



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Community Services

Monday, July 28, 2008
1:02 p.m.

Transcript No. 27-1-2

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

Standing Committee on Community Services

Rodney, Dave, Calgary-Lougheed (PC), Chair
Hehr, Kent, Calgary-Buffalo (L), Deputy Chair

Benito, Carl, Edmonton-Mill Woods (PC)
Bhardwaj, Naresh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (PC)
Chase, Harry B., Calgary-Varsity (L)
Doerksen, Arno, Strathmore-Brooks (PC)
Horne, Fred, Edmonton-Rutherford (PC) *
Johnson, Jeff, Athabasca-Redwater (PC)
Johnston, Art, Calgary-Hays (PC)
Lukaszuk, Thomas A., Edmonton-Castle Downs (PC)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP)
Sandhu, Peter, Edmonton-Manning (PC) **
Sarich, Janice, Edmonton-Decore (PC)
Sherman, Dr. Raj, Edmonton-Meadowlark (PC) ***

* substitution for Carl Benito
** substitution for Naresh Bhardwaj
*** substitution for Thomas Lukaszuk

Bill 18 Sponsor

Blackett, Hon. Lindsay, Calgary-North West (PC)

Department of Culture and Community Spirit Participants

Katherine Huising	Director, Jubilee Auditoria of Alberta
Paul Pearson	Director, Arts Services

Support Staff

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

1:02 p.m.

Monday, July 28, 2008

[Mr. Rodney in the chair]

The Chair: Well, ladies and gentlemen, if I take a look at the clock, it is 1:02 p.m. or so. I'm very pleased to see all of you here, and I believe we have some people on the line.

We have 10 items on the agenda. The first is the call to order, so I want to do exactly that: call this meeting to order. Welcome, everybody.

I will ask each of the members at this table and staff to introduce themselves for the record. I will start with a gentleman who is participating via conference call. Mr. Hehr, are you there?

Mr. Hehr: Yes, I am. Thank you very much.

The Chair: That's Kent Hehr, MLA for Calgary-Buffalo, correct, sir?

Mr. Hehr: Yup.

The Chair: Perhaps we can go around the table and introduce ourselves, then, for the record.

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

Mr. Chase: Harry Chase, Calgary-Varsity.
Hi, Kent. See you tomorrow.

Mr. Johnson: Jeff Johnson, Athabasca-Redwater.

Mr. Doerksen: Arno Doerksen, Strathmore-Brooks.

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

Ms Stewart: Katrina Stewart, research assistant, Legislative Assembly Office.

Ms Sorensen: Rhonda Sorensen, manager of communications services at the Legislative Assembly Office.

Ms Dean: Shannon Dean, Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

Ms Huising: Katherine Huising, Culture and Community Spirit.

Mr. Pearson: Paul Pearson, Culture and Community Spirit.

Mr. Horne: Fred Horne, Edmonton-Rutherford, on behalf of Carl Benito, Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Mr. Sandhu: Good afternoon. Peter Sandhu, MLA, Edmonton-Manning, covering for Naresh Bhardwaj.

Dr. Sherman: Hello. Raj Sherman, Edmonton-Meadowlark, substituting for Thomas Lukaszuk, Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Mrs. Sarich: Good afternoon. Janice Sarich, Edmonton-Decore and parliamentary assistant for the Minister of Education.

Mr. Johnston: Good afternoon. Art Johnston from Calgary-Hays.

The Chair: Thank you so much, everyone. I don't need to say it all over again – Sandhu, Horne, and Sherman in for Bhardwaj, Benito, and Lukaszuk – but I do want to mention that it is according to our Standing Order 56(2.1) to (2.3).

A few housekeeping items. A reminder: some of you folks already know that *Hansard* operates these microphones remotely, so you do not need to turn them on or off as we sometimes do when they're not here. You probably have experienced the BlackBerry situation where, if these are a little too close to the microphone and they go off, there are certain communications issues. So if you would either turn yours off or move it a little further away from the microphones, that would be appreciated.

On to Item 2. Are there any changes required for the approval of the agenda? Seeing none, I'd like someone to move – and I'll word it this way – that the agenda for the Monday, July 28, 2008, meeting of the Standing Committee on Community Services be adopted. Okay. Did you see the hands go up? There are people that are really anxious to go. That's Janice and Art. Good. All those in favour of the motion, please raise your hand or otherwise indicate, Mr. Hehr.

Mr. Hehr: Will do.

The Chair: You're in favour, Mr. Hehr?

Mr. Hehr: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Anyone opposed to the agenda as presented? Then that motion is carried.

On to item 3. Meeting minutes you received on the intranet for June 23, 2008. Are there any changes required, ladies and gentlemen, that you may have noticed? No. Okay. I'll phrase a motion, and then I'll ask for a volunteer. Moved by X that the minutes of the June 23, 2008, meeting of the Standing Committee on Community Services be adopted as circulated. Let's do it the other way. Either Janice or Art. These do not need to be seconded; therefore, I can call the question. All those in favour, please raise your hand or otherwise indicate, Kent.

Mr. Hehr: Aye.

The Chair: Aye. Any objections? That motion is carried as well.

Wow. If we've gone through three points already, I guess we'll be done in about 10 more minutes, won't we? Famous last words. That's like Air Canada saying that the plane is going to land early. Am I allowed to say that?

Let's get on to point 4. One of the major reasons that we're here today, ladies and gentlemen, of course, is the technical briefing on Bill 18, the Film and Video Classification Act. We have two wonderful guests who've joined us at the committee's request from the last meeting. They're going to present a PowerPoint, as I understand it, and only after will you entertain questions. Is that correct? You'd prefer that members jot down any questions, and, Kent, maybe you can just make a note for yourself as well. So we'll let these two fine young individuals present all that they have, and we'll take questions. In the meantime, Kent, I'll give you first option to go afterwards, but I'll make a list. If in the middle of their presentation something comes to your mind, ladies and gentlemen, if you'd just raise your hand, we'll keep a little running speakers list going, okay?

Over to you two. You're going to present from up here. Is that correct?

Ms Huising: Yes.

The Chair: We'll hold the applause for the end as well, then. Okay. Good.

Ms Huising: Mr. Rodney, members of the standing committee, and special guests, my name is Katherine Huising, and my colleague Paul Pearson and I are delighted to have this opportunity today to present to you on Bill 18.

The process of developing the Film and Video Classification Act began several years ago. As often happens, the simplicity of initial issues, film and video classification, have other elements added when you get into the detail of existing legislation. Today we're going to spend about 15 minutes providing you with a technical briefing on the work behind Bill 18.

For Mr. Hehr, we're moving to slide 2 now. Bill 18, the Film and Video Classification Act, replaces the existing Amusements Act and accomplishes three key elements. First, it eliminates the archaic and outdated references within the Amusements Act. Second, it describes in legislation the current practice of film and video classification. Third, it addresses the issues of secondary ticket sales.

Slide 3. The Amusements Act was first passed in the Alberta Legislature in February of 1912. The act has had minor modifications since its introduction, so it is significantly out of date. When first reading the Amusements Act, I was intrigued to see some of the definitions provided. I'm going to share one with you. A "moving picture machine" means a machine or device in which film is used and that is operated by or with the aid of electricity and adapted or used to project pictorial representations on a screen or other surface." I can't imagine what the writers of this document would say about where technology has taken us almost a hundred years later.

1:10

In its current form the Amusements Act covers an entire spectrum of amusements such as dances and exhibitions as well as a number of establishments such as dance halls and pavilions. These have not been regulated for some time within this act. Furthermore, the act refers to banning or cutting films, which the Alberta government has not practised in over 20 years. The last time a film was banned or edited in Alberta was in 1987. That film was *Silent Night, Deadly Night*. Just to give you a little insight into that, *Silent Night, Deadly Night* was one of the most controversial films of the late 1980s simply because the killer was dressed as Santa Claus. In fact, in the U.S.A. the American PTA fought to have this film removed from theatres due to its subject matter and the fact that it was being shown at Christmastime.

The film classification section of the arts branch focuses on reviewing films, classifying films, and ensuring that information about film content is made available to the public. Paul Pearson will now outline the current film and video classification practices in this legislation.

Mr. Pearson: Thanks, Katherine.

Thank you, Mr. Rodney, members of the committee, and guests. I'd like to start by describing for you the current film classification process and the roles and responsibilities of those involved in that process. Three professional film classification officers are employed by the arts branch and report to me, the director of arts services. I, in turn, report to the executive director of the arts branch, who reports to the assistant deputy minister of the culture division, who reports to the deputy minister of Alberta Culture and Community Spirit.

The film classification officers are all professional staff who have at least one degree, generally in education, the social sciences, and/or film studies. They also have a great deal of experience

working with community and industry groups, which, as you'll see in a slide or two, is important for their jobs. As director I am responsible for the daily supervision of these staff as well as general operations, policy, and procedures for classifying films. The executive director has the designated signing authority for distribution licences and exemptions for nonprofit organizations.

Moving on to slide 5, the daily business of classifying films works like this. Distributors like Warner Bros., Fox, et cetera, send us films that are going to be shown in theatres in Alberta. We have a screening room set up on the south side of Edmonton. Our in-house projectionist runs the film for the film classification officers. The officers watch the film, then discuss it and come to an agreement about what the rating should be and whether or not there should be any other advisories like "violence" or "not recommended for young children." This then becomes the official Alberta rating for the film.

The officers also create something called the classification report, which goes into greater detail about the elements in each film. This report is posted on our website. The address for the site is in the bottom corner of each of these slides. Parents can visit and do visit in great numbers the site to find out, for example, what kinds of violence are in a film they're considering taking their children to see, whether it's historical war violence or cartoon superhero violence, et cetera. The ratings and advisories are then communicated to the distributors by phone and posted on our site for the public, for movie theatres, and for the media. As this slide notes, the business of film classification is providing information to Alberta moviegoers, not cutting or banning films.

Moving to slide 6, it is important to know that the film classification officers do not operate in a vacuum. In addition to their education and professional experience they spend a lot of time working with the public and our various stakeholders. Every once in a while a distributor will disagree with a rating our staff have given a film. In cases where the distributor would like to see a different rating – always a lower rating, by the way – and where Alberta's rating is different from the rating given by the majority of other English-speaking jurisdictions, we will grant an appeal. How that works is that we bring the film back in and run an evening screening for a panel of volunteers. Albertans can sign up on our website to be an appeal panel member, and so far more than a hundred have.

The film comes in. We call around to get five parents, teachers, and/or child care professionals to come in for the appeal. We also try to get someone from the movie exhibition industry to sit on each appeal panel. We give them a copy of our classification guidelines and spend some time explaining the process and the job of classifying the film. They watch the film. After they've watched it, we facilitate a discussion at which at least one film classification officer is in attendance to observe the discussion, and we ask the panel to give us a recommendation on what they think the rating should be. In addition to helping us rate a contentious film, this process also allows us to connect with regular Alberta moviegoers to check in on community standards, as it were.

The film classification officers also spend a great deal of time working with community not-for-profit organizations and film festivals. We deal with everything from small church groups to the Japanese anime festivals that happen in almost every large town in Alberta to the big international film festivals in Calgary and Edmonton. These nonprofit groups have the option of classifying their own films.

Film festivals and community groups tend to have very specific and very specialized audiences, and the organizers of these festivals tend to know these audiences very well. If they choose, they can classify their own films using our classification guidelines. The film

classification officers spend a great deal of time working with these organizations either classifying their films for them or teaching them how to classify their own films. These self-classifications are closely monitored, and of course we reserve the right to change a rating or to revoke the privilege if it is not being used responsibly.

The film classification officers also attend provincial and national industry events such as the Motion Picture Theatre Association of Alberta conference. We also have a three-year schedule for visiting every movie theatre in the province and meeting with the managers and staff on the ground.

Finally, we also do formal research such as the comprehensive program evaluation that started this process. I'll talk more about that in a minute.

Moving on to slide 7, Bill 18 changes none of what I have just described for you. Bill 18 also does not set up a new system for classifying adult material, home video, or video games. All of this material is currently classified by other industry organizations. You've probably heard of the Entertainment Software Rating Board, ESRB, that classifies video games. The public recognition and industry acceptance of and compliance with their video game rating system is excellent. With the full co-operation of the Retail Council of Canada there is not a store or rental place in the country that does not comply with these ratings. The same can be said for both the home video and adult video industries. The current Amusements Act recognizes ratings given to this material by the respective organizations, and Bill 18 does the same.

As I mentioned in a previous slide, the executive director of the arts branch has been delegated the signing authority for the distribution licences and not-for-profit exemptions. Bill 18 states this outright.

Moving to slide 8. So what does Bill 18 change? Well, in addition to cleaning up and modernizing the language, as Katherine referenced, this new legislation removes a ratings category that hasn't been used in many, many years. Most people don't know this, but to the right of the R rating there is an A rating. This rating was designed to be used to classify adult material and does exactly the same job as the R. Children under the age of 18 are not allowed in to see an A-rated film. Of course, the last public theatre that showed adult material closed decades ago, and the A hasn't been used since.

Bill 18 also puts what is called a floor on the 18A rating. This floor means that parents cannot bring their children who are under the age of 14 into an 18A-rated film. As things stand now, anyone can get into an 18A film if they're accompanied by an adult. This has led to the occasional problem, most notably with things like the Stars & Strollers screenings. This is where a movie theatre allows moms to bring their babies into a theatre for a morning show. They're quite popular all over the province.

The trouble is that sometimes moms will bring in their older children who aren't yet of school age as well as their infants. I'm betting that more than one of you has had the experience of being in a film where a parent has brought a child who is way too young to be there. Bill 18 will ensure that theatres don't show 18A films for these screenings. This floor was instituted in Manitoba several years ago and has proven very effective and popular. It also came out as a recommendation from the focus group research we conducted.

Finally, Bill 18 updates the penalty for contravening the act. Under the Amusements Act the maximum fine is not more than \$200. This is hardly a deterrent for a multinational exhibition chain. The \$10,000 for an individual and the \$100,000 for a corporation set out in Bill 18 is considerably less than the \$250,000 for a corporation in Ontario and is identical to B.C.'s fine of \$10,000 for an individual.

Turning to slide 9 now, I've mentioned a couple of times the

research that has been done around film classification. I want to stress that the changes embodied in Bill 18 are the direct result of a number of different research projects that have been conducted over the past few years. In 2006 the department of tourism, parks, recreation, and culture completed a comprehensive program evaluation of the film classification program. A key recommendation of this program evaluation was the need to revisit the Amusements Act and seek legislative review.

Since 2002 the following research has been completed. A series of questions on the survey of Albertans, a telephone survey completed annually with a random sample of 1,000 adult Albertans, was conducted. Questions explored general knowledge and awareness related to the film rating systems and overall perceptions about film content and regulation.

A total of six focus groups in Edmonton, Stettler, and Calgary were conducted, three with parents of children aged eight to 17 and three with youth aged 14 to 17. These focus groups examined perceptions of film content and discussed key concerns in relation to the regulation of film viewing.

1:20

A telephone survey was completed with movie exhibitors in Alberta. Fifty-seven of 69 eligible respondents completed the survey. This survey assessed current practices of monitoring film access, information needs, and ways to enhance working relationships between movie theatres and the government.

A telephone survey with movie distributors who operate in Alberta was also conducted. Seventeen eligible respondents completed this survey. The survey explored current issues related to the film rating system, information needs, and ways to enhance relationships between movie distributors and the government.

Finally, a series of questions on an omnibus telephone survey was completed with a random sample of 900 adult Albertans. These questions asked about the use of the film rating system, perceptions of the role of government in film classification, and impressions of forming a national film rating system.

Bill 18 is the result of all of this research and consultation. I'm going to turn it over to my colleague Katherine to talk a bit about secondary ticket sales now.

Ms Huising: Thank you, Paul.

If we move to slide 10, in my introduction I mentioned that other issues become apparent when you begin in-depth evaluation into changing legislation. With the Amusements Act the issue that arose was secondary ticket sales. This is a very current issue and is being discussed across North America. Websites such as StubHub, which was recently purchased by eBay, have moved the resale of entertainment and sporting tickets into a \$2 billion industry in 2006. Our existing legislation states:

No person shall sell, barter or exchange a ticket of admission to a place of amusement for a price or consideration greater than that paid or given for it to the owner of the place to which it authorizes admission.

The penalty is not more than \$200. Bill 18 no longer prohibits the resale of tickets for more than face value.

What does this change mean for Albertans? Well, think of the Albertan who purchased two tickets to an Edmonton Oilers playoff game at Rexall Place in the spring of 2006 through a friend of a friend or an online site. The mother and son drive in from northern Alberta and arrive at the venue to discover their \$3,000 purchase of two tickets is wasted. The tickets they purchased are fraudulent. The original tickets were stolen, and the original owner reported the theft to the Oilers and was reissued his tickets.

There is simply no recourse available to the mother and son because what they have purchased is an illegal product in the

province of Alberta as outlined in the current Amusements Act. However, by removing all reference to ticket resale, this Albertan would have had protection within the Criminal Code of Canada and the Fair Trading Act within Alberta. Alberta Justice has recommended that the act not make any reference to ticket resale because there is other legislation governing this issue.

Slide 11. With the removal of this regulation there are three resources that will serve Albertans. First, industry-developed standards: the industry will be able to create mechanisms for addressing this. We've seen this in the province of British Columbia, which does allow for ticket reselling. The industry there has developed systems. Issues of fraudulent sales, as outlined in my example, can be addressed by the legal system as this is covered within the Criminal Code of Canada. The issue of price gouging can be addressed by the Fair Trading Act, section 6, which specifically prohibits a supplier in a consumer transaction from charging "a price for goods or services that grossly exceeds the price at which similar goods or services are readily available without informing the consumer of the difference in price and the reason for the difference."

There are more specific protections available to consumers who purchase tickets electronically in the Internet sales regulations under the Fair Trading Act. The Minister of Service Alberta is designated as the minister responsible for the Fair Trading Act. If it is determined that suppliers acting as ticket resellers are found to be a source of consumer losses or ongoing market fraud, Service Alberta has the ability to amend the legislation.

This is good governance. It provides protection to consumers while ensuring transparent legislation. All legislation dealing with sale and resale activity will be located in one act to ensure a well-informed public.

Slide 12 addresses the research that we conducted with regard to secondary ticket sales. We conducted a total of 11 interviews with 17 different representatives from ticket sellers and promoters active in Alberta. This included representation from sellers and promoters working in cultural, entertainment, and sporting areas of ticket sales. These interviews were held with venue managers from concert halls to arenas. In addition to national concert promoters, we met with Alberta promoters and sporting franchises, and these interviewees were as far north as Grande Prairie or as far south as Lethbridge.

To reaffirm what we had heard from the industry, two focus groups with ticket buyers were held to gauge the level of importance placed on ticket resales and assess the reaction to eliminating the law. These groups were made up of individuals who were single ticket buyers as well as season ticket holders for cultural and sporting events. Consumer advocates, legal associations, and other government of Alberta ministries, including Alberta Justice and Service Alberta, were also contacted to solicit their reactions and thoughts in relation to secondary ticket sales.

There was also research completed on other jurisdictions' legislation on this issue. Ontario and Manitoba remain the only Canadian jurisdictions that have legislation which strictly prohibits secondary ticket sales. There are no American states which prohibit secondary ticket sales, and only four American states now have legislation imposing price caps on secondary ticket sales. One of these states is currently in the process of removing that restriction.

Finally, a review of relevant literature on this current issue related to secondary sales and how it was being addressed in other jurisdictions world-wide was conducted.

Mr. Pearson: Thanks, Katherine.

To conclude, we've put up three of the differences between the Amusements Act and Bill 18. I'll let you read the slide for your-

selves, though I can't pass up the opportunity to use the phrase "moving picture machine" in an official presentation. I'll also point out that the new language in Bill 18 allows for the government to classify films that are delivered to the theatre and shown digitally. The new 3-D or RealD films that are being shown, for example, have never seen a frame of film. The Amusements Act currently has no provision for classifying this kind of material.

I think this is also a good time to briefly address the proposed federal tax bill, Bill C-10. Bill C-10 is all about production tax credits. It allows the federal government to withhold funding for films that are deemed to be inappropriate. Bill 18, on the other hand, has absolutely nothing to do with production. It is concerned only with films that are being shown in public for a fee in Alberta. It also removes the province's power to cut or ban a film, focusing instead on providing information for Albertans who want to go and see a movie.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

The Chair: Well, thank you very much, Katherine and Paul. Very thorough and very concise at the same time. That's a great art, especially around this place.

I'll ask Kent if he has a question, but I'll look around the table first. So far I have one person on my speaking list and only one, so we'll get to Mr. Chase after we find out if Mr. Hehr has a question or a statement. Are you still there, Kent?

Mr. Hehr: Sorry about that. I had it muted there. But no. Just thank you very much for the initial presentation. If anything strikes, I'll let it be known.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

On to Mr. Chase.

Mr. Chase: I was particularly interested that the government has no authority to cut or ban a film. Under the definition of film, is video part of the definition of film? When it's then transferred to video, it's still that same overall banning, or does the government have a secondary ability to ban a film once it's reproduced for sale as a video?

Mr. Pearson: No. The definition of film includes any media storage device that transmits intellectual property, so that includes videos and video games. The government does not have the power to ban those materials. That rests with the federal government and the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. Chase: Okay. Then one of the concerns – well, basically, my underlying concern – for Bill 18 may be addressed with that statement. But on the idea that a minister would appoint a singular individual as opposed to a triumvirate or a tripartite, however you like – in other words, one individual is replacing three experienced individuals – regardless of whether it's one or three, the government's ability to override the decisions of all the individuals you've talked about and all the processes and the filters: if it has been preapproved, the government does not have the veto power based on Bill 18.

1:30

Mr. Pearson: Forgive me if I'm not quite understanding your question. A point of clarification: the censor board as it is currently set up has not done any work in film classification for a great number of years. I'm not quite sure, actually, why it exists. Responsibility for film classification rests with the minister. The

minister has designated this down to the staff in the department. Of course, the minister, having the ultimate responsibility for the operations of that department, remains the final word on that, so the minister would still have the ability to act as he saw fit.

Mr. Chase: I'm sorry if I'm not being absolutely clear. If the minister has the power to override any of the individuals in the ministry, does that not then give the minister the right to cut or ban a film?

Mr. Pearson: The act does not give the government the ability to cut or ban a film. It simply states that the government's job is viewing films and providing information to Albertans, applying the age ratings on them.

The Chair: For clarification, if I may, Mr. Chase, that authority to cut or ban does indeed rest with the federal government in the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. Chase: Okay. So the main purpose, then, of Bill 18, so that I understand it, is to bring it into the 21st century in terms of vocabulary, but the minister does not have the power, therefore, for the third time kind of thing, to interfere or censor art in the form of film.

Mr. Pearson: No, the minister does not have that power.

Mr. Chase: I appreciate that clarification.

The Chair: Speaking of art, the hon. Art Johnston, please.

Mr. Johnston: Nice segue. Thank you. In consideration of the mandatory maximum, was there any consideration given to a mandatory minimum?

Mr. Pearson: That was discussed around the table, and I can get you more detail about that in a written response. I don't have that information with me.

The Chair: If you could do that through the chair, we can disseminate that from here.

Mr. Johnston: That would be great. Thank you very much.

Would this be the time to bring up wording, if I read something in the wording when I went through the act previously? Is that appropriate at this time?

The Chair: If you two are okay with it, go ahead, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. Johnston: Okay. Actually, the wording is "class," and I thought it should be "category." I don't have it in front of me at this point in time, but I believe it's the very first. It says a class of people instead of what I feel should be a category. I just personally didn't like the wording where it says class. Does that jump out at you right now?

Mr. Pearson: I am familiar with the clause that you're referring to. The word "class" was chosen because it is common across the country in terms of film classification. It's an industry term: class of film. I understand, though, your reactions to the word "class." I hear you.

Mr. Johnston: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Anyone else care to ask any questions of our two presenters? No?

Well, with that I will thank you very, very much again for being so very thorough, and good luck with your work. It's an important job, and we appreciate that you're doing it. All the best.

On to item 5, ladies and gentlemen: review of additional briefing items on Bill 18. It was a source of a little bit of consternation last meeting – I don't know if you recall that – whether we call him Dr. Phil or not, but indeed it is over to the good doctor to review some documents that were prepared for the committee by the research staff. We'll ask you to go ahead, sir. I was very happy to see what was happening across the country. If you care to comment? I know it was very thorough in black and white. What would you like to share with us at this point?

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just like to go over some of our observations in terms of comparing Bill 18 with other legislation across the country. If I may, I'll just go through, like I said, some of the observations. Basically my summary right now will mirror what was presented to you in the written document.

In terms of the classification authority, under Bill 18 the executive director, who is the classification authority in this proposed legislation, is appointed by the minister. In most of the jurisdictions under comparison the classification authority is also appointed, either by the minister or by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Nova Scotia is the only jurisdiction under study in this comparison where the minister classifies film.

In terms of approval of films and videos Bill 18 does not require that films be submitted for approval, but it does require that they be classified. Nova Scotia does not require that films be approved but does allow for regulations to be made prohibiting particular films. Quebec does not require that films be approved, but with some exceptions only French language films may be classified. British Columbia does require that films be submitted for approval. Ontario likewise requires that films of particular classes, as set out in the regulations, be submitted for approval.

Turning to classification of films and videos, all jurisdictions provide for films to be classified, and all of the compared jurisdictions require that films be classified in order to be exhibited or distributed. Note that Quebec is the only jurisdiction that sets out a classification scheme in the act itself. All other jurisdictions compared, including Alberta in this proposed legislation, allow for the classification scheme to be set out in the regulations. Bill 18 and Nova Scotia legislation both provide that classification should be based on a viewing of the film, review of documentation describing the content of the film, or by adopting the classification established by another person or another body.

Exemptions. Under Bill 18 and the Ontario legislation any exemption to the requirement for classification will be determined in the regulations. British Columbia's legislation allows nonprofit cultural organizations to be exempted from the requirement that films be approved for exhibition in theatres. Furthermore, the director in British Columbia is not required to remove materials from films if the theme is artistic, historical, political, educational, or scientific. Nova Scotia's list of exemptions includes films that are educational, cultural, religious, political, or are used for industrial or business promotions. Other films may be exempted pursuant to the regulations. Quebec's list of exemptions includes films that are educational, for vocational training purposes, of sporting events, or films that are exhibited at a diplomatic event or film festival.

In terms of appeals, all of the compared jurisdictions allow for an appeal of a decision regarding a film's classification.

Licensing. Bill 18 requires that a person hold a licence in order to distribute films for exhibition. Ontario also requires licences for

distribution and exhibition of films. British Columbia requires licences for distributors and retailers of motion pictures and adult films. Quebec requires that each screen on which a film will be shown be licensed and that commercial operations selling or leasing films be licensed. The legislation in Nova Scotia allows for the creation of regulations regarding licences.

Turning to provisions regarding minors, Bill 18 and the British Columbia legislation make specific provisions prohibiting minors from attending, renting, or buying films of particular classifications and adult films. Nova Scotia and Ontario legislation leave these restrictions to the regulations. Quebec's classification system is set out in the act itself and contains a category for 18 and over.

In terms of display of classifications and advertising all of the jurisdictions compared in this briefing, including Alberta's Bill 18, have requirements with regard to the display of a film's classification at theatres and on a film's packaging. Note that only British Columbia and Quebec statutes have provisions regarding film advertising or film trailers.

1:40

Turning to inspections, all of the compared jurisdictions have provisions allowing for the inspection of premises without warrant and at a reasonable time for the purposes of administering and enforcing the statutes.

Purpose of the act. Bill 18 and the Quebec legislation contain purpose or objective sections. Note, however, that Quebec's objectives are more extensive than Bill 18's purpose section and emphasize the development of Quebec's cinema or film industry.

Video games. In Bill 18 and British Columbia and Ontario legislation video games are included in the definitions of films or motion pictures. They are classified under the same provisions in the legislation as films and motion pictures. Nova Scotia, however, defines video games separately, allows for the making of regulations respecting video games, and generally adopts the classifications of the Entertainment Software Rating Board, which is out of the United States, which you've heard about previously.

Lastly, I just wanted to reiterate the statement made earlier about the federal Bill C-10, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, 2006. Bill C-10 is a federal bill which seeks to amend the Income Tax Act. Now, one of the amendments appears to have the effect of allowing the minister of Canadian heritage to decide not to grant Canadian film and video production certificates to productions for which public financial support is contrary to public policy. This would have the effect of preventing the production from using certain tax credits. Therefore, Bill C-10 has financial implications for film and video productions. However, as we now know, Bill 18 and other legislation considered in this briefing all deal with the classification of completed films and videos.

So that is it, Mr. Chair. We're prepared to answer any questions on this cross-jurisdictional comparison if there are any.

The Chair: Okay. I wonder if history is repeating itself. When I look around the table, I see one hand, but I would like to go to Mr. Hehr first and find out: did you have any questions for the good doctor, Kent?

Mr. Hehr: Everything is fine.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Chase: Philip, do you feel sufficiently comfortable to make recommendations based on either provincial or federal regulations that would potentially strengthen Bill 18? You pointed out jurisdic-

tional differences between Quebec, B.C., Nova Scotia, for example, separating the video games from the videos. Was there anything in the legislation that you noticed which would potentially clarify or add strength, clarity of wording to Bill 18 that you would recommend for us to consider in the amending process or the strengthening of Bill 18?

Dr. Massolin: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, for the question. I don't think we're quite in a position to recommend anything, unfortunately. This document is just simply for information purposes, just to compare and give a sense of what's happening in the other jurisdictions.

The Chair: As a good LAO service would. The rest is up to us – isn't it? – as elected officials. Thank you for that.

Is there anyone else who would like to ask a question of an individual that is well respected and does some great work for us? Thank you and the people in your department. Much appreciated.

Dr. Massolin: I must just add if I may, Mr. Chair, that Katrina, to my left here, did much of the work.

The Chair: Yeah. That's why I looked over to her and made the secondary comment. Thank you again, Katrina.

On to item 6, ladies and gentlemen, the review process, and point (a), the stakeholder list. If you did print off what was available to you, you know that there is a stakeholder list. In the neighbourhood of 40 stakeholders are listed. Based on the direction from our committee at the last meeting, I worked with our staff to make sure that the list effectively targeted the interest groups that are most likely to participate in a review of Bill 18. All of these stakeholders were contacted by letter or e-mail to advise them of our work, and that was sent out a while ago, back on July 11.

Point (b), the receipt of written submissions and the process for that. It was decided at our last meeting, if you remember, that we'd put out a call for written submissions, and we will take a look at the advertising for this in a moment. We should address the process for receiving these submissions. In order to ensure that all committee members have access to the submissions, we want to make sure that all submissions are directed to the committee clerk. You don't want to just have it sitting in your office and your office alone, do you? Jody's contact information is available right on the public website, and it will also be included in the ad that we will be referring to shortly. Some MLAs may receive submissions from constituents at their local offices, so we'll ask you to ask them to submit them directly as per the website.

Once these are received, the submissions will be processed, and the originals will be kept as part of the committee record. They'll be numbered for easy reference and will be posted on the committee's secure internal site on a regular basis. Once we've had the opportunity to review them, we can decide in September if they should be available on our public website or not.

Questions or comments on the process for receipt of written submissions? No? Seeing none, let's move on to scheduling public hearing presentations, which could be quite exciting.

It was also determined by a motion at the last meeting that the committee would hold a public hearing on Bill 18, and you've all been asked to keep September 18 open on your schedule to accommodate this hearing. We'll be able to set a more specific time frame once we're better able to gauge the number of groups and individuals that are interested in making a presentation.

As you'll see when we discuss the communications plan next, we've asked that parties who are interested in making a presentation

at the hearing indicate this in their written submission. Based on the experience of last year's policy field committees, they allowed five or 10 minutes for presentations, five or 10 minutes for questions from committee members after that, and it seemed to work really quite well. With the consent of the committee, the committee clerk with my direction could begin contacting stakeholders as early as mid-August to start scheduling presentations.

I wondered if there were questions or comments on that. I see at least one familiar hand. Kent Hehr, did you have anything to say about that one?

Mr. Hehr: Everything is good.

The Chair: Okay. That's great. You must be in Calgary.

Mr. Hehr: I love the work this committee is doing. You know, I can't add anything further to it, so that means they're tickety-boo, I guess.

The Chair: Thank you, Deputy Chair. Your colleague has a question or comment.

Mr. Chase: In looking at the stakeholder list, I didn't see any specific – and I stand to be corrected – cultural groups, for example First Nations. A large part of our Alberta history and portrayal, especially with the number of westerns that have been produced, portray First Nations in various lights. I know First Nations members could be members of the Chamber of Commerce; they could be a part of art councils. Also, I didn't see any sort of ethnic groups that might be consulted based on different artistic portrayals or principles or forms of censorship. I didn't see cultural groups captured in the stakeholder list. I could very well be wrong, and they could be encompassed under other authorities, but it just seemed to be not there.

The Chair: Well, as I mentioned, there was a great deal of help in putting this list together. I don't know if we have comments from those who did research on who would be appropriate to include or if our clerk cares to comment.

Doctor, go ahead.

Dr. Massolin: Sure. I can comment. I think just in terms of the general parameters of this list and in putting it together, we followed the direction of the committee as was indicated at the last meeting but also sort of rounded out that list by thinking about other prominent groups that would want to be consulted with respect to the provisions of the bill and not going much broader than that. While, you know, some of these groups that are mentioned may have an interest but perhaps not necessarily a direct interest, they may be captured through the public consultation process.

1:50

The Chair: Does that satisfy? What I'm hearing from you, Doctor, and what my understanding was from before: those directly affected are on this list for sure. There may be any number of ethnic or otherwise groups that may be interested or indirectly affected, but this would be coming into their awareness with the communications plan that we're about to discuss in addition to the fact that it was quite widely publicized when Bill 18 was directed at first reading from the Legislature to come to this committee. Everything is on the website as well. I don't know if that satisfies. Do you want to hear more of the communications plan first, Mr. Chase?

Mr. Chase: That may resolve my concerns. With various demo-

graphics as well as cultural groups I just want to make sure that we reach out as broadly as we can to encompass all ages and all cultures and, you know, be truly reflective of the Alberta experience.

The Chair: Sure. I have a feeling it might be a good idea to hear the communications plan because, indeed, that should be seen by every Albertan that opens up all sorts of print material. I won't steal any of their thunder unless there's anyone else who wanted to make further comment on that.

Go ahead, Mrs. Sarich.

Mrs. Sarich: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just in response. Maybe this might be helpful, given that there was a legislative review of the Amusements Act and a document prepared for our committee which outlined the consultation process, key comments, some of the overview of results, and the stakeholders. I believe it was quite extensive and very comprehensive. With the confidence that we're going to be rolling out another opportunity, I think that those other groups that you speak of or are brought to the attention of the committee would be captured by those other offerings through the committee.

The Chair: Indeed. I think that's completely fair to say.

Mrs. Sarich: I don't think it'll be overshadowed by anything. The other stakeholders would be welcomed and included.

The Chair: Right. Indeed, that was more than a four-year process with not only surveys but focus groups and interviews across the province with all sorts of groups involved. Good point.

Mrs. Sarich: Thank you.

The Chair: Well, then, that gets back to my original point of the schedule process for the public hearing. If the committee would be okay with it, then I would work towards the scheduling of public hearings. I'll give you a sample motion. For instance, I'll put it this way: someone could move that the chair of this Standing Committee on Community Services be authorized to approve the scheduling process for the public hearing. Is that a motion that one of you would like to make so that we can move forward on scheduling?

Mr. Chase: I guess I'll move that we proceed with the public hearing schedule dates. Does that capture the intent?

The Chair: Well, I think we just need to make sure that we know that the chair would do that. The way that I had it phrased was: moved – it could be by Mr. Chase in this case – that the chair of the Standing Committee on Community Services be authorized to approve the scheduling process for the public hearing.

Mr. Chase: Then I'll just simplify it. I move
the process for the scheduling of the public hearings as proposed by
the chair.

The Chair: We don't need a seconder, but we do need a vote. All those in favour, please say aye or otherwise indicate. Okay. Mr. Hehr, do you care to have your vote registered? Kent, are you on mute?

Mr. Hehr: Yes. Sorry about that.

The Chair: That was a yes, then?

Mr. Hehr: Yes.

The Chair: Good. Thank you, sir, and thank you, Mr. Chase, for making that motion.

Draft communications plan. This is something we've all been looking forward to, as we asked for it at our last meeting. Based on our instructions, we've got a comprehensive document, as I understand. Rhonda, is this true?

Ms Sorensen: I hope so.

The Chair: Can you take us through what it is that you've whipped up.

Ms Sorensen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hopefully, you've all had a chance to take a look at the draft communications plan that was put on the website late last week, I believe. I'll walk you through as quickly as I can.

If you go through to about halfway down page 1, we start with the development of some basic key messages. These messages would be carried forward in any public consultation: any news releases, advertising, websites. They're fairly general statements, the one being that it's important to involve Albertans in this process as the committee is going through it, the second being that this bill would replace the Amusements Act. The third message relates to the content of the bill and the essential purposes of it, which are to provide a comprehensive procedure for the classification of films and to provide for the dissemination of information concerning the nature and the content of films.

Essentially what I'm looking for here today would be a general acceptance of those messages. If the committee agrees to those messages, like I say, they would be carried forward in any messaging that we do with the public.

I'll carry on with the whole . . .

The Chair: Would you like feedback on that immediately rather than waiting till the end?

Ms Sorensen: Maybe we'll go through it, and then the committee can decide if it wants to accept the whole plan or if it wants to go through the individual recommendations.

Underneath the Development of Key Public Messages is the media relations component. That is just the dissemination of news releases. Typically we would do a news release at the very beginning in conjunction with the advertising. That just goes out to all Alberta media. Of course, with news releases you never have a guarantee whether or not it will be picked up. That's what the advertising is for, a little further down. We would also do a release should any information come out during this review process that the committee feels needs some public input. Then typically we'll do a release at the end of the committee's work just to inform Albertans about what the committee has found.

On to page 2. This is just for your information, of course. You've probably all seen that there is a public website. For your information communications can provide the committee with measurement statistics. For example, if we were to do an advertisement, we would be able to tell if that put a spike in how people were using the website, or if we were to put out a news release, we could also see if that got the results that we were hoping for.

The last one and perhaps the one that everybody is wanting to know the most about is the advertising. At the last committee meeting – and I apologize; I was not able to be at that meeting – the committee did ask for advertising on written submissions. Based on this and based on the fact that this issue is far reaching, we are recommending a province-wide campaign. With weeklies we would be hitting 98 weekly publications, including entertainment-specific

publications such as *SEE Magazine* and *Fast Forward Weekly*. It would reach over 700,000 Albertans and will cost approximately \$23,000. With the dailies we would be recommending the same ad run in all nine dailies, for an approximate cost of \$6,500. In all of these publications we would be asking that it run in or near an entertainment section if such a section exists in the publication.

I'll just touch on the public hearings because the committee may notice that there's no specific recommendation with this yet. Typically what we do is that we wait until the results of the written submissions come in because that may help focus where we want to put our efforts for any additional advertising or even if additional advertising is required at that time.

I guess, Mr. Chair, that's my presentation. If the committee has any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

The Chair: I'll bet you there's at least one.

Kent Hehr, I'll ask you again first just because you're on the phone.

Mr. Hehr: No.

The Chair: Then we'll defer to your colleague, who is ready for his question.

Mr. Chase: Just with regard to advertising and potentially a free or a less expensive proponent. You'll capture the various individuals who are electronically engaged through the website. You'll capture those who prefer the print through the various weeklies, the 98, *Vue* and *Fast Forward*, which is wonderful. Had there been any thought of capturing the sort of more visually oriented types, like through Shaw and their rolling advertisements or some other type of public announcement potentials through the various TV stations?

Ms Sorensen: We didn't include that, and it's not that we won't be able to reach them. I'm just not certain that we have the budget to engage in television; however, I could look into some cost options for that.

2:00

Mr. Chase: That's where I was coming from: under the public announcement kind of thing, where CBC, for example, has a portion of free public. I'm not suggesting that we lay out expense on TV or radio, but if there's a public announcement portion to it, we could possibly defray the expenses and further get that message out.

Ms Sorensen: Absolutely. Mr. Chair, if I may. I think what you're referring to are the community calendars and things like that. We can certainly approach them. There's no difficulty with that. They're very similar to news releases in that if the station feels that it's coming a little bit too close to advertising, they probably won't run it. However, if we can word it more as public information, then we might have a chance.

Mr. Chase: Great.

The Chair: I would expect that common sense would dictate that you would be free to explore that possibility.

I think, Mr. Chase, it's fair to say that good or bad, right or wrong, groups in that situation may have their own criteria on it. If it's a fundraiser for cystic fibrosis versus something the government is doing, they'll make up their own mind, but if they don't have the information, they can't. Considering that it is about classification of films, et cetera, that medium might – might – be interested in this. So I don't think we need to be shy about approaching folks who might see it on a screen for free in addition to whatever.

But you need some guidance as to where we're actually going to go with this. Are there other questions or comments? Was there anything else that you wanted to add?

Ms Sorensen: Just, Mr. Chair, if I may, if the committee is essentially supportive of the entire document, I would be looking for a little bit of direction that would give me the ability to work directly with the chair and/or deputy chair simply for approvals. Because of the weeklies' deadlines for submissions we would have to be getting this advertising out this week, and I don't know that that leaves enough time to come back for a committee meeting. With other committees we've been just working directly with the chair and/or the deputy chair to get approval on those.

The Chair: Okay. Good.

Mrs. Sarich, right. You were on the list, weren't you?

Mrs. Sarich: Yes. Thank you very much. Just before we get to the direction piece, I was just wondering. On page 2, the information piece, where it says, "Communications can provide the Committee with measurement statistics," I'm wondering if we could roll that right in and that would be information supplied to the chair, given the tight timelines for rolling out the weeklies, dailies in terms of the advertising. I think that information would be important in helping decide where the emphasis should be and working that information very closely with the chair's role over the coming weeks for the advertising piece. That would be my recommendation at this point.

Second point, I guess, on the direction piece. If there's no other comment, I don't have any problem supporting directly to the chair for making those decisions over the coming weeks for the advertising piece with that information.

The Chair: The truth is that there wouldn't be a whole lot of decisions to be made if we agree to this document. I guess that's really the question.

Mrs. Sarich: Yeah.

The Chair: I thank you for your comments and recommendation. Perhaps we'll have that worded in a motion soon.

But to give you some of the direction that you do need, I see numbers on page 2. Just so that we make sure that everybody completely understands this, the rough estimates, if you're looking at the same piece of paper as me: the weeklies would be in the neighbourhood of \$23,000; the dailies would be in the neighbourhood of \$6,500.

Why don't we ask: are people comfortable with that amount of money for the weeklies and that amount of money for the dailies, and/or do you have any other questions or suggestions? Because we want as many people across this province to know about this as humanly possible, and we also want to take care of the public purse. So if you believe this is a wise investment for just under 30 grand to get as many people in the know and/or active as possible, then we'll pass this. If you have thoughts or reservations, then I'd like to hear them.

Mrs. Sarich, back to you.

Mrs. Sarich: Yes. Just one point for clarification, which would be included in the rough estimates would be others. That's the opportunity to do placement for free advertising, given the correct messaging, if those opportunities exist, to keep, I guess, the dollars in check so that you're not going to go too much over the \$29,500 in looking for other opportunities. You've got a combination of

weeklies, dailies, and others, that would be free opportunities for advertising should there be those opportunities presented.

Ms Sorensen: Absolutely. I can even amend the draft document to incorporate the community calendars and any other free opportunities.

Mrs. Sarich: Yeah, and any others.

The Chair: Yeah. We won't pass a motion to have the draft communications plan as exactly worded. It's the spirit of it, I think, that we're trying to capture here. Perhaps we could put that on the table and vote on that. Could I have someone move that the Standing Committee on Community Services approve the draft communications plan as presented? Mr. Chase, did you want to make that motion?

Mr. Chase: May I speak to the motion before making it?

The Chair: Well, let's get somebody to move it and then we'll speak to it.

Mr. Chase: Okay. Well, I move that we support the draft recommendations plan.

The Chair: Okay. Before we vote, questions, comments?

Mr. Chase: Just as we're talking about communicating with various groups and my desire to reach everyone, it may sound somewhat simplistic, but groups with auditory difficulties we can reach visually. Then, for example, people who suffer from blindness or varying degrees of blindness: without any major expense if we informed their various representative groups like the CNIB of the intent – blindness isn't a deterrent to the enjoyment of a film for its various possibilities beyond the visual – that wouldn't cost us anything. It's part of my stakeholder/outreach desires, so if I could just throw that in in terms of our outreach, that would be very much appreciated.

The Chair: A point well taken, Mr. Chase. Those who are around the table may have thought of that, may have utilized that resource before for other communications. If they haven't, I would highly suggest that the other committees do the same, whether it's CNIB or a personal favourite of mine, VoicePrint. If you're not sure of what that is, I used to volunteer when I was closer to home a little more often. If I'm not mistaken, everything would be free, and that might be a good way to go as well.

Ms Sorensen: Will do.

The Chair: Good. It kind of sounds like people are fine with the document as presented, including the just under \$30,000. I do want to note – at least I'm seeing it in front of me in black and white – costs are much lower than originally estimated at the June 23 meeting due to reduced line rates and bulk advertising deals. So you've been working hard, and we appreciate that.

Ms Sorensen: Thank you.

The Chair: But we haven't passed it yet. Any other comments or questions? Then I will call the question. All those in favour of Mr. Chase's motion that

the Standing Committee on Community Services approve the draft communications plan as presented, raise your hand or otherwise signify. Mr. Hehr?

Mr. Hehr: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. We're good to go.

Back to something that Mrs. Sarich mentioned earlier. We could word it as a motion perhaps like this: moved that the chair of the Standing Committee on Community Services be authorized to approve the final advertisement copy for publication. Is that the spirit of what you were trying to get at?

Mrs. Sarich: Yes. Part of that communications plan is that the measurement statistics be included so that you'll be able to use good judgment with that. I don't know if it needs to be included in the motion because in the document draft it just says, "Communications can provide." I'm suggesting that you will provide that directly to the chair so that the chair could use your judgment for the advertising pieces and you would have extra information provided by communications. That's all I wanted.

The Chair: Perhaps we could just make sure we have an accurate wording, then. Were you able to capture what it is? That first part that I mentioned – and this is just standard so that we can get our work done – the chair be authorized to approve final advertisement copy for publication. Did you have a chance to write anything down on the rest of it, or do we have recommendations from research on how to phrase that, or, Mrs. Sarich, did you want to just so that we all vote on the same thing?

Ms Rempel: Sure. I mean, I think that the general expectation is that, of course, staff will work with the chair and provide him with any information that he needs to make a good decision for the committee.

The Chair: So you think that the original wording is implicit?

Ms Rempel: I think it is. It's captured.

Mrs. Sarich: The original wording is fine. I can support that and move that.

The Chair: Okay. Well, we have it on the record that we work together and make good decisions based on criteria you've put forward if the rest of the committee is comfortable with that. Anything to add from communications?

Ms Sorensen: No.

The Chair: No? Okay.

2:10

Mr. Chase: I have no problem approving that motion, just a question. I don't know whether it's appropriate now or if I should wait for the motion to be approved, but I'm assuming that any information feedback with regard to the efficacy of the outreach will filter through the chair to the committee members to get a sense as to: did we get our intended value out of the advertising? Or does that have to be captured in a motion? I'm just assuming that it will filter through the chair to the rest of the committee members as the information from stakeholders, whatever feedback we get.

The Chair: I've got a response, but I think the clerk will voice it for me because I think it's the same.

Ms Rempel: Well, I will probably actually let Rhonda comment on this as well if she wants to. But certainly in the past what has happened is communications has put together a report for us

essentially after the fact, once the advertising has run, to let us know, you know, how successful it was.

Ms Sorensen: I really don't have anything to add other than: yes, Jody is right. The web statistics will measure the success of the communications strategies once they've been implemented.

The Chair: So in true all-party spirit it won't even be through the chair; it will be through the people who work for the people of Alberta in the LAO, whether it's communications, research, clerks, or otherwise.

Mr. Chase: Will you be co-ordinating the information that you'll receive from stakeholder groups as well?

Ms Sorensen: Typically the research department does that, but we work with them. We are generally able, or at least last year in the committees we were able, to really determine how much of the public input came from advertising and how much came directly from the stakeholders list.

Mr. Chase: Right. I just look forward to receiving that information.

The Chair: As do we all, I believe.

Then we'll go ahead and have that vote that

the chair of the Standing Committee on Community Services be authorized to approve the final advertisement copy for publication.

All those in favour, say aye or otherwise indicate. All those opposed? Mr. Hehr?

Mr. Hehr: In favour.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. That is carried as well.

I'm very sad to report that we're on item 8, Other Business, ladies and gentlemen. I just wonder if anyone has any or not that pertains to this committee, of course. We all have a lot of business back in our own constituencies. I know that my constituency office is very, very busy. I expect yours is as well, and perhaps you have a family member or friend you haven't seen for a little while.

If we have no other business, then I will remind you that, point 9, the next meeting has been scheduled for a Monday that happens to be September 11, 2008. I know that many of you have already advised Jody of your availability for the meeting and that most of you are able to attend. I'll thank you in advance for coming to that meeting.

I really want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for being here. I know a lot of people think that when we leave the Legislature in the so-called spring, even though it was well into June this year, and we go back in the fall, nothing really happens in between. If you're on two, four, six, eight, or 10 committees like I am, then that couldn't be further from the truth. So I want to thank you for taking the time away from your many other duties to be here today.

I'll especially thank the three substitutes in for today. If you have substituting, scheduling changes for September 11, please make sure you let Jody know.

We do need one last motion, that does not need to be seconded, and that is that the meeting be adjourned. Who would like to move? Oh, Arno was waiting to do one. Let's get Arno Doerksen down. All those in favour? I don't know if you're allowed to oppose, but anyone opposed?

Thank you, and we'll look forward to the next meeting. Have a safe, happy summer in the meantime.

[The committee adjourned at 2:14 p.m.]

