



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
Second Session

Select Special
Democratic Accountability
Committee

Monday, October 19, 2020
5:35 p.m.

Transcript No. 30-2-7

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 30th Legislature
Second Session**

Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee

Schow, Joseph R., Cardston-Siksika (UCP), Chair
Horner, Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UCP), Deputy Chair

Ceci, Joe, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Fir, Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UCP)*
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche (UCP)
Nixon, Jeremy P., Calgary-Klein (UCP)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Rutherford, Brad, Leduc-Beaumont (UCP)
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UCP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP)

* substitution for Tracy Allard

Support Staff

Shannon Dean, QC	Clerk
Stephanie LeBlanc	Clerk Assistant and Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Teri Cherkewich	Law Clerk
Trafton Koenig	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Clerk of Committees and Research Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Director of Parliamentary Programs
Amanda LeBlanc	Deputy Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

5:35 p.m.

Monday, October 19, 2020

[Mr. Schow in the chair]

The Chair: Okay. It is now after 5:30. We have dealt with all of our technical issues, and we are ready to get this meeting started, so I would like to call it to order. Welcome to members and staff in attendance for this meeting of the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee.

My name, as many of you may know, is Joseph Schow. I'm the MLA for Cardston-Siksika and chair of this committee. I'll ask members that are joining us in the committee around the table to introduce themselves for the record, and then we'll go to members that are on the phone. Starting to my right.

Mr. Horner: Good evening. Nate Horner, MLA, Drumheller-Stettler.

Ms Goodridge: Good evening. Laila Goodridge, MLA, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche.

Mr. Sigurdson: R.J. Sigurdson, MLA, Highwood.

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Jeremy Nixon, Calgary-Klein.

Ms Fir: Tanya Fir, Calgary-Peigan.

Mr. Smith: Mark Smith, MLA, Drayton Valley-Devon.

Mr. Rutherford: Brad Rutherford, Leduc-Beaumont.

Mr. Dang: Thomas Dang, Edmonton-South.

Ms Sweet: Heather Sweet, Edmonton-Manning.

Member Ceci: Joe Ceci, Calgary-Buffalo.

Ms Robert: Good evening. Nancy Robert, research officer with the Legislative Assembly Office.

Dr. Massolin: Hello. Philip Massolin, clerk of committees and research services.

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

The Chair: Excellent.

Then we have some members or individuals joining us on the phone.

Ms Pancholi: Rakhi Pancholi, MLA for Edmonton-Whitemud.

Dr. Amato: Hi. I'm Sarah Amato, research officer.

The Chair: Do I have anybody else? I see four participants but only two there. Anybody else I should be acknowledging?

Mr. Roth: The other one is the room.

The Chair: Oh, okay. The room.

I also note for the record: Ms Fir is substituting for hon. Mrs. Allard.

I note that based on the recommendations of Dr. Deena Hinshaw regarding physical distancing, attendees at today's meetings are advised to leave the appropriate distance between themselves and other meeting participants.

Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*. Committee proceedings are being live streamed and audiostreamed on the World Wide Web and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV.

Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting. That includes myself, but it was already on silent. Thinking ahead.

Pursuant to the August 24, 2020, memo from hon. Speaker Cooper I'd like to remind everyone that outside of those who have an exemption, those observing the proceedings of the Assembly or its committees are required to wear face coverings.

We will now go on to item 2 of the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. Does anyone have any changes that they would like to make? Hearing and seeing none, if I could get a member to please move a motion to approve our agenda. I see Ms Goodridge has moved that the agenda for the October 19, 2020, meeting of the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee be adopted as distributed. All those in favour, both in person and on the phone, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried.

Item 3 is approval of the minutes from the September 23, 2020, meeting and the September 24, 2020, meeting. We have draft minutes from our last two meetings, which were posted to the committee's internal website for members to review. We shall start with the September 23, 2020, meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note in the draft minutes of that meeting? Hearing and seeing none, can I please have a member move the adoption of the September 23, 2020, minutes? Mr. Horner has moved that the minutes from the September 23, 2020, meeting of the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee be adopted as distributed. All those in favour, both in person and on the phone, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried.

Moving on to the next meeting, adoption of the minutes. Are there any errors or omissions to note for the September 24, 2020, meeting minutes? Hearing and seeing none, can I please get a member of the committee to move to adopt those minutes? Mr. Smith has moved that the minutes from the September 24, 2020, meeting of the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee be adopted as distributed. Both in person and on the phone, those in favour, please say aye. Thank you. Any opposed, please say nay. That motion is carried.

Okay. We are now moving on to item 4 of the agenda. Hon. members, the committee had directed Legislative Assembly Office research services to prepare a number of documents to assist the committee in review pursuant to Government Motion 25. In addition, research services also prepared a summary of submissions that had been received by the committee from stakeholders and the public as part of its review. These documents were all posted to the committee's internal website for your review.

I would like to call upon Ms Robert and Dr. Amato from research services to give a brief overview of the documents, and then we'll open the floor to any questions the members may have for them. We'll start with Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Once again, good evening, everyone. Okay. There are about eight pieces of research that Dr. Amato and I have prepared for the committee's information. We've split them up. I will give you a bit of a summary of the ones that I prepared, and then Dr. Amato will do the same for the documents that she prepared.

Just a very high-level summary: one of the documents is a summary of the University College London Report of the Independent Commission on Referendums. That summary document just gives you a very brief look at the work of the commission and pulls out a few of the commission's recommendations that I thought might be information that the committee might be interested in seeing, and then it just duplicates an executive summary that the commission report prepared and also lists all of the 69 recommendations that the commission prepared. I'll just leave that there.

The next piece I will speak about is the summary of Alberta legislation that provides for direct democracy. That is a list in table form by statute, listed alphabetically, that then provides the provisions of each statute that allow for petitions or referendums or plebiscites, so that is how that document is organized. It also includes regulations under acts that provide for that type of direct democracy.

Moving on to the crossjurisdictional comparison of legislation respecting citizens' initiatives, that document surveyed legislation in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Zealand, Switzerland, and the United States with respect to citizens' initiatives. The document is organized in – it has two distinct parts to it. Part 3 is organized by the types of focus issues or questions that were asked by the Minister of Justice in the sessional paper that he tabled in the Assembly, so those questions are, of course: what types of initiatives should be allowed? How many signatures are needed for a successful petition? How much time is allowed to collect signatures? Who can apply to start a petition, and who must register in order to spend money on advertising? If you look at section 3 of the document, the information is broken down by those four issues.

Very quickly, the types of initiatives that we saw in the jurisdictions that were covered include legislative proposals or proposals for a bill; constitutional amendments, so proposals to amend the state or federal Constitution; approval of new enactments or, I guess, the citizens' veto is how that is sort of colloquially known; and then, finally, consultative questions, so questions on just about anything that a citizen can start a petition on and perhaps bring to the popular vote.

With respect to thresholds for successful petitions, of course, it varies by jurisdiction. In most jurisdictions the threshold is a percentage, often 10 to 15 per cent of eligible voters of the population, but it varies in terms of what the factor is. Is it based on people who voted in the last election, based on the population of the state or the area? You know, it varies in different ways. Switzerland is a bit of an outlier in that it doesn't use a percentage. It actually has a hard number of voters it requires in order for a petition to be successful. It requires a minimum of 100,000 voters to sign a petition to amend the Constitution, and it requires 50,000 signatures in order to have an optional referendum, which is the veto framework.

5:45

With respect to time to collect signatures, of course, that varies as well from, you know, 90 days in B.C. to 18 months in Switzerland. It just depends on the jurisdiction. Initiatives that are with respect to perhaps vetoing a law generally have a very tight time frame, sometimes 90 days after the law has been enacted.

With respect to who may start a petition, again, rules varied. In all jurisdictions a registered voter may start a petition, and in B.C. and Saskatchewan only a registered voter may start a petition, but in other jurisdictions the laws are a little bit less stringent. In Switzerland a citizen living abroad can start a petition, for instance. In New Zealand a petition promoter doesn't even have to be a natural person; it can be a corporation or an organization. And in the United States in addition to a registered voter, a group or an organization or a corporation may also start a petition.

With respect to who is required to register for advertising, of the jurisdictions we looked at, only B.C. has rules on that in that the authorized participants, so the proponent or registered opponents, are of course registered, and then an initiative advertising sponsor must register. Now, while other jurisdictions don't have that registration process, they monitor these activities in different ways. In New Zealand there's a limit on advertising spending, and the advertiser must file a financial statement within X number of days

of the end of the petitioning process or be subject to a number of fines.

Then section 4 of the document is then organized by jurisdiction to give members a slightly more fulsome idea of how the petitioning and referendum process works in those jurisdictions. I'm not really going to go into that. I think I've given you a general idea of how things work, so I will leave the crossjurisdictional there.

Now, finally, the summary of written submissions with respect to citizens' initiatives only. We haven't looked at the submissions related to the two different statutes yet; that will come later. With respect to citizens' initiatives we received 16 written submissions that were related to citizens' initiatives. We did receive one that was not related. It was just asking for members to support a petition, so that was not included in the summary. Of the 16 that were included, eight came from, I guess, stakeholders. I don't know if they were all invited stakeholders, but I would say that they came from organizations as opposed to private citizens. Those included Elections Alberta, two municipal associations, a constituency association, a political party, a registered third-party advertiser, a Member of Parliament, and a policy institute, and then the remaining eight came from private citizens.

A little similar to the crossjurisdictional, the document is organized by general support or opposition for citizens' initiatives and then by the topics for examination in the Minister of Justice's questions that he asked. That makes up a large portion of the document, and then people also wrote in about the process beyond those four questions that were asked. They wrote in and made suggestions with respect to actual referendums, so beyond the petitioning process, you know, and processes for the collection of signatures, different things like that, financial issues. Those comments are also broken down in that way.

I would say for the most part that there was either support for citizens' initiatives that was expressed or, rather than expressing support, just suggestions for how best to do it, to implement it. There was only one submitter who objected to the whole idea of citizens' initiatives.

I think I'm going to leave it there because I've been talking for a long time. I'll pass it on to Dr. Amato if that is okay with the chair, and then I'd be happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you.

The Chair: Dr. Amato, you can go ahead as well.

Dr. Amato: Thank you very much. Good evening. I hope you can hear me. I was responsible for four documents. I'll speak at length to two; that is, the summary of submissions with respect to recall and the crossjurisdictional with respect to recall legislation. In addition, I think that posted on the internal drive is a summary of recommendations from a report done by Elections BC in 2010. I think that's pretty self-explanatory. It was simply a compilation of the recommendations made by Elections BC in that year.

There was also a research scan of academic commentary with respect to referendums and citizens' initiatives, and I'll say maybe just a couple of words about that. That's a summary of six scholarly articles, and the approach was to do a research scan of recently published works, mainly articles, from 2015 to the present just to give the committee some idea of academic interest in these topics, the type of research that's being done, and the types of scholarly questions that are being asked about those topics. That's really the focus of that particular piece.

With respect to the crossjurisdictional, the crossjurisdictional focused on recall, and the approach that was taken was to assist the committee in answering some of the questions posed by the Minister of Justice in the sessional paper. As such, a crossjurisdictional did

endeavour to do two primary things. First, it provided information on British Columbia's Recall and Initiative Act and then, additionally, provided some information on recall legislation of state and local officials in the United States using information mainly compiled by the national council of state legislators among other sources. I also provided some information on recall in the United Kingdom. Additionally, the crossjurisdictional compares recall advertising and finance rules established by British Columbia's Recall and Initiative Act, comparing it with provisions in Alberta's Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act.

To assist the committee with all this information, I provided a number of tables throughout the document, which summarize all of the information after each section, so I'd like to just draw your attention to those. There are seven tables. The first four tables summarize the recall process in each jurisdiction, and then the following three tables summarize contribution limits in Alberta and British Columbia, provisions on third-party advertising in Alberta and British Columbia, and spending limits in Alberta and British Columbia as set out in Alberta's EFCDA and British Columbia's Recall and Initiative Act. I hope that document is somewhat helpful in providing a general overview of the recall process in the jurisdictions that I surveyed and then again in comparing the financial provisions mentioned.

With respect to the submissions summary, the focus of my summary was submissions that focused on recall legislation. The committee received a total of 17 submissions discussing recall, and they were from Elections Alberta, from two municipal associations, from a constituency association, a registered political party, a registered third-party advertiser, a Member of Parliament, a policy institute. There were also, additionally, eight submissions from private citizens. Of note, none of the 17 submissions that discussed recall explicitly opposed recall legislation in Alberta, though I should note that the two municipal associations opposed recall processes for municipal councillors.

All of the submissions, including the two from the RMA and the AUMA, made suggestions about the ways in which the process could operate in Alberta, and they focused on a number of issues, speaking for the most part quite directly to the questions asked by the Minister of Justice in the sessional paper, for example, discussing suggestions pertaining to the application process and the recall petition period, requirements for a successful petition, various financing rules, recall for municipal elected officials and school board trustees.

5:55

Then there are also, in addition, a variety of general comments expressing support generally for recall processes, in some cases stating that the process in Alberta should, to the extent possible, mirror the process in British Columbia. One submission, for example, proposed a number of general considerations for the committee.

I hope that document is also useful for the committee, and I'm happy to answer any questions about any of it. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Okay. I'd like to thank both Ms Robert and Dr. Amato for their time and their presentations.

Are there any questions that members of the committee might have for either of these two individuals?

Okay. Hearing none, again, thank you very much for your diligent work on that.

Moving on to part 4(b). As committee members are aware and just noted in the research services' presentation, the committee received over 50 written submissions as part of our review pursuant to Government Motion 25. Copies of these submissions have been made available in their entirety to all members of the committee.

As we move to consider whether or not we wish to make these submissions available to the public, I would note that our website and any related advertising about the review all indicated that submissions and the names of submitters may be made public. It is entirely the decision of the committee whether to make the submissions public or not.

Now that we have had an opportunity to review the content of the submissions, I'd like to ask Dr. Massolin to give a brief overview of past practices when it comes to making submissions public.

Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'll be brief. I mean, I'll summarize it by saying that for the most part committees in the past have opted to make written submissions public. But, of course, I'll hasten to add that it's a committee decision, and some committees have opted not to. It's not common, but it happens.

I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin.

Oh, okay. We do have some discussion on this, I suspect. I already see Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon, please go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Is it the right time to make a motion? I'd like to make a motion.

The Chair: We are now in the discussion portion, so, yes, if you'd like to make a motion . . .

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Okay. I think that since oral submissions are being made public, I think it only makes sense that written submissions be made public. As such, I'd like to present a motion.

Jeremy Nixon to move that the select . . .

The Chair: Just a quick question. Sorry, Mr. Nixon. Is this a motion that was presented 48 hours in advance?

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: I believe so, yes.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Jeremy Nixon to move that the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee make the written stakeholder submissions received by the committee in respect of citizens' initiative or recall available to the public after removing from those submissions the following:

- (a) all personal contact information other than the submitter's contact information;
- (b) all personal information about an identifiable minor;
- (c) all third-party information of a sensitive nature.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Okay. Mrs. Allard – I apologize. Ms Fir, please go ahead.

Ms Fir: It's okay. I'd like to propose a few changes to MLA Nixon's motion. Since many of the written submissions touch on all four topics in committee and the written submissions date has passed, it makes sense to release those documents. We received many submissions from the public; therefore, it also makes sense to release the documents summarizing those submissions. I'd like to make an amendment to Mr. Nixon's motion. I'd like Tanya Fir to move that we replace "submitter's contact information" with "submitter's name and location" and to insert:

- (a) make the documents entitled Summary of Written Submissions: Citizens' Initiatives and Summary of Written Submissions: Recall Legislation available to the public

and after “Democratic Accountability Committee”

(b) from invited stakeholders

before “received by the committee”

(c) the Election Act, Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act

after “in respect of” and

(d) duplicate submissions.

The Chair: Thank you.

We’re just putting that amendment up on the screen, and while you’re doing that, Mr. Roth, I will apologize for making that mistake. Both you and Mrs. Allard are exceptional members of the Legislature, and you can see how that’s an understandable mistake that I would make.

Okay. We have both the initial motion and the amendment on the screen. Is there anyone who’d like to add to the discussion? I did see Mr. Dang on my list. Did you have any . . .

Mr. Dang: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I appreciate that – I had some concerns with Mr. Nixon’s original phrasing in (a), and I think that it’s perhaps a little bit more clear now with the amendment.

The Chair: Okay.

Anybody else like to add to this discussion?

I see none. In that case I’m prepared to call the vote on this amendment. It is a long amendment, and it’s on the screen, so I don’t think I have to read it again unless – yeah. Thank you. I appreciate that. All those in favour of the amendment moved by Ms Fir, both on the phone and in person, please say aye. Thank you. Any opposed, please say no.

That amendment is carried.

We are now back on the original motion moved by Mr. Nixon, amended by Ms Fir. Any comments or discussion on this motion?

Hearing none, I’m prepared to call the question on that as well. Just moving along right here. All those in favour of the motion as moved by Mr. Nixon amended by Ms Fir, both in person and on the phone, please say aye. Any opposed, please say nay.

That motion is carried.

Is there any other discussion on this topic?

None. Hon. members, the committee also received one additional written submission labelled DAC-2020-091, which is also DAC-2020-092, after the deadline established by the committee, received October 17, 2020. Do members have any concern about including the submission as part of the committee’s review? Open the floor to discussion on that. I don’t see any. Okay.

The next steps in the review of citizens’ initiatives and recall. As we continue item 4(c)(i), if you will, we will continue our review pursuant to Government Motion 25. I believe it’s important to remind the committee that the time provided for the Assembly to complete the first part of the review related to citizens’ initiatives and recall is nearing an end. The committee is required to report back to the Assembly on or before November 13 pursuant to clause 7(a) of the motion. The committee is required to report back to the Assembly in relation to its review of the Election Act and Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act by January 13, 2021 – wow; we’re getting there so fast – pursuant to section 7(b) of the motion.

At this point in the proceedings we have received technical briefings from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and Elections Alberta, presentations from six identified stakeholders in relation to citizens’ initiatives and recall, written submissions for both the public and the identified stakeholders, and this evening the committee is holding a virtual public meeting with members of the public on the topics of citizens’ initiatives and recall. At this point

the committee should also consider what additional research support it requires at this time.

I’d like to turn the floor over to Dr. Massolin to make some comments on the kind of research his team may be able to provide to the committee at this point in the review.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this point committees often turn to research services to ask us for what is called an issues and proposals, an issues and recommendations document. Basically that’s a four-column document containing the issues – in this case it would be on citizens’ initiatives and recall – that the committee has heard to date from stakeholders, members of the public, technical briefings that the committee has received. All that information is summarized in that table format along with any sort of notes that would assist the committee members in their deliberations, including crossjurisdictional information or references to the other documents, all the research that Ms Robert and Dr. Amato talked about previously. There’ll be cross-references to that, including, in some cases, cross-references to some of the committee discussions from the *Hansard* transcripts. That would all be compiled into this issues and recommendations document to be posted on the committee’s website and to be used during the next phase of the committee’s deliberations.

Thank you.

6:05

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin. Is there anyone who’d like to add to the discussion, or are there any motions that they’re willing to bring forward?

Ms Pancholi: Mr. Chair, I’d like to speak, if I may.

The Chair: Absolutely, Ms Pancholi. Please go ahead.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you. Given the information we just received from Dr. Massolin, I’d like to move a motion, which was provided 48 hours in advance. Should I go ahead and move that motion?

The Chair: Yes, please.

Ms Pancholi: I, Rakhi Pancholi, move that

the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee direct committee research services to (a) prepare a summary document of issues identified through public submissions and stakeholder presentations to the committee, including those made through the virtual public meetings in relation to citizens’ initiatives and recall, and (b) make the summary document available to committee members by 4:30 pm on October 22, 2020.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Roth has got that on the screen very quickly. Thank you.

Thank you for that, Ms Pancholi. Would you like to give us any of the rationale behind that or open it to discussion?

Ms Pancholi: Yeah. I’d just like to add, actually. I realize this motion was provided 48 hours ahead of time, but given what Dr. Massolin just said, I’m just questioning whether or not perhaps it would be – and I hope it wouldn’t be a formal amendment just to indicate that it’s not just an issues document but also include those recommendations that Dr. Massolin referred to in his comments earlier. Perhaps that’s implied, and it’s not necessary to actually include that wording in the motion, but the intention behind this is simply to, of course, do exactly what Dr. Massolin had just outlined.

I think it is important, given the abbreviated timelines that we have right now. I think I anticipate that given the requirement of motions being submitted 48 hours ahead of time, we would likely –

in order to properly deliberate this, I've included in the motion asking for this information to be provided by October 22 so that we have a few days before. I think motions would be due this upcoming Monday, the 26th. This would allow for a few days for all members to review the summary and the issues identified from the presentations and the virtual public meetings. I believe a timeline might just be helpful to make sure that we can have that information with enough time to draft any motions for deliberation.

The Chair: We're turning that over to Dr. Massolin for a moment. I saw him shaking his head.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I think. I wasn't shaking my head at you. I would never do that. I think I was nodding my head really quickly.

Be that as it may, I was just basically conferring with my colleague here, Ms Robert. I think that the answer to all this, Ms Pancholi's concern, is basically that, yes, we would, in spite of the motion, basically prepare a summary of issues plus recommendations and proposals all in one. The motion doesn't say "recommendations," but I think that's understood. It doesn't say sort of "written submissions," but I think that's understood, that we'd compile all the information the committee has heard to date, that you mentioned in your remarks previously, compile that into the document for the committee's use.

The Chair: Just for the edification of those not in here, I believe Dr. Massolin was shaking his head no, that another motion would not be necessary. But he outlined that just now.

Ms Pancholi, it sounds to me like another motion or an amendment is not required. It's rather just implied.

Does anyone else want to add to the discussion here?

Mr. Horner: Just a quick question, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Horner, please go ahead.

Mr. Horner: Just more of a question for research. It sounds like a very reasonable motion. I'm just curious on the timeline. Is October 22 reasonable for research?

Dr. Massolin: I can speak to that. I mean, it's very tight, but I understand as well, as Ms Pancholi pointed out, that the time frame is tight, given the fact that at the end of next week you're into deliberations. I think it's acceptable.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Horner.

Anyone else who would like to add to this discussion?

Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question on the motion as moved by Ms Pancholi. Both in person and on the phone, all those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Okay.

That motion is carried.

We are still in discussion of item 4(c). Is there any other discussion or motions that anyone would like to bring forward at this time?

Hearing none, we'll move on to item 5, other business.

Ms Pancholi: Mr. Chair, I just have a quick question about our upcoming virtual public meeting.

The Chair: Yeah. I have a little bit to read here, Ms Pancholi, and then I'll turn the floor over to you first after that, if you don't mind.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you.

The Chair: It might answer your question. If it doesn't, then you're more than welcome to go ahead.

Hon. members, one quick note about the virtual public meeting for the evening. Members are please asked to allow some distance between themselves and the microphones during the public meeting this evening when speaking. With the teleconference option that the committee will be interfacing with this evening, if we speak too close to the microphone it tends to cut out on the telephone, and it will become difficult for those participating to hear the members speaking.

I suspect that was not the question you were going to ask, Ms Pancholi, so please go ahead.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No, that was not my question. I just actually had a question that – I just couldn't locate on our committee website the list of the individuals who are registered to present. Is that somewhere? I just couldn't find it on our website, to know the names of the individuals who are presenting this evening.

The Chair: Mr. Roth is happy to send those out to the members, but that is not on the committee website. I spoke to Mr. Roth this morning. We had eight members participating at that time, and now we're up to close to 10. I think it was a fluid document. I don't want to put words in Mr. Roth's mouth, but it might have been premature to send out a list prior to now.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you. If we can have it, it's just easier to keep track of who's presenting if we could see their names, so that would be great. I understand why it hasn't been done already, but I appreciate that.

The Chair: More than a fair request. Mr. Roth is on that.

I will also mention that the subcommittee was tasked with outlining some of the parameters of the meeting this evening. One of the portions of that was the time allotment both for presenters and for members of caucus on each side to ask questions. The recommendation was two minutes per presenter and then two minutes per caucus. Unless there are any significant objections to that, I'd like to proceed with that as already outlined just for clarity's sake. If there's anything else you'd like to add to that, I'm happy to have a discussion about that at the moment as well.

Hearing none, okay, are there any other issues members would wish to bring forward?

Hearing none, the next date that the committee will be held. The virtual town hall this evening in relation to citizens' initiatives and recall from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., and then the committee is set to begin its deliberations on October 29, 2020, at 8 a.m. That is early.

With that, we would now move to adjourn. Can I get someone to form a motion to adjourn? I see Ms Goodridge moves that the October 19, 2020, meeting of the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee be adjourned. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried, and this meeting is adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 6:12 p.m.]

