



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 28th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Natural Gas Production

Wednesday, February 26, 2014
1:16 p.m.

Transcript No. 28-1-35

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

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Kennedy-Glans, Donna, QC, Calgary-Varsity (PC), Chair
Dorward, David C., Edmonton-Gold Bar (PC),* Acting Chair
Anglin, Joe, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (W), Deputy Chair

Allen, Mike, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (Ind)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (W)
Bikman, Gary, Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (ND)
Blakeman, Laurie, Edmonton-Centre (AL)
Calahasen, Pearl, Lesser Slave Lake (PC)
Casey, Ron, Banff-Cochrane (PC)
Fenske, Jacquie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (PC)
Hale, Jason W., Strathmore-Brooks (W)
Johnson, Linda, Calgary-Glenmore (PC)
Khan, Stephen, St. Albert (PC)
Kubinec, Maureen, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (PC)
Lemke, Ken, Stony Plain (PC)
Luan, Jason, Calgary-Hawkwood (PC)**
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (W)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (W)***
Webber, Len, Calgary-Foothills (PC)

* substitution for Donna Kennedy-Glans

** substitution for Stephen Khan

*** substitution for Joe Anglin

Support Staff

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

1:16 p.m.

Wednesday, February 26, 2014

[Mr. Dorward in the chair]

The Acting Chair: I'd like to call the meeting to order. Welcome, all members and staff in attendance at today's meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship. My name is David Dorward, MLA for Edmonton-Gold Bar, substituting as chair under Standing Order 56(2.3) for Donna Kennedy-Glans.

I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. Members who are sitting in as substitutes for committee members should indicate this in their introduction. If we could, let's go through the individuals in the room first, and then we'll do the individuals on the phone, starting with the most southern in Alberta and working north. Why don't we try that out?

Why don't we go to the right? Mr. Bilous.

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

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

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

Ms Fenske: Hi. Jacquie Fenske, MLA, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

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

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

Ms Zhang: Nancy Zhang, legislative research officer.

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

Mr. Tyrell: Chris Tyrell, committee clerk.

The Acting Chair: On the phone?

Mr. Casey: Ron Casey, Banff-Cochrane.

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

Mr. Bikman: Gary Bikman, Cardston-Taber-Warner.

Mr. Lemke: Ken Lemke, Stony Plain.

The Acting Chair: All right. Are there others?

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. The microphone consoles are operated by *Hansard* staff. Please keep cellphones, iPhones, BlackBerrys off the table as they may interfere with the audiofeed. Audio of committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard* for your information.

Now, we had an agenda posted online, and I hope you've all had a chance to look over that. Could we have a motion regarding that agenda? Mr. Sandhu. All in favour of the agenda? Anybody on the phone disagree with the agenda or want to make comments at all? All right. Assume that's moved, then. Carried.

You've all had a chance to look over the minutes from the last meeting. Would somebody move the adoption of the minutes?

Ms L. Johnson: So moved.

The Acting Chair: MLA Johnson. Are there any comments regarding those minutes? Anyone on the phone? All in favour? That motion is carried.

I'm going to just give a brief summary, then, of our situation, then turn it over to Dr. Massolin, our committee research person, amongst other titles. When this committee met last December, LAO research guided members through the two documents that they had prepared to assist the committee with the committee's deliberations on the committee's review. One was a summary of the stakeholder presentations; the other one was a table of proposed recommendations, both of which were made available to members on the internal committee website. Last meeting adjourned prior to the committee's reviewing the list of recommendations submitted by the PC and Liberal caucuses.

At this point I'd like to turn the floor over to Dr. Massolin to first help us get caught up with a refresher on where we were sitting at the time, where we left off last meeting, and where we are with the draft final report. We'll then move to dealing with the outstanding caucus recommendations from the last meeting. Finally, we'll go through the report piece by piece and fill in the areas where there are some gaps like around the topic of incentives and LNG export, which will blend together with some of the other recommendations that have been made as we go through that piece.

So, Dr. Massolin, I'd like to turn the floor over to you.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and as you mentioned, maybe I'll just give a brief recap of what the committee accomplished in its December meeting last year, where it stands now, and what it needs to do to finalize the draft report process.

As you mentioned, Mr. Chair, the committee at its last meeting managed to go through this proposed recommendations document, which I hope committee members have before them. Basically, that's the document that includes that large table of three columns, which is based on broad issue areas, priorities, and proposed stakeholder recommendations. As you mentioned, the committee managed to make it through most of those, but there are a few gaps, including incentives and LNG export. Also, there is section 4.0 of that document, starting on page 8, which deals with the proposed recommendations by the Progressive Conservative caucus and then one proposed recommendation suggested by the Liberal caucus.

At the last meeting research services took the committee through that table and outlined stakeholders' proposals. The proposed recommendations are divided into five topic areas, including access to markets, regulatory certainty and change, incentives, lack of infrastructure, and education. The committee discussed and proposed recommendations by topic and decided that the final report should emphasize value-added opportunities such as increased petrochemical production and the development gas-to-liquid facilities.

The committee also discussed some specific recommendations such as flexible regulations to keep current with changing technology, re-examining weight restrictions on roads for LNG vehicles, that government should find ways to offset the costs associated with building fuelling systems and infrastructure to encourage greater natural gas use, and, lastly, that government, with industry, should educate the general public on the costs, benefits, safety, and risks of natural gas use.

Research services took that information, that direction, from the committee, and we formulated nine recommendations based on those deliberations from the last committee meeting. That is what you see in terms of the draft final report. Just note that that draft final report is just a partial report because we need to get through

more of the topic areas, the proposals, today. The next step is to finalize that draft report, and then the committee tables it in the Assembly.

What's missing? Well, the missing bits are, as I said in going over those areas, incentives, LNG export, and the PC caucus recommendations. As you mentioned yourself, Mr. Chair, the PC caucus recommendations will cover some of those areas in terms of incentives, LNG exports. It'll also sort of overlap with some of the recommendations already written within that draft report. So we'll deal with those, I guess, on a piecemeal basis to avoid that overlap and deal with what the committee would like to include in its final report.

One final note before we go right into the PC caucus recommendations is that I think there might be some need for wording changes just to clean up some of the words. I guess we can deal with that as we go through this as well, Mr. Chair.

With that, perhaps we can start by looking at the PC caucus recommendations, which, as I mentioned, is section 4.0 of the proposed recommendations document, which starts on page 8, starting off with vehicles. I don't know how you'd like to deal with this, Mr. Chair, but perhaps you can deal with each sort of, well, however you wish to.

1:25

The Acting Chair: Well, I would take some direction from the committee as to that. There are several ways to proceed. One would be to have Dr. Massolin do a section – and that comprises maybe up to five bullet points – and then discuss anything of concern within that section. Then perhaps we could have a motion by each section to take the discussion that we've done and put it into the report. We can address that as we kind of move forward and see if that's working. Does anybody on the committee have any comments as to whether that works or not for them? Is that good? Okay. Well, let's try it that way.

Start with vehicles, and away we go.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. Perhaps what we could do is talk about, as you say, vehicles and the proposed recommendation that comprises, you know, the first paragraph. I don't know. Would you like me to just read these into the record?

The Acting Chair: If you could, that would be good.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. This is the proposed PC recommendation.

The Committee recommends that the Government examine transitioning its light vehicle fleet and encouraging the transition of light vehicle fleets of Agencies, Boards, Commissions and Municipalities to natural gas fueling province wide over the normal time frame of vehicle replacement should the Government find transition to encourage all of the following objectives:

Reduce the government sector's direct emissions of NO_x, SO_x and CO₂,

Help to spur the development of a network of privately owned natural gas fueling stations to enable travel on Alberta's entire Highway network with natural gas vehicles,

Reduce the lifecycle cost of the Government vehicle fleet.

Now, I suppose that's a good chunk to deal with to start, Mr. Chair, but maybe before I turn it back to you, I just wanted to point out that that second indented portion there, "Help to spur the development" and so forth, is close to the recommendation concerning LNG corridors that has already been included in the draft committee report on page 13. Maybe the committee would also like to consider that while they mull over this particular proposed recommendation.

The Acting Chair: Could you go through that? I believe it's the top of page 13 in the draft final report.

Dr. Massolin: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Could you go through those bullets?

Dr. Massolin: Certainly. The recommendation that's proposed in the draft report starts on the bottom of page 12, and I'll read the whole thing.

The Committee recommends that the Government of Alberta, in the interest of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from heavy-duty trucks, encourage the use of natural gas as a transportation fuel by considering the following policy options:

- Re-examine the existing weight restrictions on Alberta's roads and bridges, and ensure that weight restrictions do not unnecessarily penalize trucks with liquefied natural gas containers, which may increase the overall weight of trucks; and
- Undertake a study of the feasibility of CNG and LNG vehicle corridors designed to withstand the additional weight of CNG and LNG tanks on trucks and buses, and which would provide a route on which CNG/LNG fueling stations could be built.

It's that second bullet where there's a bit of overlap. Then the recommendation continues.

The Committee further recommends that the Government find ways to offset the costs associated with building fueling systems, through incentives, in order to encourage the construction of more LNG/CNG fueling infrastructure, which will in turn encourage greater use of natural gas as a fuel.

The Acting Chair: My question to the committee would be: do you feel that the recommendation in the draft report is sufficient in strength to cover the PC recommendation on this part, "Help to spur the development of"?

Mr. Bilous, go ahead.

Mr. Bilous: Sure. I mean, this kind of relates to the point but maybe the whole paragraph as well. So a certainty or clarification that I would like is, again, defining the word "help." I mean, I can appreciate that this is a report, and it's difficult to put a dollar amount onto it. For me to get behind a recommendation like this, you know, looking at what the costs are and, again, if we're encouraging municipalities to flip their fleets over when they transition in the normal time frame – again, I'm looking at: what are those costs, and what burdens, if the committee is recommending it to municipalities, are we imposing on municipalities?

The Acting Chair: Do you feel that there is some wording in there that you have a recommendation to change at all? Or is that just kind of a general . . .

Mr. Bilous: I guess I'm asking the PC caucus if they can further clarify or define the word "help" as far as "help to spur the development of a network of privately owned natural gas fueling stations."

The Acting Chair: Well, thus far what I've heard is that nobody has said that that wording needs to change in the draft report relative to the part of the privately owned fuelling stations. The present wording in the final report doesn't have the word "help." So unless somebody wants to put in the word "help," it isn't in there right now.

MLA Kubinec.

Ms Kubinec: Yes. I think the way it's worded in the final report, "undertake a study of the feasibility," is better wording than what we have in the proposed recommendation, "help to spur." It's a little more specific about what we would do. So can we actually just take that sentence out, "help to spur," and just go with what's in the report?

The Acting Chair: Yeah.

Ms Kubinec: Then is everybody of the opinion that that covers it?

The Acting Chair: That seems like the consensus so far, with everybody nodding their head.

Anybody on the line have any comments on that part?

Okay. It sounds like the committee is happy to go with the recommendation as it already exists in the draft final report and to take out that part which is covered in there already. Okay?

Dr. Massolin: So, Mr. Chair, that leaves the question of what to do with the remainder of the PC caucus recommendation.

The Acting Chair: Well, I think that it expands the wording in the recommendation. The question is: where is it best fitted into the report? Where does it best fit in the report?

Dr. Massolin: You know, on that score, Mr. Chair and the committee, I mean, you could perhaps leave it to us to find a good place to put it in, where it's contextually appropriate. Of course, your decision. But I suppose at this point we need agreement that the committee is okay with the remainder of it as it's worded.

The Acting Chair: All right. We're taking out "help to spur the development of." Does anybody have any other comments that would be in a negative way towards putting the rest of that wording in as a recommendation? Generally okay with it?

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Chair, including the top of page 9? Or are we only looking at the bottom of page 8 in the report? So the two other points, "reduce the government sector's direct emissions" and "reduce the lifecycle cost": those are the two that we're discussing right now remaining or being added to the final report.

The Acting Chair: Yeah. The bottom of page 8: we're striking "help to spur the development of," and we're leaving in the paragraph and the two subparagraphs there. So we're leaving in "reduce the government sector's direct emissions" and "reduce the lifecycle cost of." That's what I'm hearing from the committee so far.

Okay with that? Thank you.

All right. Proceed.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. We will fit that in where appropriate.

I'm wondering if we can just sort of deal with the next proposed recommendation a bit out of order. On page 9 it's the second proposed recommendation. "The Committee sees value in the Government forging partnerships with other state and provincial governments," et cetera. The reason why is that this recommendation is also similar to the recommendation on page 13 that has to do with the building of the LNG corridor, that very one that we talked about. Page 13, the second bullet: "Undertake a study of the feasibility of CNG and LNG vehicle corridors designed to withstand the additional weight . . ."

Our question to the committee, Mr. Chair, is whether or not that recommendation is already covered by what's already in the draft report.

1:35

The Acting Chair: Yeah. I want to make sure that we are feeling that the wording, that "the Committee sees value in the Government forging partnerships" – there's that little piece – and the last little part, "the Government forming technological and regulatory best practice partnerships" are covered in the draft report thus far, saying that "a study of the feasibility of CNG and LNG vehicle corridors designed to withstand the additional weight of . . . and which would provide a route." Is it fulsome enough in the report as was decided on the PC recommendations? It seems like the PC recommendations are talking about a little bit more fulsome interaction with state and provincial governments and forming technological and regulatory best practice partnerships world-wide with other governments, reaching out to those kind of things. Are we okay with the wording? As Dr. Massolin has said, it does link, but does it link enough that you're happy with it?

Dr. Massolin: Just one other point. Maybe I didn't make it clear. Of course, I just pointed it out to say that there are similarities; it's not identical. We can also incorporate and amalgamate.

The Acting Chair: Yeah. Thank you.

Anybody on the line? Any thoughts about that? I'm asking whether we want to strengthen particularly that bullet at the top of page 13 in the draft report to include any conversation regarding partnerships not only with state and provincial governments but partnerships on the basis of forming technological and regulatory best practices or if we're happy with it.

Ms Kubinec: In that second bullet on page 9, "sees value" to me is maybe not as strong as we should put it. In the bullet above we used "recommends." "Sees value" is a little too soft if what we would like to see happen is the forging of partnerships. So maybe we need to change the wording to "recommends."

The Acting Chair: All right. Ms Kubinec, it sounds like you're saying that you feel that it would be good to include the partnership side of the wording in there and incorporate something along those lines into that second bullet at the top of page 13 of the draft report, then.

Ms Kubinec: Either that or a new bullet because this is talking about forging partnerships, which to me is a little different than studying the feasibility.

The Acting Chair: Dr. Massolin, is that doable in the sense of incorporating that in there?

Dr. Massolin: Absolutely.

The Acting Chair: Does anybody have any other comments to collaborate what MLA Kubinec is saying? MLA Bilous.

Mr. Casey: Mr. Chairman, I'm having a tough time following this because we seem to be jumping from one document to the other. Unless I have totally the wrong documents in front of me, I'm not getting half the wording that you're referring to in this. So if we could just make sure we clarify what document we're referring to when we reference page numbers.

The Acting Chair: Okay. MLA Bilous, can I just take the floor from you for a second to clarify that?

Mr. Bilous: Absolutely.

The Acting Chair: We'll get right back to you.

I apologize for that. From an overall perspective, referring to the draft final report which is dated – well, it says on the front, “Draft Final Report: The Monetization of Natural Gas.” There are 20 pages in that report, and we are referencing the top of page 13 in that report. We're also working closely with another document, which is called Summary of Priorities and Proposed Stakeholder Recommendations, Natural Gas Revue, and that's dated December 10 and is comprised of 12 pages. So those are the two documents that we are referring to. Do you have both of those documents, MLA Casey?

Mr. Casey: Yes, I do.

The Acting Chair: Okay. So we'll try to stick to both of those, and if we're referring to another document, we'll certainly jump in there and let you know. As of right now in the summary of priorities we're on the second paragraph on page 9, which is one of the PC recommendations. We're discussing whether or not that can be incorporated into the second bullet at the top of page 13 or a new bullet at the top of page 13 of the final draft report. Does that tie it up together a little bit better?

So if I was to say that we're at the top of page 9, second paragraph, “The Committee sees value in the Government forging partnerships,” and the bullet on page 13 is to “undertake a study of the feasibility” and talks about vehicle corridors, they're definitely both talking about the corridors. The one in the PC recommendations on page 9 speaks more to the need to forge some partnerships, particularly along technological and regulatory best practice, whereas at the top of page 13 the second bullet just talks about the corridor piece of that.

MLA Kubinec had said that it sounds like we might want to put something in there regarding that. Dr. Massolin confirmed that it could be a separate bullet. Then I gave the floor to MLA Bilous, which I'll do right now.

Mr. Bilous: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just going to say that I'm not sure if I'm comfortable with the proposed recommendation of changing the wording from “sees value” to “recommends” that the government, you know, goes ahead and forges partnerships with other state and provincial governments, encouraging LNG and CNG vehicle corridors.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Any other comments on that? Were you feeling strongly about it, MLA Kubinec?

Ms Kubinec: No, not necessarily. It was something that made sense to me. My thought process is not necessarily the same as everyone's.

The Acting Chair: Okay. So we get some kind of feeling that it's not a great, big, huge issue.

Does anybody on the line, then, have any comments on this area?

Okay. So what happened here: we have a draft report; we have a PC recommendation; we heard one MLA, MLA Kubinec, speak to the need to incorporate that in there; and I think I heard MLA Bilous say that he did want to change the wording there as far as “sees value.” If I was to summarize, maybe, then can we leave it to our research area to put that wording somewhere into that bullet at the top of page 13? Is everybody in concurrence with that? Okay. Great. I'm seeing lots of heads shaking and not too much talking from the phone side of things, so that's good.

Okay. Carry on.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. Great. The next proposed recommendation is the very first paragraph on page 9 of the proposed recommendation document.

The Committee also recommends that the Government examine requiring contractors providing provincially funded services to the Government, Agencies, Boards, Commissions and Municipalities to transition to natural gas vehicles where practical and economic.

Maybe before the committee considers that one, we just thought of, perhaps, a slight alteration to the wording just because maybe it's not as clear as it could be. I don't know if you want me to read that into the record right now, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Yeah, if you could. Do you have some suggestions?

Dr. Massolin: Just some slight changes. Yeah. They don't change the meaning, of course; it's just the wording of it.

So here's the proposal for wording changes. The committee also recommends that

the government examine the requirement that contractors that provide provincially funded services to government, agencies, boards, commissions, and municipalities transition to natural gas vehicles where practical and economic.

The Acting Chair: All right. Well, basically, adding the words “the potential for” prior to “requiring contractors” and “that provide” instead of “providing”, which is probably more appropriate.

Dr. Massolin: Actually, just that the government examine the requirement that contractors that provide provincially funded services to government, agencies, boards, commissions, and municipalities transition to . . . et cetera. That's the . . .

The Acting Chair: Context there.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Well, everybody can get ready to make any comments they want to make on that, but prior to that if we could maybe just pause for a second. We've had two MLAs join us.

Mr. Luan and Mr. Strankman, could you both introduce yourselves, please? If you're substituting for somebody, could you let the good folks that are listening here and on *Hansard* know that?

Mr. Luan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jason Luan, MLA, Calgary-Hawkwood. I apologize. I thought it started at 1:30. I'm substituting for MLA Stephen Khan.

1:45

The Acting Chair: Mr. Strankman, are you there? I thought I heard you, Mr. Strankman. If you do hear us, then join in any time you'd like, and we'll introduce you for the record. Mr. Strankman – I believe he's going to join us – is substituting for Mr. Joe Anglin, who is the deputy chair as well.

We've just had this read into the record. Is there discussion on that piece? Obviously, the PC group is likely in favour of it since they came up with it. Any comments from anybody else who doesn't like that wording at all? I'm kind of hearing that we're good with that, and I certainly am in favour of that wording if everybody else is, so why don't we proceed on that one?

Mr. Casey: Ron Casey from Banff-Cochrane, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Yes. I recognize you, Mr. Casey.

Mr. Casey: Where are we suggesting we add that in the draft document?

The Acting Chair: Well, earlier we had made the general comment that what we'd ask our research group to do is to find the best place to put it in, and that would be either in the form of a recommendation, in bold somewhere in there.

Dr. Massolin, anything to add to that?

Dr. Massolin: Yes. I think that's exactly right, Mr. Chair.

The other piece to this is that then the entire draft report will be approved at the next stage, so the wording, you know, the recommendation within context, will be approved along with the rest of the draft final report.

The Acting Chair: Did you have any thoughts, MLA Casey, on where it was better to put it than another place?

Mr. Casey: No. I just wasn't clear as to whether there was a recommendation coming as to where to place it. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Good.

All right. Well, let's move on.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. We're still on page 9 of the proposed PC recommendations. The third paragraph:

The Committee applauds the LNG pilot studies ongoing by Bison Transport and CN Rail, and looks forward to the widespread adoption of LNG fueling in truck and rail transport.

Mr. Bilous: With this recommendation I have an issue, or I'm not sure I'm comfortable with the second half of that phrasing, "and looks forward to the widespread adoption of LNG fueling in truck and rail transport." That's a very definitive response and moving toward action. To my understanding, most of the recommendations are for further study and further investigation whereas this is directing the government to adopt "LNG fueling in truck and rail transport."

The Acting Chair: Just an idea. In the sense that that is pretty soft on the recommendation side of things, it's more of an acknowledgement, a bit of a shout-out. Would you feel better if it was in the body of the report rather than a recommendation in bold? Would that make sense, to incorporate it into the body of the report somewhere? I mean, I certainly don't mind listening to some ideas about how the words "and looks forward to the widespread adoption," if that's a concern, could be modified if any MLA wants to bring up some kind of wording change there.

Let's deal with, first, whether it should be a recommendation or whether it should be in the body. I'm personally feeling like it could be in the body.

Ms Fenske: I would think that it should be in the body and not a separate recommendation because it's not recommending anything. It's applauding them, as you said. I don't think we want to take up our recommendations by just doing the shout-outs.

The Acting Chair: All right. Mr. Bilous, can we carry on that dialogue? Do you have any changes?

Mr. Bilous: I'm okay with the recommendation of moving it to the body. I think, you know, there are two different points in this third phrase. I have no problem with saying, "The Committee applauds the LNG pilot studies ongoing by Bison Transport and CN Rail." I have no issues with that, but I think that that is

separate from the second half. I have an issue with the wording as far as "and looks forward to the widespread adoption of LNG fueling in truck and rail transport."

The Acting Chair: Can I make a suggestion?

Mr. Bilous: Sure. Please.

The Acting Chair: "And looks forward to the use of."

Mr. Bilous: Or "to the exploration of LNG fueling in truck and rail transport."

The Acting Chair: Could we also say: positive results coming out of the pilot studies?

Ms L. Johnson: Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, MLA Johnson.

Ms L. Johnson: What I'm hearing is that it could be two sentences. One is, "We applaud the efforts of these two companies," and the second, to me, is the whole reason we're meeting and discussing LNG, increased adoption in Alberta. Do we need the second part of the sentence at all?

The Acting Chair: Because that's what the flavour of the report is? Is that what you're saying?

Ms L. Johnson: Yeah. That's my understanding, my interpretation of all the work we've done here.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Is anybody feeling strongly that they want to leave that second part of the wording in there, or are we okay just to go with the main context of that, which was to recognize the great work done there and encourage them to carry on? A period after "Rail" and drop the rest? Are you feeling good about that, MLA Bilous?

Mr. Bilous: I'm in favour of that, to put a period after "CN Rail" and strike the rest of that sentence.

Ms L. Johnson: Okay.

The Acting Chair: Anybody on the line have any comments on that? Okay. That finishes one section.

Dr. Massolin: One quick question about that just so we get it right. That was just incorporated into the body, or is it going to be a recommendation?

The Acting Chair: The consensus, I think, from the committee was to put it into the body of the report, wherever you feel it's appropriate. As chair I'm sure we'll have the chance to review that.

Dr. Massolin: Sure.

The Acting Chair: All right. Well, we can cross our fingers and hope like hay that we get through the rest of this with everybody agreeing on what we're going to do, or we can make a motion and get this piece done. I'm kind of in favour of doing that. Would anyone like to make a motion with respect to the PC recommendations on vehicles?

Ms Fenske: So moved.

The Acting Chair: All right. The motion probably would sound like:

Subject to the discussion that was held, the PC recommendations on vehicles are approved for committee research to incorporate into the draft final report.

Everybody agreed on that? Anybody on the line disagree with that? Okay. Thank you very much. I think everybody is nodding in the room, so that's carried.

Regulatory.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We also have a proposed wording change for this first paragraph under Regulatory. Do you want me to read the original, or should I just read the proposed change?

The Acting Chair: Everybody should have the original in there, and if they want to reread it, then they can ask for that. Let's go right to the rewording.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. The rewording would be as follows: to encourage the licensing of alternative liquefied natural gas containers, the committee recommends that Alberta Transportation raise with the appropriate licensing body the issues associated with imposing weight limits for trucks carrying liquefied natural gas containers.

Mr. Bilous: Is it worth while clarifying why? Again, the fact is that LNG trucks are much heavier than diesel. I mean, I don't know if the committee feels that it would be valuable to include the impetus or the reason behind the recommendation within it.

The Acting Chair: My question would be: is that in the body of the report already?

Dr. Massolin: Well, yes. I'll reference the draft report now. Specifically, on page 12 the second to last paragraph explains the issue of weight and CNG versus LNG and how LNG trucks are "400 to 500 kilograms heavier than an equivalent diesel truck due to the weight of the LNG tanks." That's, I think, the specific explanation of that issue.

1:55

The Acting Chair: Is that part satisfactory? Go ahead, MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: I guess my thought would be that that recommendation would fit under the body where it explains the 400 to 500 kilograms heavier, correct?

The Acting Chair: If that's the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Bilous: It's a question of clarification, in which case it wouldn't be necessary to also include it in the recommendation.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. I mean, we can build it into the recommendation. I've got another choice here, or is that adequate?

The Acting Chair: I don't know that we've heard from everybody on the wording, but certainly with respect to the location I think MLA Bilous is spot-on with that one. If we could put that in, that piece, on page 12 I presume, that would be great.

Dr. Massolin: Yes.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Good.

Now, as to wording? You know, for me, the wording is a little bit softer, but I think it frames it probably as well as it needs to be framed in kind of a better way rather than being a little bit choppy, as in the one before.

Any comments on the line at all on this one?

Mr. Casey: Could we just hear the recommendation again, the new one?

The Acting Chair: MLA Casey, thank you. You want to hear the recommendation again, and I'll have Dr. Massolin do that.

Dr. Massolin: Sure. Here's the reworded proposed recommendation: to encourage the licensing of alternative liquefied natural gas containers, the committee recommends that Alberta Transportation raise with the appropriate licensing body the issues associated with imposing weight limits for trucks carrying liquefied natural gas containers.

Mr. Bikman: As an old trucker, can I just add that that sounds like it isn't the fuel tanks that the truck is being powered by but, rather, that it would be transporting liquid natural gas, and that's, of course, not the intent. Since it is only 400 or 500 kilograms of additional weight due to the tanks, that's something that they can easily address. The fact that it's referenced at the bottom of page 12, near the bottom, that last paragraph before Recommendations, I think that's satisfactory. Just increasing the width of the front tires by one inch, or 2.54 centimetres for you younger folks, would increase the carrying capacity allowed by the licensing jurisdiction for that truck.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Bikman, are you suggesting that the wording that we've just gone through is not necessary in the report?

Mr. Bikman: It isn't from my perspective, but I'm a fairly straightforward guy. I don't think it's necessary because the report itself identifies the additional weight, and that is easily addressed by the licensing or regulatory groups, as I said, by just requiring those trucks to have front tires that are one inch wider, each front tire.

The Acting Chair: Yeah.
MLA Johnson.

Ms L. Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Aren't there two weight factors here? One is the weight factor of the vehicle itself and what's allowed on the roads, and the other is the weight factor of what bridges will take. I want to make sure that both concerns which have been identified by the committee are in the report. One is in the "400 to 500 kilograms" reference. My understanding of this recommendation is that it identifies the containers, not the roads, and what we have at the top of page 13 are the roads and bridges and the additional weight. It's the vehicle itself right now.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.
Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. I was just going to point out exactly what Ms Johnson pointed out, that at the top of page 13 it deals with the issue of bridges and roads and increasing the weight limits. That's what we heard at the last meeting. This is, you know, the other side of the same coin, right? If the committee wants to strengthen that by including this as well, then that could be done, but my understanding – and I could be wrong on this – is that you get at the problem by increasing the weight limits on the roads and

bridges. Right? If you increase those limits, then the trucks can be heavier.

Having said that, the other thing I was going to add to this is that the proposed wording that I gave the committee could be altered to address Mr. Bikman's concern by saying the following – I won't read the whole thing out – basically that Alberta Transportation raise with the appropriate licensing body the issues associated with imposing weight limits for trucks equipped with liquefied natural gas tanks. That way it's crystal clear that we're talking about the fact that the units are powered by LNG as opposed to carrying LNG.

Mr. Bikman: Well, then I think you can just say that, Dr. Massolin. You don't have to say that it's equipped with those tanks. If it's powered by liquefied natural gas, it's implied that there must be tanks to carry that fuel. The point is that those trucks therefore weigh 400 to 500 kilograms more.

Now, the road surfaces can certainly handle more weight. It's just legislating to say that we want them to be allowed to haul more weight. It doesn't actually make the road or the bridge have the capacity to hold more weight. If it requires that the bridges or the roads be upgraded, that's an expense that we don't want to go through. I think our assumption in making the recommendation is that we're not going to have that expense but that it is just going to require a sort of recognition that the structures already have the capacity, and one of the ways you address the capacity of extra weight is by the square inches of tire that you have on the road. That's why I made my earlier reference.

I'm not trying to belabour this, and I think what we've got is fine. If you want to change it to something, that's fine too. I'm just trying to help everybody understand it a little more clearly, what it is we're talking about. Maybe you already understand it better than I do.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, MLA Bikman, and actually you did add some strength to that in terms of helping to get that clarification.

Does anybody have, then, any other comments in this little area? I think we're pretty much in a consensus of where we're rolling ahead with the revised wording and potentially changing those last four or five words to make it clearer.

Mr. Casey: Sort of related to what Gary was talking about here on the top of page 13, the first bullet: "Re-examine the existing weight restrictions on Alberta's roads and bridges." Well, re-examining this to ensure that the weight restrictions do not unnecessarily penalize trucks – Gary is absolutely right there. This is an engineering question, and I'm not sure that that was ever where we were going with this, where we wanted to re-engineer all of our roads and all of our bridges to allow for heavier vehicles.

I agree totally with the second bullet there, and I think that does it, where it says, "Undertake a study of the feasibility" of the vehicle corridors. So we look at where we have roads that have the capacity, where we have bridges that have the capacity, and we identify those, but the re-examining of the existing – I need someone to help me with that a little bit.

The Acting Chair: Say that last part, please, MLA Casey. What do you need help with?

Mr. Casey: Well, the whole idea of: "Re-examine the existing weight restrictions on Alberta's roads and bridges, and ensure that weight restrictions do not unnecessarily penalize trucks." Well, the problem here is that the roads and the bridges are engineered

to a weight restriction, so we can re-examine them all we want, but that isn't going to allow for heavier vehicles to be either on the roads or on the bridges because it's an engineering question here.

If we're talking about re-engineering, that's one thing, but I don't get this first bullet at all. I don't understand for a minute what it's trying to tell us.

The Acting Chair: Well, personally, the way I read it – I mean, you might be presupposing the re-examination, but that still may be a healthy exercise, to go through the re-examination.

I wasn't involved in – because I wasn't on the committee until I was substituted today. Was there already a discussion of this area? Does anybody want to comment on that at all?

2:05

Dr. Massolin: Well, I can just say that the intention behind this – and, of course, it's up for grabs in terms of revising the wording that's there – was simply to allow heavier vehicles, i.e., those powered by LNG, to travel down Alberta's roads and bridges by altering the weight restriction limitations on those, you know, in terms of the law, the legal aspect of it, not in terms of the engineering aspect of it.

The Acting Chair: Yeah. I mean, the way I read that bullet, I don't see that it's purporting to change any engineering on any road or bridge. I just think it's saying – I mean, I don't know, and the reason that I don't know is, I guess, because we're asking them to re-examine it. Let's say that a maximum capacity allowed on a road is 80 per cent of the maximum from an engineering perspective that it can have. Maybe it needs to be 83 per cent in order to allow that extra 3 per cent so that LNG vehicles can drive on those roads. I don't know. But that's why you would presumably want to do the re-examination. Does that make any sense?

Mr. Casey: I think the problem I have is the "ensure." So we're going to re-examine the existing weight restrictions, and then we're going to "ensure that weight restrictions do not unnecessarily . . ." If we had something in there that was, "Where appropriate, that weight restrictions do not," something along that line – I think this, in my mind, anyway, is really unclear. The issue here was that vehicles powered by LNG were heavier and that we wanted to make sure that there was an allowance where the roads had the capacity for them to run with a heavier load. I'm just not sure that this captures it. Anyway, that's only me, and I won't belabour it.

The Acting Chair: MLA Johnson.

Ms L. Johnson: Thank you. I think the two bullets have to be read together. The second one talks about corridors. The consistent theme throughout the presentations we got was that LNG-powered trucks won't be on every road in Alberta because there are all kinds of interprovincial transport that go on, the size of the loads they can carry that is going to be financially viable for them. So I think that when you leave the two of them side by side, the corridor and the re-examination will work together. If the corridor is going to ahead, then the roads and bridges as part of that corridor are the ones that are really going to have to be kept in line.

That's my interpretation, MLA Casey.

The Acting Chair: All right. Well, here's where we sit thus far. We've had a discussion of the first paragraph under regulatory. We have scheduled about an hour and ten minutes left in our

meeting, by the way. Then we had a discussion of the first bullet at the top of page 13 and the words “ensure” and “do not unnecessarily,” and we had had already some discussion in that area. I’m feeling like MLA Casey is not making a motion here; he’s more having a discussion for clarity. He may have received some.

Are we okay with the revised wording with the modification of the last four or five words as proposed by Dr. Massolin?

Mr. Bilous: Could you read the whole thing again?

The Acting Chair: For the committee could you read the whole thing again? Thank you, MLA Bilous.

Dr. Massolin: Yes, I will.

To encourage the licensing of alternative liquefied natural gas containers, the committee recommends that Alberta Transportation raise with the appropriate licensing body the issues associated with imposing weight limits for trucks equipped with liquefied natural gas tanks.

The Acting Chair: All right. Well, let’s take that as consensus and move on to the next paragraph.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. The next paragraph.

The Committee recommends that the Government take an activist approach in front of the National Energy Board, the Alberta Energy Regulator, and the BC Oil and Gas Commission to ensure that Alberta gas is able to flow to west coast LNG facilities should the private sector choose to do so.

The one minor wording change: as opposed to “in front of,” we would just suggest “before” the National Energy Board.

Thank you.

The Acting Chair: All right. Thank you, Dr. Massolin.
Any discussion on that?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Bilous.

The Acting Chair: Oh, I’m sorry. I’m absolutely dreaming.

Mr. Bilous: Well, I’m sure that this recommendation is going to go over like a lead balloon, but I’m going to propose that that paragraph ends after “LNG facilities,” striking out “should the private sector choose to do so.”

Ms L. Johnson: End after “LNG facilities”?

Mr. Bilous: Correct.

The Acting Chair: MLA Bilous, could you read what you’re proposing?

Mr. Bilous: Sure, and I’ll incorporate the change that Dr. Massolin proposed: the committee recommends that the government take an activist approach before the National Energy Board, the Alberta Energy Regulator, and the BC Oil and Gas Commission to ensure that Alberta gas is able to flow to west coast LNG facilities. Period. Strike out “should the private sector choose to do so.”

The Acting Chair: Did you want to include the lead balloon part in there?

Mr. Bilous: No.

The Acting Chair: Or is that just a side comment?

Mr. Bilous: No. That was a side comment. Yeah. Nowhere we’ll write in “lead balloon.”

The Acting Chair: Does anybody else have any comments on that? MLA Johnson, you’re waving at me.

Ms L. Johnson: Yeah. I’m scribbling in the air here. I’d like to understand why you want that removed. Then I was having a problem with the word “activist.” I’m thinking engaged, participate, engaged approach.

Mr. Bilous: Proactive.

Ms L. Johnson: Proactive.

The Acting Chair: Okay. So I’m hearing a couple of words there. Shall we deal with that little piece first because that’s a little part of it? I have a couple of suggestions instead of the word “activist,” “engaged” or “proactive.” Do you folks on the phone line have any comments on the words “proactive” or “engaged” or “activist”?

Mr. Casey: Proactive is my vote.

Ms L. Johnson: Proactive.

The Acting Chair: In the room? I’m hearing a lot of nods for the word “proactive.” Thank you, MLA Bilous, for suggesting that.

Now let’s go back to MLA Bilous’ proposal that he threw on the table as to wording, the words “should the private sector choose to do so.” Could you give us some reference, MLA Bilous, as to why you would like to have that removed?

Mr. Bilous: Sure. I mean, my initial understanding of this was not wanting to limit this to the private sector, again, should the government decide to pursue this through the public sector or even a Crown corporation. But, I mean, upon reading this a second time, it can be interpreted a few different ways, that it’s the private sector that is, you know, encouraging or – like, I guess I still want to recommend that that gets taken out or at least clarified because I’m not sure what the PC caucus meant when they said “should the private sector choose to do so” because the recommendation is that it’s the government that’s lobbying or being proactive to these bodies. So why is the private sector deciding if the government should be proactive or not?

Ms L. Johnson: I read it that the government is . . .

The Acting Chair: MLA Johnson, go ahead.

Ms L. Johnson: Sorry. My interpretation of it is that the government will be supportive of private sector choosing to do so.

Mr. Bilous: Choosing to . . .

The Acting Chair: MLA Bilous, go ahead.

Mr. Bilous: Sorry, Mr. Chair. The private sector choosing to . . .

Ms L. Johnson: Work to have the gas flow to the west coast.

Mr. Bilous: Right.

The Acting Chair: At the end of the day we clearly have a – the discussion point, as far as if I could just summarize that, is that it sounds like, MLA Bilous, you’re saying that the words “should the private sector choose to do so” would prevent the public sector from doing that, and the existing wording seems to say that the

private sector probably is the one who would fight to have that done or to take care of that in our world, that we exist in. Is that fair to say?

Mr. Bilous: Yes, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Are there any individuals that are on the phone lines that would like to comment on this, how strongly they feel that that wording should remain or not?

2:15

Mr. Bikman: I think that one of the reasons I like the wording the way it is is that we're addressing the issues of market driven. I understand where Mr. Bilous is coming from, I think, and not just philosophically and showing orange colouring but also just the idea that it opens it up more that government can be more involved in pushing to make this happen. Obviously, as a strong free enterpriser my perspective is that the government should facilitate and get out of the way or encourage the free flow of trade and commerce and in this case facilitate or make it easier for the private enterprise to interact with the government, that regulates some aspects of what it would like to be able to do. So I think it's a minor point that's more of a philosophical difference.

I think Mr. Bilous has personal leanings and his party is more in favour of the government taking a greater lead in seeing that these things happen. My party and I and perhaps most of us that come from a conservative background see it as government's job just to kind of get out of the way of free enterprise and see that it's allowed to do its job, with certain restrictions, obviously. But in this area I think we're probably pretty much on the same page.

The Acting Chair: MLA Luan, do you have any strong thoughts on this one way or the other, if I go to the second paragraph under regulatory on page 9, as to whether we should keep the words "should the private sector choose to do so" or whether we feel it's important to have those words in there at all? Does anybody have any comments? MLA Luan, I didn't want to put you on the spot.

Mr. Luan: Well, you know, I want to first commend the chair for wearing the right shirt. I followed your memo: almost identical.

The Acting Chair: Yeah. The reference there, of course, is that many of us are recognizing antibullying day and wearing pink shirts to bring awareness to the devastating effects of bullying in our society and how we should speak up against that. Thank you for wearing pink.

Mr. Luan: Thank you for that.

On your question of: do I have a strong preference? Actually, no. Either way is fine to me.

The Acting Chair: Anybody else? MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Sorry. You know what? I'm actually just going to propose to the committee that we strike that second paragraph out completely. I mean, on the one hand, if the private sector chooses to lobby the National Energy Board or the Alberta Energy Regulator, et cetera, that – again, you know, Mr. Bikman, if I can take your words in their true meaning, if you're talking about removing government, then let's remove them from being a lobby organization for these other boards and leave it up to the private sector completely.

The Acting Chair: Okay. I just about had everybody agree to drop the last eight words, and we got some discussion relative to

dropping the paragraph. Any comments from the committee on that?

Ms L. Johnson: It's important to keep the paragraph.

The Acting Chair: Okay. I'm kind of hearing that we should keep the paragraph. Anybody on the line have any comments on that?

Mr. Lemke: Weren't we discussing a previous motion already? I thought there was a motion made to drop part of the sentence.

The Acting Chair: First off, we're totally in discussion here. We're just clarifying that there is no motion. We're able to bounce around however we'd like because we're in discussion rather than on a particular motion.

Mr. Lemke: All right.

The Acting Chair: Nobody has proposed a motion that I'm dealing with right now. So go ahead. Do you have a comment?

Mr. Lemke: Well, no. I'll save my comment until there's a motion made.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Well, the motion may follow here shortly, so we'll find out.

Any other comments on whether that paragraph should remain in either its present framework or adjusted by dropping the last eight words?

Mr. Bikman: I'd like to see it stay as it is.

Ms L. Johnson: I so move.

The Acting Chair: Okay. MLA Johnson just made a motion. Do you want to clarify? Did you want to go ahead and word a motion?

Ms L. Johnson: I so move that paragraph 2 . . .

The Acting Chair: Of the regulatory section.

Ms L. Johnson: . . . of the regulatory section . . .

The Acting Chair: Be worded as follows.

Ms L. Johnson: Yes. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: With substituting the word "active" with "proactive," as suggested by MLA Bilous. Would you like to in your motion have the last eight words remain or take them out?

Ms L. Johnson: Sorry. Well, let's read the sentence. How about we do it that way?

The committee recommends that the government take a proactive approach before the National Energy Board, the Alberta Energy Regulator, and the BC Oil and Gas Commission to ensure that Alberta gas is able to flow to west coast LNG facilities, should the private sector choose to do so.

The Acting Chair: All right. Any discussion on that motion?

All in favour of that motion? All right. Any opposed? We have one vote in opposition, so that motion is carried. Thank you.

We still need to deal with – that motion covered the second point under regulatory on the PC recommendations.

Before we continue, why don't you go ahead, Dr. Massolin? I may cut you off.

Dr. Massolin: Sure. No problem.

The third paragraph:

The Committee asks the Government to examine strategies to reduce pipeline tolls on Alberta gas through the existing delivery pipelines as volumes are shifted to other markets, to avoid decreased flow from British Columbia to the Nova Gas Trunk Line unfairly affecting pipeline tolls in Alberta.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Anybody have any comment on that? Did anybody get any other feedback on that one at all from anyone? Anybody on the line have any comments on that one? So we're good to go.

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Chair?

The Acting Chair: Yes, MLA Bilous?

Mr. Bilous: Sorry. I'm just asking for clarification, I guess. So we're asking the government to examine strategies to reduce pipeline tolls on Alberta gas. We're talking about pipeline companies paying tolls going through British Columbia? Forgive me for my ignorance, but could we get clarification on that?

The Acting Chair: Was there any discussion, Dr. Massolin? I'm in a bit of a disadvantaged situation about this section, not having been at all the other meetings.

Dr. Massolin: Well, I can't speak to the specifics of this recommendation. I can talk about the generalities, and that is the access of Alberta gas to pipelines through which the gas would flow to the export facilities on the west coast, right? So pipelines and tolls would be a factor there.

Mr. Bilous: So you're talking about companies that are wanting to export LNG, paying the pipeline companies a toll to use the pipeline to transport the LNG?

The Acting Chair: MLA Kubinec, do you have any recollection on this one? Personally, I see a fair bit of consternation about the wording here. MLA Kubinec, do you have any comments on that?

Ms Kubinec: No. But I'm wondering if this is one that we could ask for it to come back or that it be deleted. If it's causing us to be confused, it's likely going to cause others reading this report to be confused, so perhaps we should just eliminate it.

The Acting Chair: MLA Bilous, I'm feeling the same as you, and I'm seeing that it's awful wordy with respect to Nova and pipelines and tolls.

Anybody on the line have any comments on this particular one or recollection of why that popped up so suddenly?

2:25

Mr. Hale: Yes. I'd like clarification as to who came up with this recommendation, if it was from the members of the committee from the PC caucus or if it was from someone outside our committee. I would like some clarification, too, on exactly what they're talking about there.

The Acting Chair: It definitely was a sentence that came out of the PC caucus discussions, but I'm looking around the room, and I'm seeing a lot of individuals who certainly don't have a problem with striking it out, as MLA Bilous said. He asked a very solid, strong question about it, and we're not getting a lot of traction on this one. Is everybody okay with taking that out? All right. Well, we'll strike that one.

Let's move on.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. The next recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the Government request the National Energy Board and the Alberta Energy Regulator to report on Natural Gas Liquids volumes crossing provincial borders and being exported as LNG, [so] as to provide transparency on petrochemical feed stock availability and opportunities for domestic utilization of such.

The Acting Chair: Any questions on that one? Okay. Nobody on the line? So it sounds like that one is okay to go ahead. I'm hearing some nods. Carry on.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. The next proposed recommendation.

The Committee recommends that the Government highlight the value of dry gas to potential LNG customers.

The Acting Chair: That's pretty straightforward, I think. Okay. Good. Next.

Dr. Massolin:

The Committee recommends that the Government encourage increased efficiencies in natural gas and Natural Gas Liquids processing and shipping infrastructure, and with a goal of achieving more competitive processing costs and tolls. The Government can achieve this by encouraging optimal utilization of processing and shipping infrastructure, including consolidation of that infrastructure where volumes warrant.

The Acting Chair: Anybody on the line have any concerns over those last couple and, particularly, this one? These are just, I think, clarifying and bringing out the importance of these things that were heard in the reports that we got. Okay. I think we have consensus on that, so we're done on that piece, then.

We've already had a motion on the second paragraph of the section called Regulatory on page 9. Can I entertain a motion regarding paragraphs 1, 4, and 5 and incorporate the striking of 3 on the PC recommendations?

MLA Luan. Let me just clarify before you go on, MLA Luan. There actually is kind of a space missing there, so we need to deal with paragraphs 1, 4, 5 and 6 and strike 3 under regulatory, page 9 of the PC recommendations.

Do you have a motion in that regard, MLA Luan?

Mr. Luan: I so move.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Thank you. All in favour of that motion, please indicate. Anybody on the line, indicate in favour. Any opposed? All right. We got that motion through.

Carry on, Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Under the category Further Study the first proposed recommendation is:

The Committee recommends that the Government examine a program similar to the Incremental Ethane Extraction Program to encourage further partnerships between the manufacturers and the gas sector.

The Acting Chair: Just for the committee's edification MLA Blakeman of the Liberal caucus is late. She's indicated she'll be on her way right away, and I'll update her when she arrives.

Any comments on that line? We're good to go? Agreed?

The second one there.

Dr. Massolin:

The Committee recommends that the Government examine creating a framework for junior natural gas producers to enter into co-operative agreements for the marketing of gas and the formation of export joint ventures with overseas consumers of LNG.

The Acting Chair: Any comments on the line or in the room on that one? It sounds like we're agreed.

Number 3.

Dr. Massolin:

The Committee recommends that the Government conduct a market access study related to the potential for Alberta gas exports to California.

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Chair?

The Acting Chair: Yes. Go ahead, MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Can I ask for clarification on where this one came from? We're talking about the export of LNG, but this is a specific recommendation to conduct a market access study for California. I'm wondering where that came from, and I'm not sure I'm comfortable with making that recommendation for a variety of reasons. Number one, I mean, the U.S. has a significant amount of natural gas, so I'm not sure how prudent it would be to recommend this to the government, to conduct a market access study.

The Acting Chair: MLA Fenske, do you want to comment?

Ms Fenske: I believe I recall some discussion that California was a potential market for us, so I'm thinking that's why it's specifically identified. We had some discussion about that at one of the meetings, so that's why I'm thinking it was there. I don't know exactly how it got there.

The Acting Chair: Anybody on the line have comments on that?

MLA Bilous, how strong are you feeling about this? Does it detract from the report?

Mr. Bilous: I'm okay with leaving it in. Thank you, MLA Fenske.

The Acting Chair: All right. I think we cleared one section there, Further Study. Can we have a motion on that section? MLA Sandhu.

Mr. Sandhu: I so move.

The Acting Chair: Moved that

those three go as stated.

Thank you very much.

All in favour of that motion? Any opposed? Anybody on the line opposed? All right. Thank you very much.

Carry on.

Dr. Massolin: Under the category Co-Generation:

The Committee recommends that the Government examine barriers to the widespread adoption of natural gas and heat co-generation in multi-family residential, commercial, industrial, neighbourhood, and regional developments.

The Acting Chair: Any comments on that one? We're okay with that one? Okay.

Carry on.

Dr. Massolin:

The Committee applauds the widespread adoption of large scale industrial co-generation in Alberta.

The Acting Chair: Anybody have any concerns with that one or comments at all? All right. We're agreed on that one.

Can we have a motion on the Co-Generation section? MLA Johnson moves that

we accept the two paragraphs under Co-Generation.

All in favour of that motion? Any opposed? Any opposed on the line? That's carried.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, now we're moving on to Proposed Recommendations Suggested by the Liberal Caucus. That sole proposed recommendation is as follows:

Renewable energy should be examined and a cost-benefit analysis should be conducted as Alberta attempts to reduce its carbon footprint.

The Acting Chair: At this point in time I would ask the committee if they would allow about a five-minute break in consideration of MLA Blakeman wanting to speak to this issue, if we could just take what the Speaker says is a comfort break for four minutes?

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Chair?

The Acting Chair: Yes. Go ahead, MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: I'm not sure if there is going to be time for this, but I know in the actual report – I'm probably jumping around, aren't I? – there were a couple of parts that we as the committee wanted to review as far as wording. I don't know if now would be a good time? Okay. We'll do that after.

The other question that I have is: is it too late for me to make a proposed recommendation from my own caucus at this point in time?

The Acting Chair: I don't think there's anything wrong with making any motion at any time. We have not adjourned yet, so why don't you go ahead, MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Sure. Unless the committee feels strongly about a five-minute break, in which case I can do it after the Liberal caucus recommendation.

Ms Fenske: I would like to leave earlier rather than later.

2:35

The Acting Chair: So why don't you proceed? Do you have anything in writing at all that we could copy?

Mr. Bilous: Not that you could copy, but I can just read it. It's very short.

The Acting Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bilous: It's just a recommendation that the government engage in meaningful consultation with environmental and indigenous groups in regard to this study. I mean, that's the recommendation. I'll just explain it very briefly to the committee. The reasoning behind it is just that in our list of presenters we didn't have any presentations from indigenous groups or from environmental groups. Again, the logic is that in order to have a fulsome picture, we should really have heard from all sides and all different points of view and perspectives.

The Acting Chair: Is this just for discussion so far? You haven't made any motion yet?

Mr. Bilous: Sure. Let's start with the discussion first if you want, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Did we have these groups asked to present, and they weren't able to at all?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, if you're directing that to me, those groups did not appear on the stakeholders list that was approved by the committee.

Ms Fenske: Well, I do believe that we had the opportunity to put names forward, and I think that that's probably the time that they should have been. I know that there were people, I think, that came forward and said, "You missed us," early in the process, when we were discussing and receiving presentations. So I'm kind of hesitant. That's like going through the whole report again with them. I understand where you're coming from with respect to – you know, they certainly are stakeholders. But we looked at specific groups, so why wouldn't we have called them to this while we were entertaining presentations?

Mr. Bilous: That's a valid question. That might have been an oversight, but I don't think that it's too late to encourage or recommend that the government engage with these groups before moving forward. I mean, I don't think that this report is the be-all and end-all and that the government can move forward with policy immediately. I think it's recommending that these groups that didn't have an opportunity to present to this committee be engaged in a meaningful way regarding the monetization of LNG.

Ms Fenske: Well, certainly, we want to engage with all Albertans, but when you put words in like "meaningful," it could be anything, and that's very subjective. I think if we go out to – I mean, what's the timeline actually? When do we have to have this report in front of the House?

The Acting Chair: Dr. Massolin, would you like to speak to that? We need to have that in the record anyways.

Dr. Massolin: Yes, Mr. Chair. The deadline for this review is, I believe, March 10.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

If I could just throw this on the table. Our scope of reference is the following:

That in the interest of encouraging broader and higher value use of natural gas both domestically and abroad, the Committee undertake a study of public policy tools to . . .

Then there are four bullets under that.

So I don't know that it's in our scope of reference to tell the government who else they should talk to. I mean, I think that groups have the chance to come forward – and I've heard that maybe they didn't get the chance, or somehow along the line they didn't communicate, not that they still can't at all with the government to provide their own report towards this situation – but I don't know that in our scope of reference we really have that package of who else the government could talk to.

Mr. Luan: I'm just trying to pitch in some constructive solutions. I'm looking, MLA Bilous, to see if this addresses your concern. I can relate my past experience of working with aboriginal communities. Sometimes our way of scheduling things isn't the most optimal way of engaging them. We can say: yes, the opportunity has been given, but you haven't done anything, and therefore we're done. If we continue doing that, I don't think we'll be that successful in engaging them anyway. By the same token, we've got business moving along, so we can't be lingering forever because then there's nothing moving forward.

Here's my recommendation if that fits MLA Bilous's concerns. We proceed as is but with the notion that we continue welcoming those other parties to be involved. My understanding is that even

if the committee made a recommendation to the House, that's not the end of it. The minister still has time to decide what to do with our recommendation. I think your effort – and I'm going to support you on that – is to recognize that there are those other aboriginal communities who may have an interest in being part of this and they missed it somehow. So we continue to leave the door open.

The Acting Chair: That could be in the form, for example, of the minority report that the NDP caucus is able to put in there.

Mr. Bilous: Which we will. I mean, I appreciate the words of MLA Luan and the recognition that our definition of invitation may not necessarily be universal in how it's interpreted or applied. But I think it's important – when I recommend indigenous groups, environmental groups, it's also from the point of view of economic partnerships because we need to recognize that many of the pipelines that are built go through aboriginal communities. I think that they have a direct stake in this and in the government pursuing it. Again, this is a recommendation that the government engage with these groups. I'm not suggesting that the committee, you know, recommence all of our engagements and start from square one again. This is just adding a recommendation, an acknowledgement, that we didn't have representatives from those two different areas present to the committee and that the government engage with them.

The Acting Chair: Okay.

Sorry. I think I heard somebody on the line. Go ahead, MLA Casey.

Mr. Casey: My sense here is that we also didn't include landowner groups and private landowners across Alberta. I mean, the truth is that natural gas and natural gas pipelines affect a whole variety of landowners and different interest groups. Our job here was to understand the monetization of natural gas and what, in fact, needed to be done in order to improve that or enhance that. So our job was to look at sort of the current circumstance and then make recommendations to the government for moving forward.

Any policy that moves forward is naturally going to have to include those affected stakeholders, whether they be aboriginal groups, whether they be private landowners, whether they be municipalities, or whether they be NGOs. All we're doing is recommending that the policy move ahead. We don't have enough meat on any of these policy recommendations to actually go out and discuss with anyone. So at this point I think it's more than appropriate to move ahead with what we have with the recognition that by policy alone we're going to have to engage those stakeholders before anything changes as far as government policy.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

At this stage I would ask MLA Bilous to conclude the conversation side – and I think you've already acknowledged that you'll probably put that in your minority report – or make a motion that we could deal with.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate MLA Casey's points, but I think that leaving it up to the fact that it is part of process – I think it needs to be identified and acknowledged that these groups were not part of the consultation process or that they did not present to this committee. So I am going to make a motion that

the committee recommends that the government engage in meaningful consultation with environmental and indigenous groups.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Is there any further discussion on that motion? Go ahead, MLA Lemke.

2:45

Mr. Lemke: Thank you. I'm going to speak against the motion. Frankly, it disturbs me a little bit. MLA Bilous had the opportunity in the last several months to bring this to the committee's attention. To do it now just seems to me like politicizing this process, and it disturbs me. I think we can all be proud of the report that was done in a bipartisan nature, so an effort, whether he intends it or not, to make this somehow political disturbs me. I mirror MLA Casey's words. I mean, there are lots of people that this committee could have talked to and didn't and lots of people that would need to be consulted before anything happened, and certainly indigenous groups are one of them. Landowners are another. So from that perspective I do not support this motion.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

All in favour of the motion, please indicate. I'm seeing one in the room. Is there anybody in favour of motion on the line? I'm hearing none. All opposed, please indicate. That motion is defeated.

That, I think, concludes the recommendations part. We now are still waiting, for the record, for MLA Blakeman to speak to the Liberal recommendation that was written into the record. With the committee's permission I'll defer a conversation on that until MLA Blakeman is able to be here, assuming she's still on her way.

Maybe we could move into the section about looking at the gaps now within the report, having filled some of the gaps with a recommendation.

Dr. Massolin, would you like to carry on that conversation, then?

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Right now I think that it's appropriate that the committee turn its attention to the draft final report. We've dealt with some of the elements, some of the proposed recommendations in this report, to this point, but there may be a few recommendations that the committee has not necessarily approved per se, or there might be other proposals that the committee would like to put forward as well.

But perhaps we should start, Mr. Chair, on page 13 because at the last meeting, right towards the end of the meeting, there was a discussion about the recommendation that appears at the end of page 13. Mr. Chair, I'll read out that recommendation and then tell you what the issue is.

The Committee recommends that the Government, with industry, should play a role in educating companies and the general public on the safety, risks, costs, and benefits of natural gas (LNG and CNG) in order to increase acceptance and adoption of natural gas as a fuel.

The issue was whether or not a wording change should be made. The motion was passed. The suggestion was to make the change, if appropriate, during this approval process. The question revolved around "with industry" and the appropriateness of the wording there.

Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Could you just clarify what you said there? There was a motion to deal with it at this meeting?

Dr. Massolin: Well, no. Sorry. The motion had passed to adopt the wording as it is represented on page 13. The suggestion was that for the changes required, that could be dealt with at this part of the process, which is the approval of the draft report.

The Acting Chair: Oh, okay.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you.

The Acting Chair: MLA Kubinec, go ahead.

Ms Kubinec: I move that we strike the words "with industry," leaving the rest intact from that recommendation. My rationale for that is that we as the government can't force industry to do anything. But I still think we need to go forward with playing that role. So I would like to strike the words "with industry."

The Acting Chair: In hearing that, the argument, I believe, as per my reading of the discussion from before in *Hansard*, was that there was concern over the word "with," meaning that government would have to work with industry to play the role. The discussion seemed to be that, well, no, that wasn't the intention, that industry also could play a role.

Is your point that industry will play a role if they want to play a role, and therefore our report can simply say, "The government should play a role," and obviously if industry want to come along with that, then that's fine? Is that your intention?

Ms Kubinec: That's correct. As I said, repeating, we can't dictate what industry shall do. They hopefully will, but we need to be playing the role of educating companies and the general public.

The Acting Chair: All right. Any discussion, then, on that motion?

Mr. Bilous: It's interesting. I recall feeling that it shouldn't just be the government's role to educate. If industry is interested in, you know, LNG or, again, increasing either our natural gas production or the transportation of it, it shouldn't just fall to the government. However, I do agree that government shouldn't have to do it with industry or be obligated to work with industry in the education process. So I'm comfortable with striking out "with industry."

The Acting Chair: Is there anybody on the line that has any comments?

Okay. All in favour of eliminating the words "with industry" in the recommendation on page 13 of the draft final report, please indicate. I'm seeing the room indicate. Is there anybody opposed? Is there anybody opposed on the line? Hearing none, that motion is carried. All right. Thank you.

Dr. Massolin, the next point you wanted to make in here.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't know exactly how the committee would like to address the draft report as it stands. Again, to reiterate, there have already been a few changes in terms of incorporating new information there and slightly revising what has already been written, but perhaps I can try to lead the committee through the recommendations it hasn't addressed, to get approval so that if there are any revisions or amendments that need to happen, we can deal with that for the next iteration of this. Is that okay?

The Acting Chair: Agreed.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. I'll just take the committee through the actual recommendations and not all the contextual information, but of course, Mr. Chair, if the committee has any recommendations as to any wording changes, whether it's in the context or the actual recommendations, we will make those changes.

The Acting Chair: Just for clarification, when was the draft final report available to all the committee members?

Dr. Massolin: I can't remember exactly, but it's been available for about two weeks maybe. Mr. Tyrell?

Mr. Tyrell: About a week and a half.

Dr. Massolin: About a week and a half. Okay.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Good.

Dr. Massolin: The first recommendation, I believe, appears at the top of page 6 of the draft final report. Would you like me to read it?

The Acting Chair: Yes, please.

Dr. Massolin: Okay.

The Committee recognizes that Alberta has an abundant supply of natural gas and that the Government of Alberta should encourage greater use of natural gas in the province given its abundant supply and given the environmental benefits, such as decreased greenhouse gas emissions, relative to other non-renewable resources. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Government conduct additional studies on the costs and environmental impacts associated with the use of natural gas in relation to other non-renewable resources.

The Acting Chair: Just as a point of clarity or something administratively, was there a plan to number the recommendations so that in the future rather than say, "on page," we number them?

Dr. Massolin: We can certainly do that, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Let's do that.

Dr. Massolin: Sure.

The Acting Chair: Does anybody have any comments on that recommendation that was read on the top of page 6, positives or negatives?

Let's try to deal with these in one motion again. So why don't you proceed.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. The next group of recommendations is presented on pages 9 and 10.

The Committee recognizes the potential benefits to Alberta's economy of natural gas projects in the form of increased taxation and royalties to the Province and greater employment opportunities. It also considers that there are opportunity costs of exporting Alberta's natural gas, which may result in lost value to the Province. As a result, the Committee recommends that the Government prioritize value-added projects, such as petrochemical production and gas-to-liquids projects that use natural gas within the province. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the Government investigate policy tools such as sliding royalty scales and cluster development to encourage the growth of, and facilitate investment in, Alberta's petrochemical industry.

Would you like me to deal with them piecemeal, or should I read all of the group?

The Acting Chair: I think it would be best to read the group. Is that okay, committee? Yeah? Okay.

2:55

Dr. Massolin:

The Committee recommends that the Government of Alberta support value-added processing of natural gas and ensure the sustainability of the petrochemical industry in Alberta with a view to creating increased employment opportunities within the

province, including increased partnerships with Aboriginal communities in Alberta.

The committee recognizes that significant benefits can be obtained from using natural gas in petrochemical production in Alberta. Given that the increased value-added protection will require supporting infrastructure, such as transportation infrastructure, the Committee recommends that the Government facilitate the construction of additional infrastructure such as transportation networks, needed to support the development of the petrochemical industry and value-added projects.

The Acting Chair: All right. That wording is fairly succinct. Anybody on the line? I'm getting nods from the room.

Mr. Casey: I just had a question about the first bullet, I guess we'll call it.

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, MLA Casey.

Mr. Casey: The first sentence there is really something that I feel should be up in the body of the report because what we're doing is that we're burying these two recommendations that I think are very important as stand alones inside of this bigger paragraph. The first sentence there is really just rationalizing these two recommendations, just as the body of the report rationalized the rest. So my preference would be that we see those first two sentences removed and put up in the body of the report and that we break these out into two separate recommendations so it's much more clear.

The Acting Chair: Any other comments?

Much more clear or much more lost in the body of the report? That's always the counter to stating something in the wording.

Dr. Massolin, did you have any thoughts about how those two sentences emerged as being part of the recommendation?

Dr. Massolin: Okay. Mr. Chair, those two sentences that Mr. Casey highlighted are incorporated and expressed already in the body of the report. They're included in this recommendation here to give context and to emphasize that, but of course we'll follow what the committee decides.

The Acting Chair: For anybody who wasn't in the room at the time, the discussion is on the first paragraph of the recommendations on page 9. MLA Casey had a comment that perhaps the first two sentences in the first paragraph are not allowing emphasis on the real thing that we want to say, which is the recommendations piece of that.

Any other comments on the line or in the room as to whether we should keep or not keep? Dr. Massolin just said that the information contained in the first two sentences is already in the body of the report.

MLA Kubinec.

Ms Kubinec: Yes. I would respectfully disagree in that we're hoping this report will be read far and wide, but some may choose to just go directly to the recommendations. To me, if they do that, then leaving those two sentences is important because that talks to the rationale of why we're doing what we're doing.

Mr. Bilous: I'd like to echo the words of MLA Kubinec in that although I can appreciate MLA Casey's point that the first two sentences aren't a direct recommendation, they do lead into the recommendation and provide the rationale behind it, and I do think that it emphasizes the value of the recommendation and

highlights it for other members in the House who aren't part of this committee and also for Albertans across the province.

The Acting Chair: Anybody else on the line?
Any comment back to that, MLA Casey?

Mr. Casey: Mr. Chair, I guess my point is that I'd like to read these reports and have consistency. What I don't see is consistency. In other words, in one case we have a rationalization; in the next we have just a recommendation; in the next we have a rationalization. So if we are going to provide a preamble to each recommendation, then we need to do that in each and every case. So I'm not hooked one way or the other. I'm simply saying that we need to be consistent if we want this report to read correctly.

Back to MLA Kubinec's point, I agree totally. If we're going to add context to this so that people can read it and they will go directly to the recommendations, then we need to add context to each and every recommendation that we're making in this report.

Mr. Bilous: I think it's a very valid point that MLA Casey brought up. When I'm looking through the recommendations elsewhere in this report, there is a rationale attached with all of the recommendations. I mean, without me reading through all of them, there is a sentence, whether it's the first one, that says that the committee recognizes Alberta's abundant supply of natural gas and that the government of Alberta should encourage greater use, et cetera, et cetera. I agree with Mr. Casey that there should be consistency, and I would advocate that those one- to two-phrase rationalizations are included in the recommendations.

The Acting Chair: Might I suggest something as the chair, that you can either say that you don't like or say that you like, because I do see the blend in here. As I read through the recommendations, I also saw that there is about a 50-50 split of firing right to a recommendation versus having what I would call, say, a key consideration. Maybe that is a word I would use. So how do you feel about having our recommendations shown in bold and then having a heading under that saying Key Considerations in bold and moving the recognizes-type wordings down to Key Considerations? Then they're not blended in; they're not lost in the body of the report. They are highlighted but after the recommendations, and then the recommendations are pure.

Ms Kubinec: You know, I kind of would prefer that with each of the recommendations there be that little bit of a preamble rather than pulling things out. I know of people, me being one of them, who will go right to the recommendation, and if it's spoken to right before you're going to read the recommendation, then you've got context right there with "the Committee recommends." To be consistent, if we asked our esteemed helpers here to just make it consistent throughout the report. I'm looking on page 12, and that's one, that MLA Casey referred to, where we've jumped right to the recommendation. If there could be a little bit of a preamble, if you will, before that on the rationale, that just would work well in my brain.

Mr. Bilous: If we follow that recommendation on page 12, the preamble actually comes in the centre of the sentence. I'll read it. It says: "The Committee recommends that the Government of Alberta, in the interest of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from heavy-duty trucks." That's the rationale behind the recommendation. It just happens to come in the middle of the phrase and not at the beginning of the sentence. I do think that that context is very, very valuable, even for ourselves on this committee, to remind us where the recommendation came from. I mean, we can ask our

research or the LAO to put that at the beginning of the sentence in order to keep it consistent, but my reading is that that context piece is valuable.

The Acting Chair: Okay. MLA Casey, I would ask if you are feeling more comfortable if that modification is made to all of the recommendations in the report.

Mr. Casey: Yes. Absolutely. My whole point was just that it be consistent as you read it.

The Acting Chair: Okay. I'm starting to feel like the consensus is that without too much work I think we could probably add a presentence coming out of the body of the report, adding nothing new or changing the context of things but perhaps emphasizing or putting it in the correct order, as MLA Bilous has pointed out, being a former English teacher, I assume.

Mr. Bilous: Yes.

The Acting Chair: Noted and acknowledged and thanked, actually.

So we think we can probably do that.

Dr. Massolin.

3:05

Dr. Massolin: Yes. We'd have no problem doing that, Mr. Chair.

The other thing I wanted just to add to that is that for the additions to the final report, i.e. the recommendations that were just approved, we'll also do that because they're not written in such a way that they always have that rationale or preamble. So we'll add that as well for consistency's sake.

The Acting Chair: Okay. I think we're at the top of page 11. Just for clarity, I think we're going to ask for one motion at the end.

Go ahead.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At the top of page 11 of the draft final report:

The Committee recognizes that with any decision made in regard to how the Government should monetize Alberta's natural gas, a stable regulatory framework needs to be in place in order to attract and maintain investment in the province. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the Government should ensure that there is consistency and stability with future regulations surrounding the natural gas industry so that investors have certainty when making long-term investments in Alberta.

Technology related to natural gas extraction, production, and the public use of natural gas, such as in heavy-duty transport or personal vehicles, is advancing. The Committee recognizes that regulations regarding natural gas from its extraction to its usage (as CNG or LNG) need to be flexible in order to adapt to advancing technology. As a result, the Committee recommends that the Government periodically review the regulatory framework to ensure that it is current with changing technology in the natural gas industry and to update regulations as needed to encompass technological innovations.

Mr. Bilous: I just wanted to say to the committee that when I was reading these two recommendations, something came to mind that I know is probably inherent in the report and should be inherent in the actions of the government. We're saying in these points that "the Committee recommends that the Government should ensure that there is consistency and stability with future regulations surrounding the natural gas industry," and we're talking about: in the best interests of investors to have certainty when making long-

term investments in Alberta. You know, what struck me was that there was an omission to iterate the responsibility that the government should act in the best interests of Albertans. It seems like that comes through in that they're acting in the best interests of industry as far as stability, which is understandable, but I felt as though we should highlight that the government is acting in the best interests of Albertans.

The Acting Chair: Any comments on that line or in the room?

Mr. Bilous: I'm not sure how or where to work that in, and I should have finished the sentence by saying, "To act in the best interests of Albertans as well" or "also" so that we're acknowledging both. I'm not sure if either Dr. Massolin or his team could find a way to include that in this recommendation. I don't have any recommendations.

The Acting Chair: All of me wants to say that there are many things inherent in a report which are kind of motherhood statements relative to what's going on. For example, in the context of budget considerations we could put in every recommendation that budget considerations should be taken into account, but one would think that the duly elected government would be acting in the interests of Albertans, wouldn't you think?

Mr. Bilous: One would think, but I don't know if it's always the case that it's applied, so I think that having it articulated is valuable.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Go ahead, MLA Johnson. Did you have a comment?

Ms L. Johnson: It goes back to the scope. It was on public policy tools to encourage consumer use. I'm with the chair that we're operating in the best interests of Albertans from all perspectives around this table, and that's why the committees work. You may call me naive, but that's why I come to this building, to do my job, to work on behalf of all Albertans.

The Acting Chair: In the absence of hearing a motion, perhaps we could move along. I did want to mention – and those comments were certainly noted, Mr. Bilous – that the time is 3:10. Although we're scheduled to 3:15, we are able to continue on with this committee meeting until we receive a motion which would be voted on and would need to be carried in order to adjourn. With, I hope, the approval of the committee to eke on a little bit longer here, we can do that. Is that okay with everybody, or do we make a motion and end our meeting? We do have some severe time limitations relative to the timing of getting this report out of the gate, and I don't think we need more than 10 minutes, quite frankly, to finish.

Ms L. Johnson: I have a flight to catch at 5 o'clock, so I'd like to leave the building by 4.

The Acting Chair: Well, it's also okay to leave, I think. We'd still have a quorum.

Ms L. Johnson: All right. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Shall we carry on? Thank you.

Dr. Massolin: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I think, you know, I can facilitate this by saying that the recommendations on pages 12 and 13 have already been discussed. I don't know if we need to go over them, but it's your call, of course.

The Acting Chair: All right. Well, I think we did, so that's great.

Ms Kubinec: I would like to move that we accept all of the recommendations with the amendments that have been spoken of today and that we conclude this portion of the recommendations and move forward.

The Acting Chair: All right. Any further discussion on that? All in favour of that motion? Anybody on the line disagree with that motion or want to object? No? Hearing none, that motion is carried unanimously. Congratulations.

Ms Kubinec: I would just like to also put on record that I would really like to thank on behalf of our whole committee the list of people, under Acknowledgements on page 14 of the report, who have worked so hard on this report. I really appreciate your dedication to what you do.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

Now, as we're drawing towards the end of the report-writing process, I'd invite a motion – and we can discuss the way we go ahead. Given the severe time limitations that we have relative to getting the report out, we can make a motion that we accept the report as it is now, which is probably not appropriate because we've already agreed that we'll have some look-see. We could make a motion that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship authorize the chair, certainly in consultation with the working group, to finalize the report.

That might be a better way to go.

Any discussion on that? MLA Bilous.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You're saying that the chair will finalize or approve the final draft of the report?

The Acting Chair: No. I mean, anybody in the committee can make whatever motion they would want to make. I was just suggesting that one way to go is to have the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship authorize the chair, in consultation with the working group, to finalize the committee draft report into final form, upon which time it would be sent to the Assembly. Certainly, the working group is involved in that process.

Mr. Bilous: Again, as long as within that, the minority reports will be accepted as part of the final draft.

The Acting Chair: Does somebody want to make that motion?

Mr. Luan: So moved.

The Acting Chair: All in favour of that motion? Any opposed? Anybody on the line opposed? All right.

I would remind members that minority reports should be submitted to the committee clerk no later than Wednesday, March 5, for inclusion in the tabling of the report.

Is there any other business?

If there is another meeting, the committee clerk will contact committee members regarding the meeting.

Would someone like to make a motion to adjourn? MLA Bilous. All in favour? Is there anybody on the line that is opposed to adjourning? That is carried. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 3:15 p.m.]

