



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Second Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Personal Information Protection Act Review

Tuesday, June 14, 2016
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-2-8

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

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (ND), Chair
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (ND)
Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (W)*
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (ND)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (ND)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (W)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (ND)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (ND)**

* substitution for Wes Taylor

** substitution for Shaye Anderson

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Stephanie LeBlanc	Parliamentary Counsel and Legal Research Officer
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 and Broadcast Services
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

10 a.m.

Tuesday, June 14, 2016

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Chair: All right. I'd like to call the meeting to order. Welcome to members, staff, and guests in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. My name is Graham Sucha, and I am the MLA for Calgary-Shaw and chair of this committee.

I'd ask that the members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. Then we will hear from those on the phone.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, vice-chair, MLA for Little Bow.

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

Mr. Panda: Good morning. Prasad Panda, MLA, Calgary-Foothills.

Ms Dotimas: Jeanette Dotimas, LAO communications.

Mr. Carson: Good morning. Jon Carson, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Mrs. Schreiner: Good morning. Kim Schreiner, MLA for Red Deer-North.

Dr. Turner: This is Bob Turner, MLA, Edmonton-Whitemud. I'm substituting for Shaye Anderson, Leduc-Beaumont.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, MLA, Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Maria Fitzpatrick, MLA, Lethbridge-East.

Dr. Amato: Sarah Amato, research officer.

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

Mr. Roth: Good morning. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

The Chair: Those on the phone?

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

Mr. Coolahan: Craig Coolahan, MLA, Calgary-Klein.

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

Mr. W. Anderson: Wayne Anderson, substituting for Wes Taylor.

The Chair: All right. I'd like to mention for the record that as per Standing Order 56(2.1) to (2.4) Mr. Wayne Anderson is the official substitute for Mr. Wes Taylor, and Dr. Bob Turner is the official substitute for Mr. Shaye Anderson.

I hear that Mr. Piquette has also joined the teleconference. Are you there, Mr. Piquette?

Mr. Piquette: Yes. I am.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. The microphone consoles are operated by *Hansard* staff, so there is no need to touch them. 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*. Audio access and

meeting transcripts are obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

Up next is the approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions members would like to suggest? Seeing none, could I get a member to move the agenda? All right. Moved by Mr. Carson that the agenda for the June 14, 2016, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated. All those in favour say aye. All opposed? Carried.

Next up is approval of the meeting minutes for December 18, 2015. We're going to move approval of these minutes. Are there any errors or omissions to note?

Mr. Gotfried: I just noted one small typo under item 4(a)(ii), as moved by myself. Under review of revised draft stakeholder list, the second motion, "add additional names and organization": that should be plural, "organizations."

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Gotfried: Inconsequential, but it should be plural, "organizations."

The Chair: Okay. Can I get a mover for the amendment? Mr. Connolly. All those in favour of the amendment say aye. Those opposed? All right.

Are there any other errors or omissions to note? Seeing none, could I get a mover for the minutes? Ms Fitzpatrick. Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the minutes as amended of the December 18, 2015, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as revised. All in favour? Opposed? All right. The motion is carried.

Hon. members, at the December 18, 2015, meeting the committee issued an invitation for written submissions from stakeholders and the public and received 36 written submissions in response, five of which were from members of the public. A document summarizing the submissions was posted to the committee's internal website last week. I would now ask Dr. Amato to provide us with a summary of the submissions received.

Dr. Amato: Good morning. Hopefully, you all have a copy of the summary of submissions. As was just stated, this document summarizes issues identified in 36 written submissions from a variety of stakeholders and members of the public, including the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, Service Alberta, unions, a public interest advocacy group, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, private-sector organizations, nonprofit organizations, professional regulatory organizations, and, as I said, five members of the public among others.

Most stakeholders responded to questions raised by the discussion guide. The submission summary, therefore, follows the discussion guide and is organized according to topics and questions presented in that document. The summary, as you'll notice, groups submissions by types of organization, presenting, for example, the views of private-sector organizations, unions, nonprofit organizations, and professional regulatory organizations together for comparison.

In general, you'll also note that there is little agreement among the stakeholders about any of the issues, but when agreement occurs, it is the result of common experience. You'll see that in their responses stakeholders wrote about their experiences working with PIPA, but not all submissions by nonprofit organizations suggest that the provisions in PIPA pertaining to nonprofits remain unchanged. Similarly, the submissions of insurance companies are grouped together under private-sector organizations and tend to be similar even as they provide different rationales for their statements.

Then sometimes you will also note that the same organizations in a category disagree quite radically.

Perhaps I'll give you a flavour of some of the main issues identified and commented on by stakeholders in their written submissions to the committee. For example, the first topic under discussion is freedom of expression, and that's summarized there. What you find is that a number of the submissions by unions expressed the view that recent amendments to PIPA related to the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information during a strike are overly narrow. The Information and Privacy Commissioner as well as other organizations, in contrast, do not recommend any additional changes to PIPA regarding freedom of expression, but some other submissions suggest that other organizations need special provisions to better accommodate their expressive rights.

Another example might be exemptions to the application of PIPA. Here some organizations find the exemptions to PIPA appropriate while others submit that specific exemptions are problematic. There is no agreement among organizations about which exemptions should be amended.

Perhaps I'll just give another two examples. A smaller one might be fees for accessing records. Here most organizations find the provisions regarding fees for access to personal information appropriate while others request that PIPA be amended to include a fee schedule.

In terms of, for example, notification of a breach of privacy several submissions suggest that these provisions be amended to better address breaches made by third-party service providers. Other submissions recommended no changes and expressed approval of the existing system while still others recommend increased harmonization with the federal Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act.

10:10

So this is just a flavour of the summary. It's quite lengthy. I think the take-home point is that the stakeholders and members of the public engaged with the discussion guide, they spoke about their experiences, they often made very, very technical comments on the act, and that is, really, why the summary is as lengthy as it is. I also think and hope that you'll find it quite a rich document in terms of the ways in which the different organizations and members of the public reflect on their experience in interacting with this piece of legislation.

I thank you for your attention, and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

The Chair: All right. Thank you, Dr. Amato.

Are there any questions or comments regarding the submissions summary? Mr. Connolly.

Mr. Connolly: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Dr. Amato. As you know, PIPA is a comprehensive act, and consent to collect, store, and distribute personal information is an important part of PIPA. My question is: how did stakeholders, organizations – private and not-for-profit – respond to consent provisions in PIPA? Do they think it's appropriate, or does it need to be reviewed?

Dr. Amato: There are several discussions about consent provisions. There are two main headings in the document about consent; there's Consent and then also Exceptions to Consent. I just reviewed what we might say is the lack of consensus on exceptions to consent. In general, I'll just summarize what I just said with regard to exceptions to consent. The various organizations, again, responded from their experience, and there's no consensus on changes that might be made to exceptions to consent. Some organizations are

expressing satisfaction with the act; others are not. Again, there's no consensus there.

With regard to consent most private-sector organizations find the consent provisions in PIPA actually appropriate. However, there are organizations that suggested that provisions regarding consent be more stringent and expressed particular concern about the consent by not opting out.

I think that, in summary, there tends to be little agreement amongst both stakeholders and members of the public on these issues, which are, as you said, fundamental to PIPA.

Mr. Connolly: Right. Just a follow-up. You kind of touched on this a little bit. What did stakeholders say about exempting/including nonprofits and groups registered under the Societies Act from PIPA?

Dr. Amato: That's another section that's discussed in the document. You'll find there that there was also, in general, a very interesting discussion and little agreement. There's a nice discussion about this in the guide, several pages, and you'll find that several nonprofit organizations – there's a difference there, you might say, between nonprofit organizations and all other organizations. In general, all other organizations say, "I think that the provisions of PIPA are all right, and they should remain the same" or "All nonprofit organizations should be brought under the umbrella of the act."

Amongst nonprofit organizations and several large nonprofit organizations, what we might call umbrella groups that have different kinds of nonprofit organizations affiliated with them, you find little agreement. One fairly large organization says in there that bringing all nonprofits under the umbrella of the act will be overly burdensome to nonprofit organizations while another fairly large umbrella organization says that this is a very good idea. Then other organizations, including some individuals, discuss the ways in which some nonprofit organizations, in fact, deal with large quantities of personal information and that it may be a good idea to bring them under the act. Again, there's not a very clear picture that emerges there.

Mr. Connolly: Thank you.

The Chair: Are there any other questions? On the phone?

Seeing none, we'll move to the next item on the agenda, the consideration of whether the written submissions should be posted to the committee's public website. I would note at this time that it is common practice, should the committee decide to make these submissions available on the external website, to redact personal contact information, the identity of minors, and any unrelated third-party information. This has been a general practice of the committees. Stakeholder letters as well as advertisements for public input did advise that submissions and the identities of the authors may be made public.

With that, are there any comments or questions with regard to the posting of written submissions?

Mr. Schneider: That was my question, whether the submitters had knowledge that they may become public. Could I ask what has gone on in the past when the committee – well, PIPA has been reviewed several times. [interjection] Just once? Okay.

Were submissions allowed public at that point? Were they posted? Same criteria? I mean, were the submitters understanding that there was a possibility of them being posted? I'm just wondering what history showed us.

Dr. Massolin: Well, this is the first time that PIPA has been reviewed by this type of committee.

Mr. Schneider: Okay.

Dr. Massolin: Prior it was done by a select special committee. Certainly, there were public submissions. The submitters' names were listed in the report. I don't know if the submissions themselves were publicly posted. I can't say that for sure. I can get back to you on that.

In terms of other committees' practices typically what happens is that the ad and the stakeholder letter both indicate that the submissions may be made public by the committee. So that's where we are in terms of the committee's decisions. The committee's practice as well is to redact sort of personal identifying information, excepting, of course, the name.

Thank you.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

The Chair: Are there any other comments or questions?

Mr. Gotfried: Just a clarification. In our advertising and when the documentation went out, it did indicate that this was going to be a public forum. Is that correct? Am I clear in that understanding?

The Chair: Could we just have confirmation for the record?

Dr. Massolin: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Gotfried: That's great. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Any other questions?

Seeing none, could I have a mover that the written submissions made by the standing committee be posted? Okay. Moved by Mr. Connolly that written submissions made to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future pertaining to the review of the Personal Information Protection Act be posted to the committee's external website with the exception of personal contact information, references to minors, and any unrelated third-party information. All in favour? All opposed?

Mr. Gotfried: There was no discussion on that motion?

The Chair: That was open for questions or comments. Did you have any feedback, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: Just a suggestion that perhaps prior to or when we release this, we communicate with all of those. I mean, this is the Personal Information Protection Act. It would be, I think, at least valid for us to notify them that they have been posted. We could do that even electronically, if we have e-mail contacts for these organizations, to inform them that it is being posted and where they can find that information. They may be interested also, you know, in accessing information from other presenters and submitters.

The Chair: Is it tenable for us to do that on our end?

Mr. Roth: My understanding, I mean, with just the number of submissions, is that we could probably reach out to the individuals electronically and let them know.

The Chair: Okay. Would you like to move an amendment for that, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: I'm not certain that it needs to be amended. I think that it could be a part of the process whereby when we approve this, we also, just as a matter of process, then inform those people that have submitted that it is being posted and where they can see that

information. I'm not sure that we need an amendment. I'll defer to legal counsel.

The Chair: Is there consensus? Is everyone in agreement? Yeah? Okay.

All right. Are there any other comments in regard to the motion on the floor? I will call the question again.

10:20

Mr. Schneider: Can we hear the motion again?

The Chair: Yeah. Absolutely. Moved by Mr. Connolly that written submissions made to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future pertaining to its review of the Personal Information Protection Act be posted to the committee's external website with the exception of personal contact information, references to minors, and any unrelated third-party information.

Mr. Schneider: Okay. Excuse me. Does that address Mr. Gotfried's question?

The Chair: I'll turn to the clerk if you want any clarification here.

Mr. Roth: I think there was just general consensus that we would contact the submitters without necessarily having it in the motion.

Mr. Schneider: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

I will call the question. All those in favour, please say aye. All opposed? That motion is carried.

The next item on the agenda: the committee should consider whether it wants to hear oral presentations for this review. Should the committee choose to invite oral presentations, we would need to identify specific presenters, or the committee may wish to hold a meeting in regard to this or have some combination of both. I would note that in the 2007 review the committee did open the meeting to public presenters, and only two members of the public chose to participate. While there are resources for hosting public meetings, the committee may want to consider the cost of hosting public meetings based on recent reviews conducted by other committees of the Assembly.

With that, are there any members that have comments, questions, or suggestions for oral presentations?

Mr. Panda: If we choose to invite oral presentations, do we call both, those who want to make changes and also the people who want it to be the status quo, or do we only invite people who want to make changes?

The Chair: That would be at the will of the direction the committee wanted to take.

Mr. Panda: Okay.

The Chair: It's open for discussion on that part.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Can the LAO staff give us some cost estimates of the options being proposed for a wider public hearing?

Mr. Roth: I think it would depend on sort of the scope that the committee wanted to take, you know: if it was outside of Edmonton, if it was a public meeting in Edmonton, and where that would be. Of course, if it was a public meeting, to sort of have a conversation about the costs of advertising, for instance, that would probably be between \$10,000 and \$15,000 if it was just in Edmonton. I think the

costs would really depend on what the committee wanted that to look like.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Carson.

Mr. Carson: Thanks. I'm going to propose that, yes, we do have oral presentations. Just based on some of the feedback from the stakeholders, mainly nonprofits, I do have some people that I would like to propose have an opportunity to make an oral presentation. Those people would be the UFCW, the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations, the Federation of Calgary Communities, the Calgary Urban Project Society, and, finally, the heritage and historical society of Alberta.

The Chair: Sorry, Mr. Carson. You were going really fast. Could you just repeat those, please?

Mr. Carson: All right. The UFCW, the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations, the Federation of Calgary Communities, the Calgary Urban Project Society, and the heritage and historical society of Alberta.

The Chair: Are there any other comments or questions or suggestions?

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to have Service Alberta come as well? They've submitted in writing. Is it unusual to have them come and make an oral presentation as well? And perhaps the Privacy Commissioner.

Mr. Gotfried: I would echo what Mr. Schneider said in that Service Alberta and the Privacy Commissioner are key elements in this. Perhaps we could have them stand by as a resource while we have some of the other public oral submissions present.

The Chair: Any other comments or questions?

Mr. Schneider: Would the group agree that the oral submissions should be presented here or somewhere in Edmonton? What I'm trying to get to is that it's not a travelling road show.

The Chair: Fair enough.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, depending on where these presenters are coming from – most of them are coming from Calgary. Is there any value in doing it in Calgary?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that typically what happens when you have a stakeholder oral presentation to the committee, it occurs here. I think that for the most part groups are ready, willing, and able to travel to Edmonton.

Mr. Panda: Thank you.

Mr. Roth: Just to add to that, video conferencing has also become an option.

The Chair: And members, too, can teleconference if they need to as well.

I think we've underlined, too, the cost of moving the committee just because we have to bring the *Hansard* staff with us as well as the LAO staff. There is a significant cost as well for us going to them versus them coming to us.

Mr. Roth: Just a suggestion: perhaps the committee might want to consider giving a couple of extra days for other members to submit names. That's happened in the past as well.

The Chair: Could I get a mover for the submissions? Mr. Carson. Moved by Mr. Carson that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite the following individuals – the UFCW, the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations, the Federation of Calgary Communities, the Calgary Urban Project Society, the heritage and historical society of Alberta, Service Alberta, and the Privacy Commissioner – to make oral presentations in relation to its review of the Personal Information Protection Act at subsequent meetings.

Are there any other questions or comments about the motion?

Mr. Hunter: Yes, Mr. Chair. I have a question. That list of people or organizations that wanted to make an oral presentation: did they contact Mr. Carson and indicate that they had something to say about this? How did that all play out?

10:30

Mr. Carson: They did not contact me personally. I was just under the assumption through their submissions that they would be interested in doing an oral presentation.

Mr. Gotfried: You know what? There are a few of those organizations, obviously, like CCVO, who represent a broad spectrum of voluntary organizations. Also, the FCC, Federation of Calgary Communities, obviously represents a large number of community organizations in Calgary. CUPS, of course, is just an individual nonprofit. I'm quite familiar – I know their chairman and executive director quite well.

I wonder, you know, if we can ensure that those groups that we bring to the table are not just necessarily individual organizations but representative organizations like the CCVO, FCC, and perhaps even similar organizations in Edmonton or across the province, to be more representative. If we can pull those out, to me it would be a much more useful and productive opportunity where they have probably consolidated much of the responses from their membership.

The Chair: Are you making any suggestions for other submissions, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: Well, the fact that we have not had any specific requests from these organizations: based on that, perhaps we can get some recommendations from our legal counsel or from the committee clerk with respect to some umbrella organizations if we're not specifically familiar with those so that we can seek out very representative and more broadly, you know, collective organizations or umbrella associations to speak to us. I just think that if we want to do this, let's make sure that the time is highly productive and represents as broad a cross-section within the sectors that we're trying to address as possible.

The Chair: Any feedback in relation to this? Any other comments in regard to this?

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, like Mr. Clerk suggested, you know, we're going to ask the members if there are going to be any other names, so we'll allow a couple of days to look at that. Alternatively, when you're going to send them electronic communication about the public posting on our committee website, you can ask them the other question: hey, do you want to come and do an oral presentation?

The Chair: Would that be through the open oral presentations?

Mr. Roth: Yeah. It would be a question of whom the committee would want to invite at this stage as opposed to, you know, sort of a public meeting. I'm not sure if that's what you're meaning, Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: For those people who gave written submissions – and Mr. Carson is proposing some of them come and give oral presentations – I'm saying that you're going to write to all of them anyway that you're going to post their submissions publicly, so at the same time, if you want to, ask them if they want to come and do an oral presentation.

The Chair: Please proceed.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that the committee may want to be as strategic and as efficient as possible. I think that's the process we're dealing with here in terms of singling out those organizations from those areas that interact with PIPA that would provide the committee the most value in its oral presentation process. You know, strategic, I guess, is the word. You've already got their written feedback, so you want to just sort of delve in maybe more deeply, ask questions of these organizations, get some more information to probe about their written submissions. That's kind of the exercise, I believe.

If I may continue, Mr. Chair, to sort of address Mr. Gotfried's concern or point, I think we can say that the voluntary organizations are well represented in that list that's been provided. But maybe we'd ask in turn what sort of organizations or areas he'd like to see added to that list. You know, I think that if he gave us an idea or the committee gave us an idea, we could maybe come up with some additional suggestions if that's what's desired.

Thank you.

The Chair: Any comments or questions?

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Please proceed, Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Yeah. You know, I think that Mr. Carson is on a great path there with the Calgary CCVO, but I would note that there is also an Edmonton Chamber of Voluntary Organizations to make sure we have some geographic representation. We also might want to make sure that we're finding similar organizations in some of the smaller centres or even rural areas around Alberta just to be broadly representative. You know, I think organizations like FCC: obviously, I'm sure there's a counterpart in Edmonton as well, and perhaps there's another organization. You know, I think that he's on exactly the right path in terms of our seeking some further information.

If we could get some recommendations from counsel on this, I think that would take us to a great place for us to just sort of dive a little bit deeper, and perhaps we can go into some of the partner organizations that they have and pick out some things there and ask them in advance to bring some insights forward on those specific issues.

The Chair: Just for some clarification, Mr. Gotfried, you're looking at not-for-profits and volunteer organizations specifically?

Mr. Gotfried: I think that just in that regard we need to have representation where it may also be required, whether that's from unions or from for-profit organizations or from other community organizations, but I think that where we have opportunities where there's a broad representation from an umbrella organization, whether that be nonprofit or other organizations, we should take that opportunity.

The Chair: Any comments from counsel?

Ms Dean: Mr. Chair, if I understand the request, I think you're looking for recommendations with respect to umbrella organizations that are representative of various groups impacted by the legislation, and I think the research team can take this request away – give us a few days – and come back with some recommendations to add to the committee's list of presenters.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Please proceed, Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: In the interests of moving things forward, I think perhaps what we should do is maybe have a motion such that it recommends invitations to those organizations noted – they may not all necessarily want to present – but that we also in that motion have: and further individual or representative organizations as recommended by counsel. Then we can at least move this forward and perhaps advance the process without stalling the process.

The Chair: Okay. Just bear with us, Mr. Gotfried. We're just drafting this right now.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you.

The Chair: In the meantime are there any questions or comments?

Mr. Carson: I would just comment on what MLA Gotfried just said. I think it's a good idea for sure, and it's important that we do hear from as many people as we can, especially people who specifically did submit submissions up to this point. Of course, we haven't made any decisions, so I think it's important that we do hear from as many people as we can. I would second his idea for sure.

Mr. Panda: We wanted to hear from them, but they chose not to submit anything, so now are we going back and asking more than who has already submitted? That's my question.

The Chair: I think that what overarchingly – and I'll read the amendment out in a second here – it kind of pertains to is any feedback that the research staff may have about additional presentations, that presenters that may be of benefit to the committee will receive invitations to participate moving forward.

Please proceed.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Maybe we can help in terms of just giving a little bit of a preview of the types of areas in addition to those that have already been mentioned. They're areas, I think, that are important and stakeholder groups that, you know, in a broad sense would be important to the committee, we feel. Then we'll come back with the specific names of the organizations.

I'll just pass it over to Dr. Amato if that's okay, Mr. Chair.

10:40

Dr. Amato: I think that the issues that are presented in the responses to PIPA are reflective of different types of organizations. As I said, there is little agreement amongst the organizations, but often they represent broad groups of stakeholders. For example, if the committee is interested in professional regulatory organizations, each of those groups tends to be an umbrella organization; the College of Physicians & Surgeons, as an example, or the Real Estate Council of Alberta. Those represent all sorts of organizations that then come together under that broad umbrella, and that stakeholder, when it presented, spoke broadly for its membership.

The nonprofit organizations are represented in the list that was just put forward in terms of people who submitted to the committee.

But then there are also other types of organizations which may be of interest to the committee. There are, of course, the different private-sector organizations, some of which are very, very large. There are some very, very large insurance companies. There are some marketing organizations. The Canadian Marketing Association: that's a very big umbrella organization. Then there are also organizations that deal very, very specifically with Internet technology. That also may be of interest to the committee. There is the Canadian Information Processing Society of Alberta. There's also the National Association for Information Destruction Canada.

I think that there are all sorts of options there of very, very large organizations that represent different kinds of interests and different kinds of individual organizations. Some of them are Alberta-wide organizations, and some of them are also national organizations that interact with this piece of legislation in different ways. So these are, of course, all possibilities.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, if I can just add to that and just sort of close the loop, if you will, if it squares with the will of the committee and that amendment to the motion, what we can do is put forward the organizations themselves that fall under those categories that Dr. Amato just indicated, and that can be sort of presented to the committee offline.

Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Any other questions or comments? Go ahead, Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Yeah. You know what? I really like that approach. I mean, we've got, again, special records for associations, nonprofits, and the private sector. An offline list of some representative or more vocal groups and that: I think it's incumbent upon us to make sure we hear from all sectors if possible.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Hunter: I was just going to say, in listening to counsel, that it sounds like there is not consensus on many of these points. I'm just wondering if we can make sure that when we get oral presentations, it's giving us both sides of the story so that when we do make laws or we make changes to PIPA, we have at least been presented with both sides.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, what I can offer here is that I think that, yes, these organizations that you already have on your list and that will be added to that list, presumably, at some future point will present different sides to the issue.

But I would also say, you know, following what Dr. Amato said in her submissions summary, that the written submissions as represented in that summary do indicate both sides. I think that you've got a lot of that information already in the written submissions.

The Chair: That being said, I will call the question. Moved by Mr. Carson that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite the following organizations and, further, that representatives of other organizations suggested by the committee research staff be added to the list, the following invited stakeholders being the UFCW, the Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations, the Federation of Calgary Communities, the Calgary Urban Project Society, the heritage and historical society of Alberta, Service Alberta, and the Privacy Commissioner, to make oral presentations in relation

to its review of the Personal Information Protection Act at subsequent meetings.

All those in favour please say aye. All opposed? The motion is carried.

We'll now move to the next item on the agenda, which is a communications update. I would now like to invite Jeanette Dotimas, LAO communications, to provide an update to the committee. Please proceed.

Ms Dotimas: Thank you, sir. I'm just here to close the loop on the communications component of the call for submissions that went out for PIPA. Basically, the initiatives that were proposed by communications for LAO and approved by the committee were carried out as directed.

We had a news release sent out on January 18, and then the campaign, of course, spanned from January 19 to February 26, when the call for submissions closed. We placed ads in nine Alberta daily newspapers. We placed online ads in five markets in Alberta. We also bought Facebook and Twitter ads that spanned the entire January 19 to February 26 campaign.

We had other initiatives as well, that were cost free, to support the campaign. We had, of course, media relations. Again, we made sure that we facilitated all interviews that were requested of the chair. We found out that about a dozen newspapers throughout the province carried the news release and elaborated on what was being requested of the public. We updated the committee pages and included links to the ad itself for more information. As well, the discussion guide was placed on the committee page. We had additional social media posts as well to remind people of the closing dates, and throughout the campaign reminders were also sent out.

Finally, we had written a brief news article for constituency newsletters, if the members on the committee chose to use those. We created an e-card as well, linking back to the information on the website, for distribution as needed.

On the specific results, of course, stemming from all of those initiatives, if there are any other questions, I can certainly address them.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any questions for LAO communications? On the phone? Okay.

Thank you very much.

We'll move to the next item on the agenda. Hon. members, the committee has a mandate to review the Personal Information Protection Act within 18 months of having commenced. We hit the one-year mark for the review in July. Therefore, the committee may wish to consider a revised timeline to complete the review before the allotted time has elapsed.

To aid in this process, a draft revised timeline has been prepared with possible dates for meetings for this coming fall. It was posted on the internal website last week for the committee's consideration. Are there any questions or comments in relation to the document? On the phone? No?

Seeing none, is there general agreement, then, with the following revised proposed timeline for completion of this review? Please proceed.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I move adoption of the timeline.

The Chair: Okay. Moved by MLA Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future adopt the proposed timeline and that it serve as a basis for scheduling future meetings for the review of the Personal Information Protection Act.

All those in favour please say aye. Opposed? Okay. The motion is carried.

Now to the subject of other business. Are there any other issues for discussion?

Seeing none, we will move to the date of the next meeting. The next meeting of the committee shall be a date in September according to the adoption of the timeline of the committee. We will

send out a poll shortly for a mutual date of all committee members.

If there's nothing else for this committee to consider, I'll call for a motion of adjournment. Moved by Mr. Panda that the June 14, 2016, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adjourned. All those in favour please say aye. Opposed? All right. The motion is carried. The meeting now stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 10:50 a.m.]

