



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 27th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Health

Freedom of Information and Protection
of Privacy Act Review

Monday, July 19, 2010
9:02 a.m.

Transcript No. 27-3-7

9:02 a.m.

Monday, July 19, 2010

[Mr. McFarland in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order and ask that we introduce ourselves for the record. I would also ask that those members substituting for a committee member today indicate for the record who they are substituting for. I'd like to start on my left.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Karen Sawchuk, committee clerk.

Dr. Sherman: Raj Sherman, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Mr. Quest: Dave Quest, Strathcona.

Ms Friesacher: Melanie Friesacher, communications consultant, Legislative Assembly Office.

Ms LeBlanc: Stephanie LeBlanc, legal research officer, Legislative Assembly Office.

Dr. Massolin: Good morning. Philip Massolin, committee research co-ordinator, Legislative Assembly Office.

Ms Lynas: Hilary Lynas, Service Alberta.

Ms Mun: Marilyn Mun, assistant commissioner with the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Mrs. Kamuchik: Louise Kamuchik, Clerk Assistant, director of House services, LAO.

Ms Blakeman: I'm usually taller, and my name would be Dr. Kevin Taft, but it's actually Laurie Blakeman because I'm subbing in for him. So I'd like to welcome with an extra big welcome each and every one of you to my rain-sogged, soaked, wonderful, fabulous constituency of Edmonton-Centre.

Mr. Vandermeer: Tony Vandermeer, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

Mr. Dallas: Good morning. Cal Dallas, Red Deer-South, substituting for Verlyn Olson.

Mr. Lindsay: Good morning. Fred Lindsay, Stony Plain.

Mr. Elniski: Doug Elniski, Edmonton-Calder, substituting for Fred Horne.

Mr. Rogers: Good morning. George Rogers, Leduc-Beaumont-Devon, substituting for the Member for Highwood, George Groeneveld.

Ms Pastoor: Good morning. Bridget Pastoor, Lethbridge-East and deputy chair.

The Chair: I'm Barry McFarland from Little Bow, chair of the committee.

Members should have copies . . .

Mrs. Forsyth: And I'm Heather Forsyth.

The Chair: I'm sorry, Heather.

Heather, if you run across anything that you can't hear very clearly, could you just at the appropriate time let us know if there is too much noise or distraction that it isn't coming through clearly?

Mrs. Forsyth: I will do that, Mr. Chair. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you. Sorry about that.

As I started to say, all of the members should have copies of the revised meeting agenda and supporting documents, which were updated and posted to the internal committee website on Friday. If anyone needs copies of these reading materials, would you please let Karen know right now? Very good.

Item 2, the approval of the agenda. Are there any items that the members would like to add to the agenda under Other Business? If not, I'd entertain a motion that the revised agenda for July 19 for the Standing Committee on Health be adopted as circulated.

Mr. Rogers: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rogers. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The actual July 7 meeting minutes. Have members had a chance to review this? Are there any questions, errors, or omissions? If not, I'll entertain a motion that they be adopted as circulated. Mr. Lindsay. All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Item 4, the business arising from the minutes of the last meeting. The Minister of Service Alberta in response to questions at the July 7 meeting: the copies have been provided to us. If anyone has any questions.

Ms Blakeman: Copies were indeed supplied although not necessarily answers. I had asked specifically what other resolutions had been sought, and the answer that I'm given is that the solution resides in the FOIP Act. So on the record I take it from the minister's office, then, that no other resolutions to these particular issues were sought. Can anyone confirm or deny? Anybody?

Ms Lynas: Well, I don't know whether the Métis settlements ombudsman's office has looked at other solutions or not. Our understanding of the issue is that the issue is an access issue. You know, because the office is covered by the FOIP Act, individuals can make an access request. Then following the rules set out in the FOIP Act for access is what is causing the problems for that office, so they have asked that the fix be made in the FOIP Act.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you for that. My question was specific to what resolutions the government had sought. I take it, then, given your answer, that no other possible resolution was sought, that the government is standing firm; it just wants the act changed. Yes. Okay.

Thank you.

The Chair: Any other comments or questions?

Then if that's just for information, we'll move on to item 5, the committee research. With respect to written submissions, the summary and analysis, I'd like to turn this over to Ms LeBlanc to lead us through the document. Then I'll open the floor to questions from our committee members.

Ms LeBlanc: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The LAO research section has prepared a document that summarizes the written submissions and provides an analysis of some of the more common issues raised in

the submissions. In the summary section of the document comments from submitters are usually quoted but are sometimes paraphrased. The excerpts from the submissions are categorized according to their subject. The document is not intended to be a comprehensive review and does not capture all of the recommendations of each submitter.

The majority of submissions dealt with the access to information side of the FOIP Act as opposed to the protection of privacy. There were many comments received regarding fees for access to information. Another popular topic was the timelines for public bodies to respond to access requests. The timelines for the commissioner to complete reviews were also an issue.

In the analysis section of the document eight popular issues were chosen for discussion. Although these issues were raised by several submitters, they may not be key issues in the committee's view following their deliberations. The research section can provide further analysis if required on the issues that the committees finds to be most pertinent.

The committee received a total of 35 written submissions. Approximately half of the total submissions were received from organizations that are public bodies under the FOIP Act. Twenty of the submitters are based in Edmonton and area, six in Calgary and area, eight in other locations, and one submitter's location was unknown. The chart on page 27 of the document breaks the submitters down into various categories, the largest of which is municipalities.

Appendix B has a list of the submitters asking to appear and willing to appear if the committee holds public hearings. We've also been told that in addition to those groups listed in the appendix the B.C. Freedom of Information and Privacy Association has made a request through Service Alberta to appear before the committee.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks, Ms LeBlanc.

Any questions for her?

Thanks again for the overview.

9:10

Ms Blakeman: Excuse me.

The Chair: Yes. I'm sorry. I didn't see your hand.

Ms Blakeman: Thanks very much. Just to recap, then. What I heard the individual say was that the most popular topics had been comprised for our review, but that doesn't comprise all of them, and there was no opinion offered as to which were the most important. Is that correct?

Ms LeBlanc: That's right. We just picked some of the issues that were most frequently commented on. We didn't select any issues that we thought were important because that's for the committee to decide.

Ms Blakeman: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

Mr. Rogers: If I may, Mr. Chairman, to Ms LeBlanc, if I heard you correctly, the summaries indicated that most of the respondents dealt with the issue of access to information and really very little on the focus of protection of privacy. So it seems to me that most of what we're hearing from our public says, I would take it, that they're fairly comfortable with the protection of privacy that's afforded in the act.

Ms LeBlanc: Most of the submissions did comment on the access

to information side. There were issues about the exemptions, exceptions, and then as well the process to access information and to resolve disputes related to access to information. There was a bit of discussion in relation to the protection of privacy about third-party organizations holding personal information, but other than that it was primarily the access to information that was the issue raised in the submissions.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you.

The Chair: Anything further?

If not, I think we're going to talk about the additional research requests, then, with respect to the letter that came from Ms Notley, dated July 15, 2010, in which she requested additional research to be done to assist the committee in its review of the FOIP Act. I'll now open that one up for discussion. Mr. Dallas.

Mr. Dallas: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Just reviewing the request, at first glance these seem to be reasonable requests, but I wondered if our research support could comment with respect to the volume of research that's required to comply with these requests and what timeline might be associated with that.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can respond to that. The first comment I would make is to point out that these issues have all been raised in the submissions. In terms of the timeline to fulfill the request in terms of preparing a national interjurisdictional comparison, that is a significant amount of work. It would take probably at least three weeks, probably a little bit longer, to prepare a document containing, you know, a comparison on each of these issues.

The Chair: Mr. Dallas.

Mr. Dallas: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Appreciating that, obviously, that is a substantial volume of work, if the research feels that they can complete the work within that time frame or four weeks, I would suggest that the committee support that request and would be prepared to make a motion that

the request made by Ms Notley be complied with and the research presented back to the committee.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, that time frame, then, fits?

Dr. Massolin: About a month? I do know, Mr. Chair, that the next meeting is in early September, so I think that time frame would allow us to complete this request.

The Chair: Having heard Mr. Dallas's motion, then, discussion?

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification, if I may, to Dr. Massolin. Then if I heard you correctly, sir, this request fits within the scope of what you've been doing. It just provides you, if we pass this motion, a little bit more time to specifically focus on this comprehensive list. Is that correct?

Dr. Massolin: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I don't know what you mean by comprehensive list.

Mr. Rogers: Well, again, I'm just substituting, so I've tried to bring myself up to speed as much as possible, but my understanding is that this request is for additional information beyond the summaries that have been provided so far.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. My understanding is that it's a request to see

what's happening in other jurisdictions on this issue. For instance, on the timeline issue what do other jurisdictions do? What is their time frame? Do they have a time limit? What's the extension period, that sort of thing? So it's a matter of just seeing how Alberta's act compares to other jurisdictions in these regards. I think that's in line with the issues that have been raised in the submissions.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you. In essence, it would just provide a little bit more comprehensive meat, for lack of a better term, to what we've garnered so far.

Dr. Massolin: Well, Mr. Chair, in my view, I think this enables the committee to have more information on which to base its discussions, its deliberations on what to do with some of these issues.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you.

The Chair: Ms Pastoor.

Ms Pastoor: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't want to cloud the motion, and I don't want to add anything more to this request, but I guess my question would be: while you're doing these interjurisdictional comparisons, do you compare budgets, and do you compare staffing?

Dr. Massolin: Well, I don't think that that was the intention, but I think, Mr. Chair, we can attempt to include that in the information we provide to the committee if that's what the committee desires.

Ms Pastoor: I think that would probably have to be a different motion. Would it?

The Chair: Well, I'm not totally sure.

Ms Pastoor: I'm piggybacking off Rachel's letter, but there is a motion on the floor. I don't want to cloud that, but I would like that information.

The Chair: I'd ask the mover of the motion to make a comment here.

Mr. Dallas: Well, maybe I could ask a question that might be difficult to answer. I guess that at the outset my thought is that we should treat that as a separate motion. The reason is that I would be cautious about making comparisons with respect to budgets and staffing given that the way these services might be performed in other jurisdictions might not necessarily align with other related legislation in those jurisdictions.

I guess what I don't want to see at the end of the day is a report that compares budgets and staffing levels and that type of thing, that really ends up to be an apples and oranges comparison, and that the committee contemplate decisions on the basis of information that's difficult to compare. I don't know to what degree that could occur, but that would be the cautionary note that I would have with respect to that. We have a fairly straightforward request for research here that I think is reasonable and would provide good information to the committee. I guess that's the nature of my motion, and I'd like to see us proceed and deliberate that motion, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Ms Pastoor, and then we'll take another comment.

Ms Pastoor: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with the last speaker and the mover of that motion. Let's get that motion forward, and then I'll bring a different motion forward.

The Chair: Very good. Just for clarification, Dr. Massolin, this comparison takes into account that our legislation is totally different, totally separate, and a different jurisdiction than any other. It's simply going to be a comparison for information of what's happening in other jurisdictions. Is that correct?

Dr. Massolin: Yes, Mr. Chair. We'll be mindful of the differences in the legislation, certainly.

The Chair: I'm sorry. We've got one more question here. Mr. Lindsay.

9:20

Mr. Lindsay: Thank you, Chair. I support the motion as well. I think it's always good to check what other jurisdictions are doing. The only concern I have with the motion is a lack of a timeline. I think we should specify that the research should be completed by our September 2 meeting to ensure that we don't get delayed in our process.

The Chair: Would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Mr. Dallas: I sure would.

Ms Blakeman: Sorry. Can we back it up so that we have enough time to read it before the meeting? If it's not due until the meeting, we don't have time to read it.

The Chair: If I were to suggest, while our committee clerk is checking this out – Dr. Massolin, I see you might have a comment to make.

Dr. Massolin: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair. In terms of a timeline, in order to allow the committee time to read the report, I would propose that we could have this research done by the 27th of August, which is a Friday, which would give about a week for the committee to read the document.

The Chair: Is the 27th adequate for the members? Ms Blakeman, are you thinking a couple of days earlier?

Ms Blakeman: I'd prefer it earlier because then you can get at it in smaller chunks, but I will bow to the wisdom of the research department.

The Chair: Let's give them a second to have a little conference and see if they can come up with any – is the 25th possible?

Dr. Massolin: Yes. We can try for the 25th, certainly.

The Chair: Is that agreeable to committee members?

Ms Blakeman: Yes. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Very good. Then the amended motion would indicate that

this cross-jurisdictional comparison be provided to the committee by August 25 in preparation for the September 2 meeting.
Is that adequate?

Mrs. Forsyth: Agreed.

The Chair: Thanks, Heather. Everyone else in favour?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Good.

Now Ms Pastoor.

Ms Pastoor: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to, I guess, put into a motion the information that I would like from the interjurisdictional comparisons, which would be the budgeting and staffing. I'm not sure that it's really apples and oranges because I think, as we go into other jurisdictional areas, it always is apples and oranges. We don't always do everything the same, and their time frames are going to be different than what ours are. Some are longer, some are shorter, some have extensions, and some don't. I think that that would also affect how effective or not effective they are and how they can meet their deadlines.

I think that a budgeting and staffing comparison would be interesting. I guess my question to research, Dr. Massolin, would be: is that really onerous, or is that type of information going to come up automatically when you look at interjurisdictionals?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, I think that information would be available, but I would request that the committee perhaps consider that we use our judgment as research staff to pick the jurisdictions that are more comparable to Alberta in this regard. I'd offer that to the committee.

The Chair: Bearing in mind again – I may be repeating myself – that it is our jurisdiction, it is our legislation, and I wouldn't want anyone thinking that because we have numerous other jurisdictions, we're going to suddenly start tailing ours into what's being done in other jurisdictions.

Ms Pastoor: No. That certainly wasn't my intent, Mr. Chair. I think it's just a matter of comparisons. Probably it could be called best business practices in any other, you know, review.

The Chair: Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. With all due respect to Ms Pastoor, I really have to wonder if we need to tell these very capable researchers, you know, that kind of fine detail in terms of what they need to put in a comparison that they would bring back before us. I, frankly, don't think this motion is necessary.

The Chair: Any other comment?

Ms Blakeman: If we don't give them instructions, how are they supposed to know what to do?

The Chair: The chair is open to other comments.

Mrs. Forsyth: Mr. Chair, if I may.

The Chair: Yes, Mrs. Forsyth.

Mrs. Forsyth: Thank you very much. I appreciate the comment that Bridget is making, and I also listened intently to the comment that I think Mr. Rogers made in regard to the onerous job that the research staff will have to do. I can only tell you from past experience that they do a wonderful job, and they do well-researched material. I think what Bridget is trying to do is say, "Specifically, this is what we're looking for" instead of having them go all over the map, so I have no problem supporting Bridget's motion in regard to,

you know, comparison on staff, et cetera. I think it just, as Ms Blakeman alluded to, is asking them to be specific instead of all over the map.

The Chair: Well, we do have a motion that's been passed that deals with Ms Notley's request, which is fairly specific, about national and interjurisdictional bodies. If the research people are able to put together ancillary information that comes along as a result of it, I'm quite confident they'll provide that to us. Am I wrong?

Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. As I understand it, the ancillary information, as you put it, Mr. Chair, would simply be budgets and personnel for the more relevant jurisdictions across Canada, and by relevant I mean that maybe the territories and perhaps P.E.I. wouldn't be quite as pertinent to Alberta's situation. That's all I'm referring to, and we can use our judgment in that regard in terms of putting this information together.

The Chair: But you're fairly confident that if the information is available, you'll be able to access it? You don't have to go to great lengths to try to dig it out from some source?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. I think it would be available, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Does that give everyone a little bit of comfort? Any other questions?

Then the motion as presented by Ms Pastoor. Do you want it read back?

Ms Pastoor: Yes, please. I'd love to know what I said.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That the cross-jurisdictional analysis also address budgets and staffing in other comparable jurisdictions.

Ms Pastoor: Yes. Thank you.

The Chair: If available. All in favour? Opposed? It's carried. Thank you, committee.

Now, item 5(b), additional research, has been dealt with.

Ms Blakeman: I'm not sure where it's appropriate to put this, but as I start to work my way through the information that's in front of us, it strikes me that at some point we need to have a discussion about what we think the issues are going to be that we're going to wrestle with. In my reading of what we have so far, they seem to break down into categories of expanding the scope of exceptions, issues of clarification. I think that's where we would need evidence that the act was actually being applied differently, but a number of the submitters have said: well, we need clarification on this issue or that issue.

The issues around access, which include time, money, and the exemptions that are used, like section 24: it's quite clear that better than 50 per cent of the time things are being dealt with in a timely manner and in an accessible, economic manner if we start to look at pie charts and things. Some of the issues that may require more research, I think those ones are a matter of arguing.

9:30

I'm quite struck by the number of requests that the police services deal with. They're dealing with a thousand requests, far and away the largest number. Of the public bodies that fall under this act, they

deal with far and away the largest number. If you look at page 14 of the last available FOIP report, I mean, the others are minuscule compared to this. The police services and commissions are getting by far the lion's share of the load there.

They've also put in a number of requests, and I think that's an issue that needs to be specifically looked at. You know, it's no secret that I always feel that the police are asking for way too much surveillance ability, and they always want to make their own lives easier. Fair enough. It's our job to push back and make sure that we don't allow too much of a police state to creep into place. We're the balancer there. I am struck by how much they are trying to handle, so I think there's an issue there.

There's clearly an issue around third-party storage of databases, which we don't even begin to understand – there are a number of requests to move to harmonize FOIP with PIPA or PIPEDA – and the whole issue of new technology, data sharing, electronic harvesting, e-mails, Facebook, the very fact of electronic records. A number of them brought up IT, the disaster recovery, and how people are trying to get at that information through the back door, basically. So I think we need to explore that new technology area.

I think the question is resolved, but we clearly need to put that on the record, around the sharing of information on integrated programs. I think that the FOIP commissioner talked about that. To my reading of it in the act, it's addressed, but clearly groups still feel that they don't have the freedom to do it.

That's what I've identified as the sort of major issues that we need to deal with. Now, how did the committee see that it was going to be proceeding from this point? Today seems to be about where we ask for further research on things so that we can understand the issues and move forward the next time we meet. That's what I've identified as the issues that we're going to end up dealing with according to what we've been asked to deal with. What now?

The Chair: Well, according to what we discussed back in April, when we were setting out the parameters for time, my recollection is that September 13 and 14, after we heard from the various presenters, we would be discussing just those kinds of issues, Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Okay. So if I want any research done in order to be able to speak intelligently in those September 13 and 14 meetings, now is when I have to ask for it?

The Chair: Well, I would think that between now and the point in time after this meeting when we've decided where, who, and how we're going to hear from the presenters, it's fair ball for you to ask for the information that you're wanting to get from Dr. Massolin and his group.

Ms Blakeman: Okay. I'll ask for it now, then. I think that I can figure out expanding the scope of exceptions. There isn't necessarily more information required. But I think that finding out if there actually is evidence that certain sections need to be clarified because people are applying the act differently does need further investigation beyond what I'm capable of. The different groups have clearly identified that they think there needs to be clarification, so I'm assuming research can pick it up there. What we need to do is go back and see whether they're actually applying the act differently. That tells us if there's a real problem or a perceived problem on their part, and therefore they're hesitating on the way to proceed.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, you took some notes. Have you got a comment?

Dr. Massolin: I think I understand the request, but maybe if I could get it one more time, that would be advantageous for us.

Ms Blakeman: Sorry. Without going through and actually giving you the specific examples, what I started to notice as groupings, which I've put on the record now, one of the groupings was different entities asking for clarification on the act because they felt they could or could not proceed in a particular way. My question is always: well, is it really a problem, or do they just think it's a problem, and they're not proceeding as a result of that? Is there evidence that they're actually applying the act differently? If they are, then we have a problem as a legislative committee that's charged to look at the act. The act is confusing for them, and we need to change it. But if that's not the case, then we don't need to change anything. They just need a refresher course on how to apply the act and move forward.

One of the examples of that is the question of the sharing of information and the silos. For example, there's a group saying and the Minister of Education is on record as saying: we can't go forward on this. But the office of the Privacy Commissioner is saying quite specifically that there is a clause there that absolutely identifies that that's the point of it, to share information of joint programming.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you for the clarification, to the member. I think it's a reasonable request on the one hand. On the other hand, in order for us to be successful in researching this request, I think we would benefit from additional examples. I mean, you've given one in terms of sharing of information and silos, and we can look at that specifically, but if there are other examples, that would be really helpful because otherwise, you know, you're kind of fishing around for something that might not be there or evidence that might not be there.

Ms Blakeman: I'm sorry. I can get you a list. I'd have to go through and pull it out of my notes, and I can't do it this second.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, I would imagine, speaking just in general terms, that everyone here probably can think of one or two. If you're looking for an example, it may be as simple as a school jurisdiction freedom of information officer who makes a decision that pictures of classes that have graduated from a school are contrary to the act and that they must be taken down and destroyed. I know, without trying to embarrass anyone that I might have dealt with, that that ran across our constituency at some point, and quite frankly I was very alarmed that somebody wanted to destroy a bit of history by taking down pictures of graduating classes from grade 9 to grade 12 for the past 50 years and destroying them. It seemed to me to be totally beyond what the act was intended to protect or provide.

Ms Blakeman: I can go through and offer a list back to research.

The Chair: Maybe that'd be the best, Ms Blakeman, if you could or any other member. Mrs. Forsyth, if you've got some of those as well.

Mrs. Forsyth: Yes. Thanks, Chair. I will do that.

Dr. Massolin: Just one other thing. There's another reason for requesting examples here, and it's a practical reason. As you've indicated, Mr. Chair, you yourself can think of one right off the top of your head, and there are probably many, many others. I guess

there's the practical issue of the time frame which we have to research some of these issues. I would maybe make the request of the committee to limit those, just to think of maybe the top few examples in order that we are successful in researching this in the time frame allotted.

The Chair: Right. The committee clerk has made a comment to me that would be probably most helpful to you. If anyone has a list of these examples, would you please forward them to the committee clerk, and then maybe we can put them in groups. You know, they may not be exactly the same, but maybe they follow a theme. Maybe that would make it a little easier to narrow down these items for the research component.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah. I'm happy to. I'm pulling from the submissions that we got. I did take notes as I went along, so I just have to pull that, and I'm happy to forward it to the clerk.

9:40

The Chair: If you will please, committee members, forward those to the committee clerk, and she can share them with research. Okay.

Ms Blakeman: A second area that I would appreciate help on, just to understand the issues, is trying to get to the bottom of what's happening to the police services and commissions and the number of inquiries that they're getting. In '08-09 they had 962 freedom of information requests for personal information and 106 for general information. Over a thousand inquiries out of – I'm just eyeballing it here – less than 2,000, so they had well over 50 per cent. Well over 50 per cent. What's going on there? If we could just get some information about what the heck is going on. It's not clear from their submission requests why and who's requesting. If we can help them here. How do we help balance this issue?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, if I may comment on this one. I'm not sure, you know, what direction the committee wants to go specifically, but I would also offer to the committee that perhaps you might want to ask the organizations themselves. Knowing that we have the public hearings coming up, you might actually think of inviting these organizations and asking them directly.

Ms Blakeman: What a good idea. That would be public hearings. Great. I'm okay with that.

The Chair: Well, I guess that comes back to the comment that was made first that it will all flow. But I think it's imperative that we're going to hear from the presenters. It's probably going to trigger some other questions, and we're going to allow time for some of these questions to be asked of the presenters, too.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah. I'm okay. I think that's a great idea, actually.

My third research area is around the third-party storage of databases, where we're contracting for outside groups to store our information, and how much control we have over it at that point. This was raised repeatedly, more than half a dozen times, in what I read. Clearly, there's an issue about that. I don't quite understand how we could put a lid on it or whether we need to or what we need to explore around this. There was no obvious group to come forward and talk to us in the public hearing. Maybe we need to seek out expert opinion from somewhere. Is there someone out there that could talk to us about third-party storage?

The other one that would be similar to this is the new technology. Is there a group out there that could come and talk to us about new

technology and data sharing and social networking, Internet-based harvesting? I just don't have the expertise to talk about this, and I think we could charge our researchers – it's a lot of work for you guys – is there an expert that we could find to bring in that could just help us get on top of this?

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, a comment?

Dr. Massolin: Well, Mr. Chair, we could endeavour to seek out who might be available and bring that back to the committee for a decision. I don't know what the mechanism would be at that point. I can't say right off, right here and now, but we can research it.

The Chair: We could identify if there have been or if you're aware of any changes in the new technology, as Ms Blakeman has pointed out.

Ms Blakeman: Or experts is what we're looking for.

Given the timelines, could we agree that it would go back to the chair and the deputy chair and the clerk for a decision? Otherwise you've got to wait until we meet again at the beginning of September, which is a huge delay for you.

The Chair: The deputy chair and the committee clerk are nodding their approval to that suggestion.

Ms Blakeman: So if you can pass ideas for experts on in those two areas, the third-party storage and what I'm calling new technology, that would be great.

The Chair: Ms Pastoor.

Ms Pastoor: Thank you. Further to the discussion about third-party storage and, actually, do we control or not control, I think of the instance where, in fact, American firms have set up our – I'm not sure if they've set up our health, but certainly they've set up some of our IT communications and our IT databases. Because of the security act in the States – I've forgotten exactly what the name of it is – home security, or whatever . . .

The Chair: Homeland security.

Ms Pastoor: Homeland security. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

. . . they actually would have access to our information. That would be, I suppose, the FBI or whomever. I think that that's something that should be looked at as well under third-party storage and how we control what we have.

Ms Blakeman: The last time we looked at this, we did insert a section recognizing the implications of the PATRIOT Act. But the FOIP Act specifically, you know, is the government and its public bodies holding information or collecting information. Increasingly, government is contracting out, and that's my issue: how are we controlling this?

There are lots of suggestions in the submissions about, you know, having good contracts to control this kind of thing and that they have to agree to be subject to the same limitations and expectations. But there's also some push-back in that saying: well, in some cases we're dealing with international corporations, and they will not be seen as an employee. End of discussion. So this is an area that we need to get on top of, and we need experts to help us with that, I think.

Thank you for the effort you are about to undertake.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Those were the areas where I felt that I

needed help understanding the issues that have been raised. I'm hoping I'm not the only one this will benefit.

Mr. Lindsay: Just a comment, Chair. I think, again, some of the information that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre is looking for will come forward when we hear from the submitters. A lot of third-party information that's gathered in other countries, certainly, the province of Alberta wouldn't have any control over or could even put legislation in place that would protect that information if it's requested when you're crossing the border into the United States, for example. They seem to have more history on us than we certainly have here in Canada. Although it may be a concern, it would be interesting to hear what the submitters have to say, and maybe that will put it into context.

The Chair: Thanks for the comment. I know there were some comments made that I think if the general public just heard for the very first time, Ms Blakeman, it might alarm the heck out of them. You know, it would be nice to clarify how much of that is fact and how much isn't, so maybe Service Alberta would be able to help us a little bit in that direction as well, in clarifying what is contracted out, if any. I'm new to this as well, you know, so when I hear those kinds of comments, it's brand new to me. But let's make a conscious effort if it becomes part of the research to have a discussion about it; that's for sure.

Ms Blakeman: Good. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Could we now move on to item 6, the oral presentations. There are a couple of items, as you might see on our agenda, the first one being invitation to submitters and/or a call for presentations. There was a comment made on how many presenters there were willing to make a presentation. The second part we'll deal with is scheduling of the public meetings, the location, and the meeting format.

I would suggest that the committee first decide if it wishes to hear only from those people or organizations who indicated in their written submission their interest in making an oral presentation or if we want to advertise the scheduling of public meetings and invite the public to be present. I think those are two things that we might want to discuss at this point.

Mr. Elniski.

Mr. Elniski: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question with regard to the stakeholder organizations that have submitted that said that they would be requesting is: would it be our expectation that they're going to do an oral presentation on their written presentation, or are we going to allow them to go in other directions as well?

The Chair: I'm open to comments here, but I was hopeful that a public presenter would not simply come here and rehash what they've already given us in written form; more highlight what their main concerns are and give us an opportunity to have some dialogue with them.

Mr. Elniski: Excellent. Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: That's my personal hope. Anyone else have a comment? Ms Pastoor.

9:50

Ms Pastoor: Thank you. In light of the comments made by the Member for Edmonton-Centre and the comment replied from the

research that suggested that we actually ask the questions when the people are here, I don't see that the Edmonton Police is on this list, and they might be one that we would want to ask to come.

The Chair: Is there any objection to that? Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know. Again, I'm speaking as not a permanent member of this committee, but unless we're going to reopen the process and beat the bushes to get everybody here, I don't know why we would single out particular organizations and say, "We'd like you to come," but then not single out others. So I'd just raise a little caution in terms of us deciding who we think of, beyond who has already indicated an interest in coming, that we start saying: well, we'd like to have you but not you. I just throw that out, some caution.

The Chair: Okay. Comment made.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you very much, Mr. Rogers, for your caution, but I think we have identified an area. I'm presuming that any of the police services or commissions that submitted would welcome the opportunity to appear before us and clarify, as we have identified that they're dealing with an enormous number of requests. I'd like to be able to help them there, but I need to get a better understanding of whether it's a real issue or not. I appreciate that they didn't put themselves on the list, but I guess all we can do at this point is contact them and say: we're interested in hearing from you, and we invite you to come. If they say no, then I guess that settles it, and we will make our own decision based on the information that's in front of us.

Mr. Lindsay: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I think there are two ways to get clarification or additional information. Number one, if any of the submitters have put something before the committee that we want to have more information on, we can certainly request that in writing or invite them to come before the committee. So I think there are two options there. But, again, I think we'd have to be specific as to what exactly we're looking for.

In regard to the police and the number of requests that they get, that certainly doesn't surprise me when you consider the nature of their business and the fact that investigations always involve lawyers, and they're always making requests to prepare their cases. So it's not a surprise at all. But, again, we should hear that from the police jurisdiction.

The Chair: I appreciate the comment from the former Solicitor General. That means quite a bit. I appreciate also that you've more or less identified that in the case of Ms Blakeman if quite a large number of issues have come up as a result of the commission, then the committee could very well ask that specific group to come in and have a discussion and answer some questions. I think it's more along Mr. Rogers' cautionary note that we just want to be careful that we don't start taking a very small cross-section and asking them to come in to clarify something.

Mr. Lindsay: If I could just expand on my initial comments. Again, the Member for Edmonton-Centre mentioned the, quote, police state, which is quite a popular phrase today. Again, it's probably prudent to bring those people in to explain the reasons for the requests. When you look at the sophistication of organized crime in Canada and internationally, I'm sure that's what's behind some of the requests for additional information and the sharing of information between jurisdictions. So, again, I think it would prudent to hear from them.

The Chair: Thanks for that. I think I hear, basically, a consensus that we're going to ask those people who indicated – I'm sorry. Ms LeBlanc.

Ms LeBlanc: In addition to those seven submitters requesting to appear, also the four officers of the Legislature indicated that they would be pleased to appear if they would be of assistance to the committee. We were also told that the B.C. Freedom of Information and Privacy Association also wanted to appear even though they didn't indicate that in their submission. So there are the four officers of the Legislature as well as the B.C. FIPA group.

The Chair: Could I have a clarification? Why would we be listening to the B.C. group as opposed to somebody else?

Ms LeBlanc: I think in their submission they may have indicated that they had received some funding from an Alberta organization to prepare the submission.

The Chair: Interesting. I don't know what that has to do with this review. I really don't.

Ms Blakeman: They were pretty thorough. I don't see a need to have them appear before the committee for additional clarification. They were very thorough. I'm quite satisfied with their written submission.

I also haven't seen significant issues come up around the four officers of the Legislature, so I wouldn't require to see them, but others may.

Out of the list that are willing to appear if requested, I would be interested in hearing from the Alberta Universities Association because they had a number of issues that were a little different in some ways. I'd be interested in hearing from them, but I think the others on that list who may appear or are willing to appear are clear.

The Chair: Thank you.
Ms Pastoor.

Ms Pastoor: Thank you. My question would be to Dr. Massolin. Is there any connection with TILMA now or in the future that would be coming under that TILMA legislation?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, that is an interesting question. We would certainly have to research that before we could provide an answer.

Ms Pastoor: I'm just wondering if that was why B.C. was so interested, because of the TILMA connection.

Dr. Massolin: No. They didn't mention that.

Ms Pastoor: Okay.

The Chair: All right. Committee Clerk, you've got some information that we need to decide upon here, and I think it has to do with the schedule and so on. Please comment.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There are actually two items that the committee could consider. We've got three dates set aside: September 2 and 3, which are a Thursday, Friday, and then the following Thursday, September 9. Whether the committee wanted to hold public meetings in Edmonton only or have one date in Calgary: you know, if the committee chose that, it could be that we sat in Edmonton on the 2nd and the 3rd; then the stand-alone date,

September 9, we could be in Calgary. That's totally at the discretion of the committee.

The other issue is: how would the committee like to conduct their public meetings? Do you want 15 minutes presentation, 15 minutes questions, some other time mix? It's another issue that the committee has to decide on.

We do need to have an ultimate decision on who from this list on this appendix we want to invite to appear and which ones we'll be declining.

Three issues, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Forsyth: Mr. Chair, if I may?

The Chair: Yes.

Mrs. Forsyth: I'm just going to comment on the dates because I think the committee clerk and the people that are working on this will determine the best time possible. It was indicated 15 minutes. I like the idea that was presented in regard to Edmonton September 2 and 3 and possibly Calgary September 9. The reason I like that suggestion is that somewhere somebody had mentioned that there were 20, I think, submissions that came from Edmonton, six from Calgary, and, if I recall, eight from somewhere else. While the somewhere else wasn't identified, there is no question that we have to have probably, I would suggest, two days in Edmonton. I notice when you flip through here the people that wanted to request in Edmonton, specifically one was noted at no expense to her. So I'm okay with the dates that were suggested by Karen.

The Chair: Thanks for that, Mrs. Forsyth.

I need a clarification and a sense from everyone here. It would appear that we've got 11 potential presenters.

10:00

Ms LeBlanc: As well, those additional two that I just mentioned.

The Chair: Okay. Thirteen.

A lot of times half an hour is an awful lot. At some point you just start repeating. I don't know if we're planning on very short meetings – and this is just a personal observation – but would we not be able to do all of these in two days, 13 presentations? There is an expense to having all the staff and everyone move and get set up, go to another location, whether there are, from the looks of it, two there and two from other parts of the province.

Mrs. Forsyth: I'm fine with that also, Chair, with two days in Edmonton. There's nothing stopping presenters from Calgary getting on the phone like I have. Actually, *Hansard* has done a good job.

The Chair: I just missed something here. Sorry, Mrs. Forsyth.

Mrs. Forsyth: Oh, I'm sorry. You were suggesting that there are 13 potential presenters and it possibly could be done in two days. Then you alluded to the expenses. What I am suggesting is that we could have two days in Edmonton on September 2 and 3 or September 2 and 9 or 3 and 9. I really don't care. If there are people that want to present from Calgary – and I'm looking at one of the exceptions, where she said no expenses – there is nothing wrong with somebody dialing in on the telephone conference call and making a presentation.

The Chair: Okay. Are you suggesting that for those from outside of Edmonton, throughout the rest of the province, maybe a teleconference is a good alternative?

Mrs. Forsyth: That's one option for them if you're looking at expenses, as you alluded to, because of staff and everything, everyone having to go to a different city.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you for that.

Ms Blakeman: Well, one of the other things we've done is ask for experts to be able to come to us. We could schedule time for the experts to be in as part of that time we've already set aside. So that we don't end up with additional meetings, put the experts in as part of these three days.

The Chair: They can come, but they're not presenting.

Ms Blakeman: We could schedule the experts in as part of the three days that we're looking at here or put them at the end of the row. I mean, these issues are complicated, so I think it's appropriate to allocate half an hour. If we go short, we're not going to go that much short. I just think that the experts that we've asked to come to us and explain things should be incorporated into these public presentation times, not outside of that so that we'd have to meet again.

The Chair: The experts you're referring to, as an example, would be the Edmonton Police Commission, if that were the case, Ms Blakeman?

Ms Blakeman: No. It was specific to the third-party storage and the new technology.

The Chair: Okay. But that's assuming a lot of things. It may well be that research comes up with the information, and it's self-explanatory, and we don't need to interview those people.

Ms Blakeman: To that I'd say: wahoo. But it also leaves us time that if they can't find it or can't write it in a paper and they think an expert should appear, then we can put him in there.

The Chair: Okay.
Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Lindsay: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a comment. I agree with your suggestion that we probably could wrap this thing up in two days, possibly one day in Edmonton and one day in Calgary. Then if we require, after we hear the submissions, some comments from some experts, whoever we identify as requiring further information from, we could do that at a follow-up meeting. I wouldn't see any benefit to doing that before we get through the process of hearing the submissions.

The Chair: I'd like the committee clerk to make a comment on something that we might want to consider.

Mrs. Sawchuk: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess the one issue is that if the committee decided to advertise, you know, as a public meeting, inviting oral presentations, then it's a whole new ball game because you could in fact have other parties showing up, as a true public meeting, providing access to the public. It's what the committee needs to decide.

Ms Blakeman: When we set out upon this, we were quite clear when we did the original advertisements that we would ask people if they wish to be part of a public hearing process. I think if we review *Hansard*, we would see that this discussion has already happened and that we really didn't intend to throw this wide open. I think that we deal with the people – we had a process in place, we should stick to the process. We offered in the original advertisements: if you're interested in speaking to us, do a written submission and indicate you want to come back and speak to us or that you might be willing to if we had additional questions. Let's stick with that. I would not open this up to a free-for-all public hearing.

The Chair: Thank you for that.

I just wondered if the committee clerk was talking about making people aware that it's a public meeting, they can come and listen to the oral presentations. Is that what you meant?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Actually, no, Mr. Chair. Well, I mean, it's the committee's decision. I wouldn't expect that the committee would want to incur that expense just for the purpose of saying we're having a public meeting. We have our external website. Anybody can access it. They can get meeting dates from there. They can listen. There's a live audio feed if that's all they're after, kind of being involved from that perspective.

The Chair: Decision time. We need a motion on the books that the Standing Committee on Health schedule public meetings in Edmonton and Calgary, Edmonton only, teleconference – I'm just throwing things out – to hear oral presentations on the review of this act. We've had some discussion. Is somebody prepared to make a motion with respect to the composition of the meetings?

Mr. Rogers: I'm willing to move something, Mr. Chairman. I'll give it a shot. I would move that
the committee invite the list of stakeholders who have requested to appear and that we would also invite the Alberta Universities Association to two meetings . . .

The Chair: I believe they're already on there, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Well, they've said: submitters willing to appear if requested. I'm just reading from this list.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Rogers:
. . . and that these meetings be held on the two dates suggested earlier, two dates in September, in Edmonton, and that participants from outside the Edmonton area be encouraged to participate by teleconference.

The Chair: If they can't attend in person.

Mr. Rogers: Absolutely.

The Chair: Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you. Excellent motion except that we'd agreed that we would contact someone to represent the police services, and that needs to be included on the list.

Mr. Rogers: It was discussed, Mr. Chairman, but unless I missed an agreement somewhere, I didn't get that. I didn't get that, where we made that agreement.

Mr. Lindsay: It wasn't a formal motion; it was consent. I thought we had consent to that.

The Chair: Mr. Lindsay is indicating that he thought there was consent to that, Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you, Mr. Lindsay.

The Chair: So with your permission, we'll incorporate that into the motion. Or do you want it separate?

Mr. Rogers: No, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. Now, was that the Edmonton Police Commission, for clarification?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Edmonton Police Service.

Mr. Rogers: Edmonton Police Service. So what about the RCMP?

Ms Blakeman: They didn't submit.

Mr. Rogers: They didn't submit. Okay. Thank you.

Ms LeBlanc: Just for clarification, would the officers of the Legislature and B.C. FIPA be included in that list? The officers did specifically request to appear, but they didn't make the list.

The Chair: Your words were: if we felt the need to have them here?

Ms LeBlanc: In the case of the officers of the Legislature I believe it was if the committee would like to request them. B.C. FIPA didn't mention anything in their submission, but they made a request through Service Alberta to appear.

The Chair: Okay. Ms Pastoor.

I'm not ignoring it. We're going to get you an answer here.

Ms Pastoor: Actually, it was exactly along those same lines. I knew we had the police department, but I wasn't sure whether we had come to any conclusion. At this point in time I think I would like to hear from B.C., just because they asked. If they are prepared to fund the trip, then clearly it's important to them, at least.

10:10

Mr. Rogers: Well, if I may, Mr. Chairman, B.C. is not included in my motion. I was very specific to my list. Now, we've by friendly amendment added

the Edmonton Police Service.

My list did not include B.C.

An Hon. Member: What about the four officers?

Mr. Rogers: The four officers. Again, I didn't hear any consensus around the table about the officers. Personally, for example, with our Privacy Commissioner, I think it would make sense to hear from that individual. If we decide here as a committee that we want to have all the officers or some of the officers, I have yet to hear that discussion, Mr. Chairman. The motion that I have put forward so far does not include B.C., and that's where I want to leave it.

Mr. Dallas: Mr. Chair, if Mr. Rogers would consider an amendment, I think the inclusion of the officers is an appropriate dialogue, particularly if it were possible to schedule those towards the end of the presenters on the second day. I think there may be some relevant observations or questions that members might like to put to the

officers given some of the discussion that'll happen on the previous day or day and a half of that deliberation. So I think the committee would be well served to include the officers.

The Chair: I'm going to take a chairman's prerogative. Challenge me if you want. We're going to deal with the original motion, and then we will deal with a motion for the four officers, and then we'll deal with the B.C. group by separate motion because we'll go round and round and round. Let's keep it clean and simple.

Mr. Rogers: Including the Edmonton Police Service in my original motion.

The Chair: Okay. The original motion of Mr. Rogers that all presenters, by teleconference if it's available, come here – you're welcome, in so many words – including the Edmonton Police Service, for September 2 and 3. All in favour?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you.

Now somebody can open up the motion or not on the four officers.

Mr. Dallas: Mr. Chair, I would move that for the presentations on September 3 an invitation be extended to the officers of the Legislature to participate with the committee.

The Chair: Not to change it, Mr. Dallas. Is the idea to garner more information if we want to ask questions, or is it to have them present again?

Mr. Dallas: I think to allocate the time in the same manner as for the other presenters. The officers, should they desire to present, would be able to make a 15-minute presentation and then 15 minutes provided to interact with the committee. Should the officers not wish to present, we request that they appear before the committee and that the committee use that time period, should they desire, to dialogue with the officers.

The Chair: Okay. Any questions on Mr. Dallas's motion?
Seeing none, all in favour?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Carried.

Now Ms Pastoor, with respect to the B.C. FIPA.

Ms Pastoor: I think I know where this is going to end up. Anyway, I still would like it on the public record that if someone is willing and wanting to appear before a committee in Alberta and they're willing to pay their own costs to get here, there must be a reason, and they must be interested enough to do that. Therefore, I think that it would be advantageous to at least allow them to present and hear what they have to say.

From my past experience sitting on these kinds of committees, I really feel that the last 15 minutes is probably the most valuable in terms of where we can actually ask questions and get replies from them. There are often things that you've read in their presentations, and something different will come up when they actually make that second presentation, and questions often arise from that. That would be my reason that we would ask B.C. FIPA to present.

The Chair: Thanks, Ms Pastoor.

Two questions on your motion. Mr. Vandermeer, followed by Ms Blakeman.

Mr. Vandermeer: Yeah. I'm kind of curious to see what they have to say and if we can learn from them in 15 minutes to a half-hour where they've made mistakes or something like that. I'm kind of curious to hear what they have to say.

The Chair: Ms Pastoor, not to change your motion, but if they chose to do it by teleconference, is that an option?

Ms Pastoor: Teleconferences are always my last option. I just feel that when you have people in front of you, you get a totally different feeling for how the discussion is going. If that was the last option, then, yes, I could go for that.

The Chair: Well, not to dictate to them but if it made sense to them economically.

Ms Pastoor: Yes. That's always my very last fallback position. I just feel that it's easier to deal with people face to face.

The Chair: Further discussion on the motion? Ms Blakeman waved off.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah. My comment was something different, not on this subject.

The Chair: Then I'm going to call the question. All in favour of Ms Pastoor's motion that

B.C. FIPA be included in the list of oral presenters.
Opposed?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, it was a tie vote, so you have to cast the deciding vote. We had five members voting in favour and five members voting against out of 11. The chair, of course, does not vote on the initial, so it falls to the chair to cast the deciding vote.

The Chair: Well, seeing as how it's a tie vote, I guess we'll go with giving the benefit to Ms Pastoor's request.

Mrs. Forsyth: All right, Barry. Attaboy.

The Chair: As much as I don't want to, Mrs. Forsyth.
Ms Pastoor.

Ms Pastoor: Thank you.

The Chair: Ms Blakeman.

Ms Blakeman: Thank you. If I could just clarify the previous motion, which was around the officers of the Legislature appearing. On page 9 of their submission they offer: "the four Officers of the Legislature named herein would be pleased to have their General Counsel appear on their behalf to review and discuss this Submission with the Members of the Standing Committee." The motion said the four officers, but in their submission they offered their counsel. Who's coming, their counsel or the four officers?

The Chair: The motion was the officers.

Ms Blakeman: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: If somebody wanted something different, they should have specified it in their motion.

Okay. Could we just take a two-minute break? I want to review with you and the committee clerk what other items we have to have finished off here. We're just going to take a two-minute caucus, or whatever we call it.

10:20

Mrs. Forsyth: Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes. I can hear you.

Mrs. Forsyth: Is there anything that I need to hang on the phone for?

The Chair: That's what we were just trying to decide here.

Mrs. Forsyth: I'll call back in two minutes, then.

The Chair: Very good.

[The committee adjourned from 10:20 a.m. to 10:24 a.m.]

The Chair: Committee members, we'll come back to order. We've just got a couple of, basically, housekeeping items. I just want to confirm that the committee will not be advertising for additional oral presentations from the public, so that it's on the record. As much as the wording may have led people to believe, they were given the opportunity to indicate if they wanted to make presentations by a certain timeline. We don't require a motion for that. I gather that we will now be advertising the dates.

Ms Friesacher: Communications would recommend that a media advisory be distributed to Alberta media just notifying them of the details of the hearings and the presenters. As well, we'll post that on the website.

The Chair: And no hearings?

Ms Friesacher: No. Correct.

The Chair: Right. Okay.
Other business?

Ms Blakeman: I just had one clarification. One of the submissions referred to the regulations. I downloaded the act to refer to but not the regulations. Where are they available?

Mrs. Sawchuk: Mr. Chair, I would believe that we could probably – we'll pull them from either the FOIP commissioner's website or Service Alberta's, just provide a link. We'll put them onto both the committee website and the external site if the committee would prefer.

Ms Blakeman: Yeah. Thanks. There was a specific reference to a regulation, and I couldn't find it. If I can't find it, other people can't either. If you could post that to the public website, then I can get it from there.

Thank you.

The Chair: Ms LeBlanc, can you add to that?

Ms LeBlanc: The FOIP regulation is also available on QP Source, the Queen's Printer website.

The Chair: No further items?

The dates of the next meetings, as we've discussed, are Thursday, September 2, and Friday, September 3, in Edmonton. To repeat for those that are listening, the teleconference is an option for those that may not want to travel that far or if the weather is bad or for whatever reason. All of these will be posted on the internal committee website closer to the meeting dates.

If there is no further discussion on any item, I would like to thank everyone for their attendance. We have a formal motion. Mr. Lindsay. We will call this meeting adjourned. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 10:28 a.m.]

