

Title: Monday, October 15, 2007 PIPA Review Committee

Date: 07/10/15

Time: 9:30 a.m.\

[Mrs. Ady in the chair]

The Chair: I think we'll go ahead and begin because the clock tells me that it's time. I do know that we have at least one more member joining us. I think he'll be here momentarily, and I'm not certain on the other two. One, I know, sent regrets, had a scheduling conflict.

I'd like to thank all committee members for rejoining in what might be our final meeting of this particular committee, depending on how the work goes today. I don't know. We'll see, but for sure we're hitting what I'll call near the end of the process. As we anticipate a sit coming here fairly shortly, it would be nice to know that we can report back under the time that was allotted us to do our work. Anyway, we'll see how today proceeds.

I'm supposed to ask everyone to introduce themselves for the record, so I think we'll begin down on this corner of the table and move this way.

Mrs. Kamuchik: Good morning, everyone. It's Louise Kamuchik, Clerk Assistant, director of House services.

Ms Sales: Tracey Sales, communications consultant with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Mr. MacDonald: Hugh MacDonald, Edmonton-Gold Bar. Good morning.

Mr. Lund: Ty Lund, Rocky Mountain House.

Mr. VanderBurg: George VanderBurg, Whitecourt-Ste. Anne.

Mr. Ducharme: Denis Ducharme, Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Mr. McFarland: Barry McFarland, Little Bow.

The Chair: I am Cindy Ady, Calgary-Shaw.

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

Mr. Coutts: Good morning. Dave Coutts, Livingstone-Macleod.

Mr. Webber: Hello. Len Webber, Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. Martin: Ray Martin, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

Ms Adhopia: Preeti Adhopia, office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Mr. Thackeray: Tom Thackeray, Service Alberta.

Ms Lynas: Hilary Lynas, Service Alberta.

Ms Lynn-George: Jann Lynn-George, Service Alberta.

Ms Swanek: Amanda Swanek, Service Alberta.

Ms Kreutzer Work: Kim Kreutzer Work, Service Alberta.

The Chair: For the record we see that Gord Graydon from Grande Prairie-Wapiti has joined us. Welcome.

Okay. Just a few housekeeping items for the record. The draft

report was circulated to members during the third week of September, and other meeting minutes were posted on the internal website last Tuesday, October 9. As you know, we have this fresh new look where we don't send you volumes of paper. We now get on our laptops and take a look. This is the draft final report of the committee, and our focus today is completing our review of this document so that we can adopt the report and complete our mandate.

To begin with, let's take a look at the agenda. Do all members see that? Can someone please move the adoption of today's agenda. Ray Martin. All in favour? Moved by Ray Martin that the agenda for the October 15, 2007, meeting of the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee be adopted as circulated. No revisions, I'm assuming. We've already voted.

I would like someone to move the adoption of the minutes from our last few meetings. Now, as you notice, we've had several, and I have to have a separate motion for each set of minutes. The first one would be May 1. Do I see someone that would adopt May 1 meeting minutes? Anyone have them in front of them? Ty Lund. All those in favour?

June 21. Would someone please adopt the June 21 meeting minutes?

Mr. Graydon: So moved.

The Chair: Gord Graydon. All those in favour?

The minutes for June 27. Would someone move the adoption of the meeting minutes for June 27? Denis Ducharme. All those in favour?

August 8 meeting of the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee be adopted as circulated. Would a member please move those? I see David Coutts. All those in favour? Okay.

We'll move on: business arising from the last meeting. There was a request for copies of the 2006-2007 annual report of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. At our last meeting there was a request made for this copy. The 2006-2007 annual is not yet available. The committee clerk provided a link to the previous year's report for all members. Since this was for information purposes only, there is no motion necessary.

I'd like to begin by having a discussion of the draft final report. As we're nearing the end of the process, the technical team provided a draft final report several weeks ago for our review. As I understand it, when drafting the recommendations in the report, the technical team has in some cases not used the wording in the motions made by the committee. This rewording was done to improve the clarity of the recommendations. Hilary will provide an explanation of what needs to be done and have other staff present certain matters.

Hilary.

Ms Lynas: Thank you.

The Chair: Sorry.

Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald: Madam Chair, could I get an explanation from you, please? In the draft report on page 51 recommendations 24 and 25 have been omitted on the list from appendix C, yet they're included in the draft report. What is the reason for that?

The Chair: Could we get an explanation? Yes, please.

Ms Lynas: Sure. In the list that's included in appendix C, we group

the recommendations. The first group is recommendations for amendment to the act. Then the next group is recommendations for other action; that was mainly to consult with another department or level of government. The last category was where the committee made a recommendation not to make a change to the act, and 24 and 25 are in that list. The list at the end is not in numerical order because we did put it in those categories.

Mr. MacDonald: If I'm understanding this correctly, those are the ones that were not unanimously supported by the committee.

Ms Lynas: Numbers 24 and 25 are included on page 54 under the category of no change recommended to the act. They're included in the report, but just the list at the back is not in true numerical order.

Mr. MacDonald: Excellent. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions?

Then we'll turn the time over to Hilary.

Ms Lynas: Okay. Under this agenda item we provided three documents. In order to get to discussing the report, I propose that we move from the specific issue to the more general.

The first document relates to a single recommendation, 46. The second is a table showing where we have reworded a recommendation from a motion that was in *Hansard*. This was done with the intent of making the recommendation clearer, keeping in mind that many recommendations need to be turned into drafting instructions at some point. The last document is the report itself. We wrote the report with a business audience in mind and tried to avoid technical language and jargon as much as possible. We're looking forward to hearing the committee's comments on those.

If we go back to the first document, this recommendation was somewhat unclear to us, and we felt it necessary to bring it up today. As written, the recommendation includes an "and/or" clause. We're seeking clarification on whether this was the committee's intention or whether the recommendation should be limited to one thing or the other.

I'm going to turn it over to Jann. She can explain what this recommendation is about and what the options are.

Ms Lynn-George: You have a piece of paper in front of you which gives you the motion as passed then the recommendation as it appears in the report. As Hilary mentioned, we've got "and/or" in there, and we need to make a decision whether it's "and" or "or."

Just to remind you of what this was about, the committee considered penalties under PIPA. Under the act only the courts can find a person guilty of an offence and impose a fine. The committee clearly supported allowing the courts to divert fines imposed for offences under PIPA to programs and activities that support related purposes, but the motion that was passed was unclear because it seems to allow the court to direct an individual to pay money directly to someone delivering a program or performing some activity. That's not the way the court would handle fines.

Also, the committee didn't actually discuss any action that a court might order a person convicted of an offence to take other than funding a program or activity. What we're trying to establish is whether the committee wanted the courts to be able to impose a fine and then divert the funds to a specific purpose or whether it wanted to order somebody, an organization to pay money for some purpose instead of a fine. Is it one or the other or both? If it's one or the other, you can choose one of those. If it's both, "and" is what we're looking for.

9:40

The Chair: Okay. The committee has in front of it a document that shows some different options, but before we look at those options, are there any questions regarding this issue?

Mr. Ducharme: Madam Chairman, I believe I had debated that at the time when it was brought forward to the committee. I don't have a copy of the *Hansard*. I was wondering if there would be a copy of the *Hansard* that would be readily available so that we can just go back?

Ms Lynn-George: It's August 8, page 169.

The Chair: Are there copies of it available that we could just pull?

Ms Lynn-George: We didn't distribute them, but I have it here.

The Chair: The clerk tells me that she can pull it up and print it. Would we like to take a break for five minutes while we wait for that document? Okay, everybody, run and go get some coffee for five minutes. We'll be back with printed documents for you.

[The committee adjourned from 9:42 a.m. to 9:47 a.m.]

The Chair: I'd like to call the committee back to order if possible. We've lost a committee member, but I think he'll be back.

Mr. Ducharme, have you been able to take a look at *Hansard*?

Mr. Ducharme: Yes. I saw that I moved it. In light of there not being a lot of wordage there to help us, we have to recollect our past thoughts here. Just a moment, please.

The Chair: Okay. We'll just pause for another few moments.

Mr. Ducharme: Madam Chair, if I recall the debate that took place at the time, we as a committee felt that if there was going to be a fine that was going to be imposed on someone – and I think the technical staff indicated that there were very few times that fines had been imposed – it would be used to promote the legislation, whether it be in terms of education programs, et cetera, that we were not directing the money back to Treasury Board, and that any fines imposed would be done in terms of a public awareness campaign or other situations in terms of making the legislation better known to the public. When I look at it that way, I think the recommendation that we put forward still answers that without needing further clarification, but my English may not be as good as others'.

The Chair: Hilary, do you have a response for us?

Ms Lynas: I'll turn it to Jann.

Ms Lynn-George: The problem is that we have "and/or," and we need a decision whether it's "and" or "or." Is it one or the other or both? Do you want to say that the courts can direct a person to take some action? At the time there was no suggestion about what action might be taken because the commissioner can already order organizations to comply with the act, and those orders are enforceable as orders of the court. So that's a little uncertain.

The second part, to direct that a fine imposed under the act be used for a program or activity that supports the purposes of the act, was very clear. It was very clear that that was what was wanted. It was not so clear whether this other part was wanted.

The Chair: That being said, we're really talking about a wording issue here.

Ms Lynn-George: Well, no. When we go to the courts and say, "This is what you have the power to do," they want to know if it is this or it is this or it is both.

The Chair: Okay. I see in front of us some different options that might actually capture what it is that the hon. member is trying to get at. Maybe we could just review those options and see whether they actually cover off what is the intent of what we're trying to do with the act.

The first one would be that the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee recommend that

the act be amended to allow the courts the discretion to direct a person convicted of an offence under the act to take some action that promotes the purposes of the act and to direct that a fine imposed under the act be used for a program or activity that supports or promotes the purposes of the act,

or that the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee recommend that

the act be amended to allow the courts the discretion to direct a person convicted of an offence under the act to take some action that promotes the purposes of the act,

or that the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee recommend that

the act be amended to allow the courts the discretion to direct that a fine imposed under the act be used for a program or activity that supports or promotes the purposes of the act.

I do think that kind of leads itself to the intent of what the hon. member is speaking of. It's really: which option do we think actually does it best?

Mr. VanderBurg: Well, to get moving on this, I would make a motion that we recommend that

the act be amended to allow the courts the discretion to direct that a fine imposed under the act be used for a program or activity that supports or promotes the purposes of the act.

I think that's your last option.

The Chair: It is. It would be the third one that I read.

We have a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion? Any questions? Are we all feeling that it will do the job?

Mr. Martin: Seeing that there have never been any fines yet, it probably will.

The Chair: Yeah. I was wondering if we would make them sit in a room and shred for 90 hours or something, but it seems to be that there are other options.

Since we have the motion, all those in favour? That looks unanimous to me. Thank you.

Okay. Now, we also have some additional proposed changes to the wording of recommendations. The committee should have this document before it. I'll let the technical support staff continue its review of the proposed revisions. If you're wondering what that looks like, it's this one. Correct?

Ms Lynas: This next document is a table, and it shows the wording of motions in *Hansard* and compares them to the recommendations that we've actually included in the final report. The ones in grey are the more minor wording changes. In some cases a recommendation was changed because the meaning of the motion would not be clear to the reader. For example, there are a couple of motions that say

that the decision was to maintain the status quo, so we needed to put some context around that. In other cases a change was made to clarify references to other documents or to make a recommendation clearer. We did include in the column labelled Comments what the reason was for making a change. What we are proposing is a motion to approve all the changes in that table.

The Chair: I'll ask the committee. Would you like to go through those changes one by one? Are there specific issues that you would like to discuss and want to pass them as a whole? I'm open to the discretion of the table. Is there anyone that has a particular issue with any of these wording changes?

9:55

Mr. Martin: Well, not about the wording changes. I just wanted to bring up another matter that's flown in since, and I don't know when to do that. I don't think that for all of us to go through – we've had the wordsmiths go through it, and frankly they're probably better at it than we are. But there are a couple of issues I want to raise.

The Chair: We could maybe put those under Other Business.

Mr. Martin: It has to do with the specific recommendations of things that have come in from NAID about the destruction. I think we should take a look at it.

The Chair: Why don't we place that under number 7, Other Business? We're all agreed? All those in favour? Okay. We'll add that as number 7.

Mr. McFarland: Madam Chairman, under recommendation 6 – I thought you couldn't make a negative motion – if I read it right, if you did nothing, it would just leave the act alone. Could I just ask for a clarification on what the wording was intended to mean?

Ms Lynas: There were some motions made not to make a change to the act, and we did have to think about whether we should include those in the report or not. The ones that we have included in the report were done because we felt that since the committee did spend time considering and discussing that topic, we should put it in the report just so that the organization that made that submission would see that, yes, the committee did discuss it and made a recommendation. However, the recommendation was not to make a change to the act.

Mr. McFarland: I just wondered if there's a simpler way to say the same thing: after lots of discussion the committee decided to leave the legislation or the act as printed.

Ms Lynas: Yeah. Well, that was the original recommendation. Our motion was to maintain the status quo. It would make sense if an individual was reading the whole report and then read that recommendation, but whenever we have a list of just the recommendations, it wouldn't have any meaning to the reader.

The Chair: Mr. MacDonald first and then George.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Specific to recommendation 6 – and I know we had a discussion earlier on this – currently if a religious organization sends a circular on a weekly basis around to members of the congregation – for instance, with phone numbers and names of who is teaching Sunday school and who is on the maintenance committee and who is on the audit committee – are they breaking the law?

Ms Kreutzer Work: Madam Chair, if I could speak to that. It will depend on how that religious organization is incorporated or established. Under the Societies Act and the Religious Societies' Land Act there is some leeway to allow for the disclosure of a membership list to a member in order for that member to use it to handle the affairs of the congregation. For other religious organizations that aren't incorporated that way, then they're looking at a question of consent from their members, which they may have obtained.

Mr. MacDonald: Thanks.

Mr. VanderBurg: I'd like to make a motion to adopt the final report with the recommendations listed on pages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

That would be the complete list that's been provided. So to adopt the final report with the amendments to the recommendations as provided on those pages.

The Chair: Then we are just voting on these recommendations, correct? Okay.

All right. We have a motion in front of us. Is there any discussion beyond what we've already had? All those in favour?

Mr. MacDonald: For the record, Madam Chairman, I'm opposed to this.

The Chair: To these wording changes?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. So noted. It is passed. Thank you.

I was going to move next for an adoption of the final report, but prior to doing that, I would like to return, actually, to item 7, Other Business – because I know we have other business before we adopt the final report that I think we should discuss – unless a committee member has a problem with that. Okay.

Mr. Martin, I know that you raised that.

Mr. Martin: Yeah. Well, I don't want to hold up the report necessarily, but remember that NAID Canada made a presentation. Since then we've all got copies of a couple of recommendations that they are making, and it seems to me to make some sense. One of the things we found out: that some businesses, at least, or other groups are pretty careless, you know, in keeping information long beyond its usefulness. I don't think that we've hit on that in the recommendations; maybe I'm wrong about that.

They're suggesting a couple of resolutions, I believe, that probably make some sense. I don't know if everybody got this just a week or so ago. I'd just throw this out for what it's worth. They're talking of a couple of recommendations for amending PIPA to deal with the specific problem that I was talking about. They're talking about a new section 35. You know, that's where they sort of looked at it and thought it might go. They say:

When an organization determines personal information is no longer needed, that information must be destroyed before it is disposed of. Destruction is defined as the physical obliteration of records in order to render them useless or ineffective and to ensure reconstruction of the information (or parts thereof) is not practical.

They also talked about a new section 36: "An organization must develop an information destruction policy detailing destruction methods and responsibilities." I think that's an important point because we did hear some horror stories. As I look quickly through

this, I don't think we've really dealt with that specific issue. That's why I wanted to bring this forward at this point.

The Chair: Let me ask the staff first, before we open that discussion, if they have an answer to this particular issue that is dealt with in the report.

Ms Lynas: There is one recommendation, number 29, where an organization can be required to destroy or anonymize personal information that an organization no longer requires for legal or business purposes. There isn't a specific recommendation to add the definition of destruction into the act. The dictionary definition of destruction is very close to what NAID is proposing as a definition. So in all likelihood, if the commissioner was making a decision, he would come up with pretty much the same definition of whether something was destroyed or not.

I guess another point on this is that it's coming very close to sort of a technical standard. Standards tend to change over time, and often acts aren't that explicit. They usually say what should be done, not how it should be done, to this level of detail.

The Chair: Anyone else on the committee want to respond to this part?

Mr. McFarland: I agree with Mr. Martin. Particularly in section 35 I don't think it would hurt to put in some minimum standard or definition. I don't know that I'm eager to pursue a new section 36. It seems to me it would just mean some more administrative and bureaucratic makeup to the whole system, whereas if somebody simply didn't comply and was found not to have destroyed, then I would think they'd be subject to a fine, and the rest of the act would cover that off.

The Chair: Any other members?

Mr. Martin: Well, what Mr. McFarland is talking about: I don't think that's an important part of section 36. But I think it's important that we specifically say that this is a problem because of some of the horror stories that we've heard. So I would move that we add – I don't care where, but they say under section 35. I'll read it again for the record:

When an organization determines personal information is no longer needed, that information must be destroyed before it is disposed of. Destruction is defined as the physical obliteration of records in order to render them useless or ineffective and to ensure reconstruction of the information (or parts thereof) is not practical.

10:05

The Chair: Anyone else?

Well, seeing none, my only fear, of course, and maybe the staff could respond to this: we're talking about a large array of very small organizations, so before we get too carried away, we have to ask ourselves, you know, how that looks when you put it out there in the real world a little bit. I don't have any real issues personally with the idea that people should be destroying people's personal information just because of the identity issues that we have today, but I just want to make sure that we're thinking about that as well.

Mr. Ducharme: I think it's very clear: shred it before you put it in the dumpster.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to call the question, seeing no other issues. All those in favour of Mr. Martin's motion? It's unanimous

this time. No, it's not unanimous, thank you, but it did pass. It carried. Thank you.

My question would be, of course: do we need to see this particular piece before we can actually pass the final report?

Ms Lynas: I guess that's for the members to decide. I mean, we could always provide this one piece separately for people to look at.

The Chair: I see more discussion going on over the motion, but the motion has passed, so we will leave it. One did have an opportunity to raise one's hand.

Mr. McFarland: Would it be insurmountable to insert one sentence itemizing or clarifying what Mr. Martin is trying say in that section 29 on pages 32 and 33 of the draft? Shredding paper is okay, but what about purging computer discs and that kind of thing? The destruction definition I think would be, as an example, a very clear thing to throw in.

Ms Lynn-George: I think that we could certainly expand the discussion on page 32 – that's recommendation 29 – and add the point about the definition into recommendation 29.

The Chair: Could we perhaps take another small break and have you guys give us this language, pass it around the table to see if we're comfortable with it so that we don't delay the actual completion of the report? Are members in favour of taking another five-minute break? I hope someone can write in five. I think it's a fairly small line, small change. Okay, we'll take another five-minute break.

[The committee adjourned from 10:08 a.m. to 10:16 a.m.]

The Chair: Okay. I'd like to call the meeting back from the extended five-minute break that we took. Thank you very much to the staff for being able to move so quickly. If you could put before us the proposal on the rewording, we'll see if it meets with the committee's approval.

Ms Lynn-George: In recommendation 29, retention of personal information, go down to the fourth paragraph. We're proposing to add an extra sentence here after the first sentence. It would now read, "The Committee supported an approach that would require organizations to dispose of personal information that is no longer needed." New sentence: committee members recognize the importance of ensuring that records that are no longer required are effectively destroyed. Then you read on: "In addition, the Committee believed that the Commissioner should have the ability to enforce the proper disposal of information," et cetera.

Then in the recommendation itself we propose adding something at the end. I'll just read it and tell you where the addition comes. The recommendation is: that the act be amended to require an organization to destroy or anonymize within a reasonable time personal information that an organization no longer requires for legal or business purposes. Addition: and to add a definition of destruction to the act.

The Chair: Now, my understanding is that you didn't want to have a definition of destruction because technology changes. Could you answer that question?

Ms Lynn-George: We don't think a definition is needed because the dictionary definition is already satisfactory. Destroy means demol-

ish, pull or break down, shatter, smash to pieces, make useless, spoil utterly. The *Oxford* dictionary already serves the purpose. If the committee wants to add a definition, we could do that, but we don't consider it necessary, and when we go to Legislative Counsel, they probably won't consider it necessary either.

The Chair: I just wanted to clarify that.

Could I have somebody put a motion on the floor so that we could have discussion about this? Mr. Lund moves that this be added to the report as just described by staff. Discussion? Anyone have any issues with this? Problems?

Mr. McFarland: I like the explanation. I'm only putting this forward as a suggestion, hopefully constructive, that if you just simply changed a little bit on your last addition. I'll just read it to you: and to implement the definition of destruction in the act. Would that accomplish the same thing?

Ms Kreutzer Work: I think the wording that you're using implies that there already is a definition of destruction in the act. Am I understanding you correctly?

Mr. McFarland: Okay. And there isn't?

Ms Kreutzer Work: There is not. No.

Mr. McFarland: Okay. Good. Ignore the comment. Thanks.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, I'll put the motion in front of the committee. All those in favour? It carries. Thank you.

Moving right along, we need a motion that the Select Special Personal Information Protection Act Review Committee adopt the final report with the amendment to recommendation 46, the revised wording of the recommendations, and the revised wording of recommendations as approved.

Could I get someone to bring that? Mr. Ducharme.

Open now for discussion or questions.

Mr. VanderBurg: Isn't that just what I previously did?

The Chair: Yes, but we hadn't included these things, so we need a motion to bring this forward.

Mr. VanderBurg: And isn't it to 47?

The Chair: It was to recommendation 46, is what we did earlier – correct? – as well as the revised wording of recommendations.

Ms Lynas: Twenty-nine.

The Chair: To 29.

Mr. Ducharme brought forward the motion. Are there any questions or discussions on adopting the final report with those changes? Seeing none, all those in favour? It carried, with one abstainer, Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I'm opposed, please.

The Chair: Yes, he's opposed.

Mr. MacDonald: Not abstained.

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. MacDonald.

On the printing and the tabling of the final report our communications staff wishes to discuss some final matters regarding the designing and printing of the committee's final report as well as the news release related to the completion of the committee's mandate. I'll turn it over to Rhonda or Tracey.

Ms Sales: Thank you, Mrs. Chair. Basically, we just need a few items wrapped up as far as the printing is concerned. In the past we've printed 500 to 1,000 reports for various committees. For example, for the Conflicts of Interest Act Review Committee report we printed 1,000 copies. Basically, we're just looking for direction on quantity. As well, for previous reports we've printed a full colour cover and black and white on the inside, and we just want to clarify that that again is the direction of the committee.

Following that, in the past we've also created news releases to be released following the tabling of the report in the House, and we just want to know if that would be the direction of the committee as well, in which case we can prepare a news release this week and have it e-mailed to the chair for review.

The other item is the website. As we will be posting the report to the website, we're just looking for clarification on how long following that we should keep the site live. Generally speaking, three to six months is what has been done in the past.

The Chair: I heard a series of questions there. We'll begin with the first one, the quantity issue. Of those 1,000 reports how many were actually used?

Ms Sales: I'm sorry. I actually don't know that.

Mr. VanderBurg: Well, on that point, you know, in our libraries and in the Legislature we're required each to have a copy, but I would keep it to a minimum and let our staff figure out what that point is. We chop down a lot of trees just for our reports, and then they end up in the recycle bins. We have the website out there. I'd keep it going as long as possible and keep the printing to a minimum, to what's required for legislative purposes. Every member has to have a copy, the libraries, all of these people, so a couple hundred should be able to do it.

The Chair: Would you recommend colour?

Mr. VanderBurg: No.

The Chair: No? Okay.

Mr. VanderBurg: I can read in black and white.

The Chair: You can read in black and white.

Anyone else? The recommendation in front of the committee is that we leave it to the number for the purposes that the staff would determine, that we do not want it in colour.

Then as far as the news releases, do we want to vote on just that section? We'll deal with that; that's just administrative.

As far as the website and news releases, if a tree falls in the forest, and we don't cut it down and create paper, I think we should have a news release to let people know that the report has been completed; they know we've been out doing our work. I wouldn't have any

objections to the idea of a news release. Anyone else on the committee have objection to that? For sure, a website I think of as the same tool, and obviously it gives everybody access. Three to six months was the suggestion.

Mr. VanderBurg: Again, why couldn't this just be posted? Why do we have to keep a special website going? Why couldn't we just incorporate this into the Alberta government website or the Legislative offices website? I mean, we have so many websites. Tom? I don't know. Is there a reason?

The Chair: I see an answer coming from the bottom of the table.

Mrs. Kamuchik: It really should not be posted on the government website. This is a committee of the Legislative Assembly, so it can be left on the Legislative Assembly website.

Mr. VanderBurg: That's what I meant, yeah.

10:25

The Chair: Right. Okay. So on the Legislative Assembly website.

I think that that answered all the questions to the communications people. Anything that we missed there?

Ms Sales: No, I don't think so. Just clarification, though, on the printing. In the past the cover itself has been in colour and the inside black and white. Is that what you have agreed to, or did you want it all black and white now?

The Chair: I think our lean, mean committee wanted it all black and white. Correct, committee? Yes.

Ms Sales: Okay.

The Chair: I'll be tabling the committee's final report during our fall 2007 session, and copies will be distributed to all MLAs at that time. We'll also be distributing copies to all parties who were directly notified of the committee's review, whether or not they made a submission or appeared before the committee. As mentioned by our communications staff, the committee website will remain operational for a period of time, and the final report will also be available there.

On behalf of the committee, though, I'd like to take just a minute to thank the technical support staff for having all those answers to the questions that we asked through this review, Service Alberta, the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, also the administrative support staff from the Legislative Assembly Office, who so ably assisted this committee with its review of the Personal Information Protection Act. I would also personally like to thank all committee members for meeting through the summer, sometimes a difficult thing to do when we're off doing a lot of work in our constituencies. I appreciate the time and effort that you made to attend these meetings and to help us do this work.

The committee's mandate has now been met, and I'd like to call for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lund. All those in favour of adjourning? Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 10:27 a.m.]