



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 28th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Thursday, September 27, 2012
1:05 p.m.

Transcript No. 28-1-2

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

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Kennedy-Glans, Donna, Calgary-Varsity (PC), Chair
Rowe, Bruce, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (W), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Rob, Airdrie (W)
Anglin, Joe, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL)
Brown, Dr. Neil, QC, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (PC)
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)
Cao, Wayne C.N., Calgary-Fort (PC)
Casey, Ron, Banff-Cochrane (PC)
Dorward, David, Edmonton-Gold Bar (PC)*
Fenske, Jacquie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (PC)
Hale, Jason W., Strathmore-Brooks (W)
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (AL)
Johnson, Linda, Calgary-Glenmore (PC)
Kubinec, Maureen, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (PC)
Lemke, Ken, Stony Plain (PC)
Leskiw, Genia, Bonnyville-Cold Lake (PC)
Olesen, Cathy, Sherwood Park (PC)**
Quest, Dave, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (PC)***
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)
Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)
Xiao, David H., Edmonton-McClung (PC)
Young, Steve, Edmonton-Riverview (PC)
Vacant

* substitution for David Xiao

** substitution for Steve Young

*** substitution for Rick Fraser

Support Staff

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

1:05 p.m. Thursday, September 27, 2012

[Ms Kennedy-Glans in the chair]

The Chair: All right. We're going to start, folks. Apologies for being five minutes late here. We'll try to improve this record. We're all here but one, so I think that's pretty wonderful for a big committee like this. This is our second meeting, and I think we're achieving some progress. I'm very pleased with that.

I'd like to ask everyone here at the table to introduce themselves, and I'll start with myself. I'm the chair, Donna Kennedy-Glans. I'll turn to my right, to the vice-chair.

Mr. Rowe: Thank you very much, Donna. I'm Bruce Rowe, MLA for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills and deputy chair of this committee.

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

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

Mr. Dorward: David Dorward, MLA for Edmonton-Gold Bar and representing MLA David Xiao, who is out of the country.

Ms Calahasen: Pearl Calahasen, Lesser Slave Lake.

Mr. Hale: Jason Hale, MLA, Strathmore-Brooks.

Mr. Webber: Len Webber, Calgary-Foothills.

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

Ms Blakeman: Laurie Blakeman, and I'd like to welcome each and every one of you to my fabulous constituency of Edmonton-Centre.

Ms Fenske: Jacquie Fenske, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

Mr. Olesen: Cathy Olesen, Sherwood Park. I'm sitting in for Steve Young today.

Mr. Casey: Ron Casey, Banff-Cochrane.

Ms L. Johnson: Linda Johnson, Calgary-Glenmore.

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

Mr. Lemke: Ken Lemke, Stony Plain.

Ms Sorensen: Rhonda Sorensen, manager of corporate communications and broadcast services for the LAO.

Mr. Bilous: Good afternoon. Deron Bilous, MLA for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

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

Ms Dean: Good afternoon. Shannon Dean, Senior Parliamentary Counsel, director of House services.

Mr. Sandhu: Good afternoon. Peter Sandhu, MLA, Edmonton-Manning.

Mr. Anglin: Joe Anglin, MLA, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Mr. Cao: Wayne Cao, MLA for Calgary-Fort.

Mr. Quest: Dave Quest, Strathcona-Sherwood Park, subbing for Rick Fraser.

Dr. Brown: Neil Brown, Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

The Chair: I'd also like to make reference to Drew Barnes on the line. Are you there with us, Drew?

Mr. Barnes: Donna, yes, I am.

The Chair: Thank you.

The standard process here – I'm sure you're all familiar with it – is that we don't have to touch the microphone consoles. They'll be automatically started so that only one of us can speak at a time. If you've got a cellphone or an iPhone around, could you please turn it off? It can interfere with the audiofeed. As we all know, this is being recorded for *Hansard*, by *Hansard*, and will be available – is it tomorrow, or is it even today, Mrs. Sawchuk?

Mrs. Sawchuk: The *Hansard* transcript itself won't be posted until early next week, but the audio is live.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

The first motion is pretty perfunctory. It's approving the agenda itself. If everyone has a copy of the agenda in front of them, would someone like to move that the agenda for this meeting be adopted as circulated? Mr. Anglin, maybe you could specifically move that the agenda for the September 27, 2012, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be adopted.

Mr. Anglin: I have moved.

The Chair: All in favour? Anyone opposed? Motion carried.

The next motion is the approval of the meeting minutes for our July meeting, back in the summer, if everybody has had a chance to look at those. They were filed by Mrs. Sawchuk. Would somebody like to move?

Ms Calahasen: I so do, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Ms Calahasen would like to move that the minutes of the July 25, 2012, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be adopted as circulated. All in favour? Any objections? Carried.

All right. Now let's get into the meat of this committee. I am really pleased as chair to report that we've had a highly functioning working group represented by all four caucuses represented at this table. The process that we agreed to last time, for issues for this committee's consideration to be forwarded to the representatives of the four caucuses and then to be discussed among those four members, who come back to this table with the fruits of that discussion, has gone very well. As chair I'm really grateful to colleagues from the other caucuses for that co-operation and collaborative approach.

In that same spirit I'd like to invite the three other members of that working group – Bruce Rowe, representing the Wildrose; Laurie Blakeman, representing the Liberal caucus; and Deron Bilous, representing the NDP caucus – to spend a few minutes, a maximum of five minutes, to share with this whole committee the ideas and issues that were recommended by your individual caucuses.

Bruce, I'll start with you if you'll just spend a few minutes to share with us what your recommendations were.

Mr. Rowe: Thank you, Madam Chair. I put out an e-mail to our members quite some time ago, and we got back three main topics that we wished to address as well as a fourth that had already been put on the table by another party. We just left that one off.

The three main topics that we wanted to see addressed were the electricity market, the transmission line projects, as well as the fracking in the oil patch. I don't think that there's anything in the motion right now – is there? – to address the fracking issue. As I'm sure everyone has heard, it's getting to be quite an issue right across the province on just what is happening, what it's doing to our water table and so on. So I think that's an important one.

We did also mention pipeline integrity, which had been put on the table, I believe, by the NDP. I think that's also an important one given what's going on out there today.

That's basically it. I won't take up the full five minutes. That's basically what we put on the table.

The Chair: Thanks, Mr. Rowe.

Ms Blakeman, do you want to share the Liberal caucus's recommendations for issues?

Ms Blakeman: I will. We did have a retreat and discussed this at the retreat, the issues that we would like to see this committee address, I'm presuming, over the period of a year. Number one was gravel and gravel mining in alluvial aquifers in particular. We also would like to see waste management and that theory of a take-back policy looked at so we have fewer landfills in the province, research jurisdictions which are acknowledged to be doing environmental protection right – what does that actually look like? – and finally, government incentives and/or investments in hydro dams in northern rivers.

I have to say that as pleasant as the process has been up to now, I was a little taken aback to come in and find that the draft motion has already been handed out to everybody. It does make me wonder why I'm going through this exercise if the motion has already been presented. It makes it very difficult to get over the chill and try to put something else on the table when the one that's been approved, I'm guessing by the Tory caucus, is already printed and in front of us. It does really put a chill on trying to bring anything else forward and, I think, tells me as an opposition member that while I'm welcome to put forward suggestions, they're going to be vetted by the Tory caucus and come out looking like a draft motion that says, "Moved by XX," and then it's there.

So I'm of two minds because I certainly appreciate the preparation in getting everything done in advance so that it's all done correctly, but on the other hand – well, I think I've made my point.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Blakeman. We will open the floor for questions about the particular issues brought forward by the respective caucuses.

To your point about the nature of the motions, it's pretty standard practice in most meetings that I've participated in and that the LAO manages to have draft motions prepared. The motions around the issues that we were going to put on the table were something that we agreed to at the working group, so I don't have any difficulty with that as the chair.

1:15

Ms Blakeman: Well, with respect, prior to the last election the only people that turned up with the drafts already done were members of the Tory caucus. They weren't actually put in front of us although we knew they had them. I do think it creates a chill about anybody else being able to get a motion on. I have been

successful in the past in being able to convince members of the government caucus to go along with something that I presented on the floor, but that makes it more difficult when that kind of thing is already presented.

The Chair: Ms Blakeman, you are absolutely welcome at any time to prepare motions in advance and to provide them to me. I would be very open to your motions.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah. I just don't have the resources to do that. I'm sorry.

The Chair: Mr. Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Madam Chair. The New Democrat caucus discussed several issues, and I can say that I was pleased to see from the list that some of the issues that we feel are important were already present from some of the other caucuses.

To go through them briefly, the exploration of upgrading bitumen within Alberta was one of our priorities as far as adding value to our natural resources. As well, we looked at our current pipeline infrastructure and the safety and integrity of those pipelines and the systems within Alberta. We looked at transportation of resources to market and exploring other methods – and I recognize that pipelines are one of those methods – and looked as well, as my colleague from the Wildrose had mentioned, at fracking. We'd like to look at the implications not only on our water and the water table but also on our air and land quality.

The Chair: Thank you.

As indicated earlier, the four of us met. We talked through these issues. It was regrettable that Mr. Bilous wasn't able to join us, but we talked later for about half an hour. We went through the issues fairly closely to talk about why caucuses felt that these issues were important and then to explain what is being done in government now to address those issues, if anything. I would like our caucus to report on that because we did not table a particular issue.

The PC caucus did not table issues at this point in time. It doesn't mean we won't be in the future, but at this point in time we have not tabled issues. From the issues that were tabled, the four of us were able to come to an agreement on a particular issue, which will be tabled as a motion here today. But before doing that, I'd like our caucus to respond to some of the recommendations made by the opposition caucuses, so I open up the floor to that or to questions.

Mr. Hehr: Just a question. I know I submitted this proposal to both the economic development group that I'm on as well as this committee. Could you just brief me on which committee is handling that request?

The Chair: It's a very good question, Mr. Hehr, and thank you for raising it.

Mr. Hehr had raised a proposal about reinvigorating something like the Alberta Energy Company – and I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Mr. Hehr: That's essentially it.

The Chair: Yeah. The question arises as to whether that issue should land for consideration in this committee or the Economic Future all-party committee. That is being examined right now, Mr. Hehr, and as soon as we have an answer, we will share that with you.

Mr. Hehr: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Brown: Okay. I'll ask a question about the electricity market issue. What exactly was the intention there?

Mr. Rowe: If I could, I'll defer to our Energy critic, Mr. Anglin, to answer that question.

Mr. Anglin: What we have in the market itself – and your caucus knows this – is a Retail Market Review Committee report that has not been released yet by the minister. That is a report that is narrow in scope. It's looking at the retail market, particularly at what's called the regulated rate option. Beyond that, we have the wholesale market, and no one – and that report doesn't address it – even proposes to look at that issue.

Now, I'm not going to get into a long definition of it, but that is significant when you are looking at the price of electricity, in particular how that is managed to run our industries in this province. It's not just the retail people, the consumers, like you and I at home. It is about how our industry consumes electricity, which is 80 per cent of the market.

Dr. Brown: So what exactly were you proposing to do?

Mr. Anglin: I can bring a number of suggestions, but I'll just give you an example of the problem so the people here understand the problem. Right now the problem is that the market is capped at \$1,000 a megawatt. If you remember when the lights went out – I think it was in June – the market hit \$1,000 a megawatt. It's actually \$999.99. One of the problems is that when we do that, it is a tremendous expense to our industries. Some industries have complained and very vocally. They've written the previous PC caucus and said: this is going to cost jobs.

Now, the AESO has come forward with a preliminary suggestion – they haven't officially come forward with it – to raise that cap from \$1,000 a megawatt to \$3,000 a megawatt. That's significant, and that would significantly impact the economic activity of this province.

One of the suggestions, when we get into the debate, is something called day-ahead firm market pricing. Now, what that is I'll explain in simple terms. You buy a refrigerator from Sears for whatever price, and they deliver it in four days. They don't show up at your door and say: "Oh, by the way, the price changed on that refrigerator. You owe us another \$300 for it." With electricity, in doing what's called day-ahead firm pricing, if we were to adopt that, when a generator offers electricity for sale at \$45 a megawatt, they would be responsible for going out to the market to buy it for \$3,000 a megawatt to deliver it for \$45 because that's what they signed on to and that's what they promised.

What it would do is put the risk of the market, which industry wants, on the industry and not on the consumers. That is one option of many that are available for how we can stabilize the wholesale electricity market, which in turn affects the retail market. That report will be coming forth. As the minister said today, he's not sure when he's going to release it, but he expects it to be released when they're done reviewing it.

Does that answer your question?

Dr. Brown: Yes.

The Chair: Welcome, Mr. Anderson. We have a full committee here. That is very wonderful. Congratulations to all of you.

Mr. Anderson: And we're not even getting paid.

The Chair: And we're not getting paid. That's right, Rob.

Any other questions on the issues raised by the opposition caucuses?

Okay. I would like to invite Ms Johnson to respond on behalf of the PC caucus to those recommendations just to follow up.

Ms L. Johnson: On Mr. Rowe's observation: our colleagues at the Department of Energy are pursuing the electric market situation, and we're waiting for their report. We don't want to have duplication of effort – we have their recommendations and the conclusions of their review of the submission to their department – so that our time is well used.

We do have agreement on another topic to move forward with, and that's where we're heading today.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Rowe: If I could, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Rowe: Are you suggesting, then, by that that we're going to deal with one topic and one topic only in this committee?

The Chair: I'll answer that. We have the capacity and the ability to look at several issues as we go forward. I think it's up to the committee itself to decide how we want to allocate our time. Right now, because we don't have a lot of experience in this process, I think testing ourselves with one issue to start with is probably prudent, but there is the possibility of always adding issues as we go. It may be that we look at something for a short period of time, something for a longer period of time. Of course, we only have six months maximum.

1:25

Mr. Anglin: Just for clarification, because I answered a question there, I'm not looking to double down on or duplicate the retail review. My example was dealing with the wholesale market, which the retail review does not cover. It's not in the terms of reference. The wholesale market makes up 80 per cent of the consumption in this province. There's a huge section there that is not being looked at by that retail review committee. That's why I asked this to be brought forward.

Ms L. Johnson: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. I'd also like to address the question of fracking. It came up quite consistently as an issue at this table, and I think a lot of people are concerned about fracking. It may well be that this is an issue for this table to tackle. Many of us have looked at the question. It is being pursued right now within the ERCB. Again, it seems inappropriate for us to be looking at the issue of fracking as a committee at the same time as the ERCB is endeavouring to look at the issue. It doesn't mean, though, that the issue is not on the table and that at the right point in time we resurrect the issue. Does that make sense to people?

Mr. Anderson: I know that I just attended a couple of meetings on this, community meetings outside the Airdrie area, and this is becoming a pretty heated issue for folks, as you know. I just don't know if a review by the ERCB is going to be considered . . .

Ms Blakeman: Fulsome?

Mr. Anderson: Fulsome. Thank you, Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Thorough? In-depth?

Mr. Anderson: Not so much that. I don't think it's going to be felt that it is completely impartial, to be frank. That's not coming from me. That's coming from people who are constituents, I think, in a lot of the areas around this table.

I think the great opportunity we have here in this committee is to do things and have folks in in a very open and transparent way so that those folks that are concerned about this issue can actually feel that they are being heard and feel that a more impartial group is looking at it. I'm not trying to take a slight at the ERCB. I'm just saying that the perception is that that's not an impartial arbitrator of this issue.

The Chair: Anybody else have a comment?

Mr. Anglin: Just to add to Rob's comments, this is an issue that has a double-edged sword to it. When Bruce brought it up, I think he brought it up more from a landowner's perspective and from some of the things we're hearing in the rural areas. But with the industry itself, when you speak to industry, they know they have a problem. Industry is a little bit frustrated. You have some companies who are abiding by what I would call a very high bar of practice and other industry members who are not going by the same standard. We have some issues around this.

If Alberta is going to lead the way, maybe Alberta needs to set some standards here on how this is going to be done effectively. This problem goes into Saskatchewan, it goes into Quebec, and it is a problem for our industry all across Canada. When I speak to some industry members, they're absolutely concerned about this and looking for direction. When I look at landowners, they are up in arms, they're worried, they're scared, and there's a lot of misinformation.

I would agree with Rob on the fact that I don't think the ERCB is going to convince any of the landowners out there that that's impartial. A bipartisan committee has some value to it, and we need to think in those terms. This is important for our economic activity.

Ms Blakeman: Just a note that there is some new ground being laid here if I understood the previous speaker. If the government caucus has decided that the same reason applies for this committee not being able to investigate something – that is, a ministry is already working on a report, and the ERCB is already working on a report – it thus ranks the ERCB on the same level as government. Therefore, when we go to ask questions of the ministries around the ERCB, they have to be willing to answer those questions. I now hear they're ranked the same. They're being used as an excuse for this committee not being able to look at it. So new ground, but I'm glad we've got it out there so that we know the rules.

The Chair: Ms Blakeman, I'll respond to that comment. I think that's quite an unfair allegation. We're trying to be good stewards for the resources that we have available, and the time of 25 people is a huge resource for this province.

What we're trying to communicate is that the ERCB evaluating the question of fracking or a pipeline study being done at the same time as this committee is looking at pipeline issues – we're trying to get to the essential issues. For two entities at the same time to be looking at exactly the same issue would, I think, not be a prudent use of resources. So what we were suggesting and what we talked about in our working group was the concept of: if the ERCB is looking at fracking or if an independent reviewer is looking at pipeline integrity, then let's look at the outcomes or the process that they're taking and figure out what the undelineated

space might look like. The two can happen at the same time, but does it make sense for two entities to be looking at exactly the same questions at the same time?

Did you have a comment?

Dr. Brown: I have a comment. I think that, you know, certainly, as Mr. Anderson pointed out, there is a level of concern out there and really wanting some information. I don't believe, personally, that we have the technical expertise to substitute ourselves for the ERCB, and I don't share the concern about them being unfair or biased in any way. Nevertheless, I think that if we knew that there was a limited scope to what we were undertaking in terms of getting some information about where fracking is going on, what formations are being fracked, what are the risks, what are the vertical implications of fracking – I do believe that there's a public concern out there, and I think that perhaps something in the way of information would be valuable to see whether or not we need to do anything further.

So what I'm suggesting is that information is good, but I don't see ourselves as being arbiters of whether fracking is good or bad. It's obviously very important economically to the province. It's been going on very safely for decades and decades. It's only recently that there have been a lot of concerns raised about it. I think that information would be good. Perhaps have somebody come and give a presentation on, you know, what the extent of fracking is, what it does, and so on. I certainly wouldn't have any objection to that sort of a scope of endeavour.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hale.

Mr. Hale: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I also agree. I think it would be good for the people who don't understand fracking to get someone in to talk about it.

A suggestion I'd like to make is that, you know, when they have these reports like Group 10, their independent pipeline review, maybe we should get a copy of that as well as the ERCB so that we can go through them. As the Energy critic for the Official Opposition I'm taking a personal role in looking at fracking and exploring all of the options. It might be a good idea for us to get those reports, to see if we agree with the ERCB and what they're recommending, maybe not go into a full-fledged committee review of it but definitely have a look at the reports and see what some of the members of this committee that understand those issues recommend.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hehr: Well, unless I'm mistaken, the ERCB deals with rules as they exist now. I think our job as legislators is to look at the review and the findings and what they're doing and then, after that report, when we've looked into the challenges that maybe exist, whether Alberta needs to make recommendations to improve those rules and standards of what actually happens in fracking. I think I would probably agree that we're better off waiting until we have this report and then moving from there to: "What are the challenges? Do we need upgrades in what the ERCB is looking at and analyzing in going ahead?" That may be a more important role: what happens after this and whether we are doing the best to protect both land and water as well as creating economic opportunity.

1:35

Mr. Anglin: Just a comment to Dr. Brown. If we choose to look at this subject, I would recommend that we look at it in the context of best practices. This is an important issue for both sides in this

discussion. Property owners who are affected by this are quite well informed of what fracking is. Many of them work in the industry. They know what fracking is. They know what the best practices are.

On a cursory look what we're finding is – and I don't have solid data to support what I'm about to say – that the companies that have a very high bar of best practices are not the companies that are really the problem out there. The companies that have a very low bar are the ones setting the reputation and causing most of the problems out in the rural areas.

Now, this is significant because in Quebec there was a moratorium issued, and there's no fracking allowed. CAPP actually made a suggestion to the Quebec government for a very high bar that they brought forward. I can tell you from the rural perspective that many of the people who are concerned about fracking looked at CAPP's suggestion and said: that's what we wanted.

So if we choose to look at it, I would suggest that we look at it not from such a technical side, though we'd want it explained to everyone on this committee, but that the responsibility of this committee would maybe be to make a suggestion to the Minister of Energy that this high bar that industry has recommended and that I think they have or probably will bring to us would satisfy industry and satisfy much of the public who have been suffering under this onslaught of fracking that's been going on.

The Chair: Thank you.

As chair I undertake to deliver to this table, when it's issued, the ERCB review on fracking and as well the review of the independent pipeline integrity question. Then we can look at that and decide as a group where we want to go from there.

Mr. Rowe: I would have a higher level of comfort, Madam Chair, if I knew where they are in that report. I mean, is it two years out? Is it four years out? Is it six months out? What is it? It's an issue that needs to be addressed soon. Is there any way we can get that information back to this committee?

The Chair: That's why I like you as a deputy chair. This is how we work together all the time.

My understanding – and, please, if anybody has specific knowledge, correct me – is that the pipeline review is supposed to be done by the end of this year. I do not know exactly the timing of the ERCB review on fracking. I do not believe it is into next spring. I think it's before that. As soon as I have clear knowledge, I will share that with you.

Mr. Rowe: Thank you.

Mr. Anglin: I have to jump in on this.

The Chair: We're going to have to move to the issue at hand, though.

Mr. Anglin: I know, but it is important. Yes, they're doing the report; yes, they're doing the study; and, yes, they'll probably be complete in the time frame they say they will be complete in. As with the current retail market review we don't know when that report, which is ready right now, will be released. I see no reason why it can't be released to this committee with a confidentiality agreement until the ministry is ready to release it.

Now, the reason I brought that forward is that the issue of water, that report that was released this summer, was six years in holding before they released it. The report had been done and completed six years ago, and it finally went public this summer. I think that's my concern. I can live with the ERCB doing the report and finishing it, but we need to get it in a timely fashion.

The Chair: Mr. Anglin, this table has clearly left a message that they're watching, so that message, no doubt, will be delivered. Thank you.

Moving on, I'm very happy to report that the four members of this working group were able to conclude a recommendation on an issue to pursue, to start this process with. That issue is one that has been around for a long time, and it's an opportunity. I know that all of you are familiar with it because the issue has been shared. There is potential for hydroelectric production in northern Alberta on a couple of the rivers. There's been quite a bit of work that's been done, most recently in 2010 by Hatch, and the report was shared with you. It's a 2010 technical report that looks at the Peace River and looks at the Slave River and the potential of those rivers to provide hydroelectricity in the northern part of the province and, in particular, to help us address some of the needs in producing in the oil sands.

We will go into this in more depth as we move through this meeting, but I think that if everybody is familiar with this issue and you have discussed it, you know, previously and taken a look at the materials that have been posted, we can talk about the questions in relation to that. But I think it would be easier to have the motion on the table and then talk about that, so if someone would like to move that we pursue this particular issue, that would be wonderful. The vice-chair would be a good choice here.

Mr. Rowe: Yes. The motion itself is under tab 2 in your binders. Do I have to read the whole thing?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Rowe: It's going into *Hansard*. All right. Moved that in the interest of encouraging sustainable development and exploring methods to reduce Alberta's carbon footprint, the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship undertake a study of the potential for expanded hydroelectric energy production in northern Alberta and that the scope of the review shall include the following:

- potential for development;
- trade-offs between run-of-river projects and storage dam projects;
- potential for partnerships with First Nations, provinces, and territories;
- barriers to development;
- environmental advantages and disadvantages;
- economic, environmental, and social implications of development and assessing if a balance can be achieved; and
- the economics of investment in long-payoff projects but shall exclude those issues within the mandate of the Retail Market Review Committee, the Critical Transmission Review Committee, and the regulatory enhancement project to reduce duplication of effort.

That's the motion.

The Chair: All right. Would we like to discuss this before we move on it?

Mr. Cao: Well, I think it's an outstanding initiative. When I hear about this, basically, I see the dam to get the water for development. My thinking is that when you talk about development, it means industry and other things. I was wondering whether that includes agriculture because agriculture is, in fact, very important, that we have the land, that we have water, and that we can grow food for the world continuously. That's just my clarification.

The Chair: Certainly. Within the scope of potential for development that could include all types of development. In north-

ern Alberta the priorities seem to be on oil sands development, but it doesn't exclude that.

Mr. Hehr: Well, in the bullet points there are many things being discussed. What I'm going to bring up is probably caught within one of those bullet points, but I'm just going to make sure. It's my understanding that many of the provinces who have gone down the path of hydroelectric energy production have established Crown corporations to operate these things for the citizens of their province, maybe in their wisdom, maybe not. I think a discussion of that: whether this should possibly go to a private industry provider or whether this may be in the best interests of Alberta's long-term future, that this be moved to something like the structure of some other jurisdictions.

The Chair: My immediate reaction would be, Mr. Hehr, that barriers to development may be picked up under other issues.

Mr. Hehr: Well, I'd like that explored, then, at that point in time.

The Chair: Understood.

Mr. Anderson: Well, I think the motion is very good. It's certainly something I would like to support. It's amazing to me that we have such an untapped resource up there, potentially clean power, and such a massive amount of it.

As we try to reduce our carbon footprint specifically in the oil sands but not just the oil sands – obviously, our coal plants are responsible for a lot of that CO₂ – I think that researching this is important. I would like to see this not involve Crown corporations, but of course we can have a discussion on that. If we can remove barriers and have this energy harnessed in an environmentally sustainable fashion, I think that this is something that's long overdue, and I'd be willing to support studying it.

1:45

Mr. Anglin: I just would like to change one word in that motion. It is important because I think it could mire us down if this motion passes. Where you write in the last paragraph "but shall exclude those issues," I do not want to duplicate the Retail Market Review Committee or the transmission review committee, but you cannot exclude issues that are relevant to all when we talk electricity because it's all connected. So I would ask you to change the words "but shall exclude" to "but shall seek to avoid." In other words, I trust the chair to keep us from duplicating the discussion on the topics. I mean, I want to focus on the hydroelectric, but you cannot exclude – those issues are all connected, and in one form or another we will touch upon those as we try to decide what is best when we go down this debate.

The Chair: You're sounding like a lawyer, Mr. Anglin. That's a compliment, coming from me.

Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Sorry. What just happened with Mr. Anglin's suggestion? Is it accepted?

The Chair: I think it's open for discussion, Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Okay. I will wait, then, while people react to what he just put on the table. I'm raising a different issue.

The Chair: Mr. Hehr had a point as well.

Mr. Hehr: Just, you know, my response to my good friend Mr. Anderson is that I'm agnostic at this time as to whether it's a Crown corporation or the like. I think that's why this committee is

here, to really try and take off our preconceived blinders – I come with them as well, Rob – and look at how this is actually structured and whether in an open and honest fashion we can look at it. I think that's the value of this, and I'd actually encourage everyone to try and do that and look at it in an open, fair manner as to what is best for the long-term interests of this province. Maybe our preconceived notions may be different than what we currently think they are.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Kubinec.

Ms Kubinec: Yes. I'm wondering if Mr. Anglin is putting an amendment on the table. Then we could vote on it and move on to the main motion.

The Chair: As I understand it, he is putting an amendment on the table, which would be that the last two lines of that motion read: "but shall seek to avoid those issues within the mandate of the Retail Market Review Committee, the Critical Transmission Review Committee, and the regulatory enhancement project to reduce duplication of effort." We're now putting an amended motion on the table. Ms Blakeman, what I will do is suggest we vote on this amendment first and then get to your comments.

Ms Blakeman: That's why I said what I did.

The Chair: You've got good experience. Thank you very much for sharing it with all of us.

Let's vote on the amendment to the motion. All in favour? Any declines? It's moved.

Okay. Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you. I was just responding to the remarks that were made by our colleague Mr. Cao. I did not propose this with an idea towards enabling more development as a result of possibly pursuing energy through water in our northern rivers, and I want to be very clear that I did not intend that. I intended that we look to alternate sources of energy, which possibly could include hydroelectric and specifically run of river, not by damming. This is part of my overall concern about reducing our consumption of coal, which currently drives most of our electricity-producing plants. That was what was behind my proposal of this issue for consideration by the committee, not as a source of additional development, particularly in northern Alberta.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Casey: I just had a question relating to the sixth bullet down here. I certainly have no issue with the "economic, environmental, and social implications of development." What I do have some question around is: "and assessing if a balance can be achieved."

Balance is one of those words that gets used a lot, and everybody has a different interpretation. Is it equally balanced: 50-50, 33-33-33? So by using the word "balance," I'm not sure what we're adding to the motion, here. I guess I would like to understand why that's there. Certainly, "economic, environmental, and social implications of development" is something we want to review. But I'm not sure what we're talking about, if we're clear what we're talking about, when we say "balance" because it really leads to potential misinterpretation by everyone.

The Chair: Maybe for the record we could just be very clear that the use of "balance" here does not mean that we're trying to

achieve a perfect 50-50 balance. Would that be acceptable, Mr. Casey?

Mr. Casey: I think it's a word that can lead to some misunderstanding down the road, having had several lifetime experiences where that has been the case. I would certainly put an amendment on the floor to remove everything after the comma; in other words, to remove "and assessing if a balance can be achieved."

The Chair: Okay. Would you guys like to take another vote on an amendment to the amended motion? We're talking about "economic, environmental, and social implications of development" and deleting "and assessing if a balance can be achieved."

Mr. Casey: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. All in favour of that motion? Against? Okay. It is so moved.

Ms Kubinec: Just a question on when we would have this review finished.

The Chair: The time frame that we are allowed is six months, and that would be the outside edge. You may decide to do it in a shorter time as a committee, but six months is the maximum.

Ms Kubinec: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Madam Chair. I first just wanted to echo my colleague Ms Blakeman's sentiments, that the New Democrat caucus is also behind this issue and exploring the value of hydroelectricity as a cleaner form of energy in order to reduce Alberta's footprint but also our reliance on coal, which is one of our major forms of electricity.

In addition to that, I actually have a friendly amendment that I'd like to put onto the floor. It's regarding the third bullet: "potential for partnerships with First Nations, provinces, and territories." I'd like to replace the term "First Nations" with "aboriginal," or I'm open to defining aboriginal by including Métis and Inuit because First Nations only applies to certain groups of peoples.

The Chair: All right. So the recommendation you are making for the third amendment is "potential for partnerships with aboriginals, provinces, and territories." All in favour of this third amendment?

Ms Calahasen: Before you vote, Madam Chair, it's not "aboriginals"; it's "aboriginal people." I would prefer that.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Calahasen. The third amendment is "potential for partnerships with aboriginal people, provinces, and territories." Any other discussion on that amendment? All in favour? Opposed?

Mr. Barnes?

Mr. Barnes: I'm in favour.

The Chair: You're keeping track of all this. Good for you.

Mr. Barnes: I'm trying.

The Chair: Thank you. It's carried.

All right. Mr. Dorward, you had a comment. Do you have an amendment, too?

1:55

Mr. Dorward: No. We passed by. I'm fine. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other discussion?

Mr. Anglin: I'd just like to clarify one thing. River-run projects actually have dams. All of them do. It's a technical requirement. They're much smaller than the larger dams, but they still have dams, and you need to know that as we pursue it.

The Chair: All right. If we've finished with the discussion, can we have a vote on the motion, which has been revised three times?

Mr. Rowe moved that in the interest of encouraging sustainable development and exploring methods to reduce Alberta's carbon footprint, the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship undertake a study of the potential for expanded hydroelectric energy production in northern Alberta and that the scope of the review shall include the following:

- potential for development;
- trade-offs between run-of-river projects and storage dam projects;
- potential for partnerships with aboriginal people, provinces, and territories;
- barriers to development;
- environmental advantages and disadvantages;
- economic, environmental, and social implications of development; and
- the economics of investment in long-payoff projects but shall seek to avoid those issues within the mandate of the Retail Market Review Committee, the Critical Transmission Review Committee, and the regulatory enhancement project to reduce duplication of effort.

Lovely. I'm happy with this. All in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Congratulations, team. We've decided on one issue. This is progress.

Before we move on to the next point on our agenda, I also want to remind everyone that as we agreed at our last meeting, if people have issues going forward – they can arise for many reasons – please take those issues to the representative of your caucus on this committee. They will flow it through to me as the chair. I undertake to report to you on those issues as they arise at every single meeting. Any questions on that?

Ms Blakeman: What now happens with the themes or issues that were brought up? Do they stay in the hopper to be considered again at the end of the six months of this project, or do we start over again? I would really like to see the gravel mining discussed by this committee or looked into, and I have no sense of what happens once we complete this particular project we just voted on.

The Chair: My understanding, Ms Blakeman, is that everything stays current unless you pull it off the list.

Ms Blakeman: So at the conclusion of this particular project we revisit the list that we had.

The Chair: You may revisit the list every month if you wish, but I think for the purposes of time it would be more efficient to decide that we will look at all of these in February, for example.

Ms Blakeman: Okay.

The Chair: Or earlier if you choose.

Mr. Hehr: Is it possible to look at that issue now, even with our ongoing schedule? With what we have, do you think we could handle two issues at once?

The Chair: Mr. Hehr, we actually talked about that in our small group, the working group. The concern we have is that the possibility of a ministry giving us an issue is very probable. It's what they do. Then we'd have a situation where we're trying to work out the process for this committee at the same time as we're dealing with several issues. So I think we were kind of trying to walk before we run.

Mr. Hehr: Okay. Which ministries are we expecting, I guess, proposals from?

The Chair: Well, the ministries that are under the umbrella of this group.

Mr. Hehr: Have they informed you of a proposal that's coming forward at this time?

The Chair: No, they have not.

Mr. Hehr: Then I would doubt it's forthcoming, to be frank.

The Chair: I don't agree with that.

Mr. Hehr: No? All right.

The Chair: I don't agree with that, but it's certainly something we can monitor, folks. I don't think we're locked in here.

Mr. Dorward, you had a comment as well?

Mr. Dorward: Actually, for the second time in a row somebody – that was my question.

The Chair: All right. The next issue on our agenda is identification of stakeholders to present to this committee. We have to design an approach that works for us as a committee. How are we going to solicit, seek people with expertise in this area, people who are affected by the choices we make? We will be sitting at the recommended time of our next meeting. We will decide as a committee on the stakeholders that we want to hear from. I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Massolin to address the issue of how we will develop that stakeholders list.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would just like to point out to you and to the committee that research services from the Legislative Assembly Office has in the past provided policy committees a stakeholders list. So we've researched the issues involved in a particular review or bill and then from that have derived a list of appropriate stakeholders to consult, organized by category, and then presented that draft stakeholders list to the committee for the committee's approval. I'm just here today to say that research services will be available to provide that service yet again to the committee.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any questions?

Mr. Anglin: Do we get to make suggestions for stakeholders to be included now, or do we wait for you to submit the list and, if we see the stakeholders we want on there, make that suggestion then?

The Chair: What we've discussed and I think would continue to recommend is that they happen coincidentally. As individual caucuses or as individual members of this committee, however

you choose to act, you may identify groups that you would like to hear from. If you will give that information to myself as chair, Dr. Massolin will make that recommendation and will put a consolidated list together to be discussed by the working group.

Mr. Anglin: Sounds good.

Ms Kubinec: I'd be willing to put a motion on the floor that committee research services complete a draft stakeholders list identifying organizations with expertise in or potentially affected by expanded hydroelectric energy production in northern Alberta and submit the draft list to the chair and that the caucuses represented on the committee also submit their recommendations to the chair for review by the working group of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship and submission to the committee for its approval at the next meeting.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Kubinec.

Any discussion on that motion? Okay. The only comment I would make is that to the extent that you can identify an individual within an organization to come before us, I think we should. Obviously, other people and other provinces have all-party committees and the federal government does, and many of their recommendations to us are to make sure that you're very specific about the individual that you want to come from an organization so that you are assured that we have the expertise at the table that we're trying to access.

All in favour of this motion? Any objections? It's carried.

Mr. Rowe: Madam Chair, I have a question perhaps related to that. Do we have a budget to commission studies or to spend money to gather information, or are we out on our own?

The Chair: Are we passing the hat around, Mr. Rowe? No.

Mr. Rowe: Good luck with that.

The Chair: Ms Dean, would you like to comment on that?

Ms Dean: I'm not sure. Does the committee clerk have the committee's budget available?

Mrs. Sawchuk: I'll have to check, Madam Chair.

The Chair: We do have a budget. I can assure you of that. It's the number that's relevant.

While Mrs. Sawchuk is looking that up, does anybody have any other questions about this?

Okay. Mrs. Sawchuk is suggesting she will get back to us on that and will report to the whole committee on that.

Mr. Hehr: Will we be discussing in our groups after this meeting what particular things we'd like Dr. Phil to research and to go forward on and the like, or is that an appropriate discussion to have now?

The Chair: You are reading our minds. This is the next item on the agenda. Clairvoyant.

Mr. Hehr: Nice. Good stuff. I should read my agenda.

The Chair: All right. The next topic on this agenda is research.

Mr. Webber: Just on that, depending, I guess, on what our budget is, I would like to put Dr. Massolin to work on further research. At this time I will make a motion to have Dr. Massolin or the committee of research services complete a summary of issues surrounding hydroelectric energy in northern Alberta, specifically

within the Athabasca, Peace, and Slave river basins, including an annotated bibliography, and provide that information to the chair for distribution to our committee, the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship, in advance of the next meeting date.

I assume we have enough money in our budget to have Dr. Massolin go ahead with that research, so I would put that motion on the table.

2:05

Mr. Hehr: Back to the issue that both Mr. Anderson and I are concerned about, what would be the best way to structure this? I would like Dr. Massolin to look into what other provinces and jurisdictions are doing. As a side note, maybe this committee wants to look at whether an organization, KPMG or someone else, would actually look at the economic case on this front and what actually is better for the long-term interests of this province. I don't know whether we'd have the resources to do that. I don't know if maybe Dr. Massolin would be able to provide that economic analysis – I'm not sure – but it may be something, if Dr. Massolin didn't feel that was in his purview, for that third party to assess.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess there are two questions there. I suppose the first one is: what are other jurisdictions doing in terms of development of hydroelectric power? That's a pretty big mouthful there. I mean, obviously, there's limitation there in terms of which jurisdictions would have hydroelectricity to the extent that it's developable and economic and so forth. But to do a full-blown study of that, it could be done in terms of a literature review, but it would take some time.

Mr. Hehr: I guess I'm primarily looking at how to structure this, whether it's better to be shipped out to private enterprise or possibly look at a partnership with the Alberta government and a private organization or whether it's better for us to do it ourselves.

Dr. Massolin: I guess it depends on what the committee wants in terms of having a fresh study of this from an economic point of view or having us do, like I say, a literature review of what's already out there on the economic side of it or whatever angle the committee wants us to investigate. We could do that. So that's the choice there.

Mr. Hehr: On the literature review I find you can get, depending on the source, a different spin, whatever it is. I think a real economic analysis from an organization, done top to bottom, when we get to that path would be beneficial to all members, to make that with all those facts in front of us as to: what are the risks, what are the rewards, and what's really in our best interest? It will be difficult to decipher even from that report what it is. This is not easy stuff to say totally right or wrong. It's shades of grey in all directions. You've got to do what probably makes sense at the time.

The Chair: Mr. Hehr, I'll comment on that. I think it is a bit of an iterative process. The LAO resources are not a separate cost to this committee, but we only have one Dr. Massolin, so we have to be prudent, I think, and appropriate in the way we direct that research. I also think that as we have presentations to this committee, we may get a better sense of where we want that research to advance and how. I think that will be a really important piece of the discussion.

Mr. Anglin: I apologize for being so technical, but could I put a friendly amendment onto yours to include the Mackenzie River watershed? All these rivers that you mentioned affect that, and it has to be something we would consider on any of these projects because it does back up into the Territories.

Mr. Webber: I'd just question the fact that the Mackenzie River is in a different territory.

Mr. Anglin: It is, but it is the watershed. The Slave River is part of that watershed, and the Peace River is part of that watershed. Even the article I passed around would mention the Mackenzie. It does all come out into there. So when you deal with that, you will affect that watershed.

Ms Calahasen: On that point, Madam Chair, I'm just wondering if the other provinces – like, it identifies other provinces and territories. It is in the territory, right? So I think it kind of covers that portion, I would think. Now, you're more technical than I am.

Mr. Anglin: Well, I was going to say that I'm being more technical – that's all – on the wording.

Ms Calahasen: I think it covers it, you know, because it is in the other territory, right? That's in the Territories.

The Chair: Mr. Dorward, did you have a comment on this issue?

Mr. Dorward: Yeah, I had a comment on this issue, but before I make my comment, I wouldn't mind having the motion read again so I can understand the context of the addition.

Mr. Webber: Certainly, if you don't mind, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Webber.

Mr. Webber: Moved by Len Webber that committee research services, Dr. Massolin in particular,

complete a summary of issues surrounding hydroelectric energy in northern Alberta, specifically within the Athabasca, Peace, and Slave river basins, including an annotated bibliography, and provide that information to the chair for distribution to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship in advance of the next meeting.

Mr. Dorward: Okay. Thank you.

Well, speaking of logic, it's illogical to add that river. I don't think anybody debates the fact that that would have to be a part of the analysis relative to the agreement with the Northwest Territories to deliver water out of those basins. Adding that river would mean that the researcher would have to do an annotated bibliography and all kinds of things on that particular . . .

Mr. Anglin: I wasn't adding. I was just redefining that as part of the basin, which is the Mackenzie River basin or the Mackenzie River watershed, which it's all part of. That's all I was doing.

I'll withdraw my motion so we can make it simpler.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: I was just noticing that Philip is also the researcher for Public Accounts, which I chair. Could we all just lay off a little bit on the guy? Honestly. Holy smokes.

An Hon. Member: Can we vote on that?

Mr. Anderson: Let's vote on that. There's a friendly amendment for you.

We have to understand. I don't think it's appropriate to ask a researcher to be essentially putting out an expert report on certain things. I don't think he wants that responsibility, and it's just not fair to place it – I mean, a literature review makes sense, but if we could keep the confines kind of tight here, perhaps he can help us with the public accounts of this province as well and save some time in that regard.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Cao.

Mr. Cao: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I support the motion, and I'm pleased that the Mackenzie River is not included in there because that's a totally different jurisdiction, and it's a longer one, too.

I also want to comment on Mr. Hehr's notion of a different way of doing things. I think what we're doing now as members of the committee – I expect the subject dealt with is why we have the subject and what is involved but not the how. To implement, to build, whether a private party: that's the how. So I'd leave that out.

Thank you.

Mr. Hehr: Well, I respectfully disagree. You know, if we're here, we can add our recommendations. It's the purview of the government to implement it in whatever way, shape, or form that we can. But we've been elected to represent our constituents in this province, and in my view that's what we should do. I think that precluding it, to leave what may be a contentious issue around here for another body to deal with when we have the full ability to do that here, would be an abrogation of our responsibilities to the Alberta people.

The Chair: I think the question of resource stewardship is ingrained in all of us. Notwithstanding that that's the theme of this committee, it's something that we'll have to keep in mind as we go forward. Maybe we'll never achieve perfect balance, but I think the conversation will continue, and that's perfect.

Are we all in favour of that motion? Any objections? All right. The motion is carried.

Are there any other items that someone would like to put on the table for discussion? Mr. Anderson.

2:15

Mr. Anderson: Just a question on the scope of this committee and what it can and can't research and undertake because there's obviously overlap. One issue that I know I have concerns about and many of our caucus members have concerns about is that there have been some reports – there's a Harvard study that is just out and others – that are looking at kind of the long-term projection of the supply of our most important from an economic standpoint resource, which is, of course, oil. The reports seem to suggest that because of the new fracking technologies and how they are being used throughout the world now, the long-term supply of oil is actually much, much larger, by many times, than what we thought and that peak oil is essentially not the case.

Of course, this will have a significant impact on this province and will have an effect on how we choose to develop our resources, including how fast, because obviously as prices go lower, the resource is worth less. So while prices are high, we might want to make hay. There are those types of questions that are out there. Is that something that would be within the scope of this committee, or is it such that because it's somewhat financial in nature, it would apply to – what is it? – the Committee on Alberta's Economic Future, any questions on that? That is

certainly something that I think is so related to what we do here that I'd like to see it at some point put on the list.

The Chair: Mr. Anderson, I think that just before you came in, the question came up from Mr. Hehr's recommendation that we revisit the question of having an Alberta energy company. The same question applies to that. Would that reside under this committee's jurisdiction, or would it be under Economic Future's? Our response to that is that that's being evaluated right now, and I think your question falls into the same place. We do need clarity, and we have requested that clarity. As soon as we have it, we'll share it with the full committee. It's a very good question.

Mr. Anderson: Okay. Sounds good.

The Chair: Any other issues before we move to setting the date for the next meeting?

Okay. Just one point of clarification, our operating budget for the year at this point in time is about \$150,000. I'll put that on the record.

The date of our next meeting. We are going to be sitting pretty soon. We're suggesting that we have a meeting on Wednesday, the 24th of October, after the afternoon session and before the evening session – so it's tight, 6:15 to 7:15, but we'll feed you – just to have a chance at that point in time to look at the list of stakeholders that we want to present to us. We will have talked about it and shared it with you in advance, so it won't be new to you, but just to get to some resolution so that we can start planning who we're going to invite to present to this group and when.

An Hon. Member: Again the date, Madam Chair.

The Chair: October 24 from 6:15 to 7:15.

Ms Blakeman: Madam Chair, I have to object to scheduling these meetings during a dinner break if there's an anticipated night sitting. First of all, there aren't supposed to be night sittings although it's become quite commonplace for the government to call us in for a night sitting. It's already in the standing orders that a committee of the Legislature will not sit at the same time, so you can't have a night sitting and a committee meeting, but to try and shoehorn us into a very short break means that some of us, particularly from small caucuses, will have been on the go literally all day with no break to even take a walk outside.

I cannot agree to this at all. It's very unfair scheduling, and it was not part of the agreement between the House leaders. I will be bringing up in the House leaders' meeting later this afternoon that such scheduling should not be allowed. If there's going to be a night sitting, there should be no requirement that any member is required to attend a committee meeting.

The Chair: Ms Blakeman, we talked about this. You raised it at our working committee meeting. As communicated at that time, this is an issue for the House leaders. It's very challenging to get these committee meetings in. I believe we owe it to each of our constituents to do everything possible. If we have to meet for dinner, we have to meet for dinner.

Mr. Dorward: Just for the record, it's not only one caucus that starts work very early in the morning and works very late at night.

Mr. Anderson: I'd like to thank David Dorward for that compliment about the Wildrose caucus. Thank you very much.

I would say, though, that if we are going to do that, I actually do agree with Laurie. I do think that it's just too much to jam in,

especially for the smaller caucuses. I think that's important. But if we are going to do it, can you just make sure that we do not have the stale sandwiches that we sometimes get? You know, since we have \$150,000 in the budget, let's at least have hot food, something that actually won't give us indigestion for the rest of the night.

The Chair: I cannot guarantee no indigestion, Mr. Anderson, but I will do my best.

Folks, I do understand this constraint, and I respect it. We're trying to move this committee forward. I feel we have a responsibility. There are 25 of us at this table. We have got to figure out how to use this resource most effectively. This is not a perfect

world. Maybe we will develop something that's better, and I certainly hope, like the rest of you do, that we are able to, but for the next meeting will you just bear with me, attend for one hour, figure out who the stakeholders are and when we would like them to present, and hope that you have a very good discussion at the House leaders' level.

Any other comments? All right. I need a motion to adjourn.

Ms Calahasen: I'll adjourn.

The Chair: Then we will adjourn. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 2:22 p.m.]

