



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure
Notification System Consultation Act

Wednesday, February 27, 2019
1 p.m.

Transcript No. 29-4-17

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

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP), Chair
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP), Deputy Chair
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP),* Acting Chair

Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)**
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (FCP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Kleinstauber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Payne, Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)***
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)****
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)

* substitution for Rod Loyola

** substitution for Eric Rosendahl

*** substitution for Thomas Dang

**** substitution for Prasad Panda

Bill 211 Sponsor

Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)

Support Staff

Merwan N. Saher	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Executive Director of House Services
Stephanie LeBlanc	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

1 p.m. Wednesday, February 27, 2019

[Mr. Shepherd in the chair]

The Acting Chair: All right. I'd like to call the meeting to order. Welcome to members, staff, and guests in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship.

My name is David Shepherd, MLA for Edmonton-Centre, and I'm substituting as chair of this committee. I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then I'll call on those joining in via teleconference.

Mr. Drysdale: Good afternoon. Wayne Drysdale, MLA for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Mr. Hanson: Dave Hanson, MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills.

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

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

Mr. Piquette: Good afternoon. Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater, substituting for Thomas Dang.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Good afternoon. Jamie Kleinsteuber, MLA, Calgary-Northern Hills.

Ms Payne: Good afternoon. Brandy Payne, MLA, Calgary-Acadia.

Mr. Nielsen: Good afternoon, everyone. Chris Nielsen, MLA for Edmonton-Decore.

Ms LeBlanc: Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

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

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

The Acting Chair: Thank you.
On the phone.

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

The Acting Chair: Excellent.

Ms Kazim: Anam Kazim, MLA for Calgary-Glenmore.

Mr. Loewen: Todd Loewen, MLA, Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Clark: Greg Clark, MLA, Calgary-Elbow.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

I'd just like to note for the record the following substitutions: myself today for Member Loyola as chair, Mr. Piquette for Mr. Dang, Mr. Schneider for Mr. Panda, and Mr. Dach for Mr. Rosendahl.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*. Committee proceedings are being live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

A draft agenda of the meeting has been distributed. Did anyone wish to propose any amendments to that agenda? If not, do we have

a member that would move acceptance of that agenda? Ms Payne. Thank you. All those in favour? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

All right. We were able to pull together the minutes from yesterday's meeting, and I believe those were posted online and made available. Did anyone have any concerns or changes or omissions regarding those minutes? Seeing and hearing none, is there a member that would move acceptance of those minutes? Mr. Kleinsteuber. All those in favour? Any opposed? Just to check on the phones, was there anyone opposed to the acceptance of the minutes? Excellent. Thank you. The motion is carried.

That brings us then to the main part of our discussion today, that being the review of Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act. Hon. members, the time has arrived for the committee to make its recommendations on Bill 211. As members are aware, the Legislative Assembly referred Bill 211 to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship on November 28, 2018, pursuant to Standing Order 74.1(1)(b).

Before the committee commences its deliberations on Bill 211, I'd like to take a quick moment just to reiterate the process that guides the work we'll be doing today. I just want to remind members first that Bill 211 proposes that a committee of the Legislative Assembly conduct public meetings with various stakeholders and interested parties listed in section 3 of the bill and make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly on a number of factors listed in section 2(2) of the bill, including a notification of owners of underground infrastructure, public awareness, and some other matters.

The mandate of this committee is to review Bill 211 and the proposed consultation and the reporting process, not to suggest amendments to the legislation dealing directly with underground infrastructure. As a result, committee members should in their discussions on the bill be focused on the process for reviewing the underground notification system in Alberta rather than any substantive changes to legislation or policy that may have been suggested by stakeholders.

The motion referring the bill requires that our committee report back to the Assembly no later than the week of March 4, 2019. Standing Order 74.2 gives the committee its direction in proceeding with the review, and it reads:

- (1) When a Bill is referred to a standing or special committee after first reading, the committee may conduct public hearings on the subject matter of the Bill and report its observations, opinions and recommendations with respect to the Bill to the Assembly.
- (2) Upon the concurrence of a committee report that a Bill be proceeded with, the Bill shall be placed on the Order Paper for second reading.

Are there any questions from any members regarding the context for our discussions today? All right.

Seeing and hearing none, we'll open the floor then for discussions. Mr. Piquette.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Chair. I think we heard loud and clear yesterday that this is an important issue. At the same time it seems that the more we delve into this, you know, the more complex the issue does become. We heard that a few times last time. The devil seems to be in the details, and we would certainly need to iron out those details before we take any decisive steps on this.

Therefore, I think that MLA Schneider's bill was well formed. I think it would do that. It gives us a mechanism to ensure that when the House does propose something that it fixes these issues it identified and that we're getting this right. Because of that I would like to – I'm not sure if this is the right procedure, but I would like to make a motion that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship recommend that Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, proceed.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Piquette. We have a motion on the floor. The clerk is just putting things up there. Excellent. Fairly straightforward. Do we have any discussion on the motion? Any members on the phone have any questions or comments regarding the motion from Mr. Piquette?

Mr. Nielsen: Maybe just I guess a quick thank you to MLA Schneider for moving forward on this. I know, MLA Piquette, you know, that you had some similar ideas around this, so thank you.

Mr. Schneider: I just got a lower draw.

Mr. Nielsen: You know, thank you to both of you for that work and your submissions, of course, to this committee in order for us to I think move forward and let the House chart the path forward on it.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.

Any other members have any comments or questions regarding the motion? Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: I guess I would like to say to the committee, certainly – I don't know. I've been sitting at committees for four years. I'm sure Mr. Drysdale's been around longer, but it has been a pleasure to be part of a committee that actually all seem to be on the same page. We didn't argue too much about anything, and we all agreed that this is something that needs to move forward. So I appreciate the committee's patience as we listened and heard all of the important information and allowing this to move forward, as we all know it should. Thank you to everyone.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.

Any further comments or questions regarding the motion? Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question. All those in favour of the motion that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship recommend that Bill 211 proceed. All those in favour, please say aye. On the phones? Thank you. Any opposed? On the phones?

That motion is carried.

Ms Payne: Mr. Chair?

The Acting Chair: Yes, Ms Payne.

Ms Payne: Hi. I'm not sure if this is the appropriate moment to move this, but I think it was really great hearing from Mr. Cardinal yesterday and having the conversation around how this particular issue impacts indigenous communities throughout the province. You know, after his presentation and looking at the bill again, I noted that there wasn't necessarily any part of the bill that included indigenous communities, and I think that, you know, in the spirit of reconciliation that it's, I think, something that is missing a little bit from the bill.

1:10

Ultimately, it would be up to the Assembly if they wanted to include any indigenous consultation or not, but I think that if we're looking at something that has such a vast impact on industry, agriculture, health, and safety, it's good to consult with as many folks as possible and particularly to connect with indigenous peoples to see how they're being affected or would be impacted by any changes.

If now is the correct time, I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship further recommend that any public meetings with stakeholders on the

underground infrastructure notification system in Alberta conducted pursuant to Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, include indigenous groups.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Ms Payne.

Indeed, this would be the opportunity for any additional observations, opinions, or recommendations to be appended to the report. So we have that motion on the floor. Do we have any members that wish to comment or have any questions regarding the motion? Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. Thank you very much for that motion. You kind of beat me to the punch. Would you suggest that we would be changing section 3 of the bill to include indigenous groups?

Ms Payne: I guess I would refer to the expertise of Parliamentary Counsel on what would be the best way, whether that would be something that we'd recommend an amendment to the bill or just a recommendation from the committee to the Legislature. I'm not sure which is the best way to proceed with it. I do think that the comments that we heard yesterday from Mr. Cardinal were quite valuable, and I would hate to see that perspective getting lost in the shuffle.

Mr. Schneider: Does Parliamentary Counsel . . .

Ms LeBlanc: I think just clarifying whether it would be a recommendation that the committee invite those groups or whether it would be mandated under the bill. That clarification would be helpful but not necessary that you refer to an actual section of the bill as long as the intent is clear. So you could say: must include indigenous groups.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Sure. Look, then I'll just put it all out here. I had in my motion, as I had it written, to amend section 3 of the bill. Based on information that we listened to yesterday from the president of the RMA, who I have a great deal of respect for – I spent six years as a councillor in a rural municipality – everything he said there yesterday made a lot of sense regarding water utilities and irrigation districts. But my motion was water utilities, irrigation districts, and First Nations as well, to amend one portion of that bill. I love your motion. I'm happy with it. It's just: do we have to make another motion, or can we loop it all in?

The Acting Chair: On that, Mr. Schneider, there's certainly the opportunity to amend the motion that's in front of us. If you want to add additional stakeholders that you feel should be included and should that be taken as a friendly amendment, that would be very easy to move forward. I would just note that in regard to referring to specific sections of the bill and suggesting that those be amended, the suggestion that I'm hearing from the clerk and from Parliamentary Counsel is that we might be getting a little deep into the weeds, so better that the committee provide a general recommendation of what they would like to accomplish and allow the Legislature to determine how that would best be accomplished.

Mr. Schneider: Fine. Yeah. I'm all in favour of a friendly amendment if everybody else is.

The Acting Chair: Okay. So you're proposing, then, the addition of which stakeholder groups again?

Mr. Schneider: Organizations representing water utilities and irrigation districts.

The Acting Chair: Okay. We'll give the clerk a moment to get that down. Water utilities . . .

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. Water utility organizations and irrigation districts.

The Acting Chair: All right. Mr. Schneider is proposing this amendment.

Ms Payne, would you take that as a friendly amendment?

Ms Payne: Yeah.

The Acting Chair: Absolutely.

Ms Payne: I think the more the merrier for consultation, right?

The Acting Chair: All right. We can consider that amendment accepted then. We have the amended motion in front of us. Do we have any further discussion on that?

Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Sorry. Just the amendment . . .

The Acting Chair: Just the amendment? Sorry. We do have to have a vote on the amendment? My apologies. We do need to have a vote on the amendment. So, then, is there any further discussion on the amendment before I call the question?

Seeing and hearing none, on the amendment put forward by Mr. Schneider that

the motion be amended by adding "water utility organizations and irrigation districts" after "indigenous groups,"

all those in favour? On the phones? Thank you. Any opposed? On the phones?

That amendment is carried.

We are back to the amended motion. Is there any further discussion regarding the amended motion?

Mr. Nielsen: Just a quick clarification, then, from Parliamentary Counsel so that we're not getting too deep into the woods here. By changing things, we're safe, and it still appears as a recommendation from us for the House to do that?

Ms LeBlanc: Correct.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen, and thank you, Counsel. Is there any further discussion, then, regarding this amended motion?

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question. All those in favour of the amended motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? And on the phones?

That motion is carried.

All right. Are there any additional observations, opinions, or recommendations? Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Chair, for the opportunity. Just a recommendation. Again, it goes back to and kind of mirrors the motion I made yesterday, but I feel it's very, very important that when this is finalized, it kind of represents that we're not going to have kind of a mishmash of ministries working together. It would kind of put the responsibility for notification under one department. So if you'd indulge me, I'd like to make a motion to that effect.

The Acting Chair: Certainly, Mr. Hanson. Did you have a particular wording in mind?

Mr. Hanson: Yeah. Right here. I move that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship further recommend that the report of the committee required by Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, include a recommendation for the government to designate one ministry to be responsible for underground infrastructure notification in Alberta.

Again, it's just a recommendation, and that ministry would just be responsible for notification, not, you know, receiving all the responsibility in case there was an incident or something, just so that it would be centred in one ministry.

The Acting Chair: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

So we have another motion before us. Do we have any discussion amongst members on this motion?

Mr. Nielsen: Without having notes in front of me, I just want to clarify. Would this be considered as a new motion, or is this the same kind of motion that we've already defeated?

The Acting Chair: Well, this would be a recommendation to be included in the report, so that would be, to some extent, then, substantially different from previous discussions that the committee had. The previous discussions, the clerk has just reminded me, were around sending a letter to the government recommending this or to a particular ministry. In this case, this is a recommendation for it to be appended to the report.

Mr. Nielsen: Okay.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Chair, could you add me to the list when you get a chance, please?

The Acting Chair: Yes. Please go ahead, Mr. Clark.

Mr. Clark: Yeah. Thank you. I just want to speak in favour of this motion. I see no logical reason why we wouldn't want to have a single ministry responsible for this. The motion, I think, is broad enough that it allows ministries to discuss within and between themselves which ministry that should be, so it's not overly specific. But I think that if we're going to move forward with this bill and make improvements in this area, having a single ministry ultimately accountable is a very important aspect of this. I would encourage all members to vote in favour of this motion. I, frankly, see no reason why we wouldn't.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

Do we have any other members that have any comments or thoughts on the motion in front of us?

1:20

Mr. Dach: Just looking at the word "one" – I'm just wondering if it's worth mentioning or not – should we simply say "only one," to be clear? In saying "one ministry," are we talking about a particular one? Is it clear enough in the committee's mind just to say "one" rather than "only one," if that was the intent, to really narrow it down to only one?

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dach.

Dr. Massolin, from your perspective, is this appropriately clear? Would it make any substantial difference to add the word "only"?

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, yeah, I would say that it's the committee's call as to how they want to phrase this.

The Acting Chair: Understood.

Mr. Dach, did you have any further comment?

Mr. Dach: Yeah. I'm just wondering if this is a binding motion, that the government would be bound to make sure it was only one ministry.

The Acting Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Dach. You're asking me if this would be binding?

Mr. Dach: Yeah.

The Acting Chair: No. This would simply be appended to the report as a recommendation, and then it would be at the will of the Legislature whether they chose to act on that recommendation. Of course, the Legislature itself, I suppose, unless there was an actual change made to the legislation, wouldn't have the power to compel a particular action by government.

Mr. Dach: That's what I figured, but I just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dach.
Do we have any further thoughts or discussion on this motion?

Mr. Piquette: I guess just a clarification . . .

The Acting Chair: Mr. Piquette.

Mr. Piquette: Sorry. Thank you. I guess I should have waited for you to recognize me, Mr. Chair.

I guess I've got sympathy for the direction. I'm just wondering if it makes sense to put that within the context of the report, whether that might be a separate recommendation. We're kind of getting in advance of the work of the Assembly. You know, they are going to be doing the consultation. They are going to be coming up with a report. We don't know in advance whether they might have other options that they come across, right? Maybe they'll come with another way of approaching it. In the meantime we're foreclosing kind of an option for the report. I wonder if perhaps it might be altered to be a stand-alone recommendation. Does that make any sense?

The Acting Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Piquette.
It's my understanding that the committee does have the opportunity to add additional observations, opinions, or recommendations to the report on the bill.

But perhaps if counsel has any comment as to whether this is something that could also stand as an independent motion.

Ms LeBlanc: Mr. Chair, I think the opportunity to make those additional observations would come as a component of the report on the bill.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.
Any further questions or comments, Mr. Piquette?

Mr. Piquette: Just to clarify, then, that this motion makes sense as it stands now, that it wouldn't make sense as a separate motion? I'm just trying to clarify.

Ms LeBlanc: I mean, the mover can correct me if I'm interpreting it incorrectly, but I believe this recommendation would be that the bill contemplate that the committee established pursuant to that bill consider and make a recommendation on one ministry that would be responsible for underground infrastructure notification.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Do we have any further comments or discussion on this particular motion?

Mr. Loewen: I'd like to say something.

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: Yeah. I just wanted to say that this bill revolves around One-Call, having, you know, one source for people to call when they're digging or working with utilities. Of course, it wouldn't make any sense to have multiple ministries taking care of an organization that deals with a one-call system to deal with these issues. I'm not sure if there's any resistance to this idea, but if there is, I would sure love hearing a good reason for it. It wouldn't make any sense at all, in fact would be maybe somewhat ludicrous to think that we couldn't have one ministry in charge of One-Call.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Loewen.
Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. I don't want to belabour the fact here, but as we look at the standing orders – I mean, Parliamentary Counsel could have rattled this off, too – 74.2(1) reads:

When a Bill is referred to a standing or special committee after first reading, the committee may conduct public hearings on the subject matter of the Bill and report its observations, opinions and recommendations with respect to the Bill to the Assembly.

I think, as we look at this motion today, that's all we're doing, making a recommendation. There's nothing binding to the government at all. That's what we're here to do. This is legally what we're supposed to be doing, making recommendations to the House, as was said in the House when we left the House. I said "House" a lot of times there, didn't I?

Anyway, that's it from me.

The Acting Chair: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Yeah. Just to clarify and agree with Mr. Loewen on the phone, it's basically just to simplify it. Having been somebody that's used One-Call a number of times, it really is nice that I don't have to phone six or seven utility companies that may or may not be adjacent to my property. It's always nice to have that one call. We heard from Alberta One-Call and from a few others that they don't know which department to call, whether they call Transportation or any other or Energy, for that matter, to deal with underground utilities. I think that just recommending that the government pick – and we're not telling them which ministry to pick. We're just recommending that they look at it to simplify the matter and choose one ministry that would be responsible for reporting.

Thanks.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
Do we have any further discussion on the motion? Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Yeah. Just listening to the discussion here, you know, there were concerns. I mean, the reality is that if a government changes, sometimes they change ministries, and there was concern before about: well, if we pick that one, are they going to be a here-today, gone-tomorrow kind of thing? I think this is benign enough so that we're not pigeonholing anybody here necessarily, yet it's still up to the House to decide how to proceed.

A quick question, then, to I guess it would be Parliamentary Counsel. It wouldn't necessarily put the House in a position where they have to pick any specific ministry, just that eventually a decision could be made as to where that may best lie?

Ms LeBlanc: This recommendation would come out of the committee that's established under the bill, and the way the motion is framed, it would be a recommendation.

Mr. Nielsen: Okay. Thank you.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yeah. Just briefly. I don't want to drag this out, but in the end one ministry is going to have to bring the legislation forward to get it passed. Eventually they're going to have to decide which minister is bringing the legislation forward, so it needs to be done anyway.

That's it.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship further recommend that the report of the committee regarding Bill 211 include a recommendation for the government to designate one ministry to be responsible for underground infrastructure notification in Alberta, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? On the phones?

That motion is carried.

Are there any additional observations, opinions, or recommendations?

Mr. Loewen: I'd like to make a motion, too, please.

The Acting Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: Okay. I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship further recommend that the Ministry of Transportation work with Alberta One-Call Corporation to evaluate the estimated financial costs to the ministry to participate in a mandatory underground infrastructure notification system in Alberta and report their findings to the committee appointed pursuant to Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, prior to the committee issuing its report.

1:30

The Acting Chair: Excellent. Thank you, Mr. Loewen.

I'll give the clerk a moment to pull that together.

Mr. Drysdale: The chair might tell a joke while we wait.

The Acting Chair: Indeed. Mr. Drysdale observes that the chair might tell a joke. I apologize; in preparing to be a substitute chair, I did not consult my big book of jokes.

Here we go. We have the motion now from Mr. Loewen that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship further recommend that the Ministry of Transportation partner with Alberta One-Call Corporation to evaluate the estimated financial costs to the ministry to participate in a mandatory underground infrastructure notification system in Alberta and report their findings to the committee appointed pursuant to Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, prior to the committee issuing its report.

Do we have any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Loewen: If I could just add something there.

The Acting Chair: Certainly, if you'd like to add something additional, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: Yeah. I think, again, it's just a recommendation. I think it's probably only due diligence that any time something like this happens that could affect, you know, a budget and the financial planning of a ministry, that they do kind of look into that and have this kind of discussion on the potential costs of this. I think that would be valuable information for the government to have or the Legislature to have going forward with this bill.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Loewen.

Any other members have anything? Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chair. I think we heard yesterday that there was kind of a discrepancy in the estimates between Transportation, who said it would be in the millions, \$10 million to \$15 million, and Alberta One-Call, that said it was in the thousands. I think there's quite a bit of discrepancy there, and I think we need to narrow that down a little bit.

That being said, I'd just also like to point out that when we dealt with the Grande Cache incident, it was very expensive to that community especially when we had an incident that involved Alberta Transportation, so I think it's important to move forward with this, that we get more of an estimate of what it actually would cost Transportation to be involved.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.

I have Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We were going good there for a bit, and I hate to be the one to throw the wet blanket here again. You know, we were tasked to decide if this bill proceeds forward, which we've definitely done. We've made a couple of quick recommendations. But we're starting to get into the weeds here again. We're trying to designate ministries. We're taking on duties here that should be placed with whoever that next committee will be, whether it be a current standing committee or a formed committee to deal with this. So I'm not prepared to support this. I think this lies with the next committee to do that.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.

Any other members have any thoughts or comments regarding the motion from Mr. Loewen? Anyone on the phones?

Mr. Loewen: I'd like to speak to it again.

The Acting Chair: Okay. Mr. Loewen, I hear you.

Was there someone else on the phone? No?

Go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: Okay. Yeah. Again, we're just talking about recommendations going forward, and I fail to see why there's a problem with this. It seems like it's something that should be pretty natural. Any time we come up with, you know, bills and recommendations for the Legislature, I think it's only our due diligence to recommend that they figure out the cost of what we're doing and bring that forward, too. I think the next group that looks at this should have that information in front of them. You can't make an informed decision without information. This is all about getting information to make decisions.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thanks. Yeah. Just to reinforce what Todd just said, you know, we were given that information yesterday, but the next committee may not have that information, that there is a huge discrepancy in estimates. So I think that this recommendation

would just bring it to their attention. It's not binding them to do anything about it.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
Mr. Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I guess to research services or Parliamentary Counsel: would the next committee have access to everything that was presented yesterday?

Ms LeBlanc: I understand the meetings were public and would be included in *Hansard*, so they would have access to the transcripts.

Mr. Nielsen: Yeah. So, again, this lies with the decision-making of the next committee that's either formed or assigned. They have, you know, access to everything that was presented. I'm sure the House, once it begins deliberations on this, will probably have some direction as to the scope and how far they want the committee to go. Again, I'm not going to support this. That decision lies with the next group.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nielsen.
Any further comments?

Mr. Loewen: If I could, please.

The Acting Chair: Please go ahead, Mr. Loewen.

Mr. Loewen: I just want to thank Mr. Nielsen for making the best case for this motion possible, and that is that the next group that's going to look at this will have those transcripts that are so contradictory. Why not have this information up front for them, accurate, and have, you know, time for the department to plan for it and have that proper information there? It only makes sense that they'd have that. Otherwise, they would be looking at this, and then have to ask for the proper numbers. So thanks, Mr. Nielsen, for making the best argument for this motion.

Thanks.

The Acting Chair: Are there any further comments or questions regarding the motion? Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Thanks. Yeah. Just to support again what Mr. Loewen is saying, you know, if we can get this recommendation into the government, we can actually take advantage of the construction season that's about to hit us in the summer with all the Transportation projects that are going on. It would be a great time for them to get a physical cost of what it would actually cost them to deal with the one-call system. Pretty simple.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hanson.
Any further discussion regarding the motion?

Mr. Schneider: I guess, just quickly, it is a recommendation to government. If government determines that they don't want any part of it, no harm, no fail. I guess they're the ultimate ones that get to make the decision as to what recommendation they will actually abide with or push to the side. I think that makes sense, right? I hope that makes sense to the people that might know more than I do.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Any further comments regarding the motion? Any further discussion?

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion from Mr. Loewen, please say aye. And on the phones? Thank you. All those opposed? And on the phones? That motion is defeated.

Mr. Drysdale: Can we have that recorded?

The Acting Chair: Mr. Drysdale is requesting a recorded vote. We'll start with you, Mr. Drysdale.

Mr. Drysdale: Yes.

Mr. Hanson: Aye.

Mr. Schneider: Aye.

Mr. Dach: No.

Mr. Piquette: No.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Against.

Ms Payne: No.

Mr. Nielsen: No.

The Acting Chair: And on the phones?

Mr. Loewen: Aye.

Mr. Clark: No.

Mrs. Schreiner: No.

Ms Kazim: No.

The Acting Chair: We'll have the numbers here in a moment. We have eight against and four in favour. So, as I said, the motion is defeated.

Do we have any further observations, opinions, or recommendations that members wish to put forward for the report?

1:40

If not, we can move on, then, to directions for the draft report. Now that the committee has made its recommendations for Bill 211, we need to give research services our instructions to draft a report for consideration.

Dr. Massolin, would you give us a quick overview of that process?

Dr. Massolin: Certainly. I'd be pleased to. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Since this committee, the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship, has not this Legislature, if I'm correct, reviewed a bill, just a quick review of the report-writing process. With the instruction of the committee for research services to proceed, we'll draft a report, and the meat of that report will be the recommendations that the committee has agreed to just a few moments ago.

Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin.

Anyone have any questions?

Hon. members, a common practice in similar bill reviews, both in this committee and in others, has been to instruct research services to draft a report for the committee, allow a period for members to review it, and then to authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve the report. Is there a sense among committee members as to whether the committee would like to continue that practice regarding the drafting and approval of the committee's report on Bill 211?

Mr. Schneider: In all of the committee meetings I've sat in, those are kind of the same words I've heard before, so as long as the chair

and the vice-chair are involved in making that decision, I'm all for it.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Mr. Piquette.

Mr. Piquette: Yeah. I mean, assuming we have that consensus, I guess I could propose a motion.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Piquette wishes to make a motion.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. I'd like to move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to prepare a report regarding its review of Bill 211, Alberta Underground Infrastructure Notification System Consultation Act, in accordance with the committee's recommendations and authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve the committee's final report to the Legislative Assembly on or before March 4, 2019.

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Mr. Piquette.
The clerk will work to get that motion up.
Do we have any discussion regarding the motion? To be clear,

the motion is essentially that the report would be drafted by research services, then it would be sent to all members for review, and then final approval would be given by the chair and deputy chair.

If there are no further thoughts or discussion on that, I will call the question. All those in favour of the motion as put forward by Mr. Piquette, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? On the phones?

That motion is carried.

Well, that concludes our business regarding Bill 211 today. That brings us, then, to other business. Is there any other business that members wish to bring forward today?

If not, the date of the next meeting will be at the call of the chair.

Is there a member that would like to move to adjourn?

Mr. Nielsen: So moved.

The Acting Chair: Mr. Nielsen. All those in favour of adjourning our meeting today, please say aye. Any opposed? The committee stands adjourned.

Have a good afternoon.

[The committee adjourned at 1:43 p.m.]

