



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Personal Information Protection Act Review

Friday, December 18, 2015
1 p.m.

Transcript No. 29-1-9

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature
First Session**

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Miranda, Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (ND), Chair
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (ND)
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (ND)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W)*
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (ND)
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (ND)**
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (W)***
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)

* substitution for David Schneider

** substitution for Jonathon Carson

*** substitution for Wes Taylor

Also in Attendance

Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (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
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Giovana Bianchi	Committee Clerk
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	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>

1 p.m.

Friday, December 18, 2015

[Miranda in the chair]

The Chair: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Thank you, everyone, for being here and those of you joining us by phone. Welcome to members, staff, and guests in attendance at this meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. My name is Ricardo Miranda. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Cross and the chair of the committee.

I would now ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then we will hear from those on the phone. Thank you. We'll start from here.

Mr. Schmidt: Marlin Schmidt, MLA for Edmonton-Gold Bar, substituting for Jonathon Carson, MLA for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, Edmonton-McClung.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Maria Fitzpatrick, Lethbridge-East.

Mr. Connolly: Michael Connolly, Calgary-Hawkwood.

Mr. Piquette: Colin Piquette, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

Dr. Starke: Richard Starke, MLA, Vermilion-Lloydminster, substituting for Ms Jansen.

Ms Dotimas: Jeanette Dotimas, communications for LAO.

Dr. Amato: Sarah Amato, research officer.

Dr. Massolin: Good afternoon. Philip Massolin, manager of research services.

Ms Rempel: Jody Rempel, committee clerk.

The Chair: Those of you on the phone, if you could please identify yourselves.

Mr. Gotfried: Richard Gotfried, Calgary-Fish Creek.

Mr. Coolahan: Craig Coolahan.

Mr. Smith: Mark Smith, Drayton Valley-Devon, substituting for Wes Taylor.

Mr. Nixon: Jason Nixon, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre, substituting for Mr. Schneider.

Mrs. Schreiner: MLA Kim Schreiner, Red Deer-North.

Mr. S. Anderson: Shaye Anderson, Leduc-Beaumont.

Mr. Hanson: David Hanson, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

Mr. Hunter: Grant Hunter, Cardston-Taber-Warner.

The Chair: I believe that's everyone. Thank you for joining. I want to confirm for the record that Mr. Smith is an official substitute for Mr. Taylor, Mr. Nixon is substituting for Mr. Schneider, and Mr. Schmidt is substituting for Mr. Carson.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand today. The microphone consoles are operated by the *Hansard* staff, so there is no need to touch them. Please keep your cellphones, iPhones, and BlackBerrys off the table as they may interfere with the audiofeed. 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.

Before we proceed further, I'm going to address the point of order that was raised at the end of our last meeting. I'm going to rule that there was no point of order because posting on Twitter and other uses of social media during committee meetings is not prohibited by our rules. With this in mind, however, I hope that the discussions occurring in this room are in everyone's first priority and that we will focus our energy on the issues at hand. I would also like to caution members that if you do choose to use social media during our meetings, you are responsible to the committee for what you post. We should all be mindful of our responsibility to each other for setting the tone for our work as a committee. I believe that this committee has the opportunity to do a lot of good work for Albertans, and in order to accomplish this, it is important that we listen and treat each other with the utmost respect. Albertans expect nothing less.

Keeping this in mind, I would like to move to consideration of the draft agenda for today's meeting. Are there any changes or additions that members would like to suggest to the agenda that was circulated?

Mr. Gotfried: As per my prior e-mail, under other business I would like the opportunity for a couple of minutes to just make a comment and a brief statement with respect to the working group decision.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you.
Anybody else?

Mr. Hunter: Can I just say something, please?

The Chair: Under this exact same issue or something else that you want to add to the agenda?

Mr. Hunter: No, not to add to the agenda. It's just that I can't actually hear very well on this. I'm wondering whether or not the volume can be turned up so we can hear what you guys say.

The Chair: I believe that it's turned up as loud as it can be. I'm sorry.

Mr. Hunter: Okay. That's actually better.

The Chair: Excellent.

All right. I do have a motion that the agenda for the December 18, 2015, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be revised to include discussion of a committee working group under other business and that the motion be approved as revised. Do we have a mover? Mr. Gotfried. Thank you. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed? Okay. The motion is carried.

Next are the minutes from our October 15, 2015, meeting as circulated. Are there any errors or omissions to be noted? On the phone, anybody? Okay. If not, would a member move adoption of the minutes, please. Mr. Connolly. Thank you. Those in favour of the motion that the minutes of the October 15, 2015, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated, please say aye. Any opposed? Motion carried. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is the review of the Personal Information Protection Act and research services work. As you know, at the October 15, 2015, committee meeting a discussion guide for PIPA was presented for the committee's consideration, and it was determined that committee members wished to provide input and suggest changes to the document before making it available to the

public. An updated document was circulated to the committee last week with the requested edits made in red. Dr. Massolin, could you give us a brief update on the status of this document, please.

Dr. Massolin: Certainly, I'd be pleased to. Thank you, Chair. The document is entitled Revised Draft Discussion Guide: The Personal Information Protection Act, and it was posted, as you mentioned, last week. Basically, this document has been revised according to the motion that was passed at the October 15 meeting and according to the feedback we received from the ND caucus. The document itself indicates in red – hopefully, you have the coloured version, but otherwise you can see that it's different text if you printed just in black and white. That revised text is indicated in red throughout the document. There you have it.

The Chair: Thank you.

I would like to go to the people on the phone first, so I can get you on the record if you'd like to get on the speakers list to ask any questions or make any statements on this.

Hearing none, does anybody here have any questions? No. Okay. Well, we do have a motion to move that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future approve the release of the discussion guide as distributed for the December 18, 2015, meeting for the Personal Information Protection Act.

Do I have a mover? Mr. Dach. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

The next item on the agenda is a review of the revised draft stakeholder list, which, again, at our October 15, 2015, meeting the committee reviewed these stakeholder lists and indicated that committee members wished to have further opportunity to provide input on the list. An updated list is attached, which is reflective of this input. Again I turn to you, Doctor, to give us an overview, please.

Dr. Massolin: Very similar to the discussion guide: the stakeholders list. The committee decided to defer a decision on the approval of that list pending further additions, revisions. Those revisions were submitted, and we've incorporated those additions to the document. You can see starting on page 73 there's a table of contents starting in part II: Additions – Received from ND Caucus on November 6, 2015, and anything from that point on in the document represents the additions.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'll turn first to the people on the phone. Would anyone like to get on the speakers list?

Mr. Gotfried: Yes, please.

The Chair: Thank you.

Anybody else?

Okay. Those here who would like to get on the speakers list before we start. No.

Okay. Mr. Gotfried, please go ahead with your question.

Mr. Gotfried: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess the only question I had with regard to this was . . . [inaudible]

The Chair: Sir, you're cutting out, unfortunately. Can you please repeat your question?

1:10

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. Why don't you come back to me afterwards. Go ahead if there are any [inaudible], and maybe I'll [inaudible].

I'm actually going to a stationary location here, which I should be at in two minutes.

The Chair: Send us, if possible, the question by e-mail. You're not coming through on the phone line, unfortunately.

Mr. Gotfried: All right. I will do that.

The Chair: Oh, there you are. Okay. Let's try one more time and see if we can actually hear what your question or your concern is.

Mr. Gotfried: Sure. My apologies for the line.

My question is . . . [inaudible]

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried, again, I think that you might be moving and you might not be connecting to the line as well.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay.

The Chair: Yeah. You keep cutting out. Would it be possible for you to send either the clerk or Dr. Starke a copy of the question?

Dr. Starke, would that be . . .

Mr. Gotfried: I will indeed. I'll get that to you in two minutes.

The Chair: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you.

All right. Anybody here have any questions or concerns? No. Okay. We're going to give him a few minutes.

Can you let us know when you have sent an e-mail, please?

Mr. Gotfried: Sure. Or can you hear me now?

The Chair: I can hear you now.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. My question is very simple. . . . [inaudible] . . . the list as finalized as we can and to move forward with the invitations for the subject meetings. Will we have an opportunity if we identify other potential additions to that list to also include them going forward?

The Chair: Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: If you want me to speak to it, Chair.

Mr. Gotfried, if I get this wrong, of course, speak up if you can. Basically, I think you're saying: will the committee be able to receive additions to the stakeholder list after these particular stakeholders have been sent the letter? I guess that's for the committee to decide, but I would imagine that there would be an opportunity to distribute the letter after the lists, pending the committee's approval of that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Would anybody else like to jump into this? Dr. Starke.

Dr. Starke: Oh, thank you, Chair. With regard to the revised draft stakeholder list, I think the additions are very good. It's always difficult to sort of figure out who's not there. It's a lot easier to sort of make comments on who's there. But a couple of areas that I wonder about are not included.

One is our system of libraries in the province. Libraries don't appear on the list, or at least not that I saw. You know, certainly, our libraries hold some of the largest repositories of personal information anywhere in the province. They also have a very broad reach. Most of our communities and even some of our smallest communities have libraries, and I think that they should be included

in the stakeholder list as well as in the communication and engagement plan.

The other area that is somewhat in the stakeholder list but somewhat not is humanitarian and charitable organizations. Again, a lot of these will collect a lot of personal information from their donors. I think in terms of how this would affect them going forward and the need for any changes to the act. We're talking about things like, whether it's houses of worship, youth organizations, or other charitable organizations: if they handle personal information, you know, what role will they have coming under this act, or what role could they have coming under this act? I think those are two areas that I just would ask the question whether there's consideration for including them on the stakeholder list.

The Chair: Thank you.
Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Chair. It's up to the committee if you want to include those.

The Chair: Did you have any comments?

Dr. Massolin: I would only say that I think some of the charitable organizations might be included here, but of course, you know, we could cast the net wider.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I kind of thought about the libraries, too, so I appreciate Dr. Starke bringing that up. I think that we could certainly look at it on a case-by-case basis as we move forward.

The Chair: Thank you.

I guess one of the main reasons why we're here today is because we wanted to get started on sending out those letters and approving the stakeholder list as it appears today. I guess that now the discussion can turn to whether we finalize this and make allowances for additional names to be added. You know, we do have 18 months, so there is time to do that. However, we also have to be mindful that we should get started on the initial stages of the consultation. Any thoughts about that?

Dr. Starke: By all means, get started. By all means, send out to this existing list. I think Mr. Gotfried, you know, alluded to this. I think it would be helpful if we would have the power, either as a committee or for the committee chair, to contact members of the committee to suggest specific additions to the list. Things can come up, or someone can come up and say, "Well, wait a minute; I have an interest in this, and I wasn't contacted about this process" or whatever. So I think it would be very, very helpful.

I mean, I think the additions are very good, very important, but I just wonder about some of the other ones with regard to, especially, any organization that does any significant amount of fundraising. You know, I think of organizations – and maybe they're here already. Like, I see nonprofit organizations as a large section. Maybe I haven't gone through it exhaustively. Also, any organization that has members or supporters or subscribers or donors also keeps personal information on hand, sometimes a fair bit of personal financial information if the donors are making the donations by credit card.

The Chair: Thank you.
Mr. Gotfried, please go ahead.

Mr. Gotfried: Yes. I don't know if we need to pass a motion, but I think, just in follow-up to what my colleague has said there, that if

we could at least have the practice whereby we have, through the chair possibly – that may be even the way to do it – the ability to add other organizations, specific organizations, understanding that I think we've done the best we can to try and touch as many different sectors as we can, at least have the opportunity to nominate further additions to the list, which could maybe be approved by the chair in consultation with staff.

The Chair: Okay. Dr. Massolin, please go ahead.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. Just as a kind of reminder I think the community was afforded the opportunity to make additions, and the deadline was November 6, and we did receive those additions, point one.

The second point, I guess, is that I think I see that the next item on the agenda is public consultation. I don't know what the committee is going to do there, but perhaps there is an opportunity for further consultation with respect to this issue at that point.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you. Points very well taken.

The objective, again, for the meeting today was to, number one, finalize the stakeholder list so that we can move on to the next stage, which is public consultation. I don't necessarily disagree with the idea that we can broaden our scope. It does, however, pose a couple of challenges. Number one is that if we are going to be engaging in a consultation and we're going to be asking for a deadline for submissions, then not everybody will be afforded the same amount of time, which again pushes the deadlines and the timelines of the committee a little further down. That is fine if that's what the committee decides to do, but again I think we might have some sort of understanding about wanting to get started right away with what we have and then possibly making additions later.

Ms Rempel: I was just going to make a suggestion if I could, Mr. Chair. Perhaps if the committee wanted to hold on this item and take a look at the communications item. Once they've made some decisions there about what they may or may not wish to do as far as advertising – going out on Twitter, that sort of thing – that may affect their feelings on making additions to the stakeholder list. You could come back and revisit a potential motion on the stakeholder list after those decisions are made.

1:20

The Chair: Thank you.

Do I have the consensus of the group to move to the next item on the agenda and come back to this after we have had that discussion? Yes? Anybody opposed to doing that? Excellent.

Okay. We are going to be moving to the communications piece. I believe that we've given our support staff direction on communicating with stakeholders regarding our review, and now we need to discuss whether the public consultation would be at this stage of a review. Does anybody have any thoughts on this?

Mr. Connolly: Chair, I was just wondering if it would be possible to get costing from the LAO to find out exactly how much it would be for things like Internet engagement or community engagement.

The Chair: Specifically for . . .

Mr. Connolly: The public consultations.

Ms Dotimas: I can go through the communications plan now if you'd like.

The Chair: Sure. Excellent.

Ms Dotimas: The last meeting, I guess, was on October 15. My manager, Rhonda Sorensen, was tasked to provide information back to the committee in terms of public consultation at that time in the form of written submissions only. I think the committee does have access to the communications options that were offered in that regard. One of the things that we would start off with, obviously, is creating the key messages first so that we know exactly what it is that you'd like to go out and solicit information for in terms of the review.

The first thing that we have on the recommendations would be the province-wide advertising through the weekly newspapers, which includes, I think, about 115 community newspapers across the province, which we would target to advertise in in the first week of January, so between January 9 at this point until January 15, depending on the publication date. In addition to that, we would supplement that with the province-wide daily newspapers, which would include the nine metropolitan ones with their daily coverage. I do have the costing on that, and at this time for that campaign period we're looking at approximately \$35,000. That would include the daily papers and the weekly papers at this point.

I do have costing available for online options if that's something that the committee would consider. Essentially, all of this information would be directing folks back to the written information on the website, so that would be our only limitation. We're looking at some of the online advertising. I took the *Edmonton Journal* as a sample. At this point we're looking at about \$1,200 to \$1,500 for I think I had it at about a 10-day campaign, which would cover the first print publication until the last one, in and around that time. Then we also looked at costing for online advertising as far as Facebook-and Twitter-sponsored ads. We'd be looking at about \$45 per day to get the maximum reach, which would be in and around \$5,000 in addition to the print advertising. That's daily for the duration of that print campaign in support of it.

We have the no-cost investments as well, of course, that would also be part of the campaign mix. That would include things like updating our website information, obviously, and the social media posts, which, of course, are different than social media advertising. We also would have media relations, which we always push for because that's the opportunity for the chair or the spokesperson for the committee to actually explain what it is that you're trying to reach out for. And e-cards, of course, are produced on your behalf so that we can provide that to the committee widely and to the rest of the members, and they can be sent to all of your networks and groups as well.

The last thing that I wanted to touch on is the opportunity for me or whoever is in my stead to provide written communications for you for your newsletters that you send out to constituencies. We would have that available on the website so that you could use it for those networks as well. That could explain in more detail your requests of the public.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a really important issue to a lot of Albertans. As Dr. Starke mentioned, if you have two or more people meeting together and collecting any kind of information, the rules may end up applying. I was wondering with respect to feedback, because we want to have an effective and affordable method of hearing from Albertans on it: what is the approximate cost of having meetings in separate locations? It sounds to me like it might end up being prohibitive and that the most cost-effective way might be to do what you've outlined, using social media and other forms of print advertising.

Ms Dotimas: I'd like to, if I could, defer, actually, to the committee clerk. The committee clerk could probably best answer about off-site meeting information, please.

Ms Rempel: Sure. I'm just pulling some information now. I think one thing to mention right off the top is that I believe what Jeanette is focusing on as far as advertising and communications is asking people to send in written submissions.

Ms Dotimas: Yeah.

Ms Rempel: So you may want to look at those and see what kind of response you're getting and from where before you make the decision to possibly go off-site. We recently put together some numbers for a different committee based on a similar request, and of course we used recent experience with committees going elsewhere. The very short answer would be that you're looking at between \$27,000 and \$28,000 as soon as you move out of this building. You know, those are extra costs. It includes everything from meeting venue, member travel costs, staff travel costs, equipment, and so forth.

Mr. Dach: That's what I thought. So it would be wise to avoid that type of meeting and end up with the feedback coming from written submissions, social media, and so forth, because we end up getting into hundreds of thousands of dollars pretty quickly.

Ms Rempel: Well, certainly, it could add up although I would also remind the committee that we do have some options as far as technology goes if you decide to go that route in the future. Obviously, we have teleconferencing, and if there is a particular individual you wanted to hear from as far as an oral presentation, we could certainly look into making arrangements for video conferencing as well.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Starke.

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Chair. You missed an interesting conversation, a discussion at our committee meeting this morning with regard to a travelling road show, a conversation about this issue. What I will say with regard to the communications plan is that it's quite heavy on the how, but quite frankly I think it is a little bit deficient on the what. You know, the communication plan sort of outlines whether we do dailies or weeklies, which are both good, and talks about the committee website and social media and that sort of thing, but when you page through to the ad, I have to confess that I think this ad is very dry and very sterile. The ad is really kind of dry and sterile.

We looked, actually, at a very similar ad for the special standing committee on Ethics and Accountability, and the criticism was that the advertisement would not stimulate or does not have a call to action. It really doesn't stimulate a whole lot of discussion. We talked about having right at the top of the ad, in fairly large print, two or three very attention-grabbing sorts of questions; you know, "Is your personal information and privacy important to you?" or something along those lines. If you pick this ad up and look at it, you'd say: "Personal Information Protection Act? I don't even know what that is." I think what would end up happening is that you'd have a very small number of Albertans that would even necessarily become engaged with it.

Certainly, we are reaching out very specifically to the stakeholder groups, which is good, but this isn't what we're going to send to the stakeholder groups. We're going to send a specific letter to stakeholders asking for their input and referring them directly to the

website and that sort of thing. For in-newspaper advertisements, you know, I don't think something like this is going to grab people's attention, I don't think it's going to stimulate them as a call to action, and I would venture to guess that for the \$43,000 or so that we could be spending on ads, we will need something that is quite a bit more attention grabbing than this.

You know, this would appear sort of in the public notices section in the newspaper, which tends not to be the part most read in depth of your average weekly newspaper. If you could sort of wedge it in with the obituaries, that would probably work better because it's the first thing that people page to.

1:30

The Chair: Thank you.

Before we go on any further, does anybody on the line wish to be added to the speakers list? No. Anybody else?

I'm hearing a couple of things: number one, that we need to expand, perhaps, the scope of the stakeholder list; and in terms of the actual communication plan perhaps the idea of revising the current advertising as it exists to incorporate some of the ideas that you've mentioned, Dr. Starke. We are, again, at the point of deciding whether we continue with the plan of having the stakeholders finalized and sent out to initiate the process or not being sure exactly what comes after that.

Would it be fair at this point to say that being given all of this information that we have now – I think it's a more complete picture – we make a couple of decisions: number one, whether we do begin the process now and engage the stakeholders that have already been identified in the stakeholder list and initiate the process and, while we're doing that, perhaps engage our communications person to take some of the feedback, give the committee some opportunity to provide some of the feedback, and then we can channel it to the communications so that a new ad can be formulated; and in addition to that, once we have made those decisions, whether we are going to continue opening or adding people to the stakeholder list or whether we would rely on social media to engage anybody who may have been inadvertently missed in the stakeholder list.

Dr. Massolin: Just to inform that discussion, I have a little piece of information that I gleaned since we left the discussion of the stakeholder list. I've discovered and confirmed that libraries, public libraries are not within the scope of PIPA, the Personal Information Protection Act. Rather, it's FOIP, the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, right? So I don't think that public libraries would apply here, but of course that's a committee decision.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, and point well taken.

I think maybe – Dr. Starke, correct me if I'm wrong – that the point is that there may be some stakeholders that could have potentially been missed, so your concern would be that there is a way to add those people to the list. Is that correct?

Dr. Starke: Yes, that's correct.

The Chair: Okay. With that in mind, I guess the discussion for the committee here is whether we finalize the stakeholder list and then decide whether we will add to it at a later time or whether we close it off as it exists and rely on social media to reach out to any other group that may have been missed. Thoughts?

Mr. Dach: I'd like to just kind of separate those two and just move a motion that we approve the current stakeholders list as is. Then we can do a separate motion if we like, if committee members want

to, to have any other measure that would allow further stakeholders to be added or not.

The Chair: Okay. Could you repeat that motion one more time, please?

Mr. Dach: I move that
we approve the stakeholders list as is.

The Chair: As circulated. Okay.

We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion? Concerns? Those of you on the line?

Dr. Starke: Well, just to clarify, Chair, as I said before, I have no problem with the current stakeholder list. It's fine. I just want to make sure that if we pass this motion, we're not cutting off the possibility of adding to the stakeholder list, which, I think, needs to have a mechanism to let that happen and a mechanism to let that happen fairly easily. Just as an example, just as I'm sitting here, another group that I don't see here anywhere is ag societies. We have 294 ag societies in this province. Again, they collect a lot of private information and hold a lot of private information, so I think it's something that we should also include. They could be reached quite easily through the Alberta Association of Agricultural Societies, the AAAS.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, sir.

Mr. Gotfried: I don't think we want to hold up the process of accepting the stakeholder list. I know that it has been lots of work. But as I recognized here, I think that, unfortunately, sometimes these potential additions are popping up. I would, you know, suggest that we approve this list to move forward with the process. But, again, I think that we can put in place a mechanism to formally add additions to the stakeholder list as we go forward so that they appear on our stakeholder list. As we find relevant and appropriate additions to that list, we're able to do so but without holding us back or handicapping us on approving the current list.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments?

Mr. Hanson: I agree with the previous speaker. There's no way that we're going to make this list, even if it is 119 pages long, without missing someone. We should have some provision for adding people afterwards.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

The motion that we have on the floor right now does not have a mechanism. The motion is to approve the stakeholder list. Of course, the committee is welcome to put a new motion forward to correct that.

At this time, I guess, we would have to call the vote on the motion as it stands. Those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried to approve the stakeholder list. Thank you.

Now we turn to the next item of discussion, which is the actual communications piece. Correct? The ad that has been presented, which was circulated earlier, has a specific format that members of the committee may wish to perhaps change. Can we have a discussion about that? Would anybody like to have any additional thoughts about this expressed?

Dr. Massolin: Sorry. I was just going to say that I don't know that we received direction on the second part of the stakeholders list,

whether to be able to add to that list. I think that was the second part of Mr. Dach's proposal, I believe.

Mr. Dach: No. That was not part of the motion.

Dr. Massolin: No, not part of the motion but your general proposal. You had a motion . . .

Mr. Dach: I just mentioned that the committee certainly had the right to make a second motion, if they so wished, to create a mechanism if so desired, but that wasn't part of any proposal I made.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you for that.

Do we then have a motion on the floor to add names to the stakeholder list, the mechanism being that the proposed names or organizations be forwarded to the chair for them to be added to the stakeholder list?

Dr. Starke: Chair, I'd make the motion that at the discretion of the chair additional names and organizations can be added to the stakeholder list upon proposal from any committee member.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Starke. Unfortunately, since you're not an official substitute, you cannot move the motion.

Is there anybody else who would like to move the motion?

Mr. Gotfried: I would make that motion, then, on behalf of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you.

I had both Mr. Connolly and Mr. Gotfried raise their hands at the same time.

Mr. Connolly: Mr. Gotfried can go ahead.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried. Okay. Thank you.

We have the motion on the floor. Any further discussion?

Those in favour of the motion, please indicate. Anybody opposed? The motion is carried. Thank you.

Ms Rempel: Can I clarify something?

The Chair: Sure. Please.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I could just clarify with the committee that it's assumed within these motions that you are wishing for the chair to send out correspondence to these stakeholders soliciting their input, that that would be the purpose of this stakeholder list.

The Chair: I believe so. Yes.

Ms Rempel: Okay. Great.

1:40

The Chair: Excellent.

Okay. Since we have decided to go ahead with the stakeholder list as it exists, then the correspondence can begin to be sent out. We are contemplating being able to do that in the new year, inviting stakeholders to make written submissions on the Personal Information Protection Act. Also, I believe this would be coming with the caveat that there would be a deadline of February 26, 2016, in order to submit the written submissions to the committee, yes?

Back to the communications portion that we were at. I believe that we were talking about how the ad perhaps could be changed or amended by input from the committee. Does anybody have any

points or issues they would like to raise or any questions they would like to make? Anybody on the phone? None.

Okay. Dr. Starke, if I may, I believe that you raised this concern. What would you suggest as the course of action that we should follow?

Dr. Starke: Well, Chair, with respect, the suggestion that was made at the previous committee about the same concerns with regard to the level of engagement that the advertisement would generate was simply that the chair work together with the communications staff in the LAO to work on, you know, creating an advertisement that was perhaps a little bit more eye catching – just a little bit more – and including, you know, perhaps two or three questions at the top that would then direct the reader to actually what this piece of legislation deals with. I mean, just the name of the legislation does not necessarily clearly indicate to the reader what we're talking about – right? – whereas even one or two carefully worded questions to the reader would, you know, then, I think, stimulate that.

What we decided in the past committee is that the chair would work together with the communications people because a committee can't design an ad; that's a disaster. But you, working with the communications people in the LAO, could come up with a redraft of the ad – it doesn't have to be completely redone – just some changes to it and then circulate that around to the members of the committee for their suggestions, for their input and approval, with a very tight deadline on it so that the ad can be used early in the new year to start the public advertising portion of the consultation process.

The Chair: Thank you.

Especially for the benefit of those who were not in attendance this morning at the committee, I do believe that that was in essence the spirit of the discussion that we had. It reflects the intent as well of the actions a different committee took earlier today.

The points having been raised and the issues being brought forward, I guess now I would ask if anybody else has any other concerns or questions they wish to add on this topic.

Seeing none, I would then propose a motion that – yes, Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: I'll propose a motion that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite written submissions from the public respecting its review of the Personal Information Protection Act, with a submission deadline of February 26, 2016, and that advertising and communications in this respect be delegated to the chair with the idea that the advertising be done through the most cost-effective measures as proposed by the LAO, which would include social media, media relations, and e-card strategies.

The Chair: Thank you.

Discussion? None.

Okay. Those in favour of the motion, please indicate. Those on the phone? Okay. Anyone opposed? The motion is carried. Thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is the draft timeline document. At our last meeting we asked staff to prepare a potential timeline for the review that reflects our progress to date. Does anyone have any questions or comments about the timeline?

Okay. Seeing none – thank you – we would move on to, I believe, the next item on the agenda, being other business.

Mr. Gotfried, we come to the issue that you would like to speak about, so please go ahead.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Chair. Just in following up on the chain of decisions from I believe it was our June meeting to our last

meeting with respect to not having a working group within the committee, I just wanted to share some information and some comments in that regard.

Firstly, in questioning and the conversation with the Auditor General, the following information and suggestions came forward from him. His comments about the working groups are, and I quote: "In your best interests it is clearly an effectiveness measure, but it doesn't have the ability to override your views. As I understand it, the working groups, through the various caucuses, will come back to you as members and seek your confirmation of decisions made. In the end it is built on relationships, and the proof will be in the results." Further, he adds, "as a member you should trust your working group to have your best interests and judge how well they do by looking at the results," in reference to working group activities. That was from the Auditor General commenting on the efficiency and effectiveness that is brought forward by the working group.

From the CCAF, the Canadian comprehensive auditing foundation, it was noted that through the committee of 15 at that time: "Talking about each document in detail without having the time to analyze it might not be the best use of time. Why don't you allow the working group to start the process" and make the recommendations based on submissions or tabled documents to provide background? "The advantage for you is that someone else has had the time to take a look over the document in a prior working session." Further, it was added by the CCAF that one of the considerations of the working group is overall committee efficiency without removing the opportunity to address the issues or consult at a caucus level, even within the working group's structure, while still giving the chair, vice-chair, and other working group members the latitude to operate in the best interests of the committee, depending on the relationships established by each caucus with their own House leaders or party whips, to achieve the effectiveness and efficiency required to operate within a partisan influence but nonpartisan committee.

My own comments about the outcomes and the information that I gleaned from conversations with both the CCAF and the Auditor General are that the working group can then be empowered to address non issues-based housekeeping, to reach agreement on scheduling and timing, and to establish some degree of prioritization of the issues that need to be addressed and decisions that need to be made at the full committee level though the ultimate decision-making authority always rests with the full committee.

Chair, I'd just like to ensure that the comments and recommendations in principle from the Auditor General and CCAF are on

record in support of the working group as an effective and efficient organizational tool within the committee structure and, further, to note my personal ongoing objection to the rejection by 11 members of this committee, as a rescinding of an earlier decision, of what could be a valuable tool in establishing and retaining not only a proven and recommended opportunity for effectiveness and efficiency within this committee but also an opportunity for a new, refreshing, and nonpartisan commitment to building trust and relationships between and amongst the various caucus members.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Gotfried. The statement that you've made: are you accompanying that with a motion?

Mr. Gotfried: No. It is just my own comment and statement in this regard. I think we've had enough motions on this and decisions made and unmade. I just wanted it on record that, again, in personal representations to both the Auditor General and in discussions with the CCAF, who are experts in committee structures and functioning, both noted that the working groups within the committee structure are a highly effective and efficient part of the process and part of the structure.

1:50

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other speakers? Anybody on the phone?

Seeing or hearing none, I believe we can move to the next item on the agenda, which would be to call for a meeting. I will at this time say that we will be consulting in the very near future about holding a meeting in the new year. Any comments or suggestions about that? None. Okay.

Well, if there is nothing else for the committee's consideration, I'd like to call for a motion for adjournment, to move that the December 18, 2015, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adjourned.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I so move.

The Chair: Thank you.

Those in favour, please indicate. Anyone against? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Happy holidays, everyone. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 1:51 p.m.]

