



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Conflicts of Interest Act Review

Wednesday, November 29, 2017
6:15 p.m.

Transcript No. 29-3-10

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

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP), Chair
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (UCP), Deputy Chair

Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (NDP)*
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Kleinstauber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)
Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (NDP)**
MacIntyre, Donald, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)
Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)***
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (NDP)

* substitution for Jamie Kleinstauber

** substitution for Anam Kazim

*** substitution for Thomas Dang

Support Staff

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Robert H. Reynolds, QC | Clerk |
| Shannon Dean | Law Clerk and Director of House Services |
| Trafton Koenig | Parliamentary Counsel |
| Stephanie LeBlanc | Parliamentary Counsel |
| Philip Massolin | Manager of Research and Committee Services |
| Sarah Amato | Research Officer |
| Nancy Robert | Research Officer |
| Corinne Dacyshyn | Committee Clerk |
| Jody Rempel | Committee Clerk |
| Aaron Roth | Committee Clerk |
| Karen Sawchuk | Committee Clerk |
| Rhonda Sorensen | Manager of Corporate Communications |
| Jeanette Dotimas | Communications Consultant |
| Tracey Sales | Communications Consultant |
| Janet Schwegel | Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i> |

6:15 p.m. Wednesday, November 29, 2017

[Loyola in the chair]

The Chair: I'd like to call this meeting to order. Welcome to members, staff, and guests in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship.

My name is Rod Loyola, and I'm the MLA for Edmonton-Ellerslie and chair of this committee. I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. We'll start off here to my right.

Mr. Hunter: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Grant Hunter, MLA for Cardston-Taber-Warner and deputy chair.

Mr. Loewen: Todd Loewen, MLA, Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Drysdale: Wayne Drysdale, MLA, Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Ms Luff: Robyn Luff, MLA for Calgary-East.

Dr. Turner: Bob Turner, Edmonton-Whitemud.

Mr. Nielsen: Good evening. Chris Nielsen, MLA, Edmonton-Decore.

Mr. Rosendahl: Eric Rosendahl, West Yellowhead.

Ms Woollard: Denise Woollard, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

Ms Babcock: Erin Babcock, Stony Plain.

Drever: Deborah Drever, Calgary-Bow.

Mr. Malkinson: Brian Malkinson, MLA for Calgary-Currie.

Dr. Massolin: Good evening. Philip Massolin, manager of research and committee services.

Ms Dean: Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and director of House services.

Ms Rempel: Jody Rempel, committee clerk.

The Chair: For the record Dr. Turner is substituting for Mr. Dang, Ms Luff is substituting for Ms Kazim, and Member Drever is substituting for Mr. Kleinsteuber.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. The microphone consoles are operated by the *Hansard* staff, so there's no need for the members to touch them. Please ensure all cellphones, iPhones, and BlackBerrys are in silent mode. Audio and video of committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*. Streaming access and meeting transcripts are obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

Up next is the approval of the agenda. Would a member move a motion to approval, please?

Mr. Rosendahl: So moved.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rosendahl. Okay. All in favour? Any opposed? Thank you. That motion is carried.

We have the minutes from our last meeting, and I'd ask members to check if there are any errors or omissions to note. If not, would a member move adoption of the minutes, please? I'll go with Mr. Nielsen this time. All in favour? Any opposed? Okay. That motion is carried.

I see we have another member who's joined us at the table. Please introduce yourself for the record.

Mr. Clark: Good evening. Greg Clark, MLA, Calgary-Elbow.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

As members are aware, on November 16, 2017, the Assembly passed Government Motion 32, which deemed that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be a special committee of the Assembly for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive review of the Conflicts of Interest Act. Section 48 of the act requires our review to commence prior to December 1, 2017, and provides for a one-year review period starting with our meeting today. However, we may find that we are able to complete our review in a much shorter time. Are there any questions about our mandate to review this legislation at this time?

Okay. Hearing none, Government Motion 32 also references the research materials, submissions, and other documents prepared for the 2015-2016 Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee review of the act. In setting our mandate, the Assembly has given us a bit of a head start by specifically permitting this committee to consider the materials and submissions previously received by this special committee. Although most of these documents are public record, it may be convenient to have a collection of all the Conflicts of Interest Act related documents from the select special committee compiled and made available to the committee members in one location.

Once the committee has the opportunity to review this information, we will have a better idea what other information we may need or what information needs to be updated. For example, I believe a stakeholders list was prepared for the select special committee, and I would recommend that the committee members consider potential amendments to the previous list and be prepared to address this at our next meeting. Does anyone have any questions on this matter? Yeah. Please go ahead, Ms Woollard.

Ms Woollard: Thank you. Many stakeholders and individuals took the time and effort to submit their feedback and opinions about the Conflicts of Interest Act, and I think it's important that we listen to those voices. There may have been some changes to the legal and societal landscape around the Conflicts of Interest Act rules, but it hasn't changed so much that the previous submissions are irrelevant. So I think it's very important for all members of the committee to review the material from 2015-2016, especially the stakeholders who have been contacted, and bring forward to the next meeting their ideas about other stakeholders that should be contacted.

The Chair: Would you like to make a motion in that regard?

Ms Woollard: Yes. Thank you.

The Chair: Please go ahead.

Ms Woollard: I would move that

the materials and submissions provided to the Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee as part of its consideration of the Conflicts of Interest Act be brought forward for the consideration of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship.

The Chair: Thank you very much. All in favour of the motion? Anybody opposed? Okay. Hearing none, that motion is carried.

I see we have another member who's joined us at the committee table. Could you please introduce yourself for the record?

Mr. Hanson: Thank you, Chair. David Hanson, MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you very much.

Okay. As committee members are aware from previous reviews, as part of developing a solid understanding of the act before us, it is a common practice to invite technical briefings from the ministries and officers of the Legislature that are most familiar with the legislation under consideration. In the case of the Conflicts of Interest Act this would be the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the office of the Ethics Commissioner. Does anybody have any comments in this regard? Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess, you know, because we rely on research services a lot, of course, I always want to make sure to thank them for all the hard work that they do. I think keeping in mind that this act is 48 pages long, there's a lot of information in there, so I think technical briefings from Justice and Solicitor General as well as the Ethics Commissioner are definitely appropriate, and I'd be happy to make a motion to that effect to debate and discuss it.

The Chair: Okay. Do you have a wording for that possible motion?

Mr. Nielsen: I do, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Please go ahead.

Mr. Nielsen: Of course. Moved by myself that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship invite officials from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the office of the Ethics Commissioner to provide technical briefings on the Conflicts of Interest Act at our next committee meeting.

The Chair: All in favour of the motion? Anybody opposed? Okay. Thank you. That motion is carried.

At this point I'm going to turn the floor over to Dr. Massolin, who can give us a brief overview of the support available from research services.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't have a lot to say on this because I think at this point in the Legislature most if not all the committee members around the table are familiar with the services that research services provides. I will say that the materials that were provided during the 2015-2016 review – i.e., the stakeholders list, the written submission summary, the crossjurisdictional – all could be updated by research services. Additionally, we could provide additional research services for this committee as well as, as ever, helping the committee to draft its final report.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin.

Any questions for Dr. Massolin at this point? No?

Hearing none, would somebody like to make a motion? Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Rosendahl.

Mr. Rosendahl: I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to prepare an updated crossjurisdictional comparison for the review of the Conflicts of Interest Act.

The Chair: Great. Thank you very much. All in favour of the motion? Anyone opposed? Okay. Hearing none, thank you. The motion is carried.

Wow. This is probably the fastest meeting we're ever going to have in the history of the Legislature.

Mr. Malkinson: Don't jinx it.

The Chair: Oh, I don't want to jinx it. Okay. Knock on wood.

Before we adjourn for the evening, I wanted to give everyone a quick update on what has happened regarding the various requests to present to the committee that have been received over the last two years. These organizations are aware that we need to complete our consideration of the Conflicts of Interest Act before we are in a position to meet with them. We have formally followed up with these organizations, and at this point both the recycling organizations and the Independent Power Producers Society of Alberta have confirmed their continued interest in meeting with the committee should the opportunity arise.

I just want to open that up for any comment in case people would like to say something. Please go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

6:25

Mr. Loewen: Were there any other groups that had presented requests? I didn't think those were the only two.

The Chair: Yeah, there were. I believe that the AAMD and C was the other one. When we did write to them, we did not get a response from them, most likely because they're going through a transition. But we can wait for them to get in touch with us about that.

Mr. Loewen: Okay. Thanks.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. A couple of things. I know that we're going to bring forward the comments and recommendations from the Ethics Commissioner from the Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee, and that's obviously important. Have we asked the Ethics Commissioner to come back and present to us on this? Is that something that is planned?

The Chair: Yeah. That's a request that has been made.

Mr. Clark: Okay. Good. Thank you.

The other question I had is: given today's passage of Bill 27 we've now included many new agencies within the scope of the Conflicts of Interest Act. I wonder if there is a need to reach out to the new, I think, 140 agencies that will now be subject to that, if perhaps any of them would like to present or speak to the committee or make a submission.

The Chair: As we discussed earlier on in the meeting, we're asking all members to look at the stakeholders list that was provided to the Ethics and Accountability Committee again and update it. Well, I don't know about inviting all 136 to do an oral presentation, but obviously we would ask them if they are interested in making a formal submission in writing. We could definitely invite them to do so, and then we can go from there, but that's up to the committee.

Yes, Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yes, Mr. Chair. You know, I'm a little disappointed. At our last meeting we gave direction to try and set up some meetings with these organizations that have been asking me to meet with this committee. We haven't met from October 10 to November 28, and now that we've got the Ethics Commissioner, you don't want to meet with anybody till we've dealt with this. I'm just disappointed that we've all been here in Edmonton for a month and a half and we weren't able to meet with any of these stakeholders. It's pretty disappointing to me. We had a motion at the last meeting directing you to do that. Now we're stalling again, so we'll go

another year without meeting any stakeholders. To me that's not what this committee is about, and I'm really disappointed in that.

The Chair: Note taken, Mr. Drysdale.

Yes, Mr. Loewen. Please go ahead.

Mr. Loewen: Correct me if I'm wrong, but this work we have to do now with the Conflicts of Interest Act review, the time frame on that: is that one year?

The Chair: Indeed, it is, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: So this committee will be tied up for one full year where we can't meet with these groups that have requested to meet with us?

The Chair: No. That's the permitted amount of time for the review, and I would certainly hope that our committee could wrap up the work much sooner than that. I would hope that we would. That's completely up to the committee. Once we have this review out of the way, I am completely open to inviting those that want to present to this committee to come, as we had previously agreed.

Mr. Loewen: Okay. I guess I'd like to make a motion, then. I'd like to make a motion that

this committee set up a working group that can meet with these organizations.

The Chair: Okay. We've all heard the motion by Mr. Loewen. I'd like to open it up for discussion at this point. Yes. Please go ahead.

Ms Babcock: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I want to actually thank the chair for following through and reaching out to these organizations and making that first effort and determining if they even still wanted to come in front of the committee. The two obviously do. Having a very open consultation with all Albertans is, of course, very important to us as government. I'm really excited to hear from them, but with the work of the committee being mandated in our standing orders, I think that that obviously takes precedence, as it states in our standing orders. Hopefully, we will be able to move this review along in a timely fashion and get down to other business that committee members would like to have put in front of us.

The Chair: Any further discussion on the motion? Mr. Hanson, followed by Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Hanson: Okay. I'd just like to point out that these groups have been trying to get to this committee to present for a long time. We spent a whole year on the last mandate, and now, I mean, there's no real time frame for this one other than that it could take a full year. So now it's going to be two years, two and a half years that these people have been trying to get to this committee. If we can't get a change in the standing orders to allow us to deal with issues other than the one topic that we're mandated to do, then I think it's inherent in this committee to set up an opportunity for these folks to come and join a subcommittee if that's what it takes. I think it's unreasonable to keep putting these folks off. It's, like I say, two and a half years now.

The Chair: Please go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: I think it just shows respect to these stakeholders that we try to do our best to meet with them in a timely manner. It's already beyond a timely manner, and by the time we're done this, it's probably a disrespectful amount of time. Of course, the work of this committee takes precedence. That's for sure. But these groups don't

want to create any work for us; they want to meet with us. They want to have just a little bit of our time so that we can listen to them and their concerns and their issues and what they do. I can't see why we can't take just a little bit of time and have this working group. The working group could include everybody and anybody who wants to be there to listen because there aren't going to be any decisions made. There isn't any work to be done. It is just listening, just being there to hear what these people have to say, and I don't think that's too much to ask. In fact, I think that's the least we can do.

The Chair: Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yes. I agree with my colleagues. You know, I'm not sure why we couldn't have had a meeting from October 10 till now. I go to AAMD and C, and these members come up to me and say: we've been trying to meet with your committee, and we can't. I don't know what correspondence – did you write them letters? Did you e-mail them? Did you phone them? Is there some correspondence we could see? They're frustrated that we won't meet with them, and I said that I'll gladly meet with them. I'm not sure if this government or this committee doesn't want to meet with stakeholders, but I know that I do, and I think that's our job.

I'm really disappointed that it's been two and a half years, and now it could be another year. You know, I'm embarrassed when I run into these guys out in the public that want to meet with us. I say: "Well, I want to meet with you, but the chair can't make it happen. He's been directed by the committee and hasn't done it." I'm not sure what to answer them the next time they call me and say, "Is it going to be another year?" because we've got something else to do. We had plenty of time in the last month. We've all been here. I'm disappointed. But I guess if that's the will of this chair and this committee, not to meet with stakeholders, say that now, and then I'll tell them that the next time they ask me. We just won't be meeting with them.

The Chair: Just for the record there was correspondence with these organizations. The AAMD and C did not respond to the letter that I wrote to them, so we can just note for the record that that was the case. By all means, we're ready and willing to meet with them as soon as we get our business out of the way. The sooner we get this business out of the way, we can then meet with these stakeholders.

Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you. You know, I will certainly agree that we should treat the people that want to meet with us with respect, but I think that respect means the entire committee, not just a subcommittee, a couple of voices. It's almost kind of like a half-hearted type of effort here. Our standing rules indicate that we have to get the business out of the way. I agree with you, Mr. Chair. If we're diligent about that and get it done, that frees up our time to meet.

One of the other comments I just wanted to quickly make: I was a little dismayed at almost maybe a suggestion that, like, perhaps you as the chair might be slowing things down, putting things off. I don't see that. I mean, obviously, in the last committee meeting we asked you to reach out to all the outstanding groups, see if they wanted to come see us, and you've done that. I just, you know, really wish that we'd kind of get away from some of those comments, that there's some kind of intentional interference. I, too, am happy to meet with anybody as long as our work that's been mandated by the Legislature is completed.

6:35

Mr. Loewen: I think we can send a pretty simple message to these groups that we are willing and ready to meet with them by telling

them that we have a working group that will meet with them, and the working group includes every member of the committee, and we can do that immediately. It doesn't interrupt our work on the Conflicts of Interest Act. In fact, it's not work; it's just meeting. There's no work to be done. It's just meeting with these groups. I think they won't view that as half-hearted, but they will view it as no-hearted if we don't do something.

I think it behooves us to do this. It isn't a big job. It isn't an onerous task to sit and listen to a couple of groups who want to present to us. That's simple. You can't get any simpler than this. You show up, you call in, you do whatever it takes. They present, and then they feel like they've been heard. Well, they have been heard then. Right now they haven't been heard. They've been pushed off.

We had time when we could have met with them, but it wasn't arranged. Now let's do this. Let's set up this working group – we can all be on this working group – and let's get this done.

The Chair: Yes, Ms Woollard.

Ms Woollard: Yeah. I just have to share something. I know a fair bit about meeting with groups. The thing is that if you just go in, listen, and say, "There; it's done," you're just paying lip service, and I think that that's doing a disservice to the groups that want to speak to us. Either listen seriously, where we take their concerns seriously, where we have an intent to, you know, maybe steer the direction somewhere or take some kind of action, even if it's, like I said, just keeping a record of it in order to do something – you have to do something. Otherwise, like I said, you're paying lip service. You're not really doing them any favours at all unless you actually are sitting down to take it seriously and, hopefully, go somewhere with the information that you hear. You're not just hearing noise; you're hearing people's concerns.

The Chair: Mr. Hunter.

Mr. Hunter: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've been listening, and what I've heard is our interpretation of what these stakeholders might be thinking. I think it could be very easily addressed if we just said: "What would you like? If you would like to have a subcommittee – we cannot give you the committee's time because we're engaged in other activities, but would you be okay with being able to just come and present to us as a subcommittee?" If they said yes to that and they didn't consider that as lip service or the other things that we've heard here, I think that we've facilitated them. I don't think that we have to second-guess what their intentions are. We just have to be able to do what they've asked us to do, which is to hear their position.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Loewen: Now, these groups have indicated an interest in presenting to the committee. That's simple: presenting to the committee. Now, if they show up and they decide that they want us to do something, then we would have to tell them: sorry; we can't do anything until we're done this. But there's nothing keeping us from having them present to us in a working group that can include everybody.

Again, this is very simple. Now, the government referred this Conflicts of Interest Act review to this committee. That's where it came from. So the government knew that they were giving us this. The government members knew this was coming. The government members knew that these groups wanted to meet with us. So this could have been arranged a lot simpler. We could have had an opportunity to meet with these groups. The government knew this was all going on. They didn't have to refer this to us. They could

have referred it to another committee or whatever. They could have delayed it. They could have done whatever. I mean, I guess there are some timelines in the statutory requirements.

So now we've got ourselves in a situation here, and we have an opportunity to get out of the situation very simply. We don't have to put these groups off for another six months, a year, or for we don't know how long. We have an opportunity to be here to listen to them. If they want something done, we can tell them it can't be done until after this is completed. I don't think there's any amount of disrespect to be shown to them by meeting with them like this, but there's definitely some disrespect that could be shown to them by putting them off for another year. That would be disrespectful. They would know that, yes, they're meeting with a working group of the committee, but at least they could be meeting with this group. Again, every member of this committee could be on that working group. They can meet with us just like we are here.

Again, this is a simple way out of a situation that we've got ourselves into. Like I said, the government knew this was happening. We in opposition didn't know this was all coming about. We didn't know this was coming to our committee. Now it's here. Now we have a situation, but we have a way to solve this situation, and that is to pass this motion, create a working group, set up a time, and have these groups present to us. It's very, very, very simple.

The Chair: Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that if we start talking about every member being on a working group, then that's really just the committee here. That's hardly a working group, but that wasn't what I wanted to speak about.

I think that when we're talking about a subcommittee, especially when we're mandated to do work, it's definitely appropriate when that subcommittee applies to the work that we are currently doing. I don't think this is the case here. I've seen a bit of a troubling pattern where we keep seeing suggestions about, you know: well, how can we get around it so we can do other work somewhere else when we're supposed to be focusing on what we're doing?

I think that at this point in time I'm just going to suggest to members to strike down this motion, and let's move on.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you, Chair. You know, we've been in this situation before while we waited for the report from the Ethics Commissioner, where we sat on our hands for three months, four months. As a committee we can't meet with these people because we're mandated by legislation, but if we had set up a subcommittee group that included all of us, what would have been the harm in that? We weren't doing anything as a group other than waiting for a report for months.

Now we're going to go through the whole exercise again. We're going to have to wait for a report. So the committee sits on their hands again for months, and you folks are reluctant to sit and meet with them. What is the issue here? What are we afraid of? They've been asking. [interjection] Well, yeah, of course, we're following the rules. But there's also a difference between following the rules and wasting time. Like I said, there was plenty of time, four months. What was the committee doing while we waited for the Ethics Commissioner's report? Absolutely nothing.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Okay. Unless there's anything new that people want to make arguments on, new arguments that people want to make to the discussion, I suggest that we move forward to the vote. Okay?

Yes, Mr. Loewen.

6:45

Mr. Loewen: Thank you. Now, the suggestion was that a subcommittee – I'm calling it a working group – has to work on the duty at hand, but I don't see that as being a rule or anything else that we have to follow.

The member that said that this was a troubling pattern: I mean, the troubling pattern I see is a group here, a committee here that continues to put off groups that want to meet with us even when there's plenty of opportunity to do it. Plenty of opportunity. We had a couple of months here in between the last job and this job when we could have done it, but we didn't do it. Now we have an opportunity. We've created a troubling pattern of not meeting with groups that want to meet with us.

Now we have an opportunity to pass a motion so that we can meet with these groups. Simple. I'm quite certain that there's nobody on the government side that couldn't give up a couple of hours one day to meet with these groups. I would be shocked and amazed if every single person on the government side was too busy to take two hours out of their life to meet with these groups. If they can't do that simple thing, to meet with these groups, then I'm not sure what they're doing here. I'm really not.

The Chair: Okay. Damn. I spoke way too soon earlier.

Remember that there's no need to touch the microphones. *Hansard* has taken control over it, sir.

Mr. Drysdale, please, go ahead.

Mr. Drysdale: Well, I don't want to drag this on, and it's not personal. I'm not accusing anybody of anything here other than: how many meetings is it going to take to do this work? Four? Five? Maybe you can answer that question. Like, I don't see any more than four meetings to do this work, you know, so we've got four meetings to do in a year. Can we not speed that up, get it done, and meet with stakeholders?

I mean, I'm not going to be disrespectful, Mr. Chair. I like this committee. We've got a job to do. I chaired this committee for years, and we met with stakeholders all the time. We met regularly. We met with people and listened to stakeholders, and I don't want to tell my stakeholders that we don't have time to meet with them.

I'm going to leave it at that. You'll vote it down. I know this government will just ram it through, vote it down, and not meet with anybody. But I'll leave it at that. We're done.

The Chair: Okay. Well, as I suggested before, I'm highly in favour that we get our work out of the way, get it done as soon as possible, and then we can move on to the business that you want to do.

With that, I will call the question. I'm going to ask our committee clerk here to just read the motion if you don't mind.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have compiled things a little bit, so I hope the member will correct me if this doesn't reflect his intention. I believe Mr. Loewen has moved that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship designate a working group consisting of all the members of the committee to meet with the organizations that have requested the opportunity to meet with the committee.

The Chair: Are you fine with that, Mr. Loewen?

Mr. Loewen: Yes. Very good.

The Chair: Okay. All in favour of the motion? All those opposed? Okay. That motion is defeated.

Mr. Loewen: Can we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: Sure. We will now go to a recorded vote. We'll start here to my right.

Mr. Hunter: Yes.

Mr. Hanson: Yes.

Mr. Loewen: Yes.

Mr. Drysdale: Yes.

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Ms Luff: No.

Dr. Turner: No.

Mr. Nielsen: No.

Mr. Rosendahl: No.

Ms Woollard: No.

Ms Babcock: No.

Drever: No.

Mr. Malkinson: No.

The Chair: Committee clerk, would you like to say what the result is?

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The motion has been defeated.

The Chair: Okay. So that will close that order of business.

Is there any other new business that the committee would like to bring forward?

Hearing none, our next meeting will be at the call of the chair.

I will call for a motion to adjourn. Thank you, Member Drever. We are now adjourned.

Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 6:49 p.m.]

