



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature  
First Session

Standing Committee  
on  
Alberta's Economic Future

Tuesday, July 14, 2015  
1:30 p.m.

Transcript No. 29-1-1

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

**Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future**

Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (ND), Chair  
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (W), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (ND)  
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (ND)  
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (ND)  
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (PC)  
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (W)  
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (ND)  
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (W)  
Jansen, Sandra, Calgary-North West (PC)  
Larivee, Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (ND)  
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (ND)  
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (ND)  
Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (ND)  
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (W)

**Support Staff**

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

1:30 p.m.

Tuesday, July 14, 2015

[Mr. Coolahan in the chair]

**The Chair:** Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call this inaugural meeting to order and thank all the members for coming and all the staff for coming. I know it was short notice. This is the first meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. My name is Craig Coolahan. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Klein, and I'm also the chair of this committee.

We'll go around the room for the record to introduce ourselves, starting with the deputy chair. Oh; I will make a comment on this. You don't need to touch your buttons. It's being operated by *Hansard*.

**Mr. Schneider:** Dave Schneider, MLA for Little Bow.

**Mr. Carson:** Jon Carson, MLA for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

**Mr. S. Anderson:** Shaye Anderson, MLA for Leduc-Beaumont.

**Mr. Sucha:** Graham Sucha, MLA for Calgary-Shaw.

**Mr. Horne:** Trevor Horne, MLA for Spruce Grove-St. Albert.

**Ms Larivee:** Danielle Larivee, MLA for Lesser Slave Lake.

**Mr. Taylor:** Good afternoon. Wes Taylor, Battle River-Wainwright.

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

**Dr. Amato:** Sarah Amato, research officer.

**Ms Sorensen:** Rhonda Sorensen, manager of corporate communications and broadcast.

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

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Good afternoon. Maria Fitzpatrick, Lethbridge-East.

**Ms McKittrick:** Annie McKittrick, Sherwood Park.

**Mr. Tyrell:** I'm Chris Tyrell, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** Thank you, all.

A few housekeeping – I'm sorry. Who is on the phone? It's Ms Jansen, Mr. Hanson, and Mr. Hunter. Can you hear us?

**Mr. Hunter:** Yeah, I can hear you.

**Ms Jansen:** Yes, I can.

**Mr. Hanson:** Yes, I hear you.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We can hear you, too.

A few housekeeping notes. I'd just mention that we don't need to operate the microphones as *Hansard* does that for us. Cellphones: please keep them off the desk or at least turn them off if they're on the desk. They may interfere with the signals. The audio of these proceedings will be streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*, and audio access and meeting transcripts are available on the Legislative Assembly website.

One of the purposes of today is to get a motion for telecommuting for these proceedings. Section 6 of the Legislative Assembly Act permits participation in a committee "by means of telephone or other communication facilities that permit all Members participating in the

meeting to hear each other if all members of the committee consent." The committee rooms are equipped to facilitate meeting participation by telephone. Committees have a choice of passing a motion, which needs to be passed unanimously, to approve meeting attendance by telephone for the duration of the Legislature.

So I would suggest that we entertain a motion that permits participation via teleconference during the remainder of the 29th Legislature. A motion to approve teleconference attendance for the duration of the Legislature does not preclude the committee from determining that attendance at a specific meeting is required, and in those cases a motion will be moved at the end of a particular meeting requesting the personal attendance of all members at a subsequent meeting. Would anybody like to move this motion, that is:

For the life of the 29th Legislature the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future permit committee members to participate by teleconference subject to the proviso that the committee may require members' attendance at a particular meeting upon passage of a motion to that effect at a previous meeting.

It was moved by Richard Gotfried. Sorry; what's your constituency, Richard?

**Mr. Gotfried:** Calgary-Fish Creek.

**The Chair:** Calgary-Fish Creek.

All in favour of this motion?

I'm sorry. There is opportunity for discussion. Go ahead.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Yes. I just have a question. Is it possible that it would be video conferencing as well? It's just that I have difficulty with teleconference because I'm hearing impaired, but video conference: when I can see people talking, I . . .

**The Chair:** Maybe Chris or Shannon can speak to that, but I think we're equipped here. I don't know that we are in Lethbridge.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay.

**Ms Dean:** Thank you for the question. Mr. Chair, we're not equipped to carry out that function at this point in time in these rooms. That may be something on the horizon but not before 2016.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other questions, comments?

To the motion on telecommuting, all in favour? On the phones? That did pass unanimously. That motion is carried.

We want to move another motion, on temporary substitutions. Standing Order 56(2.1) outlines the process for substitution of committee members. It reads:

A temporary substitution in the membership of a standing or special committee may be made upon written notification signed by the original Member and filed with the Clerk and Committee Chair, provided such notice is given not less than 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Our committee clerks have templates for you and your legislative assistants upon request. The template is also available online by going to the OurHouse website, clicking on My Committees on the right side of the main page, and then on the Template for Temporary Substitution Letter link. When substitutions occur, it is the responsibility of the original committee member to ensure that the substitute has been provided with all the necessary meeting material, and Members of the Legislative Assembly who are not committee members or official substitutions may attend and participate in the meetings, but they may not vote or move motions.

Actually, I need to step back just for a sec. I think we did something wrong in that first motion. I don't think the people on the teleconference were allowed to vote because we hadn't moved that motion yet. Am I correct in saying that?

**Mr. Tyrell:** Yes, but it was unanimous in the room, so . . .

**The Chair:** It was unanimous in the room, yes, so we can acknowledge that it was unanimous in the room. But going forward now on this next motion, all those online, please vote.

We'll move on to approval of today's agenda. At this point any members that want to add anything to the agenda may do so, including those on the phone.

Okay. If there's nothing to add to the agenda, then I will move that the agenda for the first meeting of 2015 of the Standing Committee on – sorry. The slightly revised agenda should have been distributed to all of you this morning. Did everyone get that? It was slightly altered. The only difference was that we eliminated 4(g). It's already taken care of under 4(d). Does that change anyone's decision? Okay. So if somebody would like to move a motion that we accept the agenda for the first meeting of 2015 of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as revised. Who put their hand up first? That's Wes Taylor.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yeah. Battle River-Wainwright.

**1:40**

**The Chair:** Any discussion? I think we're good. All in favour? On the phones? Good. Thank you. Any opposed? That motion is carried.

We're going to move to item 3 on the agenda, committee orientation. This is our first meeting, so I'd like to provide an overview of the committee's mandate and processes. For specific details we'll rely on Shannon Dean, who is the Senior Parliamentary Counsel assigned to assist our committee as well as the director of House services.

The broad mandate of this committee, the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future, relates to the areas of agriculture and rural development; international and intergovernmental relations; innovation and advanced education; infrastructure; and jobs, skills, training, and labour. The committee may meet to review a bill or to consider an issue referred to it by the Assembly and can also meet on its own initiative to consider issues within its mandate.

At this time we'll turn the floor over to Ms Dean.

**Ms Dean:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on parliamentary privilege because you've just gone through a number of orientations as new members, but I will say this. The powers, rights, and privileges of members and the institution of parliament flow through to the committees of the Assembly. This is a committee of the Assembly. It's distinct from one of your caucus committees or a government committee. It has representation from various parties, as you know, and we've got *Hansard* here recording the meeting. Meetings are typically in public unless there's a decision by the committee to go in camera. Finally, once adopted, the minutes of the committee meetings and accompanying material are made public.

So the three key privileges I want to highlight for you today are, of course, freedom of speech. As you know, as members you have the right to freedom of speech in both proceedings of the Assembly as well as in proceedings of committees of the Assembly, and this right can be traced back to 1689 and the English Bill of Rights. It is also codified in section 13 of the Legislative Assembly Act. In other words, this means that you are free to speak freely in the Assembly

or in a committee meeting without fear of being sued for your comments.

Now, this privilege ties into the second key privilege I wanted to highlight for you, and that is protection for witnesses. Just like you have freedom of speech, any witness that appears before the committee during a proceeding also has freedom of speech, and this is necessary as it provides protection to them to speak freely and free from fear that their comments will be used against them in a subsequent proceeding.

The third point I want to raise is the committee's ability to compel witnesses, otherwise known as the power to summon. Now, this occurs once a committee makes a decision to compel a witness, and the Speaker then issues a warrant. This is set out in Standing Order 69 and section 14 of the Legislative Assembly Act. I have to say that our committees usually do not resort to exercising this power. In fact, our historical records indicate that no committee of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta has ever had to do so. Usually just an invitation does the trick.

I'm going to move on, Mr. Chair, unless there are any questions, to the mandates and the functions of the committees as set out in the standing orders if I may.

**The Chair:** Please.

**Ms Dean:** Okay. So the relevant standing orders are standing orders 52.01 to 52.09. Basically, the committee has a broad mandate and wide-ranging powers. Subject to the restrictions set out in the standing orders and parliamentary convention and anything set forward by a motion of the House, the committee is the master of its own proceedings and its procedures. For example – I'm going to touch upon what the main item of business is for you today, which is your statutory review – there is no prescribed review process for you to follow. It's entirely within your purview to determine how you want to handle this. There are a number of options you can consider. For example, some variables are: what kind of legislation is being considered? Is there broad public interest? Are there lots of stakeholders? Et cetera, et cetera.

Again, the chair will be delving into this more under item 4 on the agenda, but typically you would request that some research be done on the legislation. You would likely want a technical briefing from officials at the outset of your review. At some point in time you may wish to advertise to the public to get their input on the legislation, and you may also wish to seek advice from experts in the area. Whether or not you hold public hearings: that's something for you to determine, and you may want to gauge things, see how things roll out after a number of months. Just throwing those out on the table right now. Again, the chair will go into that in more detail later.

Just to go into other functions of legislative policy committees. Aside from statutory reviews, you may be charged with reviewing a bill that the Assembly asks you to review, and the motion that is passed will set out the timeline for your review. Bills may be referred after first or second reading. If it's referred after first reading, then your review is a little bit broader than a bill that's been referred after second reading. The principle there is that the Assembly has approved the bill in principle at second reading, so the scope is narrower and your report may or may not include recommended amendments to the actual wording of the bill.

Those reviews usually take a number of months. I would say somewhere between three to six months. Now, again, the motion that has referred the legislation before you today, the Personal Information Protection Act, provides for an 18-month review, which is fairly long, so you do have lots of time. But you are

charged with a comprehensive review of both the act and the regulations made under that act, so there's lots of work to do.

Other functions of the legislative policy committees include consideration of estimates. Now, this is something that will be on your plate during the fall sitting once the budget is presented in the Assembly. In your case you will be reviewing the estimates of the departments that fall within your mandate: Agriculture and Forestry, International and Intergovernmental Relations, Innovation and Advanced Education, Infrastructure, and Jobs, Skills, Training and Labour. You are also charged with reviewing estimates of Executive Council. The way the process rolls out is that once the budget is presented, there's also a schedule of committee meetings that is tabled in the House at that time, so you will have a three-hour meeting per department with the exception of Executive Council, which would be a maximum of two hours.

Now, there are lots of details associated with the procedure for considering estimates, but we'll save that for another day given that your immediate task at hand is the statute review. One thing that you should keep in mind, however, is that once the estimates process commences in the fall and in the spring, that process has priority for your committee and you cannot conduct any work on this review, so that may impact your timeline, your work plan, et cetera.

To reiterate, matters referred to this committee by the Assembly take priority over all other matters. You may, if there has been nothing referred to you, look at a subject matter within your mandate on your own initiative. If you do decide to do that, your timeline under the standing orders is six months. Some additional roles for the committee could include reviewing regulations within your mandate, either on your own initiative or at the request of a minister. You also have the annual reports of the various government departments, agencies, boards, and commissions within your mandate permanently referred to this committee, so that's another area you can touch upon.

Finally, one other thing that I want to highlight for you is the standing order requirement for a government response to a committee report, which must occur within 150 days of the tabling of the committee's report, with the exception of committee reports on bills or public meetings.

So that wraps up my synopsis, Mr. Chair, unless there are any questions.

**The Chair:** Any questions for Ms Dean?

Okay. Well, we'll move to (d) under item 3 and introduce you to some of the support staff from the LAO who will help us with all that work that Ms Dean just described to us. We have Chris Tyrell, who is the committee clerk. He's assigned to this committee, and he's here to provide administrative, procedural, and general assistance as required, although he'll be leaving us because he has decided that the Ontario Legislature is a better place to work. I guess I just made that public.

Dr. Sarah Amato, the Legislature researcher, is part of the committee research services team responsible for the research and information needs of the committee as well as drafting of reports as directed. We've met Ms Dean. She provides legal and procedural assistance to the committee as required. Rhonda Sorensen, the manager of corporate communications and broadcast services, provides communications expertise to the committee.

1:50

Okay. Let's move to item 4, which is to talk about our mandate that was given to us through Government Motion 11, to review the Personal Information Protection Act. I'll start by reading the text of Government Motion 11 for the benefit of the committee.

Be it resolved that:

1. The Personal Information Protection Act be referred to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future and the committee shall be deemed to be the special committee of the Assembly for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive review pursuant to section 63 of that act;
2. The committee may without leave of the Assembly sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned or prorogued;
3. In accordance with section 63(2) of the Personal Information Protection Act the committee must submit its report to the Assembly within 18 months after beginning its review, and that report is to include any amendments recommended by the committee.

I don't know if Ms Dean mentioned this, but we're working from July 1 as the date for the – is that correct? Is it July 1, 2015? I believe that's when our 18-month clock begins.

**Mr. Tyrell:** This is when we start our review, so 18 months from today.

**The Chair:** Oh. Eighteen months from today. We just gained two weeks. That's good.

Okay. So (b), the review process. In short, we have, as we say, 18 months to take a look at PIPA as a whole and decide as a committee whether we feel there should be any amendments made to this act or the regulations made under this act. As was sort of alluded to and will be talked to a bit later, we can ask for input, advertise to the public, and I think Chris is speaking to gathering a list of stakeholders in a bit.

Item (c) is consideration of establishing a committee working group. During the 28th Legislature this committee created a committee working group, which met to discuss issues and prepare recommendations to the committee on a variety of topics. This working group is composed of the chair, the deputy chair, and one member of the third party. The idea behind the working group is to make better use of the committee's limited time. The working group would put forward recommendations to the committee as a whole with them having already been discussed to an extent at the working group level by all caucuses represented on the committee. The committee would also have the option of delegating tasks to the working group as it sees fit. Our LAO support staff would make themselves available to attend working group meetings as needed, but the committee will have the final say on all decision items.

Is there any discussion on that, comments?

**Ms McKittrick:** Sorry. Can you just clarify? Comments on what?

**The Chair:** I don't know. I think that's for you to decide.

So around the working committee, I guess, what the purpose of the working committee is. I was trying to describe it there. It's not a decision-making body. It's just to streamline the research and the efforts.

**Ms McKittrick:** So kind of an executive committee?

**The Chair:** If you want to call it that, sure.

**Ms McKittrick:** That's what it sounds like to me, more of an executive committee than a working group.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. I have a comment.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Based on that question, does this mean that as part of this committee we can provide comments to whoever the

representative is from our party, second party, third party, and those comments then go to the working group?

**The Chair:** Yes. Correct.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I think that, as Ms Dean alluded to, too, the process and how we do things is really up to us anyway. It's just that this is the way that this working group was established, with the chair, the deputy chair, and one of the members from the third party. I'm open to discussion on that.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Do we need a motion to establish something different?

**The Chair:** We do need a motion. We're still discussing, but we do need a motion, yeah.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Does that mean we could change the composition of that working committee, so we could say that maybe two people from each party are representatives on that working group or three or whatever?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay.

**Mr. Gotfried:** I have one question here just on some notes I have. Section 63 is referred to, which is that "the Legislative Assembly must [initiate] a comprehensive review of this Act and the regulations made under it . . . by July 1, 2015." Is that of any consideration for us here in that it's July 14 today?

**The Chair:** That's what I was referring to, Richard. I thought that was when the clock started, but I guess it starts now.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Okay. We've been given a couple of weeks.

**The Chair:** I don't know if we want to discuss what that working group looks like now and come to a conclusion. We've done it this way because that's the way it was done in the 28th Legislature.

**Ms McKittrick:** If we don't need to make a decision today, I would just like to think about it and kind of reflect on some of it, you know, that the government has changed and that there may be ways that we might want to make the committee function that is different from what it has been in the past. I'm just open to thinking about it a little bit longer and maybe strategizing on how to do the work of the committee in the most efficient way without being sold on what has happened in the past unless it is prescribed in the standing orders that we do it this way.

**The Chair:** Well, I do think the processes will come together as we move forward. I think the working committee, though, has a good representation in terms that we have a member from the government, the Official Opposition, and the third party.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. I'd like to see more people on the working committee. First of all, I think there's lots of work to be done, and I don't think it should be really put on three people. I think that it would be better if there were a few more people on the committee. Just my thoughts.

**Mr. Carson:** I'm just kind of under the assumption that these three people that are on the working committee, they're going to kind of bring back what their party or caucus has to say to this committee

itself. So in terms of actual work they will be doing, it's more kind of being an ear for their respective party, is it not?

**The Chair:** I suppose that's one part of it. We have to bear in mind, though, that the working committee is not decision-making, right?

**Mr. Sucha:** I'm under the impression that less is more and that if we have too many voices on the working committee, it might cause us to not be able to get as much work done. Whereas we can collaborate with the people who represent our caucus and float ideas off them individually, and then we can bring a concrete idea to the committee when it comes down to it as well.

**Mr. Tyrell:** Can I just make a comment?

**The Chair:** Yeah. Please.

**Mr. Tyrell:** I would just comment that for any recommendations made by the working committee to the committee, there is still the chance to debate those at the committee stage. The working group doesn't make any final decisions; they only make recommendations to the committee. So if there's anything that any other members want to speak up on, the committee would be the place to do that.

**The Chair:** I am in agreement with less is more at this point just because I think it's well represented from all stages. But, I mean, should we find that it needs to change, we can always do that.

Is there any more discussion on that? No.

I'd like to have somebody move, then, that

the chair, deputy chair, and one member of the third party form an ongoing committee working group that will meet to discuss issues and prepare recommendations to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future.

**Ms Larivee:** I move – do I need to say that all again?

**The Chair:** No, you don't.

All in favour? On the phones? That motion is carried.

**Mr. Hunter:** Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Hunter:** The question I have is: when will you decide who the member will be for the third party? Will that be done now, or is that to be done at a future date?

2:00

**The Chair:** I believe we could do that now. I had discussions with the two third-party members. It was concluded back to me that Mr. Gotfried would be that member.

Is that correct, Mr. Gotfried?

**Mr. Gotfried:** That's correct.

**The Chair:** Did you hear that on the phone?

**Mr. Hunter:** Yes, I did. Thank you very much.

**Ms Jansen:** That's correct. It's Mr. Gotfried.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll move on to (d) under item 4, role of departmental officials. The committee may wish to invite the input and technical supports of the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. Their familiarity with the act would likely be beneficial to us during our review. Also quite familiar with the act is Service Alberta, who the committee may wish to invite to play an ongoing role of support in

its review of PIPA. Any discussion on that? We will have to have a motion for that. It's just to insert the help of our department people here.

**Ms McKittrick:** Would you mind repeating that? Sorry.

**The Chair:** Sure. We may wish to invite the input and technical support of the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner – this is to deal with PIPA because they have good familiarity with the act, and it would be beneficial to our review – and also Service Alberta.

So if a member could move that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite officials from Service Alberta and the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner to attend committee meetings and participate when requested to provide technical expertise and request that department officials work in conjunction with the Legislative Assembly staff as required to support the committee during the review of the Personal Information Protection Act.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Okay. Ms Fitzpatrick moved. Any discussion? All in favour? On the phones? Thank you. That's carried.

The committee also has the option of inviting both Service Alberta and the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner to make presentations on the Personal Information Protection Act at our next meeting, which I anticipate will take place in September. This would likely include background information valuable to the committee as it begins to look at the act. We require someone to move that as well. Is there any discussion on that first? Okay. No discussion.

Would somebody like to move that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite officials from Service Alberta and the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner to provide background briefings on the Personal Information Protection Act for the committee at its next meeting.

**Mr. S. Anderson:** So moved.

**The Chair:** Moved by Mr. Anderson. All in favour? Thank you. On the phone? It's carried. [interjection] You're right. I'm sorry. I should have asked. Anyone opposed?

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** To the last motion.

**The Chair:** Did you have an opposition to that motion?

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** To the motion on the composition of the committee.

**The Chair:** Okay. Can we make that on the record, then? Can we go back to that?

**Mr. Schneider:** Can I just ask, Mr. Chairman, of the people that know: are these recorded, the motions? All recorded? I'm not talking about recorded. I'm talking about the names of the people that voted and how they voted. Are they recorded? Or is this a unanimous decision?

**The Chair:** Unless we ask for it.

**Mr. Schneider:** Right. So it wouldn't matter. Forgive me, but it doesn't matter. You should have asked, I guess, if anyone was opposed.

**The Chair:** Yeah. My apologies. That's my mistake.

Can we go back to that? Would you like your name recorded as being opposed to that?

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** I would.

**The Chair:** Okay. So under the motion that the chair, deputy chair, and one member of the third party form an ongoing committee working group that will meet to discuss issues and prepare recommendations to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future it should be noted that Ms Fitzpatrick was opposed to that motion.

**Ms McKittrick:** And me.

**The Chair:** And Ms McKittrick. I'm sorry. So there were two oppositions to that.

We'll move to item (e) under 4, which is research requirements. Our committee has the benefit of being supported by the Legislative Assembly's committee research services. They are available to conduct research for this committee on anything we feel we may need in order to conduct our review of the act. I've been informed that a prepared discussion guide, a draft stakeholders list, and a crossjurisdictional analysis are documents that will greatly aid us in our review. The crossjurisdictional analysis is a bit more involved. It may not be ready in time for the next committee meeting, but it will be ready at some point in the fall.

We also need a motion on that, and the motion is that committee research services be instructed to prepare a discussion guide and a draft stakeholders list for the committee's consideration at its next meeting and a crossjurisdictional analysis for the committee's consideration at a future meeting.

Mr. Horne, Spruce Grove-St. Albert, moved that. Any discussion on that?

**Ms McKittrick:** I was wondering what kind of input we can have before the list is prepared around ensuring that stakeholders – like, if I had names of potential stakeholders and advocacy groups and so on that I wanted included, how could I submit them? To the committee clerk?

**The Chair:** Through either the chair or the committee clerk.

**Ms McKittrick:** So committee members could submit potential stakeholders, because we come across them a lot in our constituencies or groups we've worked with, to the committee clerk before the list comes back to us in the September meeting. Is that correct?

**Mr. Tyrell:** If you do have names that you want added to the list, you could definitely send those to myself or to the chair. Or you have the option of waiting until the list comes out and then seeing if there's anyone else you'd like to be added to that list at that point. The committee would be considering the list; it wouldn't necessarily be adopted right away. There would still be the option to add more names to that list.

**Ms McKittrick:** But it seems to me, like, if we already can think about the kind of stakeholders – because, you know, we come from very different backgrounds – it might just make the work of the committee easier, and your work, if we could already make some suggestions.

**Mr. Tyrell:** If you do have those names prepared, then by all means please do so.

**Ms McKittrick:** Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

So the motion was moved by Mr. Horne on that. All in favour of that motion? On the phone? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

Item (f) under 4 is future considerations for the committee, and the following items are things we will need to discuss at a future meeting. One is public input. That's sort of what you were getting at there. We do have the option to ask the public for input on this bill as part of our review. We can choose to open it up and receive written submissions from the public. We can also invite members of the public to appear before us and make oral presentations. Once the draft stakeholder list is prepared, we can have a discussion on who we want to hear from.

Two is communications issues. Depending on how we decide to proceed on this review, we will have access to LAO communications expertise. They will be available to prepare a draft communications plan for us depending on what we decide is necessary after we've met with Service Alberta and the Information and Privacy Commissioner at the next meeting.

**2:10**

In terms of the timeline for our review, our committee support staff are willing and able to put a draft timeline together for us to look at during our next meeting. We have 18 months to complete the review, but a timeline would help us get a better sense of how long each aspect of the review might be expected to take based on past practices. I'll just note that, I mean, 18 months is our deadline. If we can get it done quicker, that's great, but reviewing parts of the budget that we have to review might hinder that.

We do need a motion on that as well. Is there any discussion prior to that?

Okay. So the motion will be that

the committee support staff be instructed to draft a proposed timeline document for the committee's consideration at its next meeting.

Who'd like to move that? Mr. Carson. All in favour? On the phone? Opposed? Hearing none, the motion is carried.

We can move on to any other business, if anybody wants to bring anything to the committee at this time. Ms McKittrick?

**Ms McKittrick:** Yeah. It would be really helpful for me before we meet in September if I had some background on the issues that were identified, as to why it was referred to our committee. If there was a document, like, that had been prepared by staff or something, that would really help me to get into the beginning of the review. I don't know if such a document exists.

**The Chair:** It's my understanding that it was just our lucky day.

**Ms McKittrick:** Okay. So there isn't. Very often when things are brought to attention, it's because something has sparked it, either something has been found to be problematic time and time again or something. So I would like to have that kind of background to prepare for the review because I know the importance of those acts, having worked with them.

**The Chair:** Right. Yeah.

Go ahead, Chris.

**Mr. Tyrell:** I mean, this review is statutorily required, so it's built into the legislation that someone has to review it by this date.

**Ms McKittrick:** So there isn't a document that has already identified anything? Nothing?

**Mr. Tyrell:** The statute would be the document.

**Ms McKittrick:** Okay. Thank you.

**Mr. Carson:** When we look into getting input from the public, how long of a timeline do we usually give that?

**The Chair:** I think we were talking about six weeks usually. Is that right? Around there?

**Ms Sorensen:** If I could speak to that, Mr. Chair. It's certainly a decision that the committee has some flexibility on. When we take out the ads, we take into consideration when the ads will run, typically a four- to six-week turnaround, depending, again, on the time of year. For example, summer might hinder the timeline a little bit, that sort of thing. But it's up to the purview of the committee.

**The Chair:** And depending on the response, I mean, it could require more.

**Ms Dean:** Mr. Chair, if I may supplement. Just so the committee is aware, I mean, decisions made around advertising obviously have cost implications for the committee, so the degree to which you advertise and how broad the scope is is something that you will have to consider at a later date.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Mr. Chairman, we're talking about costs and things here. Is there a way for us to reach out to the 87 MLAs who may have issues within their constituencies? I'll use examples. I hear about some of the challenges around PIPA with respect to sports teams and schools and things like that that seem to be ongoing. Would it be possible for us to save some money and reach out to our peers to find out if there any submissions or interests or challenges within their own constituencies that they've come across that could be submitted in writing or otherwise to save us some costs but still to reach out across the province?

**The Chair:** I think the short answer on that is yes, but I don't know if that – I think you're asking if that comes from this budget. Is that what you're asking?

**Mr. Gotfried:** To save the budget I think we can communicate internally and allow that process to take place through the MLAs themselves within their constituencies, possibly through some free-of-charge newsletters that some of us can access in our constituencies as well.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Rhonda.

**Ms Sorensen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Certainly, those types of things can be explored, and we can address that within a communications plan that we would bring forward. The more word of mouth that we can get out there, the better, and that would just supplement any paid-for initiatives that we might be looking to gain approval on.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other questions?

**Mr. Schneider:** I just wondered if Chris could tell us what the budget for this committee is, give everybody an idea.

Sorry; go ahead.

**Ms Dean:** It's around \$147,000, \$150,000.

**Mr. Schneider:** Okay. Just so that everybody kind of knew what was going on.

**Mr. Taylor:** So which media do you use? What ways do you communicate that? Do you use Facebook? Do you use newspapers? Do you use mail-outs? What avenues of media do you use?

**Ms Sorensen:** Mr. Chair, if I may.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms Sorensen:** We provide pretty much a menu of everything that we can use. So if we were to do advertising, we have options of doing it province-wide, either through dailies and/or weeklies, hitting all the community newspapers as well, and of course that carries different costs. We look at all the social media avenues. We look at radio, Google ads. Anything that you can think of we will present as an option and then let the committee choose kind of which options that they want to pursue.

**Mr. Taylor:** Okay. Thank you.

**Ms Sorensen:** Oh, sorry. If I may, Mr. Chair. If there are ideas that the committee members have that they would like us to look at that aren't presented, we're absolutely open to that.

**The Chair:** There's also the option for a public consultation where you kind of move around the province, but we have to bear in mind that number that Ms Dean just gave us.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. But public consultation doesn't mean that the whole committee has to go.

**The Chair:** Yes, it does.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** It does? Okay.

**The Chair:** Which is why we have to bear that number in mind again. But we don't know. I mean, when we get through this sort of advertising process, we don't know what the response – we'll have to gauge what the response is like. The example that was given to me last week was the pension reform of last year or two years ago, which was, you know, very contentious and required a lot of travel of the committee. It was very well attended.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. I want to ask again about public consultation. Is that kind of set in stone, that the whole committee goes, or can we provide a presentation where everybody could give it in their own constituency?

**The Chair:** Shannon, can you weigh in on that one?

**Ms Dean:** All of the committee members wouldn't necessarily have to be attendants at a true public meeting of the committee. You'd need a quorum. I mean, certainly, there are other ways that committee members can reach out and solicit input from their constituencies. It doesn't have to be a truly constituted committee meeting.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** That's good.

Okay. We're still on other business. Any other business?

**Ms McKittrick:** I wanted to know if, as we're doing this, we can bring other items for consideration. Is this going to be our sole preoccupation for the next little while, or can the committee look at a number of things at the same time?

**The Chair:** I understand exactly where you're coming from. But yes, it is going to be our preoccupation. It's mandated except when the budget comes. Then that would be our preoccupation.

**Ms McKittrick:** So there's nothing else that we can put on the agenda in terms of consideration around the committee's mandate until we're finished the PIPA review, then?

**The Chair:** Correct.

**Ms McKittrick:** Okay.

**Ms Fitzpatrick:** Okay. But if another motion came forward when session begins in the fall, then it could be, hey?

**The Chair:** But it's already in the act itself where we have to finish that unless something comes from government.

**Mr. Schneider:** Correct me if I'm wrong. I think you told us that they would never have you doing two things at once. Is that what we talked about?

2:20

**Mr. Tyrell:** It's not a common practice. I can say that. Shannon might have some more information.

**Ms Dean:** If there were competing priorities for the committee, I would say that the priority would be set out in a motion from the House as to what should be your first order of business.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Mr. Chair, we've been given 18 months on this study. Maybe if some of the more experienced people here can tell us: is it typical for us to utilize that entire 18 months? Or if we are efficient and still broad enough in our scope, can we conduct this business in a shorter period of time, for example 12 months, and maybe open up the door?

**The Chair:** I'll let Chris or Shannon speak to that, but I would say that it would be great because then we could get to some of these things.

**Mr. Tyrell:** Eighteen months is the maximum amount of time the committee has to complete the review. That's all I would say on that.

**Ms Dean:** I can just supplement. Typically, statutory reviews have a one-year timeline. So this is long, but you are charged with reviewing the regulations as well. But, typically, committees get things completed within their timeline, and I would say that a year is pretty reasonable.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Any other other business? No.

Okay. So I guess all we're left to do, then, is to see if we can land on a date for our next meeting here, and I think we should be looking at sometime in September. I'm going to suggest that I'll send out a few dates for everybody and see what works best. Sound good? Okay.

Is there anything else before we move to adjourn?

Okay. So we need somebody to move to adjourn our first meeting. Mr. Taylor. All in favour? On the phone? Opposed? Meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 2:23 p.m.]





