schedule of panel presentations in conjunction with committee staff and to include the lists received today.

Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Yes. Thank you. I think the piece that I need clarified – and I appreciate that the working group is going to take a look at this. But I'd like to hear from the standing committee members. Is there a preference that these presenters, from the lists that are being consolidated here, would be scheduled in the front end with the flexibility to add at the end? So if we have to expand what's proposed on the timeline document, that instead of two days it could be a third given the extra lists that were provided today, would it be scheduled that week of June 2? Would it be two days instead of three days? Is there a preference to have it at the front end, or does it matter that it is at the back end? I'd like to hear from committee members because that would help provide some, I believe, extra direction for the working group. I'm hearing

scheduling issues possibly with some committee members. We need to know. Is that at the beginning, or are these additions going to be at the end?

**The Chair:** Any thoughts on that, Mr. Fox?

**Mr. Fox:** I think it's where the committee can fit the time in to see these additional experts. I think it's just incumbent to hear as many experts as we can. If we can't schedule all at one point, then either we add it in the end or tack on extra days somewhere else.

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, I'm part of the working group, too, and I sort of envisioned that we would mix in all of these new lists. They all mix in equally with the ones that we got from you guys, right? It's not like an A list or a B list. Then we offer the two days in June and the other day in September to see wherever people can fit in their schedules.

**The Chair:** Now that we will be having more presenters based on the two lists that we have just received, then we have to probably go the week of June, maybe two to four days.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Okay. That's very helpful, Mr. Chair, and I thank you for the input from some of the working group members.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Again, the weeks of September 1 to 15 we can do some additional presentations if needed.

Great. Are we okay on that? All in favour? Opposed? On the phone? Carried. Okay.

Now we will move to the draft communication plan for discussion purposes. Ms Sales and Ms Dotimas from the Legislative Assembly Office communications branch will be assisting the committee as required throughout this review.

Ms Sales, I understand that you will be addressing the proposed communication plan and draft advertisements. Please go ahead. The floor is yours.

**Ms Sales:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, as was mentioned earlier, you all received a link to the plan late yesterday. I'll just walk you through the salient points of the plan.

This plan was produced along a similar vein as was followed for the high-speed rail review. In keeping with this process, of course, we have made the assumption that stakeholder groups and identified experts would be part of a direct communications strategy. As was discussed previously, you've invited them to present to the committee. It is recommended that key messaging for the review focus primarily on process and how the public groups can actually participate in the process with the committee. The general advertising strategy recommended speaks to both a call for written submissions as well as holding the public meetings.

The plan will focus primarily on a media mix that includes newspaper advertisements, social media communications, and media relations. As the topic in question is receiving substantial media attention and coverage, we recommend that the committee make the most of the cost savings and explore all media relations options. To achieve maximum economy, it's recommended that a single ad be drafted to communicate both the public meetings schedule as well as the call for written submissions. This ad would run in both Alberta's weekly papers and major daily papers.

The municipalities that are recommended to hold the public meetings are Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Fort McMurray, and Grande Prairie. We feel these locations will provide ample province-wide scope and allow for at

least one meeting to be within an acceptable distance for most people should they need to travel. Of course, those unable to attend a public meeting do have the option of participating through written submission.

Another point that I'd like to make to the committee is that committees is co-ordinating the live streaming of audio for each public meeting on Assembly Online. It just provides another way for all Albertans to participate in the meeting, and they can listen in on absolutely every committee meeting.

The estimated costs of the advertising campaign would come in just under \$45,000. The cost is based on the campaign as I have presented it, with a single run in each of Alberta's 100 weeklies and nine major dailies. With the plan as presented, should the committee wish to add additional meeting locations, this would not actually substantially increase the advertising costs. That being said, should the committee wish to supplement with another ad run, the costs would increase significantly; for example, should the committee choose to send out a reminder advertisement closer to the August 15 deadline to let the public know about the written submission deadline.

As mentioned earlier, we will be leveraging all social media avenues at our disposal, which include the Legislative Assembly Facebook and Twitter. As well, we will be exploring all available media relations opportunities to garner further coverage while keeping advertising costs as low as possible. We will of course be posting information to the committee website. As with previous reviews, the chair will be the spokesperson for the committee and make all official commentary.

On the last page of the plan you will notice the draft ad. As mentioned, this is just a sample size. All estimated costing is based on this size, but of course size does differ depending on the publication. You'll notice that, again, the ad refers to the call for submissions as well as lists all locations so that the public can actually make their decision on which meeting would be within the closest distance to themselves. We've also set the deadline to allow ample time for the presenters to prepare their materials. The ads will start running the week of May 26, so next week, and should wrap up the week of June 2, which would provide most people with about two weeks' notice so that they could put their presentations together.

I think that's about all I have to add, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Good. Thank you.

Any questions?

**Ms Kubinec:** As far as sending a reminder and spending the extra dollars, I would not support that except in social media.

**Ms Sales:** Which we will, definitely.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Good point.

Any other questions? On the phones? Bridget.

**Ms Pastoor:** Yeah. I know that it costs extra, but putting reminders in the newspaper, or probably over social media, putting reminders in that this is coming up – I mean, how many of us look at something and go, "Damn, I need to do that," and then the next thing you know, it's on top of you, and you've forgotten it, you wrote it down, those sort of things? I think reminders are really important.

**11:00**

**The Chair:** Can you address that? How much are the reminders going to cost us?

**Ms Sales:** Well, one thing to take into consideration, of course, is that a reminder advertisement in all of the weeklies and dailies would not be the same cost as what we're talking about for the original ad simply because there would be less content, so we, of course, could run quite a bit smaller ad. It may be, let's say, half the cost of the \$45,000, so we might be looking at another \$20,000.

**The Chair:** Half the cost probably would amount to about \$20,000 or so.

**Ms Sales:** Yes. That's possible. That would be on a high end.

**The Chair:** That's not a small amount of money.

**Ms Sales:** No. We can ensure throughout the process that we do keep up with social media posts as well as media relations. We can also send out reminder news releases as well.

**Ms Pastoor:** It's Bridget again.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Ms Pastoor:** Okay. Thanks. One other thing: I don't know how many people actually have automatic columns. I do. I get one a month. I wondered if the media people would maybe write up a couple of paragraphs that would be really good in a column. I could at least get it through that way, and in my August column I could also put in a reminder. Or July, actually. I've still got two columns: June, July, and August.

**Ms Sales:** You're talking about a feature article.

**Mr. Rogers:** In a local paper, a rural.

**Ms Pastoor:** Yeah. In my local paper. I have a column once a month in my local paper. If I could get a couple of, maybe, paragraphs and then a reminder paragraph, I can just put it in my column.

**The Chair:** I'm sure you can do that.

**Ms Pastoor:** I'm asking them to sort of write it up. I'll Bridgetize it, but if you guys give me the basics . . .

**The Chair:** Yeah. We will direct the committee staff to help you do that. Putting in a reminder, Bridget, is going to cost \$20,000, and I don't think we should spend that \$20,000 on a reminder.

**Ms Pastoor:** Okay. Well, then maybe we can work it through people's columns. Greg also has a column once a month.

**The Chair:** Yes. If you have those columns available to you, use them. We will provide you with the material.

**Ms Pastoor:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also would like to suggest, you know, being very mindful of the budget, that we would try to be fiscally prudent. Why wouldn't communications look for the opportunities for that type of free coverage in writing columns like in local papers in communities? I'm not talking about big metro centres. Even in the interview of the chair on what's coming up they should be actively looking for those as a public relations part of the communications plan for this committee's work. I don't see

that, unless my eyes have missed that, in their communications plan. I'm wondering if they could speak to that.

**The Chair:** Ms Sales, can you address that?

**Ms Sales:** Absolutely, Mr. Chair. I can speak to that. We would generally consider that to be part of the media relations aspect. When you do send out a news release, there's the opportunity for radio media to pick it up as well as newspaper media to pick it up and write their own article. We can also submit requests for feature articles to run.

**Mrs. Sarich:** If I'm hearing you and understanding you correctly, you don't see a media relations role for yourself as communications people, or am I missing something here?

**Ms Sales:** No. Actually, what I was saying is that if you look at page 3 of the plan, we do discuss media relations. I'm saying that attempting to garner coverage through avenues such as newspaper coverage, the writing of feature articles, and that sort of thing would fall under media relations, which is a component that we have included in the plan. Absolutely, we will explore those avenues.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Okay. Just help me with this piece, just to clarify. Again, you could do the outreach. You could be contacting these outlets across Alberta to look for those opportunities that would give an opportunity for an interview for the chair to talk about the happenings of the committee and also for some free opportunities for that coverage in terms of a column.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Sarich?

**Mrs. Sarich:** Yes?

**The Chair:** I think it's going to be very difficult for the staff to get in touch with 300 municipalities and ask them to have an article in their weekly or biweekly newspapers or magazines. However, we as MLAs, in each of our constituencies, have five or six communities. This is a very, very important issue for a lot of people in our province. I'm sure you have good contacts with your community associations. I have good contacts with my community associations. We can ask them to do that as a public service, and the staff will provide us with a write-up. I know some of those would like to get paid for it, but we will talk them into giving it pro bono, using legal terms, lawyers' terms.

**Ms Pastoor:** Mr. Chair, it's Bridget again. Sorry.

**The Chair:** Say it again.

**Ms Pastoor:** I just was interrupting, so I said sorry. So it's my turn?

**The Chair:** Let me hear from Ms Dean first.

**Ms Dean:** I just know that there's a section in the communications plan that talks about leveraging free communications strategies, and I think some of the items that Mrs. Sarich touched upon are referenced under the heading Media Relations.

**Ms Sales:** Just to clarify your point as well, Mr. Chair, when we do send out our media releases, they do go to all Alberta media, and that would make sure that even the smaller publications in the rural towns would be hit.

**The Chair:** I'm talking, actually, smaller still. Within the community associations we have, like, monthly newsletters, and I'm sure we can twist their arms to put in an article, half a page, advertising what we're doing. Really, it affects a lot of people, and I think they would look at it as a public service announcement.

**Ms Sales:** Right. Okay. Well, in that case, Mr. Chair, we could do a general article that members could use on their own if you like.

**The Chair:** Absolutely. Okay. You know, title it For a Community Newspaper, and send it to all of us, and we will send it to them.

**Ms Sales:** Okay. Absolutely.

**The Chair:** Great.

Any other questions? Ms Pastoor. Sorry.

**Ms Pastoor:** Yeah. That's fine. I'm just suggesting that both AAMD and C and AUMA, those kinds of groups, send out little newsletters. God forbid, Alberta Health Services: every time you turn around, you're tripping over some piece of whatever. So there are a number of those kinds that can be, I think, approached, this being a public service, especially Alberta Health Services, where a lot of their people are interested in pensions.

**Ms Sales:** I can speak to that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Sure.

**Ms Sales:** An avenue that we've actually explored previously, if our target is the public service specifically, is the GoA Connector. We could in fact submit the same information, as you were speaking to, for the articles to the GoA Connector and ask them to run that.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms Sales:** That would ensure that it hits the whole base, not just specific departments.

**The Chair:** Is that okay with you, Ms Pastoor?

**Ms Pastoor:** Yes. That would be fine. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Good. Thanks.

Any other questions? Any other discussions?

I need a motion now. Mr. Quadri.

**Mr. Quadri:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Quadri moved that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the draft communications plans and advertisements for Bill 9 and Bill 10 as revised.

All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Okay. We have now discussed all of the elements within the draft proposed timeline document, and I would like to call for a motion to approve the timeline as revised.

**Mr. Rogers:** I'll move that.

11:10

**The Chair:** Mr. Rogers moved that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the draft proposed timeline document respecting Bill 9 and Bill 10 as revised.

All in favour? Any objections? Carried.

We're moving right along. Now, item 4 on the agenda, other business. Is there any other business for discussion under this item? On the phone? None?

Good. Item 5 is the date of the next meeting. Members will be advised once our future meeting dates are confirmed for the weeks set out in our approved timeline documents. Questions? Mr. Stier.

**Mr. Stier:** Yeah. Thank you. With respect to the timeline that was just passed, I'm just wondering: what will be the process for this committee's responses to possible date confirmations and so on as outlined by Mr. Rogers, I believe it was? Suddenly here, with this new information we've received in the past 24 hours, there's an awful lot of potential for conflict. Essentially, possibly three weeks of the month of June are going to be blown right out of the water. I'm just wondering: how will that work? If someone could address that, I'd appreciate it.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** It being known that I'd like to make the life of the committee clerk not that easy, I'd ask her to respond to your question.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Mr. Chair, thank you. I think in all instances what we do once we have a number of dates directed to the staff either through the working group or through the chair and the deputy chair is that we poll members. With all meetings of these committees we go with quorum, with the majority of attendees available. I think in this case it's virtually impossible to get dates where all members are available for all meeting dates. We just try to work within the parameters that we have.

**The Chair:** Again, you have to take into consideration that we're out of session; everybody is in his or her own constituency. There are a lot of events that you have to attend and things like that. I don't expect, as Maureen asked earlier, all 15 members to be attending every public meeting around the province.

**Mr. Fox:** Will it be possible to call in to those public meetings?

**The Chair:** Not on the road. Unless we're up in Edmonton, I don't think you can call in because the venues would not have the capability to accommodate that.

Good. Any other questions? Suggestions? Mrs. Sarich.

**Mrs. Sarich:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Just addressing a question, in this modern time that we have with technology, I can appreciate that, like, for the larger centres, Edmonton and Calgary – Fort McMurray is a city. Red Deer is a city. Are you suggesting that there isn't the technology available for a member of the standing committee to call in to one of these sessions even to hear the presentations? I'm just wondering: what are the implications? I think we need to understand this piece because we have lots of technology in this modern age.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms Dean:** When we're looking at venues, we can certainly see if that option is available. What I can advise is that web streaming, audio web streaming, is being planned for all of these public meetings to ensure that the public and members who aren't in attendance can listen live. That's one thing that we are planning on doing. The committee clerk will do her best to find venues that can accommodate other options, but there are limitations. I mean, basically, we have to get a dedicated phone line to do the audio.

**Mrs. Sarich:** I appreciate that because if somebody listening in to today's proceedings wasn't aware of those implications – I really appreciate that information to promote a higher level of understanding, you know, as we move the committee around the province.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Pat, and then, Bridget, you're next.

**Mr. Stier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarity, I'm wondering what the alternatives are for a member who cannot find a substitute when there's an absolute conflict that can't be resolved. Is there a maximum number of days that a person is allowed to be absent on these sorts of things when they occur? Certainly, there must be some policy or something.

**The Chair:** He'll be fined 500 bucks. [laughter]

**Mr. Stier:** I suppose it's in the standing orders or something. Nonetheless, I'm just curious because there are certainly an awful lot of days here that are probably going to be threatened by conflicts.

**The Chair:** I am sure that any member who is not able to attend would have a very legitimate reason not to attend, and it's not going to be a huge deal. As long as we have quorum – and I'm sure we will have more than the required numbers – we will be okay.

**Mr. Stier:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms Pastoor.

**Ms Pastoor:** Yeah. You know, I'm having a bit of a problem with this conversation, about how we communicate in this age of technology, as MLA Sarich has pointed out. I can remember that years ago this province spent a bundle of money trying to set up teleconferences in libraries and in colleges, and I know that our public school has one. It's on a big screen. You get a whole bunch of people, you sit in a room, and you just watch it. I don't understand why that technology is not being used. You could have one in Lethbridge, and I probably could have 20 people sitting in at that meeting. It's not being used, and I know it cost a fortune to set it up.

**The Chair:** Well, Ms Pastoor, I understand what you're saying, but these are public meetings. We tried during the HSR public hearings. We could not have them at the venues that we had chosen because of the timing, because of the number of people, because of the size of the place. I don't think they're going to be readily available or easily available to us. That's the only reason we're not having a phone-in. If we could have it, we would, but I don't think we're able to have it.

**Ms Pastoor:** Well, what about the actual presentations to the committee? Are they not public?

**The Chair:** What do you mean by the actual presentations to the committee?

**Ms Pastoor:** Well, when we're going to go for two solid days listening to experts, is that not public?

**The Chair:** Yeah.

**Ms Pastoor:** So why aren't they on teleconference, where I'd have 20 people sitting in on them in Lethbridge?

**The Chair:** They're audiostreamed live. The only thing that we're saying is that we cannot have people phoning in, participating by phone. That's what we're saying.

**Ms Pastoor:** Okay. When you say that it's audiostreamed live, is that on a computer? I don't understand the technology. Is that on a computer, or can you actually put it up in a big room?

**The Chair:** Okay. I will ask Karen, the committee clerk, to explain that.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms Pastoor, actually, right now people are online listening to the proceedings of this meeting. The meetings are audiostreamed live when we are in committee as we have *Hansard* recording. The proceedings are live. They can always listen in. I think what you may have been referring to is the participation of the public during the panel presentations, and that's not something that the committee was entertaining. The panel presentations are for the benefit of the committee to get the technical information and background that they need to undertake this review, I think. But they can listen in. It's always available online.

11:20

**Ms Pastoor:** Okay. But they can't actually watch.

**Mrs. Sawchuk:** No.

**The Chair:** Are you okay with that?

**Ms Pastoor:** Well, yeah, I sort of am. I mean, I understand it all, but we've got this technology out here, and I don't think we ever use it. You know, you get in a room, and it's like a theatre. Everything is on; it's interactive. It's free. Anyway, that's okay.

**The Chair:** They can listen, but they can't phone in.

**Ms Pastoor:** They don't want to phone in. They just want to sit and listen to what we hear. But that's okay.

**The Chair:** Well, great. This was the last item on our agenda for today.

If there's no other discussion or questions, I would call for a motion to adjourn. Okay. Mr. Rowe. Great. Thank you, all, very much.

[The committee adjourned at 11:21 a.m.]





