



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature  
First Session

Standing Committee  
on  
Public Safety and Services

Wednesday, July 23, 2008  
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-1-2

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta  
The 27th Legislature  
First Session**

**Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services**

VanderBurg, George, Whitecourt-St. Anne (PC), Chair  
Kang, Darshan S., Calgary-McCall (L), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Rob, Airdrie-Chestermere (PC)  
Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Nose Hill (PC)  
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)  
Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort (PC)  
Jacobs, Broyce, Cardston-Taber-Warner (PC)  
Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC) \*  
MacDonald, Hugh, Edmonton-Gold Bar (L)  
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP)  
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)  
Woo-Paw, Teresa, Calgary-Mackay (PC)

\* substitution for Pearl Calahasen

**Bill 10 Sponsor**

Anderson, Rob, Airdrie-Chestermere (PC)

**Solicitor General and Department of Public Security Participants**

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Matthew Barker | Manager, Peace Officer Program,<br>Private Investigators and Security Guards |
| Bill Meade     | Executive Director, Special Projects Branch                                  |

**Support Staff**

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| W.J. David McNeil      | Clerk                                      |
| Louise J. Kamuchik     | Clerk Assistant/Director of House Services |
| Micheline S. Gravel    | Clerk of <i>Journals</i> /Table Research   |
| Robert H. Reynolds, QC | Senior Parliamentary Counsel               |
| Shannon Dean           | Senior Parliamentary Counsel               |
| Corinne Dacyshyn       | Committee Clerk                            |
| Erin Greidanus         | Committee Clerk                            |
| Jody Rempel            | Committee Clerk                            |
| Karen Sawchuk          | Committee Clerk                            |
| Rhonda Sorensen        | Manager of Communications Services         |
| Melanie Friesacher     | Communications Consultant                  |
| Tracey Sales           | Communications Consultant                  |
| Philip Massolin        | Committee Research Co-ordinator            |
| Diana Staley           | Research Officer                           |
| Rachel Stein           | Research Officer                           |
| Liz Sim                | Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>  |

10 a.m.

Wednesday, July 23, 2008

[Mr. VanderBurg in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning. We'll call the meeting to order. I ask the committee members to turn off their cellphones. Even if they're left on vibrate and on the table, it raises problems with the microphone system.

As well, we'll ask the committee members to go around the table and introduce themselves. I'm George VanderBurg, MLA for Whitecourt-Ste. Anne, and I chair this committee.

**Mr. Kang:** Darshan Kang, MLA for Calgary-McCall, deputy chair of the committee.

**Dr. Brown:** Neil Brown, MLA for Calgary-Nose Hill.

**Mr. Sandhu:** Peter Sandhu, MLA for Edmonton-Manning.

**Dr. Massolin:** Good morning. I'm Philip Massolin. I'm the committee research co-ordinator, Legislative Assembly Office.

**Ms Stewart:** I'm Katrina Stewart. I'm a research assistant with the Legislative Assembly Office.

**Mr. Meade:** Good morning. Bill Meade, with the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Barker:** Matt Barker, with the Solicitor General.

**Ms Friesacher:** Good morning. I'm Melanie Friesacher, communications consultant with the Legislative Assembly Office.

**Ms Dean:** Good morning. Shannon Dean, Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

**Mrs. Kamuchik:** Good morning. Louise Kamuchik, Clerk Assistant, director of House services.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Good morning. Hugh MacDonald, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

**Mr. Jacobs:** Broyce Jacobs, Cardston-Taber-Warner.

**Mrs. Leskiw:** Genia Leskiw, Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

**Ms Rempel:** Jody Rempel, committee clerk with the Legislative Assembly Office.

**The Chair:** Welcome. Genia is replacing Pearl today, and as per Standing Order 56 notice was given so that this would be allowed. As well, members, I think you've all figured out that the microphones are operated remotely, so we don't have to touch anything. Our good staff will take care of that.

We're going to move on to Approval of Agenda. I ask someone to make that motion – Broyce – that the agenda for the July 23 meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services be adopted as circulated. All those in favour? That's carried. Those opposed? Oh, sorry, Hugh. I didn't see you.

We are going to move on to the approval of the minutes of June 18. Again, I'd ask for a mover. Mr. Kang moves that the minutes of the June 18 meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and Services be adopted as circulated. Those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

We'll move on to Bill 10, and we have a couple of sections to review and the briefing documents from the Solicitor General and Department of Public Security. We have with us Bill Meade, the executive director of the special projects branch. Bill, I'll turn it over to you.

**Mr. Meade:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. We've submitted through the clerk a number of documents that were asked of us from the previous meeting. I'm not sure if you'd like me to go through them or just answer questions about them.

**The Chair:** Yeah, I want you to go through them.

**Mr. Meade:** All right. The first document, then, is the comparison document. Really, the purpose of this document was to ensure – we took a look at what was existing in the current legislation and then compared that to what we heard in terms of the consultation process and the process that we did in terms of research in looking at other jurisdictions. You'll see in that comparison document that we've identified a number of sections and then talked about the proposed, that you'd find in the draft bill, and then subsequently any comparison to the current. It really follows the proposed bill in terms of general overview, definitions, and so on and so forth. If you'd like to go through that that way, we could do that, or there might be questions about each section. I'm not sure.

**The Chair:** What are the wishes of the committee members? Would you like to go through it, or do you have some questions that you'd like to do to review these documents? That's 4(a). What are the wishes of the committee?

**Dr. Brown:** I think we should briefly go through it and review it.

**The Chair:** Okay, we'll go through it.

**Mr. Meade:** Okay, Mr. Chairman. I'll ask Matt to help me on some of these sections, but the first one is a general overview. This was really captured in MLA Anderson's PowerPoint presentation at the last meeting, so I'll probably go through that fairly quickly. It talks about, really, the current act being quite old, quite dated, and that there is a continuum of roles and responsibilities for law enforcement in the province. We see this Bill 10 as fitting into that continuum.

The next section is really definitions. We received a fair amount of input from the marketplace on the definitions. Some of the definitions are quite dated, and some of the activities associated with those definitions are dated, too. When you look at private investigators, well, investigation was what we were attempting to capture as opposed to the notion of it being private, so you'll see some change from the existing. The other word that kept coming up that was confusing for a lot of people was the notion of officer. So in this proposed legislation we're talking about removing that and that it has to be considered a guard. That's just in keeping with the notion that it isn't a police officer or peace officer but that it is a guard. Those are kind of the two big ones on definition.

The other area is really in the current legislation. Those people employed in the security industry who are employed in-house or by the employer of the property, the owner of the property, are currently not captured in the legislation. So if you were to employ the services of a security firm, those people would be captured; if you were to just hire your own people to do the security, they wouldn't be captured. There was a sense of a need to level the playing field on that point so that regardless of who the employer is, the employer

and the guards are seen to fall under this legislation. There are some, which I'll get to later, that talk about some exemptions to that, but that's a general principle that you're involved with.

There was also the notion of security dogs that came up through the consultation. This isn't what you'd see and maybe traditionally what some people think of as the junkyard dog. This legislation doesn't capture that; it's really for those who employ dogs on-leash to go and provide perimeter security, those sorts of things. There is a fair amount of need to ensure that those dogs are trained accordingly and that the handlers of those dogs are trained accordingly. There have been situations throughout North America where the dogs have actually caused injury to people because they were either inappropriately handled or weren't provided with the training. That's who we're talking about here.

Another new provision is the loss prevention folks. These are plain-clothed people that you'll find in most of the stores and malls, around shopping centres and such. They're important and provide an important role to ensure that shoplifters are dealt with accordingly. We just wanted to make sure that they were captured in it. They have a lot of interaction with the public, obviously, or at least with those who potentially have stolen. We felt the need to ensure that they were captured in this. There have also been examples – you've seen from time to time in the press, one more recently in Hamilton, I believe – where as a result of interaction between a loss prevention worker and a citizen, the citizen actually died, so we wanted to make sure that there was some amount of oversight to ensure that that work is done in the appropriate way.

#### 10:10

The other new provision. Of course, with the existing act being some 40-plus years old, the security alarm company business really wasn't what it is today although we're not talking about those who are selling those; we're really talking about those that respond to those calls. You'll see them from time to time in cars marked "alarm company," that sort of thing. They're responding to an alarm. We wanted to make sure that they were captured in this as well. These folks will come to your house if the alarm goes off and oftentimes do a perimeter check and some other things before the police are called. That's sort of the role we were trying to capture in this.

Another one is the new provision, the automotive bypass and lock tools. Maybe we'll get Matt to speak to this one because it has a federal relationship.

**Mr. Barker:** Currently the provincial government issues licences to those having lock bypass tools or locksmith tools to allow them permission to carry those tools throughout the province of Alberta. We do it through the federal Criminal Code of Canada, and through Bill 10 we're asking to formalize that process in provincial legislation, apply the same criteria and oversight to both these groups as they apply to the rest of the security services industry. It's more of a clarification of what we do currently and bringing it wholly under provincial legislation.

**Mr. Meade:** The next section is the exemptions, what I referred to a little bit earlier. You see them there listed on page 3, the RCMP and some others. Really, the thinking here is that for anybody that's governed by another piece of legislation, we didn't want to duplicate it, so they were exempt from it. That was the principle. Armoured car is federal, you'll see, and other ones around that. The bouncers, door supervisors are with Alberta Gaming and Liquor.

We also heard from the community quite loudly that there are events in Alberta wherein they tend to be volunteer events – whether

they be a fair or a rodeo or something like that, hockey, a curling bonspiel, those sorts of things – where the security is provided by volunteers. We heard that, really, that was something that wouldn't be an appropriate fit for this. If it's volunteers doing the security, they wouldn't be captured under this. However, if they're a volunteer group who are bidding on a for-profit security job, then they would be captured. So it's really: are they getting paid for the security, or is it the local community doing it? I wanted to clarify that.

It talks next about the licensing and who would need to carry a licence and compares that to the existing. It speaks about some of the need to do some background and to confirm things like liability insurance, record check, those sorts of things. There are licence criteria for both the company as well as the individual, and they're spelled out.

Ongoing licensing requirements. I'm at the top of page 5. We're looking to ensure that we continue to have relationships, obviously, with the companies to ensure things like complaint process, record keeping, access to information so that the registrar and the director can then ensure that they're meeting the standards. Much of the detail of these sections will be found in regulations.

Just a point of clarification. If Bill 10 is passed, then I would enter a process of drafting regulations and then going out and doing a full round of consultations again with the marketplace. Much of the sort of specifics will be found in the regulations, but I wanted to stress that we will be having another round of consultation with the marketplace and with other groups – professional associations or community associations, those sorts of things – who might have some interest.

The complaint process. Really, there's a range of reports and concerns that come in, some that are very, very serious and some, in fact, that have led to death in some parts of the country, others where force is used inappropriately, and others that might be seen to be somewhat frivolous. There's quite a range currently. We were able to look at those and determine that we really needed to look at some additional authorities like inspection and to formalize the complaint process so that the citizen, the employer, and the security person understand it and that we have some rigour to it so that it's appropriate.

We talked about uniform and weapon. The uniform situation: really, the need for clarity to the citizen as to who's a police officer, who's a peace officer, and who's security personnel or a security guard is very important. So what we'll be saying here is that, really, you can pick your uniform and your colours. You just can't use certain prohibited colours, like a yellow stripe and red, which represents police officers, blue and grey, which represents peace officers in the province. Really, other colours are available, and the colours will actually be part of the regulations. That's the purpose of that, to ensure that people aren't looking alike. It confuses the citizen. Whether you're dealing with a security guard or a police officer is important because they have quite different authorities, and it's important for you to know that. In the Police Act you cannot just represent yourself as a police officer, and that's very, very clear.

It also talks about the type of weapons that people can use that would be governed by this proposed legislation. We're not talking about side arms, we're not talking about tasers, but we are talking about things like batons and handcuffs and those sorts of things, which are crucial for the people in the industry. We want to make sure the people using that equipment have met certain training standards and that the employee and the employer understand how to use those and in what situations around use of force.

The next section talks about licences and how a licence would expire. We're seeing a graduated way wherein licences are renewed

every three years for those who are certainly meeting all the tests of the legislation and the regulations, and they would be varying for those who either are suspended or have issues that they must deal with. It provides a little bit longer than current for those who are meeting the standards but allows us to engage with those that aren't in a meaningful and significant way.

I know the committee had a few questions about the appeal process last time. The appeal process that we're proposing is similar to the one found in the Peace Officer Act, and it really has two streams. All serious incidents are reported to the director, and the director can suspend or cancel or vary a licence depending on it. That process, though, because the director is the one who's making the decision, we feel needs a further third-party review, and the employee who we're proposing that we suspend or cancel or vary a licence would have an opportunity to appeal that to the Law Enforcement Review Board.

In terms of the citizen who feels they might have been inappropriately treated, they can appeal the decision of the employer to the director – the director is a third party in that situation – and the director can either suspend, uphold, or modify the licence. We felt that that really was a third-party look and that it wasn't required for the citizen to go to the Law Enforcement Review Board for a fourth look. Remember that the review board can simply challenge the director's decision. That's all they can do. They can say, "I agree that you should have cancelled it" or "I don't agree that you should have cancelled their licence." If the individual citizen feels they have been harmed or mistreated, they always can go to court under a civil matter against either the security guard, the loss prevention worker, the investigator, and the employer. So that's some clarity around that position, and, like I say, it's in keeping with the current Peace Officer Act. We haven't experienced any problems associated with that process so far in terms of any complaints from people or any of those sorts of things.

**10:20**

Some housekeeping things. In terms of the registrar and the administrator those who aren't licensed can't act or put themselves in a position of acting like security personnel. The words "peace officer," "officer," or "law enforcement" are prohibited words, and the reason for that is simply, again, the comparison to either a police officer or a peace officer. We're really saying: you aren't, you don't have those authorities, and you can't conduct yourself or present yourself in any way that would confuse people to that end.

It talks about displaying company licence and some of those that are sort of more minor in the act. It talks about the act coming into force, but again we'd have to do the regulations and proclamation.

Mr. Chairman, that would be a sort of high-level view of it.

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

I'm glad you clarified that there will be another wide sweep of consultations when it comes to the drafting of the regulations because I think – and we find this with most bills that we move in the Legislature – the devil's in the details, and that always seems to be in the regulations. So I'm glad that you're going to go out for a round of consultations with the stakeholders on that point.

We have a few members that have some questions, and we'll start with Member MacDonald.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The devil is certainly in the details in this case. There are two sections which deal with regulations; however, my first question is in regard to section 24, and that's the section you . . .

**The Chair:** On page 15 of the bill, appeal to the board.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Page 15 of the bill, appeal to the board. Yes.

**The Chair:** I'd just ask members when they have questions to refer to the section and the page.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Section 24(1). In the appeal to the board the Law Enforcement Review Board is, I'm told, very busy dealing with appeals from municipal police disciplinary processes, and if they're as busy as I am told they are, how is this system going to work?

**Mr. Meade:** In terms of the purpose we felt it crucial that if the director suspends or cancels their licence, the employee who is licensed really needed a third party to go to, to appeal that, because it's really the director's decision. The third party above the director is the board. Now, if the board requires additional resources to meet this increased demand, then that would be a budgetary item I would take back through our budgetary process to provide the sufficient resources to meet those needs.

**Mr. MacDonald:** What currently is the backlog at the Law Enforcement Review Board?

**Mr. Meade:** I'm not sure of that number. I can provide that number. I don't have it with me. It's not under my areas of responsibility.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. I would really appreciate that.

On the record I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciated your advice and your time with me earlier regarding questions with this bill, Mr. Meade.

Now, is there anyone else on the list at this time?

**The Chair:** Oh, yes.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Maybe I'll just come back, then.

**The Chair:** Member Brown.

**Dr. Brown:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Given the fact that there are some reasonably onerous provisions put in there with respect to a lot of restrictions, the question that I would have would be with respect to the purpose of the legislation and the need which is being filled by virtue of the proposed enactments. There is a principle in law called the mischief rule, which lawyers and judges use to interpret legislation. Mischief basically means that you look at what the purpose of the legislation was, what is the void that is being filled, the necessity for the legislation, and so on.

I'm curious: given the complex and rather onerous provisions that we have there, could you tell us what sort of problems in terms of statistics there are with respect to how many criminal charges there have been in the province of Alberta against security guards, quasi-security guards, and so on? Are we using a sledgehammer here to kill a mosquito? What's the nature of the problem? How extensive is it? You mentioned that in other provinces there have been incidents where people have come to an untimely demise through the exercise of power by security guards. I'm wondering whether you can just edify us with respect to: what is the extent of the problem, and what are we facing here in terms of looking at our legislative response?

**Mr. Meade:** I'll maybe take a stab at that and then get Matt to fill in. Matt's the overseer of the current act, so he'd be able to provide you with that. The act is really trying to do two things. Certainly, it's aware of situations that require the proper process for folks and proper training and proper oversight. But in looking at the existing legislation, because of how old it is and because of some of the advancements in the industry, it's really not current. When you have a large percentage of the industry who are in the current act and another large percentage of the industry who aren't who are doing the exact same job, it was pointed out by many in the field that there wasn't a level playing field at all.

In addition to those events, which were serious, there were also events, home security firms, these sorts of things, that have come up. In-house security wasn't captured. The external security firms felt that was really unfair. There were a number of things like that that also led to the review. But I'll let Matt maybe speak to your point specifically.

**Mr. Barker:** I think Bill has captured the intent of the legislation. The legislation changes throughout Canada have come about as a result of a number of fatality inquiries and safety issues within the industry. There was a fatality inquiry out of Ontario that led them to embark upon changing their legislation. B.C. had some similar events, and Manitoba had an event as well. The industry itself has no mandatory training requirements in Alberta right now. Through discussion with the industry it's hoped that through the regulatory process we can establish some minimal training to help ensure not only the members of the public that come into contact with security workers but also the security workers themselves.

We don't formally collect information on criminal charges against security guards. But informally a number of companies do report to us the safety issues faced by their security personnel, and it is quite high, in my mind. We get reports of assaults, stabbings – sometimes they make the paper; sometimes they don't – on a regular basis in this province. It's hoped that by bringing some minimal structure that's acceptable to the industry, we can help reduce the injury both to those in the industry and the public they come into contact with.

**Dr. Brown:** Could you be a little bit more specific on where those complaints or incidents are arising? Is it from bar security or security patrols on property or commercial buildings? Where's the problem emanating from with respect to, you know, potential injuries and adverse incidents that you mentioned?

**Mr. Barker:** Without having formally collected, I couldn't provide the numbers. But it does seem to be in those areas where security personnel have large interactions with the public: malls, loss prevention, supermarkets, hospitals, things along those lines. Where there is a high degree of interaction with the public is where I would say it would occur.

**The Chair:** Also, I have a question on the appeal process. Misuse of a bypass tool by, say, a tow truck operator where there are present federal regulations: we're encompassing this into this regulation. Who deals with the appeal process? Is it going to be multilevel, provincial-federal?

10:30

**Mr. Barker:** Through the federal legislation now it's handed off entirely to the province. Under the current system if there was a breach of use, it would default to our office to make a decision whether to lift the licence, suspend the licence, or take other action.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Member MacDonald.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In section 20, the suspension or cancellation of a licence, "The Registrar may suspend or cancel the licence of an individual licensee or a business licensee." There's nothing in this section that I can see respecting a hearing or an adjudication of the evidence. How will that work?

**Mr. Meade:** That would fall to the director. The director would need to take into account all the evidence brought forward and then make their decision. It's the director and his staff that would do that.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Where will the records of this disciplinary hearing or this collection of evidence be kept?

**Mr. Meade:** They would be kept with the Solicitor General and Public Security. Then if the individual that's affected by this or the company appeals that decision to the board, then the board, obviously, would ask for that information.

**Mr. MacDonald:** The individual who was affected by this certainly has access to this information. Will this information then follow that person throughout their career in the security industry?

**Mr. Meade:** If they wanted to reapply for a licence? Yes, that would be kept.

**Mr. MacDonald:** How long? What time frame would that be kept for?

**Mr. Meade:** I'm not familiar with that. I'm not sure of the length of time on that. It would fall under the standard records policy, but I'm not sure how long, if it's a hundred years or something. I don't know the exact date.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Could you tell me, please, in section 36, prohibition, what exactly are "duties ordinarily performed or provided by police"? What is meant by that?

**Mr. Barker:** The intent has changed over time. Fifty years ago the police were all things to all people, so this limited what security workers could get into. Police patrolled parks. Police patrolled malls. That would have been a duty ordinarily performed by the police that a security worker couldn't get into. Now that list is greatly reduced because the police don't perform that broad-spectrum service. You need security workers in malls. You need loss prevention officers. Those are duties that would be permitted to them. If a security company wanted to advertise that they patrol streets and roads, which are clearly public areas, that would be prohibited under this section because that's normally a function performed by the police service.

**Mr. MacDonald:** So we're talking arrest, laying of charges, that sort of thing, right?

**Mr. Barker:** Yes. Utilizing the citizen's arrest authorities in pure public spaces, on roadways and sidewalks.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, can I proceed with a couple more questions, or is there a list there?

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Section 42, now, in part 8, offences and penalties. Is it the director who is going to charge the licensees?

**Mr. Barker:** We have a number of field auditors and investigators. The way the intent of this section is to move forward is that these offences will form part of the Provincial Offences Procedure Act, and where appropriate the field investigator can issue a process or a summons immediately upon detecting an offence if warranted. There will obviously be a rollout period with an education process to ensure that the industry is aware of this before we engage in a formal judicial process.

**Mr. MacDonald:** So there will be the formal charges, summons?

**Mr. Barker:** Yes. Or a provincial violation notice.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thanks.

Now, I have some additional questions if you don't mind. The first one is in section 11, the exemptions from licensing by the registrar. This was brought to my attention at another public meeting regarding this bill. What happens, for instance, with a large store chain that has stores across the country, and the head of their loss prevention department would be from Regina or Vancouver, and they come for a short period of time to do some work in Edmonton or Calgary or Grande Prairie? Are they exempt from a licence, or how do they come in here and do their work without breaking the law?

**Mr. Barker:** If the scope of their investigation occurred in Alberta and was being conducted in Alberta, they would need to be licensed here to ensure that all the principles of the legislation are met. Section 11 is designed for that office head. If he detects that there is some theft occurring in Regina and his inquiries lead him to Alberta, then with the appropriate paperwork he would just notify us that he's coming here, perform his investigations here, and go back to Regina. That is what section 11 is designed to capture. If the work was generated here and is all being conducted here, it has to be by someone licensed under this legislation.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. But is that individual, when they come here, exempt from applying for one of these licences?

**Mr. Barker:** No. He or she would have to hold a licence here in Alberta to conduct any of the work defined within.

**Mr. MacDonald:** How much is that going to cost?

**Mr. Meade:** It's similar to the Peace Officer Act. It's really to allow people to come in, and the directors of law enforcement across the country co-ordinate this activity. If it's something that's occurring in another jurisdiction but it has a trail here, then they're allowed to do that. They don't have to. But if it's something that's specific to here and they have employees that are investigating them here, then those employees have to be a part of this legislation. It works the same way as it does right now in the Peace Officer Act. In fact, the various law enforcement/police services across the country allow for that. We have to ensure that they're conducting business in Alberta that at least upholds this act.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Member MacDonald, we'll let Member Cao address his questions right now.

**Mr. Cao:** Thank you, Chairman.

Thank you for your presentation. I have a few questions. I'll probably just ask two, and then we'll go. First of all, on the definition of the people who have to have a licence, what comes to my mind right away is the parking lot attendants, the ones who sit there and people come in and pay. I was wondering: is that included or exempted?

Number two is that there's always a group that is sort of more of a community group. They patrol the community. You know, the one from New York came here and established their group that do community patrol.

**Dr. Brown:** The Guardian Angels.

**Mr. Cao:** Right.

Now, how do we deal with them? Do we ask them for a licence or not? Those are the two questions, and I have a few more.

**Mr. Meade:** I can deal with the second one first. They wouldn't be conducting themselves as security guards when they're walking the public streets, so, no, they wouldn't be part of this legislation. It depends on the work that they're doing. You know, just walking the community streets to see if there's any activity and then reporting that activity to the police: clearly they're not part of this legislation. However, if they do something in addition, for any group that starts to do things that fall under this, then they would have to be licensed. As it stands now, they're not doing the work of a security guard or an investigator, so they wouldn't.

**Mr. Barker:** On the parking lot attendants, we don't capture them. They're hired to perform a function that may include some small part of security, such as if there's a car being broken into, they'll call the police, but that's not the intent or scope of their job, so they would be exempted.

**Mr. Cao:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Member Jacobs.

10:40

**Mr. Jacobs:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Not having had the benefit of a law degree, it's always a challenge for me to understand the bills that come forward. I've learned that probably until we see the regulations, we really don't know what is going to come forth from the bill.

However, I do have a question on balance. I can appreciate the fact that probably the legislation needs to be redone and reviewed because of the changes that have occurred in the last 40 years dealing with security, protection, and the ways in which people can break the law. Again, as I read through some of the background material, the question that came to my mind was: well, are we protecting the rights of the innocent as well as giving those who are enforcing the law, either as security people or whatever, enough power to do their job? I certainly don't want people to be abused who are not committing a crime or have no intent to commit a crime. On the other hand, I want those who are in policing or security to have sufficient power to carry out their responsibilities.

It seemed to me that we sometimes restricted the ability of the enforcer with some of the clauses in the bill. Sometimes it seemed like we were overreacting to protect those who were enforcing.

Sometimes it seemed to me that if those who may be impacted were innocent, their rights weren't always protected; if they were guilty, they had too much freedom.

My question is on balance. Are you satisfied that we've achieved the balance we need in the bill to protect the rights of the public, if you will, and also allow those who are enforcing to do their job?

**Mr. Meade:** I think that's a very fair question. I've been lucky enough in my career to do this work with the Child Welfare Act with services for special-needs children and families, for the Peace Officer Act, and for this act. It's a struggle, when you're doing these things, to try to hear from the stakeholders, hear from the community, and then debate that very issue. There's never an absolute on it. I believe we're presenting something that is balanced. I also know that having us review these more regularly, not going 40 years – you know, if the Legislature feels it's balanced and we move forward and we develop regulation and you have another look at that for that process, then we need to put it in place and continue to monitor it and report back, including proposed changes if we've missed that balance.

To answer your question, I believe we have presented a balance. We're looking at background checks. We're not looking at ruling mass numbers of people out. We're looking at some minimum standards to training. We're not looking at needing to have a degree to be a security guard. We recognize that this is part of an important continuum, that the industry is crucial to the safety and security of the citizens of Alberta and the people who own property and the people who sell us our goods and services. We've attempted to take all that into account.

We've certainly consulted widely on it. For those who are considered external security firms, who have to have licences right now, they're not reporting it to be onerous. For the most part we're using that same approach. What we're talking about is capturing a group who are not currently part of it. For the most part the ones I've met within that group understand the need for it.

I think we are presenting a balance, but I do understand. I can't answer your question 100 per cent.

**Mr. Jacobs:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** I think it's incumbent upon the members of the Legislature to have more periodic reviews of our legislation. I think that when we draft legislation, you know, we have to realize that in most cases they're living documents. We have to be able to have the flexibility to review and change legislation as time goes on. I know that when I carried forward the changes in the Vital Statistics Act, in 50 years there was no provision even to record electronically. We can't let our legislation go without review and public scrutiny for those periods of time. I think it's incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure that there are annual or every three years or every five years as-needed reviews of legislation, especially when we start hearing from the public that it's not working. We need to ensure that we build that into our bills.

Member Sandhu.

**Mr. Sandhu:** Thank you, Chairman. I've got a couple of questions that just need clarification. Section 14 says: must be fit. Is there any doctor's examination for being a security guard?

The second one is the same thing, the baton training. Is there any training period on that to be a security guard?

**Mr. Meade:** I can answer the second one. We would propose minimum training associated with the use of force for those security

firms and the security guards who require it. It would be a process to apply to the director, saying why you need to use force and in what circumstances, and then there would be a process where we would set minimum standards so that people understood not just the baton but the whole use of force. We don't want people going to the baton if it's the first sign of an altercation, but sometimes that's required. So it's just use-of-force thinking that we want for folk on that one.

Your first one: is the person fit? Maybe I'll let Matt talk about that because we currently rule people in and out if they wish to be security.

**Mr. Barker:** The fit definition is applied – if you make an application and everything is in order and you have no criminal record and there's no other information that's brought forward challenging your fitness, the licence is issued. We would like to continue that, subject to some stakeholder consultation, under the new legislation. We would do an analysis of what they submit, look at the application form, ensure that all the documents are in place, ensure that any of the requirements that we agreed to in the regulations are adhered to, and then do an assessment on criminal record if there is any.

An example is that if you apply for a security guard licence for a mall or for a business and it doesn't have a driving component and you have a criminal record in relation to impaired driving, we are granting that licence right now because that doesn't have a direct impact on the job and it doesn't necessarily speak to character in the absence of any other information.

So it's an assessment on each individual's application.

**Mr. Meade:** It's focused not on their physical fitness but their emotional fitness and the fit to doing that type of work.

**Mr. Sandhu:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Kang:** I've got questions about skills and training. Do we have any framework in place for what kind of training the security person would have to go through, how broad it will be? Criminal Code of Canada, proper use of equipment, use of force including handcuffs: we have so many things here that they have to be trained on. Do we have some kind of framework in place on how intense the training will be?

**Mr. Meade:** I can tell you that will be part of the regulation process, but I can tell you going into it that we understand that the industry is varied. This bill talks about dog handlers to locksmiths to security guards to investigators. Even within the security guard field there is quite a range of activity.

The training will be associated with the activity. If it's a minimum required, which will be the principal, what's the minimum amount as opposed to something more than minimum? The focus will be on: what are the minimums? So if you're not having a lot of engagement with the public, the training is quite different than someone who is having a lot of engagement with the public.

**Mr. Kang:** So in that case, the person, he or she won't be able to pull their licence?

**Mr. Meade:** Sorry. I don't understand.

10:50

**Mr. Kang:** You know, in the act here we are proposing that they will be able to pull the licence from one company to another company. If they're not trained in the field the other company is



doing work in, then they won't be able to pull the licence. How would we cover it from that angle?

**Mr. Meade:** That will be something we'll work out with the industry. That's a balance between how much additional training for portability people need. But if you're not trained to do another job, then we would have some anxiety about you doing the other job. Certainly, if some of that additional work can be built into the minimum standards of training, then it would allow for portability. If you're doing the same job, the licence will be portable.

**Mr. Kang:** What kind of education? Grade 12? Grade 10? Grade 11?

**Mr. Meade:** We haven't spoken to education. Certainly, in the field that exists now, we wouldn't intend at this time to be talking about minimum education. The minimums are what's in the act, and then the minimums around training will be just very, very minimum in terms of what they need to do the job. We're not talking or proposing an academic base to the qualifications.

**Mr. Kang:** Can I ask one more question?

**The Chair:** Yeah.

**Mr. Kang:** See, the security jobs are mostly filled by immigrants per se, so what kind of English training will be the standard for minimum English knowledge? You know, is there any ESL program for people coming from other countries so we can bring them up to speed with a training course?

**Mr. Meade:** We propose to work with the industry, the employers or those folk. The training really is not language-based intensive, so we'll be able to offer the training to people at the level which they need to communicate to understand it. I really want to stress that the training isn't a lot of academic focus. It tends to be: what do you do in these situations? Real adult learning type activity.

**Mr. Kang:** Here we are talking of evidence collection and giving testimony in court. If the person, he or she, doesn't understand the language, how are they going to be effective in court and how are they going to be effective in collecting the evidence?

**Mr. Meade:** Most of the evidence they're collecting would be what they've witnessed. In terms of the training, it will need to meet their language issues for sure, and the training will have to be varied to account for that. I just want to stress that we're not having investigators going out doing work as a security guard. I'm going to go back to it: there's a range of jobs within this act. Some require a lot more training than others. The handling of a dog requires a lot more training than walking a perimeter of a building, different types of training. I don't want to value one over the other, but they're quite a different task, and therefore the training would be quite different.

**Mr. Kang:** So, sir, you're proposing there will be minimum basic training and then we will specialize in different fields? That's what you're trying to propose here?

**Mr. Meade:** That would be correct.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you, sir.

**The Chair:** That would be covered when you do your review with the stakeholders when it's time to draft regulations, I would imagine.

**Mr. Meade:** We'll work with the industry for sure and with the varied industries to ensure that the standards for training are minimum and meet the needs. Whether it's because it's English as second language folk or whether it's a somewhat transient workforce, there are a lot of issues with the workforce, and we'll have to ensure that the training meets the needs of the individuals, the employers, and certainly at a minimum level.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I have four more on the speakers list. Member MacDonald.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you. After reading part 4, Complaints and Discipline, I have a number of questions, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Meade. The first would be in section 25, complaints about an individual licensee. This complaint process has to unfold within 90 days after the action. I believe that in the Police Act you have one year. Why is there such a difference between the Police Act and this draft Bill 10? Or am I wrong?

**Mr. Meade:** No. It was seen that the 90 days would – you want to catch these things when they're relatively current. They tend to need that so you can have resolution to it. That was the thinking around this bill, that 90 days was sufficient for someone to say that they experienced a problem with a licensee.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Did the security industry have any comments during the consultation process regarding this 90-day period and when you compare it to the Police Act, it will be a year?

**Mr. Meade:** This is specific to the individual, right?

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes.

**Mr. Meade:** So the individual has experienced what they felt was a wrong. They have to write that within 90 days.

**Mr. Barker:** That doesn't extend to criminal matters.

**Mr. Meade:** That's correct. This does not extend to criminal matters. Criminal matters are a separate process. They immediately engage with the police.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Do you think the director of law enforcement – should they receive a copy of these complaints, or not?

**Mr. Barker:** The Law Enforcement Review Board would receive complaints upon an appeal being filed. So the public complainant files a complaint. If they're not happy with the decision, they can make their way up to the Law Enforcement Review Board. It's at that point the Law Enforcement Review Board would collect a copy. The registrar would through this legislation collect data on all public complaints filed for data tracking purposes and analysis of the industry as we move forward.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thank you.

Now, in section 26, Investigation and Disposition of Complaints, when a complaint is made, it must be investigated and disposed of. Who is doing this investigation, and what kind of training do they have?

**Mr. Meade:** The employer would be doing it at that level, and that would be built into the requirements that they would have in their licence.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. What do we have in mind here? What does investigation consist of? Is it interviews? Is it sworn statements or legal rights?

**Mr. Barker:** If we provide the same framework that we see in our peace officer program, we provide a generic list of what we expect the employer to look at in each instance. We recognize there'll be varying degree of skill, but to tie the employer into a potential issue with one of their employees is very important. This is why we ask that the initial complaint be dealt with at the employer level, so they know what's going on with their employees and can take the appropriate disciplinary action if they find the complaint to have validity.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Who would do the investigation? Is this a specific job?

**Mr. Barker:** It could be structured differently in each company. We don't know the internal practices or the internal capabilities of security guard agencies. It could be a very small company where it would be the owner, or if it's a very large company, they may have a dedicated unit for dealing with these issues.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. In section 26 you use the words "dispose of the complaint." What does "dispose" mean? Does it mean you've revoked the licence, fined the person, suspended them with or in some cases without pay? That's certainly an issue in the city of Edmonton Police Service right now.

**Mr. Barker:** "Dispose of" means that they have to deal with it either through an investigation and reaching a decision, whether the decision be that your complaint is valid, not valid, I can't tell if it's valid. Then if they do find that it's valid, they communicate to the complainant the discipline that's taken. The discipline that's taken could vary greatly due to the number of employers in our program. Some will be covered by collective agreements which are differing. Others could have different HR processes.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Let's say I'm under a cloud, I'm under a complaint process. When am I alerted that an individual has a complaint against me?

**Mr. Barker:** Through the regulations we're going to perhaps mirror some of the processes that we see in the Peace Officer Act. We would have to discuss this with the industry, but the standard practice with the Peace Officer Act is that if there's no risk to the public complainant or other process – it could be a criminal process that might be interfered with – the subject of the complaint is notified right away. These are some of the details we want to discuss with the industry to ensure that we're not overly onerous or creating a large workload for them.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Now, in section 26(2), "an employer may refuse to investigate or may discontinue the investigation." Do you think the employer has too much discretion? You know, you could have some bad publicity here, right?

11:00

**Mr. Barker:** Anything that's disposed of frivolously through subsection (2) can be appealed, and there'll be a check and balance in that process.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

**Mr. Meade:** The citizen at that time could go to the director. That's the third party. The third party in this situation is the director. The citizen can go to the director in terms of suspending or cancelling the licence, or they can go to civil court immediately – at any time, actually – if they feel that that is the most appropriate venue for them.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

Now, the next section, section 27. We're talking here about having an investigation completed in a certain time period, 90 days to complete. Now, what happens if that time period is not met? Can an employee then make a complaint if this is not dealt with straight away in 90 days?

**Mr. Barker:** Section 26(4) requires the employer to deal with the matter within 90 days. If that's not dealt with in 90 days, the ability is to go right to the registrar to have the matter disposed of.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. That's in 27(2), right?

**Mr. Barker:** Yes.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

I'd better be silent, Mr. Chairman, and let someone else ask some questions. This is quite a bill.

**The Chair:** Not a bad idea.

Member Brown.

**Dr. Brown:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions regarding sections 5 and 7, and I think that they both need some work in terms of the drafting there. The reason I think so is because for locking devices nowadays the trend is towards electronic locking devices and things like retinal scans, fingerprints, and whatnot.

I mean, you can even buy home locks now that work based on fingerprints. You've got these systems, like the OnStar system, that can remotely access locks through satellite or radio signals or cellular signals. I would be very concerned about personal identity, the electronic storage of those things like your retinal scan or like your fingerprint and whatnot, which I think is very serious in terms of your personal identity and possible theft thereof. I think you need to broaden that. The concept in section 5 seems mainly directed towards the old type of keys, and I think you need to update that verbiage in there.

With respect to section 7, specifically, I personally would be more concerned not about the person who responds in person to the location of a security alarm but the person who is on the other end of that electronic system: persons who have access to master codes, to backdoor codes, and to your security alarm system and people that have the ability to remotely access your security system and the possible misuse thereof. I really think that you need to do something about, you know, broadening that section 7 in terms of, like I said, the electronic access to security systems.

**Mr. Meade:** In terms of 7 one of the challenges we face with that one is that many, many of those companies are either not in Alberta or are, in fact, offshore, so a lot of those call centres they're going to, that have that information, aren't in the province. What we felt we could capture at least were those who are in the province, because they are responding. We did debate that very point, but the challenge was that so much of the industry isn't here.

**Dr. Brown:** Well, with great respect, though, if they do wish to do

business here in the province of Alberta, we can impose whatever conditions we wish to upon them. If we say that they need to have some sort of a proper electronic security in place to make sure that my fingerprint doesn't get copied and divulged to some third party for a nefarious purpose, then I think that's entirely within the jurisdiction of the province of Alberta.

**Mr. Meade:** I certainly understand your point about that.

**Dr. Brown:** I think that's where the industry is headed now. I mean, metal keys are going to be a thing of the past in the not-too-distant future. I think everything will become electronic. The issue there becomes: who's on the other end of the computer? I mean, where is this data stored that recognizes your fingerprint from everyone else's? It's a concern that we have. Like I said, the guy that comes around and checks to see whether or not it's a false alarm, to me, is of much less concern than somebody who has access to my security system via the telephone or cellular or satellite.

**The Chair:** Member Brown, if you go back to the beginning of the meeting, you know, the role of this committee is to make recommendations to the Legislature upon review. If we find weaknesses within the bill, we can offer that advice to the Legislature. I think you may want to park that idea for the time when we recommend some advice for the Legislature. If there's some further review that you require on that point, we can ask Bill and his team to provide you with that as well if you're uncomfortable with something in the bill.

**Dr. Brown:** Well, I guess I'm suggesting that maybe that's an area that we could look at for possible amendments of those two sections because I just don't think they reflect where the industry is going.

**The Chair:** Maybe you could give us some further advice on some wording, if there was something that we could recommend to the Legislature on that.

**Mr. Meade:** Okay. Yes.

**The Chair:** Member Brown, can I move on?

**Dr. Brown:** Yes. Please.

**The Chair:** Member Cao.

**Mr. Cao:** Thank you, Chairman. I'll continue on here. Part 6, regarding record keeping and so on. I think Member MacDonald mentioned it earlier; I'll just follow it up. I see that there are in fact four entities relating to this bill: the individual, let's just say, client, the one who goes to do the shopping, and then the business organization; then the security person; and perhaps there is a security company who hired that individual. So I see that there are four entities that are interrelated.

I'd like to stand for the individual person. For example, I go shopping, and then the security there says, "Hey, you shoplifted," and takes me in, but he works for a security company, not for the shop. When I read this, I think there are four entities in here. We need to somehow pull in the entity of the organization, the shop owner. Right now I see only the security guard and the company that employs the security person.

From my perspective, in my constituency probably two cases came to me over the years. They complained that they got held by the security guard of the shop in a very undignified manner, who

made them sit there with people passing by, and he looked like he's guilty, caught, and looked shameful.

There are two things I'd like to do, maybe look into it in either regulation or something in there that includes the shop. Let's just say the name of a shop. Superstore, for example, is responsible for dealing with the clients. Right now, the way they complained to me, the security worked for a security company contracted to look after the mall. Really, nobody's accountable for the issue. In fact, the person complained to me that she is a client of the shop being maltreated by the security company. Now do we complain to the security company or complain to the shop owner? To me there are somehow four entities to have to identify the responsibility of for such a complaint process.

**11:10**

The other part of it is in record keeping. I feel that if there is an incident in a certain shop, the record keeping of it by incident should be kept, a database to either refer to later or to argue about and so on. Where that came to me, as I said, it's not well kept. Perhaps even at the conclusion of the case it's dismissed, but I'd like to know how we keep the record of the incident in a certain database so that later if the security guard was complained about when he worked somewhere else, we still have something to relate to, or in the checking, the licensing, part of it can be used.

Those are the two things that I am trying to see in here. I'm not clear whether it's covered in here already or it will be developed in the regulations. It's about, basically, I think, something to do with the way to handle the incident, treating the person as not guilty until proven, with dignity and all of that aspect, and then the record keeping of those incidents.

**Mr. Meade:** Would you like me to comment, Mr. Chairman?

**The Chair:** Yeah. In my previous life we had retail stores, and every shoplifter that I caught was always, you know, not guilty – I don't know – and always claimed to be a regular shopper. I could never figure out why they needed to have an extra pair of jeans under the jeans they were wearing.

You know, the stakeholders involved here, Mr. Cao, have been the Northern Alberta Shopping Centre Association, Retail Alberta, Retail Council of Canada, Southern Alberta Shopping Centre Association. I mean, it's not just the security people that have been consulted here. The retail establishments have been very involved in the discussions here as well.

**Mr. Cao:** Right. But I'm not disputing the facts about guilty or not guilty. I'm talking about the process.

**The Chair:** Yeah. Okay.

**Mr. Cao:** How to handle those incidents.

**The Chair:** Bill, you have some comments?

**Mr. Meade:** Just in terms of the gathering of the information associated with the incident. That would be the responsibility of the company, but we would have access to that information, so we would be able to review it, as opposed to us storing it all. It would be quite a load.

In terms of the companies the loss prevention workers clearly are employees. I don't know this particular situation, whether it was a security guard of the mall or a security guard of the building or a loss prevention worker, but that's important because clearly the loss

prevention workers, we've come to understand, are for the most part hired by the stores themselves. So they're very much engaged.

**Mr. Cao:** Yeah. That's why I said there are four entities in here. Let's just say the person is guilty, has stolen. You know, that's no problem. But if there is a complaint, then is the complaint with the store? The store will say, "No, it's the security company that I hired," so the storekeeper is not responsible. How is the process? Clarify that. That's what I mean. There may be some area here that when I read it, it's just not clear who is not passing the buck. Okay? So the person complains with the store manager. The store manager: oh, that's the security company we hired. So that's it. Then you go and complain with the security company. Who is responsible for that complaint? That's what I'd like to see clearer or in your regulation: the process of complaint.

**The Chair:** Member Jacobs.

**Mr. Jacobs:** Thank you very much. Listening to the question posed by Member Sandhu on training caused me to ask this question. Perhaps it's somewhat of a hypothetical question. My observation in life has been that many times when we give authority, there's a human tendency to abuse the authority. Specifically, I guess, I'm asking: as we train people, is there any way to discern or ascertain the character of people that might be prone to abuse authority? I think some people handle authority better than others, and I think that how we use and handle authority when we deal with the public is important. I think it's important that we don't, you know, take advantage of people's rights by the way we handle them. So is there any psychiatric training or any psychological training or any way you have to determine the people that are most appropriate to be security people or enforcement people?

**Mr. Meade:** Certainly, in the police officer community, wherein the training is much more advanced – it tends to last a lot longer – you can start to get the feel of an individual in terms of how they're handling it. For this act that will really come only with the use of force. So we might see tendencies in the training on the use of force that would cause alarm associated with that type of activity. But I also want to state for the record that we have a lot of people employed in Alberta in this industry, and really the lion's share of them never have such situations.

You're absolutely right. There are times when we're dealing with inappropriate behaviour from someone who has issues of authority and maybe not managing it well, but that's not the normal case for folks. We'll get at a little bit of that with the training, but the training isn't really advanced and in-depth. We will look to weed those out. Firms will be taught how to weed those out. That's the kind of standard that we'll be presenting through the regulations.

**Mr. Jacobs:** A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Chairman. In the use of force, if you determine that candidates may be prone to overuse force or abuse the use of force, would they be denied a licence or be denied the ability to proceed?

**Mr. Meade:** What it does is initially it causes a question mark, and then that question mark has to be reviewed by the employer and, if it's reported, through to the director around the training or the registrar. It may or may not lead to cancellation or suspensions or not offering a licence. Sometimes it's a good thing because you identify certain tendencies, and then you can manage or modify them with other training.

**Mr. Jacobs:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Let's remember, colleagues, that the intent of the bill is not to make it so restrictive to put this industry out of business. They have hiring problems just like everybody else does. I think that we need to be aware that this industry operates fairly well, like Bill had mentioned, and with very few complaints. To establish some rules and regulations around how they operate and how they recruit and how we deal with complaints is important, but let's make sure that, like Member Brown says, we don't use such heavy-handed legislation that we put these folks out of business. That's not the intent.

**Mr. Jacobs:** Balance is important.

**The Chair:** That's right.

Member MacDonald, then Member Sandhu.

11:20

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you. I have some questions around section 27 again, the review by the registrar. Now, section 27(6): "the Registrar may vary the terms and conditions of or [even] cancel or suspend the individual licensee's licence or the employer's business licence." Can he or she, the registrar, add penalties, if I'm interpreting that correctly, if they're not satisfied that this is stringent enough?

[Mr. Kang in the chair]

**Mr. Meade:** I'm not sure in terms of penalties . . .

**Mr. MacDonald:** Well, "can vary the terms and conditions" if the registrar is not satisfied: are we giving the registrar a lot of power here?

**Mr. Meade:** So you're looking for an example of terms or a condition that they might invoke here?

**Mr. MacDonald:** I want to know why that's in there. I don't need an example.

**Mr. Meade:** There would be certain conditions that we would expect. It could be around training, that too many of their people aren't receiving the basic training. What are some other examples around that?

**Mr. Barker:** They could be in violation of the act on a repeated basis, so we'd ask for enhanced reporting requirements – "Please report to us on a regular basis how many people you hire, what training they go through" – just to keep more on top of what the particular issue is.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Now, in the next section, part 5, dealing with inspections, are you contemplating going in and doing any random inspections, or will it be only occurring as the result of a complaint?

**Mr. Barker:** We currently conduct random inspections, and we'd like that process to continue.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

I have a few other questions if I can continue, please, Mr. Chairman. Okay. Now, all the activities of the registrar: the rules of FOIP would apply, correct?

**Mr. Meade:** That's correct, although things might be severed based upon the rules of FOIP.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. That wouldn't surprise me.

With the PowerPoint presentation that we received last week, for in-house security guards Bill 10 will result in better co-ordination with police services. How will that work?

**Mr. Meade:** Similar to what we did with the Peace Officer Act, we really wanted to make sure that this is part of the continuum. What we're proposing is one of the reasons why we want to modify the existing act in proposing Bill 10: to ensure there is a co-ordination. So if, for example, you're having the loss prevention workers needing to apprehend suspects who have potentially stolen from you, we want to make sure that the process of co-ordination is worked out with the local police because ultimately they have to come and pick the individual up.

[Mr. VanderBurg in the chair]

It's things like that we'll be looking for so that they've had some conversation if it's required. Many of the associations already do this with the police. There's one in Edmonton and Calgary where they have ongoing dialogue as an association with the Edmonton police, the Calgary police, so that they ensure that there is a co-ordination. We would look to see that there was some of that in their business licence process.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thank you.

Now, section 4, dealing with the guard dog handlers. The guard dog handlers must have a licence. Who do they get that from, and what are the qualifications of the individuals who are going to provide those papers?

**Mr. Meade:** The licence would be part of this act, and the requirements would be part of the regulations, specifically what that would look like.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Now, the volunteer security guards that not regulated. Some of the bouncers and people like that, they are only – am I correct? – municipally regulated.

**Mr. Meade:** Well, there are two groups in there. You talk about the volunteers. The volunteers would not fall under this. If you want to hold a rodeo and have some people manning the door, walking around doing something, that would be something that the municipality or the local Rotary Club or whoever is holding the event would do, and they wouldn't require licensing. The bouncers, though, would be under the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Act. That's where that would fall, so it wouldn't fall under this act.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Gotcha.

Can I ask another question, please?

**The Chair:** One more, and then we'll move on to Member Sandhu.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. The section here on loss prevention workers, section 6. If you look at Mr. Webber's report and recommendations: "It is recommended that these individuals be licensed in a separate category to reflect their distinct and critical role in reducing criminal activity in retail and commercial businesses." This is on page 7, I should say, of Mr. Webber's report. It goes on to say that there's "a high degree of interaction with the public, consistent training standards are critical." They have to be able to

operate under some very stressful circumstances, from what I can understand. Do you think this section, section 6, where we identify loss prevention workers, is what Mr. Webber had in mind here, or was he looking at having a separate bill entirely for loss prevention?

**Mr. Meade:** No. I think that having the separate section is what the report requests. So we have a separate section for the loss prevention worker. You're right: the training is different, the interface with the police is different, and of course they are in plain clothes. So the regulations associated with uniforms and such will not apply to them. That's where the decision was made to have a separate section for loss prevention workers.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. What happens with a loss – no, I'll be silent. I'll get back on the list. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Member Sandhu.

**Mr. Sandhu:** Thank you, Chairman. I was just wondering about section 8, Business Licences. Is it going to fall into the TILMA agreement between provinces?

**Mr. Meade:** Yeah. We've looked at TILMA, and there isn't anything that we're in conflict with with the TILMA legislation.

**Mr. Sandhu:** So they can . . .

**Mr. Meade:** Yeah. If you're going to be doing this work in Alberta – the B.C. act isn't quite the same. I don't know if we're going to get to the comparisons research, but there are some subtle differences. So we wanted to ensure that if they're doing this work in Alberta, they have to have the licence associated with the security work. There's that other clause that allows that transfer in and out if it's that type of work. But we're not in conflict with TILMA.

**Mr. Sandhu:** Oh. So they cannot work here, then, with a B.C. security licence?

**Mr. Meade:** The B.C. legislation is different, so there had to be a recognition of the differences associated with that.

**Mr. Sandhu:** So it won't fall in that one.  
Thank you.

**The Chair:** Member MacDonald, do you have further questions?

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes, I do. Now, in section 7, please.

**Dr. Brown:** Mr. Chair, just with respect to the TILMA, if I could, Mr. MacDonald.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. Go ahead, please.

**Dr. Brown:** Is there then going to be an attempt to harmonize with British Columbia with a view to making sure that security guards and so on from British Columbia will be able to obtain employment here in Alberta and vice versa?

**Mr. Meade:** That's important. There is a national body that is made up of the director types or the registrar types, like Matt, from across the country, and as most provinces seem to be evolving to new legislation or just recently introduced legislation, there are opportunities to ensure the co-ordination, really, around the regulation

sections to ensure that we encourage that. The industry is feeling – I think it came up earlier – pressed to get people to do the work. So not only are we looking within Canada but externally to allow for transfers in to do the work that's required.

**Dr. Brown:** Would it not then be prudent to have a section in the act which would say that there could be reciprocating agreements made with other jurisdictions as the regulations are harmonized so that if, for example, British Columbia was the first one to do so, we could say in a regulation that security guards from British Columbia would be entitled to have privileges in Alberta and vice versa? A simple enabling section in there to facilitate that further integration between provinces. Just a suggestion.

Thank you, Mr. MacDonald.

**The Chair:** Member MacDonald.

11:30

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. In section 7, a security alarm responder. How does that section affect a store manager who after hours has an electronic signal to their home? There is an incident that is detected. The signal is sent to the store manager's home. Are they then caught in this act?

**Mr. Meade:** No. It's really to ensure that the person responding understands things like: they have to follow the rules of the road; they can't have lights and sirens blasting. There's some background work to ensure that there's not undesirable-type history associated with that. It's really those, that specific identified activity, not the store manager who's going back to the store to find out what happened.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. They're responding to an alarm. They don't need to get a special . . .

**Mr. Meade:** No.

**Mr. MacDonald:** They do not need to get a licence. Okay.

I had another question here, but I lost it, Mr. Chairman. Oh, yes. It's in part 1, the licensed activities, section 2. What would happen with an occupational health and safety inspector? They're not involved in this at all? They're not caught in this section?

**Mr. Barker:** If you look at section 10(1), they're engaged by the Crown or an agent of the Crown to perform investigative work, so they would be exempt. If it was an occupational health and safety officer employed internally by the company, they would be exempted by section (m).

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Now, the last question I believe I have at this time is on the code of conduct. There is to be a code of conduct, I understand. How will that be developed?

**Mr. Meade:** That would be developed at the same time we develop the regulations, and we would engage both the industry and any organizations who wanted to contribute to that discussion.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay.

My last question, Mr. Chairman, is the hotel industry. I see that they were involved in the consultation process. I had no idea that the hotel industry had so many security people hired or that they monitored their facilities so extensively. What opinions did the hotel

industry provide to Mr. Webber regarding the drafting of this bill if you can recall, please?

**Mr. Meade:** I'm going by memory. There was a range. Certainly, there was a recognition that the work is crucial to ensure the safety of the guests and the visitors to the various hotel facilities, so there needed to be ensured that that work was carried out in a way that was seen to be proper.

I think, certainly, as we continue the consultation process with groups like that, in this case the hospitality industry, we will need to ensure that we're meeting their needs around standards and training and things like that. You know, there was a varied opinion. Like that balance that we're trying to find, there is a balance in any particular group of opinions about government oversight for sure, but it was recognized to be an important part of ensuring the safety of people who visit hotels. It was work that needed to be done, and we needed to ensure there was a minimum oversight but important oversight, nonetheless, to ensure the work was done in a way that was safe for all.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you.

**Mr. Kang:** In here it is recommended that the security companies have to have liability insurance of \$1 million. How about the organization which is using the volunteer security guards? Are they required to have any liability insurance?

**Mr. Meade:** They're not required under this act to have that because they're exempted from this act.

**Mr. Kang:** Should we have some provision in there that they have to have liability insurance in case something happens?

**Mr. Meade:** Well, they would have such need depending on the event. That's the challenge, right? There's quite a variety of events. What we're saying is that this act will exempt them. Therefore, it exempts all parts of the act.

**Mr. Kang:** Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Final question, Member Cao.

**Mr. Cao:** Thank you. My question is quite simple here. For the private investigation on the section where they were talking about displaying their licence or symbol or uniform. A couple of years ago I ran into a situation. My constituent said that, in fact, he was a WCB case. There are people sent by WCB to investigate, to follow, to do surveillance on the person. It's almost like being harassed in some way in his view, so he came and complained to me. Well, my office went and asked that person who parked the car close to my office, you know, filming, and that person refused to say whether he was a private – first he denied: no, I'm not an investigator. But, in fact, he is, and he refused to show his licence, and so on.

My question is: I think that something needs to be done here for the display of the licence if you're a private investigator when you're asked or challenged on your profession. You have to do that, so show it. That's one thing. I don't know where it is in here to require that.

The other one is about the training and qualification. I remember that when we did the child care, we had different levels depending on if you look after infants or education components. You have different levels of licences. Can I see something similar here, or are

you thinking about different levels? Even colleges like NorQuest College or Bow Valley College in Calgary have a program to study and, depending on what level, certification for those requirements. I'm seeing something maybe moving in that direction here. It's not a college degree but at least certification of some kind. Give people a chance to study for it rather than, you know, rejecting them: you're not qualified. Boom. Out. Something, I think, probably in the regulation or in that part.

My last one here is regarding – in page 4 of your presentation you mentioned something about qualification, criteria, and application for individual licences, and you list sort of a preliminary list of a few things like 18 years old, Canadian citizen, and so on. Something that caught my attention is: “be fluent in speaking and writing English.” Now, there was a question before: what kind of level of training? When you specify a particular language, immediately what comes into my mind is French, a language. You know, this is a country we're talking about, so there may be some implication here that we need to cover in that aspect. That's my question, then. Thank you.

**Mr. Meade:** Do you want me to respond?

**The Chair:** You can respond. But, remember, the intention is not to make this bill so restrictive that we put these folks out of business. Let's remember that.

**Mr. Cao:** Yeah. This is just clarification, like showing the badges or the ID that you are a private investigator when you're challenged. That does not stop anybody doing anything. Also about the training levels so that at least more people have a chance to get into it.

11:40

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Meade:** I could probably just really quickly. Part 6, section 30(3), speaks to that you have to show it if you're asked. You don't have to – I mean, it would be difficult for an investigator to have it . . .

**Mr. Cao:** Yeah. Understand.

**Mr. Meade:** When they're doing the work they're doing, you know, it goes against it. In terms of the language and some of the other criteria, you'll find they did not make it into the bill. Some of that would be in regulations, but clearly the issue of English was seen not to make it into the bill. In terms of training, the minimum training will need to meet the job. It's more varied than children's services because you're going from dog handlers to security guards to loss prevention workers, that kind of thing. So the training will fit based on the requirements of the job.

**The Chair:** Well, thank you. That ends the questions for this portion.

Bill and Matthew, do you have some additional comments?

**Mr. Meade:** No. No further comment.

**The Chair:** Okay. I think it's a little more in-depth than maybe you had expected, but it gives the members a chance to ask the questions that they've had asked to them, to get on record, and get some further clarifications.

Phil, we're going to move on to the next section. You've provided us with a cross-jurisdictional comparison and a stakeholder list detailed in tab 6. As well, there were stakeholders represented

in Webber's report, on page 20 of that report: a pretty wide consultation done here.

Go ahead, Phil.

**Dr. Massolin:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just wondering: would you like me just to highlight some observations from that cross-jurisdictional piece right now, which I can do, and then we'll take questions?

**The Chair:** Yeah.

**Dr. Massolin:** Sure. Thank you. Here are some highlights, some observations in terms of doing the comparison with Bill 10 and other appropriate jurisdictions across Canada. First of all, in terms of who must be licensed. In British Columbia and Quebec both of those jurisdictions require security consultants to be licensed while in Ontario and with Bill 10 the security consultants are specifically exempted. Ontario and British Columbia include bouncers under the definition of security guards; therefore, bouncers must be licensed in those provinces. As you know, they're not included under Bill 10. Licensing and training in Alberta is done by the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission. Note that Bill 10 is unique among those jurisdictions that we studied in this piece in making provisions which deal specifically with guard dog handlers and loss prevention officers. In the other jurisdictions these are included under the definition of security guards and under the regulations.

Now, in terms of licensing exemptions. Bill 10 and Ontario's legislation specifically exempt armoured vehicle guards from licensing. British Columbia, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Newfoundland and Labrador all require armoured vehicle guards to be licensed. Now, note as well that in all provinces and territories armoured vehicle guards must also be licensed under the federal Firearms Act.

In terms of training and weapons. With Bill 10 Alberta would be the only jurisdiction to require that a licensed security business report in writing to the registrar any use of a weapon or any allegation of use of excessive force by an individual licensee employed by the security business. Note that British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador explicitly prohibit the carrying or use of firearms by security guards licensed under their respective legislation with the exception of armoured vehicle guards. All training requirements and restrictions on weapons other than those prohibitions just mentioned in British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador are left to the regulations in the other jurisdictions.

Now, in terms of individual licence requirements. Bill 10 leaves most of the licensing requirements to the regulations, as we've heard. The bill stipulates only that the requirements found in the regulations be met, that the fee be paid, and that information requested by the registrar be provided. Any age, residency, or citizenship requirements would have to be prescribed in the regulations. Ontario requires that licensees be at least 18 years of age, be entitled to work in Canada, and possess a clean criminal record. British Columbia requires that licensees be at least 19 years of age and be ordinarily resident in Canada. Quebec requires that licensees be at least 18 years of age, of good moral character, and to never have been convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code. Note that among the jurisdictions compared, only Newfoundland and Labrador requires that licensees be Canadian citizens.

Now moving on to business licence requirements, Ontario and Quebec require that owners or people in control of businesses applying for licences meet the same requirements as individual licensees. British Columbia requires that the identity of the people who own or control the business be disclosed and that a change of

ownership be reported. Bill 10 requires that the business licensee report the use of a weapon or an allegation of use of excessive force by an individual licensee employed by the business. Bill 10 and British Columbia legislation both require that the business licensee report when any individual licensee employed by the business is charged with or convicted of a criminal offence.

In terms of the cancellation or suspension of a licence all jurisdictions under comparison here allow for licences to be cancelled or suspended. British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba require that the licensee be given an opportunity to be heard before the licence is cancelled or suspended. Bill 10 and Ontario and Quebec legislation require that notice of the cancellation or suspension be given in writing. In Ontario the licensee then has a chance to respond. Under Bill 10 the notice must contain reasons for the cancellation or suspension.

Now moving on to the appeal of a decision regarding licences, all jurisdictions allow for an appeal of a decision not to grant a licence or a decision to cancel or suspend a licence. In British Columbia a licensee may ask the registrar to reconsider the decision. In Ontario there's an opportunity to show cause as to why the registrar should not take a particular action, followed by an appeal to the Licence Appeal Tribunal of Ontario. In Quebec there is an appeal to the administrative appeal tribunal of Quebec. In Saskatchewan there's appeal to a commission and then to the courts. Newfoundland and Labrador and Manitoba allow for appeals directly to the courts. Bill 10 allows for an appeal of the registrar's decision to the Law Enforcement Review Board, as we've heard.

Lastly, Mr. Chair, in terms of complaints and appeals it bears noting that all jurisdictions allow for anyone to make reports or complaints regarding licensees. In the compared jurisdictions, other than in Alberta with this proposed legislation, the complaint may be made to the registrar or the registrar's equivalent, as the case may be, and the registrar would conduct an investigation. Note that Bill 10 is unique in requiring that the complaint be made to the employer of an individual licensee and that the employer investigate the complaint in the first instance. According to Bill 10 the registrar will investigate if the complainant so requests following the employer's investigation or the employer's refusal to investigate or if the complaint is against a business licensee. However, if the complainant is not satisfied with the outcome of the investigation, the only recourse is to seek judicial review. This is true not only for Bill 10, but it is consistent in every jurisdiction that we looked at.

Just to end off here, in the case of the revocation of a licence, for all jurisdictions if a complaint results in the licensee's having his or her licence cancelled or suspended, then the licensee may appeal that decision, as we outlined earlier, to the appropriate board or to the courts, as the case may be, in the individual jurisdiction.

That's the overview that I offer here. We're ready to answer questions if you have any.

11:50

**The Chair:** Phil, that's exactly what the committee was looking for. Well done.

**Dr. Massolin:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Maybe I should have had you speak before Bill because maybe it would have been clearer for some of the members, but thank you, and well done.

Just before lunch we'll have a few short questions. Member Cao.

**Mr. Cao:** Okay. Well, thank you. This is a great overview across the nation so we don't reinvent the wheel; we learn from others.

There's a portion where you said that when the resolution of a complaint is not satisfied, the complainant, I would say, can go into – is that a judiciary review?

**Dr. Massolin:** Yes.

**Mr. Cao:** Which means court, right?

**Dr. Massolin:** That's right.

**Mr. Cao:** Which means cost to the person, right? I mean, if you are bringing something I'm not happy with, the organization ruling on, investigating their own employee, I only go to court, and now it costs. How is that dealt with in the others? First of all, probably people said: "Okay, you investigate your own employee, and then you say that he's okay. Now I have to launch a lawsuit, really, and it costs me money, so I'm not going to do it. I keep quiet and get frustrated and get mad and so on." I don't know how that gets resolved in the other jurisdictions that you talked about.

**Dr. Massolin:** Yeah. I'll defer to Katrina in case she needs to supplement. Katrina did most of the work on this, by the way. Our understanding is that all jurisdictions are similar to what Bill 10 proposes in terms of the recourse that the complainant has in case the initial review goes against the complainant.

**Ms Stewart:** Yeah, that's consistent. It is consistent across the jurisdictions. Once a member of the public has made a complaint and that complaint has been investigated up to the level of the registrar or equivalent office in each province, then that's where the decision is made. That's the third party making the decision. As they've said before, there is the option of going to court on a civil matter, or there is the option of seeking judicial review. But, as you said, that does involve going to court.

**Mr. Cao:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Excuse me on my comments, Katrina. Good job on providing the briefings for Phil to say the right things.

**Ms Stewart:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We're going to break for lunch. We have the stakeholder list provided to us from research. That's just an information item. Then we'll move on to item 5. At 12:20 sharp, back here, we'll start. Any member have a problem with 12:20? Seeing none, thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 11:54 a.m. to 12:26 p.m.]

**The Chair:** Thank you, members. We'll continue on to item 5, Consultation. As you can see, research has provided us quite a list of stakeholders. As well, the Webber report, table 1 on page 20, shows a list of stakeholders represented in his report and review. As well, the department has made it very clear that come time for drafting the regulations, there will be extensive consultation for that process. So my question to the members is: where to from here? It's a little different bill than a lot of the bills that have been reviewed by committees of the Legislature because this bill has gone through so much scrutiny and consultation. What are your wishes?

**Dr. Brown:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would propose, in terms of further consultation, that we send out a letter of invitation to all of



the identified stakeholders on our lists together with a copy of Bill 10 as it's presently drafted and invite specific comments with respect to the provisions in that bill and any suggestions for improvements or changes or alterations that might come from stakeholders, that we might consider them further in our deliberations.

**The Chair:** Well, knowing that we have to report back to the Legislature for the last week of October, if we did that, what kind of timeline do you think would be reasonable?

**Dr. Brown:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we communicate with them as soon as possible and that we advise them that any submissions ought to be made by the end of August. That would allow some time to circulate to the members any suggestions so we could consider them in advance of a meeting. I would suggest that our further meeting ought not to take place until the middle of September at the earliest.

**The Chair:** Melanie, can you give me some comments? Is that fair to staff to be able to get a letter like that out and get it done in time?

**Ms Friesacher:** I'll defer to Phil on this one.

**Dr. Massolin:** I think that as long as we have a couple of weeks between the deadline for submissions and the following meeting where we'd have to report on the summary of those written submissions, that would be sufficient.

**The Chair:** Well, then, I think it would be fair to accept a motion.

**Dr. Massolin:** In terms of the stakeholders list I just wanted to offer, if we're going that route, a couple of additions that we may have overlooked to see if it's acceptable to the committee. That is to add the RCMP, specifically K Division, because that would round out the list of the police associations, and also what is colloquially known as the health superboard, the Alberta Health Services Board. As we heard from the ministry, the security services there come into frequent contact with people, members of the public, and therefore they might want to be consulted. They should be perhaps added to the list as well.

**Dr. Brown:** Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of getting the discussion on track, I suppose, I'd like to make a motion that the committee by way of further consultation would communicate at the earliest possible date with all of our identified list of stakeholders and any additional ones that Dr. Massolin has identified with an invitation for them to provide written comments to Bill 10 as it's presently constituted by not later than August 31.

**The Chair:** Okay. We have comments. Member MacDonald.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Yes. I have a question, really. After this consultation process and there are written responses, will there be an opportunity if any of these stakeholders want to come and have a Q and A with us? Is that part of your consultation process?

**Dr. Brown:** Well, no. That's not what I had envisioned, but I suppose that if the committee decided that there were some particularly contentious issues that had been raised, it would be incumbent upon the committee to decide whether they wanted to invite somebody further to appear. I'm thinking of the very tight timelines that we have in terms of our mandate to report back to the Legislature by October, and I really don't see that we can reinvent the wheel

in hearing from stakeholders in person. I just don't think it's feasible. But, with that exception, if there are specific provisions that are identified as being contentious or that we need further input on, I think it would be free to the committee to invite such submissions.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Cao:** I go along with consultation in the way that Member Brown expressed. I can see Member MacDonald talking about if somebody wants to meet as an MLA, as a member of the committee, they can always come to our own offices and talk about the issue as well. Those are opportunities, so we can carry that in as well.

My other add-on is that when we talk about mailing out and so on, we should not forget about availability of the Internet, open so people can input there.

**The Chair:** The thing I want to caution the member on is that we all have rights as individual members of the Legislature, but this is a committee of the Legislature, and I want to make you all aware that I don't approve of a whole bunch of individual work being done. This is work being done by a committee, and I'm not going to encourage a whole bunch of private meetings being held so other members don't hear what's going on. We work as a group, we work as members appointed by the Legislature, and I think the Speaker would have an issue with individuals going around having separate meetings.

It doesn't mean that your constituents can't talk to you at any time. Everybody knows their roles as MLAs, but I'm not going to encourage separate meetings by individuals. This is why we operate as a team of the Legislature. I want to make that point clear.

**Mr. Cao:** Right. Probably I am misunderstood. I'm not saying that individual members organize a meeting. I mean that if somebody reads the material and wants to voice a particular concern, they can get hold of an MLA and say, "Hey, I have this" and those can feed back to us. So we don't need to have them here presenting and talking about the thing they already wrote to us.

**The Chair:** Well, I'd prefer that the letters come through me, the chair, and I distribute them to the members individually. You know what I just said; operate accordingly. I'm not going to tell you how to do your job as an MLA, but just know that I prefer things coming through the chair. I distribute them to everybody.

**Mr. Cao:** Right. Okay.

**The Chair:** Okay. Further discussion.

**Mr. MacDonald:** I would just like, Mr. Chairman, to get on the record that I can understand your interest in wanting to keep an eye on the flow of the paperwork with this committee, but we all have individual responsibilities as MLAs that are far beyond this committee. I can understand where you're coming from, but I take offence with your caution.

However, for the members I would like to say that a constituent of mine who is involved in the security industry requested a copy of Bill 10. I provided a copy to him. He organized a meeting, which I attended on July 2 at West Edmonton Mall. Unfortunately, he had to work and could not attend, but 65 people who had an interest in this bill in its present form took time out of their busy schedules to come to West Edmonton Mall. Some came from as far away as Calgary.

12:35

I appreciate the initiative by Dr. Brown to move that we have another consultation process because, clearly, it was indicated to me just from the attendance from a wide variety of sectors of the security industry who attended the meeting in West Edmonton Mall that there is a need for another consultation process. I would just like to get on the record saying that I would support your motion. I appreciate it, and I think it is necessary at this time.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Good.

Any further comments before I call the question? All those in favour? Those opposed? It's carried.

Any other business? Jody has asked that we have a motion to authorize the chair and the deputy chair to proceed with the stakeholder list and letter. The letter will be provided to us by you, Phil, and your staff through Jody?

**Dr. Massolin:** Through Jody. Yes.

**The Chair:** I ask for a motion to authorize this. Motion by Member Jacobs. All those in favour? Those opposed? Carried.

We'll move on to item 6. Anything else that the members would like to raise at this time? Phil, anything from you?

**Dr. Massolin:** No. Nothing from me.

**The Chair:** Bill. No?

**Mr. Meade:** No.

**The Chair:** We'll move on to the date.

Oh. Sorry.

**Mr. MacDonald:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to

again be on the record expressing my gratitude to Mr. Meade, who, after I contacted you, Mr. Chairman, agreed to meet with the stakeholders who had questions on this bill. I would just like to say again on the record: thank you for doing that. I know it's summertime, and everyone has got different schedules and whatnot, but Mr. Meade saw to it straight away that the stakeholders who had questions were contacted.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I would just like the date of the next meeting, then, left up to Member Kang and myself. We'll see how that list of stakeholders' requests or letters of concerns come back, and then I think the two of us will get together and call the meeting. But understand that we need some time for the staff to review after the 31st, and maybe the two of us will consult with you at that time. We'll call the meeting but not till after the 15th, 16th, mid-September. I think that's the timeline that you said you'd need to do the review.

**Dr. Massolin:** Yes. That would be great. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is that okay with members?

**Ms Friesacher:** Just a point of clarification. You've mentioned the stakeholder communication. Does the committee wish to do any public consultation or notice, like requesting public input?

**The Chair:** I didn't hear that in the motion, so I think we'd stick to the stakeholders, as per the motion. Thank you.

**Ms Friesacher:** All right.

**The Chair:** I'd ask for a motion to adjourn. Member Sandhu. All those in favour? Those opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Good work, everyone.

[The committee adjourned at 12:40 p.m.]



