



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature  
First Session

Standing Committee  
on  
Resource Stewardship

Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act Review

Friday, October 4, 2019  
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 30-1-4

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

**Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship**

Hanson, David B., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UCP), Chair  
Ceci, Joe, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP), Deputy Chair

Armstrong-Homeniuk, Jackie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UCP)  
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)  
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UCP)  
Horner, Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)\*  
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UCP)\*\*  
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)  
Rehn, Pat, Lesser Slave Lake (UCP)  
Rosin, Miranda D., Banff-Kananaskis (UCP)  
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)  
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)  
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UCP)  
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UCP)  
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)  
Turton, Searle, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UCP)  
Yaseen, Muhammad, Calgary-North (UCP)

\* substitution for Muhammad Yaseen

\*\* substitution for Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk

**Support Staff**

Shannon Dean	Clerk
Stephanie LeBlanc	Clerk Assistant and Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Teri Cherkewich	Law Clerk
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Clerk of Committees and Research Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Michael Kulicki	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>

## Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

### Participants

Alberta Securities Commission .....	RS-31
David Linder, Executive Director	
Alberta Union of Provincial Employees .....	RS-37
Guy Smith, President	
Lauren Montgomery, Researcher	
Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General	
Corinne Carlson, Barrister and Solicitor, Legislative Reform	
Public Service Commission	
Allison Husband, Compensation Analyst, Agency Compensation and Recruitment Policy	
Charlene Jackson, Compensation Consultant, Classification and Compensation Policy	



9 a.m.

Friday, October 4, 2019

[Mr. Hanson in the chair]

**The Chair:** Okay. Good morning. I'd like to call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship to order and welcome everyone in attendance.

My name is David Hanson, MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul and chair of the committee. I'd ask the members and those joining the committee at the table to introduce themselves for the record, and then I will call on those joining in by teleconference. We will begin to my immediate right.

**Mr. Turton:** Searle Turton, MLA for the riding of Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

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

**Ms Husband:** Allison Husband, compensation specialist with the Public Service Commission.

**Ms Jackson:** Charlene Jackson, compensation manager with the Public Service Commission.

**Ms Carlson:** Corinne Carlson with Justice and Solicitor General.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Marlin Schmidt, MLA for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

**Member Loyola:** Rod Loyola, MLA for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

**Mr. Feehan:** Richard Feehan, MLA for Edmonton-Rutherford.

**Mr. Getson:** Shane Getson, MLA, Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland.

**Ms LeBlanc:** Stephanie LeBlanc, Clerk Assistant and Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

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

**Mr. Kulicki:** Good morning. Michael Kulicki, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** Okay. Now we'll try and get everybody on the teleconference to identify themselves. Mr. Ceci, go ahead.

**Member Ceci:** Thank you, Chair Hanson. Good morning, everybody. Joe Ceci, MLA for Calgary-Buffalo and vice-chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Horner.

**Mr. Horner:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. Nate Horner, MLA, Drumheller-Stettler.

**Mr. Singh:** Good morning. Peter Singh, MLA for Calgary-East.

**Ms Rosin:** Hi. Good morning, everybody. It's MLA Miranda Rosin here from Banff-Kananaskis.

**The Chair:** Do we have anybody else on the line?

**Mr. Sabir:** Irfan Sabir, MLA, Calgary-McCall.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We also have Mr. David Linder.

**Mr. Linder:** Yes, I'm here, the executive director from the Alberta Securities Commission.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Linder.

For the record I'll note the following substitutions: Nate Horner for Muhammad Yaseen and Jackie Lovely for Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that microphones are operated by *Hansard*. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting. Committee proceedings are live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. The audio- and video streams and transcripts of meetings can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website.

Are there any changes or additions to the draft agenda?

If not, would somebody like to make a motion to approve the agenda?

**Mr. Turton:** I'll make the motion, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Turton. Moved by Mr. Turton that the agenda for the October 4, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be adopted as distributed. All in favour? Any opposed? Thank you. That is carried.

Next we have the draft minutes of our September 19 meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note?

If not, I would ask a member to make a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith. Moved by Mr. Smith that the minutes of the September 19, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be approved as distributed. All in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? Thank you. That motion is carried.

Turning now to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, at our last meeting we agreed to invite stakeholders and members of the public to make oral presentations to the committee. The caucuses were asked to submit lists of stakeholders to the chair and the deputy chair by 4:30 p.m. on Friday, September 20. For the record the stakeholders that the committee wished to invite to participate in today's meeting were the Alberta Securities Commission, the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, the Alberta branch of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, and the Fraser Institute. The ASC and the AUPE indicated that they desired to present to us today, so we will be hearing from them this morning via teleconference. In addition, a call for oral presentations from members of the public was sent out on Friday, September 20, through social media posts on Facebook and Twitter as well as a media advisory. However, this call resulted in no additional requests to appear before the committee.

Our first presentation this morning will be from Mr. David Linder, the executive director of the Alberta Securities Commission, who is joining us on the phone. Each stakeholder will be provided with five minutes to make a presentation to the committee, followed by up to 40 minutes of questions from the committee members.

Thank you very much for joining us today, Mr. Linder. Please proceed.

#### Alberta Securities Commission

**Mr. Linder:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. I would like to commence by thanking the committee for the opportunity for the ASC to submit a response in writing and to provide oral follow-up comments. Having read the minutes of your numerous meetings, I'm cognizant that this issue has already involved considerable discussion. Furthermore, as also indicated in the minutes, you do not have a lot of time to complete your assigned tasks; accordingly, I will be brief with my submissions. Also, you've set a limit on me of five minutes.

The ASC is cognizant of the importance of transparency. Indeed, at your last meeting, on September 19, in her briefing to the committee Ms Carlson of the Ministry of Justice made the following opening comments:

By way of overview, the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act requires the government of Alberta and government agencies, called public-sector bodies, to publicly disclose the compensation paid to higher income employees. Public-sector bodies are also required to disclose all income paid to board members. The disclosure is intended to increase transparency, which will help Alberta taxpayers better see how their money is spent.

As a result, we received what became known as the sunshine list, no doubt emanating from U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who commented, “Sunlight is the best disinfectant.”

With the greatest of respect to the drafters of the act and the accompanying regulatory structure, generating lists of thousands of employees and their individual compensations is not transparent, nor does it help Albertans to better understand how their money is spent and what value they receive. Disclosure of compensation without any comprehension of duties and performance distorts rather than educates the reader. Rather, an Albertan can look to the budget of the government of Alberta or the financial statements of government departments and boards and agencies to see how they are spending taxpayer dollars. Boards and agencies have approved budgets overseen by the responsible minister, and there are mechanisms for periodic reporting providing oversight. It is difficult to reconcile reams of figures as presently disclosed as equalling useful transparency.

Your committee has spoken briefly about the privacy of individuals, and I would urge you not to overlook this fundamental right of all Albertans, including those who work for the government. Why should the individual compensation of many ASC employees be public knowledge? Now, I would not suggest that this is universally true. The ASC and, I believe, other boards and agencies have published the compensation figures for their top agency executives in their annual reports, in the case of the ASC, since it left being a government department, since 1996. This is similar to public company disclosure as required by securities laws, and it, I would argue, is completely appropriate.

Your committee also talked about the media and its use of the sunshine list, which, I would agree, is limited to printing the names of those executives who are at the top of the heap compensationwise. I have to admit my conflict. I have been on those lists published by the *Herald* and the *Journal*, then picked up by B.C. and published across the country, for the past number of years. I confess that I do not enjoy the attention, but it is completely appropriate for my salary to be public and for those who run public organizations: we are accountable; it is part of our job. But it is not appropriate nor useful for ASC accountants, lawyers, managers, engineers, geologists, and investigators to have their salaries presented to the public.

In the presentation by Ms Carr to this committee at their meeting of September 19, 2019, she advised the committee that the reason AIMCo, the teachers’ pension plan, and the ATB were exempt was because they are large financial agencies that have a significant impact on the Alberta economy, and disclosing their compensation would create difficulties in retaining talent. In responding to a question from a committee member, her explanation was that “it could create a situation where other, similar entities could access that information and use that to poach folks from those agencies.” That state of affairs is not limited to those organizations. Similarly, if headhunters or other entities wish to poach, to use Ms Carr’s words, from the ASC, they know exactly what my staff makes. It is

not just the top wage earners; it is, throughout, the professionals in the organization who are liable to be plucked. These are often people who the agencies have invested years and resources in to develop their talents.

9:10

Our written submission identifies other circumstances where the sunshine list makes our workplace more difficult. The fact that colleagues know what each other makes contributes to dissension, and time is wasted having managers explain why so-and-so makes less or more than so-and-so else. It also contributes to declining employee morale and, ultimately, I would argue, departures. There are difficulties in the formulas in the present sunshine list, so notwithstanding that employees make the same base salary, some people are on the list and others are not due to differing retirement compensation structures.

I understand that there has been discussion about other jurisdictions’ regimes, and indeed Alberta was late to the dance in implementing this structure.

**The Chair:** If I could interrupt. Your five minutes are up, but we will give you an additional minute or so to wrap up if you could.

**Mr. Linder:** I certainly will, sir.

I understand that there has been discussion of other jurisdictions. I didn’t see any argument or advocacy as to why this was implemented and why it is a good idea.

One further consideration is that this new administration has talked about reduction of red tape. Not causing government departments and boards and agencies to go through the bureaucratic exercise of creating charts, checking and rechecking this disclosure would clearly be a reduction in what I would term an output requiring lots of work with little or no consequential public benefit.

In closing, I believe that Albertans can be appropriately served by disclosure of the top earners at the various government departments, boards, and agencies, and this could be done without all the requirements in the structure of the present administrative scheme.

Thank you for your attention. I will try and address any questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Linder.

I’ll now open the floor to questions from committee members. If you have any questions, please get your name on the list. Mr. Feehan, go ahead.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you very much. Mr. Linder, thank you very much for your presentation. I would just like to give you an opportunity to kind of fill out a little bit some of the comments you were able to make only briefly in your presentation given the time limits. I’d like to give you a little bit of extra time by asking about some of the particular areas. You talked, for example, about some issues around recruitment being made more difficult in this process and, of course, the opposite, people being poached and taken away from the ASC. I’m wondering if you have specific examples or if you could just spend some time talking about how that’s affected the ASC’s ability to bring on the highest level of skill and retain the highest level of skill.

**Mr. Linder:** Well, I think what we have seen – obviously, no one has come into our offices when we do our departure interviews and told us that they left because of the sunshine list, but we clearly have had an uptick in departures and turnover. This may just coincide with the sunshine list. Obviously, the fact that there has been a salary freeze for close to four years hasn’t helped. I don’t have

particular statistics other than that it has raised considerably. I do know that my employees feel very strongly that their salaries should not be disclosed. Clearly, anyone who leaves the organization leaves for more money. I would sort of draw the conclusion that it's pretty easy to figure out what someone has to offer them when this information is published.

**Mr. Feehan:** So is it your experience that people in the private sector are actually using the lists as a way of identifying salaries so that they can make offers that are better?

**Mr. Linder:** Well, I certainly have had discussions with headhunters who have advised that this information is useful to their efforts.

**Mr. Feehan:** You say that there's a net loss of expertise out of the system, out of the public service, when we have sunshine lists?

**Mr. Linder:** I would suggest that it puts us at a disadvantage that we don't need to be at.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you. I appreciate that.

You also spoke briefly about the formulas for how the \$129,000 is calculated. You didn't have much chance to sort of speak about that, but I understand there are some concerns about whether pensions are included or not. I'm wondering if you can just take a few moments to talk about the formulas and the problems that you see inherent there.

**Mr. Linder:** This may be a situation that is unique to the ASC; I'm not certain. What happened when the ASC left the government department – the lawyers and managers were thrown out of the management pension plan, and we had to supplement by RRSP those particular pension attributes. The explanation was that they felt that those people would be making too much money to be in the plan. I'm not sure if in history that bears itself out, but, in any event, what happens with the formula is that the RRSP monies are included as part of base salary whereas for people in the PSPP it is included as other income. So for purposes of calculating \$129,000, those who have an RRSP contribution are included. They may have the same base salary, but those who have the RRSP are included in the list, and those who are in the PSPP are not.

**Mr. Feehan:** So would a resolution just simply be to make a rule that an RRSP or any other pension contribution is not included in base salary and therefore not included in the list for sunshine?

**Mr. Linder:** That could address that particular issue. I'm not sure that's the greater harm, but, yes, it would.

**Mr. Feehan:** Okay. You also mentioned that this is an issue of red tape reduction and indicated that there is some expense to the public service to create, maintain, and deliver these lists to the public. Can you give me a bit of a sense about the kind of energy and time that is spent on these kinds of lists?

**Mr. Linder:** Well, I mean, obviously, when we're putting things out to the public, we want to ensure that they're correct. So there is a fair bit of time spent going through the list by accounting staff and being checked by their supervisors and our HR people to ensure that our 200 and some employees, 80-some of which I believe are on the list, are correctly and properly displayed, that they belong on the list, et cetera. I guess my view is that that is time that could be better spent sort of addressing our mandate.

**Mr. Feehan:** Great. Thank you. As well, you indicated – perhaps it was in your written submission – that people who are lower on the

list of salary compensation have been using the list as a basis for arguing for an increase of their salaries because they've become increasingly aware, of course, of other people who they're working with and wish to either, you know, have equal salary with other people they're working with or perhaps surpass them if they believe their job is more complex or whatever else. Can you tell me about the upward pressure on salaries and therefore the expense to the government for having a sunshine list?

**Mr. Linder:** Well, since the freeze has been sort of implemented, that is less of an issue, but it doesn't eliminate the dissatisfaction and the discussion. I would just submit that in most workplaces you wouldn't be running into that particular irritant.

**Mr. Feehan:** Right. Okay. But you also indicate that the turnover rate at the ASC has increased over the last number of years, and I'm wondering if you would tie the sunshine list to that in terms of people becoming increasingly aware of being paid less than others and therefore desiring to leave the public service in order to go to the private sector. Do you believe that there's a relationship between the publication of the numbers and the increase in the turnover?

**Mr. Linder:** I do. As I commented earlier, people generally don't slam the door on their way out, so they're not liable to open up on things that they think are wrong just in case they have to come back through that door. But, certainly, I do think the sunshine list is an area that causes us unnecessary strain on our departures.

**Mr. Feehan:** What types of professions is this most likely to affect?

**Mr. Linder:** Well, it's our professional class, so that's lawyers, geologists, engineers, accountants, our investigators, our analysts. I think it's throughout that group.

9:20

**Mr. Feehan:** Okay. Thank you. One last question from me, and then I'll pass it on to whoever else might have questions.

You talked about the fact that the general use of these lists in the public seems to be a reporting by media only on the very top people on the list, that generally people far down on the list, you know, their salaries are not particularly reported or reflected on. Is it your personal opinion, I guess, or professional opinion that the information provided lower down on the list is actually not providing any public service, or is it just that the media is looking for something exciting to go after government about?

**Mr. Linder:** I mean, I think the media tries to make a story out of the so-called fat cats and how highly they're paid. I think with regard to the other information, I would not think the average citizen would want to sort of go through the reams of information to get any meaningful disclosure as to what it really means. What one particular individual makes: it's hard to see how that is valuable information in terms of what a taxpayer contributes. Some people might want to check on their neighbours, but, again, I wonder how valuable that is in terms of the scheme of things.

**Mr. Feehan:** Right. So would an alteration in the \$129,000 limit be effective in reducing the exposure of people who are lower on the list? Would that be an effective thing, or are you wishing to eliminate the list altogether?

**Mr. Linder:** I don't think the list for people below executive – and it's more a privacy issue – is really valuable. I think what managers and professionals make should be their business, and we shouldn't

put ourselves at a disadvantage in trying to attract those people in that their salaries are posted publicly.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you very much. I appreciate the time you've given me.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Feehan.  
Mr. Getson, you had a question.

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. Similar to Mr. Feehan, I think I have an omnibus of questions now. It's not just one that kind of led into it. Firstly, sir, thank you very much for taking the time to, obviously, put your submissions to us and to orally submit as well. It provides a lot of colour and insight into your submissions. You answered one of my first questions. It was how big your organization was. You answered the second one with: about 80 of the 200 are on that list. Now, do you have any stats on the turnover that you've seen in the last number of years? Again, coming back to Mr. Feehan's comment, it doesn't seem to be a direct correlation with the sunshine list; it seems to be more industry indicative. Is that correct?

**Mr. Linder:** Are the people on the sunshine list the ones who are departing? Is that your question, sir?

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. Correct. I guess with the sunshine list itself you're noting – or maybe I'm hearing it the wrong way – that potentially the sunshine list is causing turnover in your organization, but I didn't hear that you had any statistics or numbers correlating that.

**Mr. Linder:** Most of our turnover is at the professional level, so those are people who tend to be above the \$129,000.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. So that would be of the 80 of the 200 in your organization that you're seeing the most turnover in?

**Mr. Linder:** Yes. In fairness, though, those people are more attractive in terms of professionally, and I can't say as a direct result of the sunshine list.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. I guess the other thing I would ask is: how does that compare to industry out there? Again, with the change in the economics over the last number of years, I know there's been lots of movement with people moving to find better opportunities or to make a little bit of extra dollars here and there or better compensation, you know, whether it's RSP contributions or otherwise. Would you think it's a steady state, or do you see something disproportionate?

**Mr. Linder:** Our turnover has been a bit higher than average.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay.

**Mr. Linder:** But, again, there are a number of reasons for that. Some people do come to this organization to get training so they can move back into industry. We don't see that as a negative, but we do find that the sunshine list is a dissatisfier to our staff.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. And the next one, I would suggest, is that you're noting a lot of professionals, so engineers, geologists, et cetera. A lot of those professional organizations typically inquire from their members what they make and what their compensation packages are so they can post annually internally, amongst those organizations, where fair dispensation is. That seems to be running in parallel, so I'm not sure if that's one of the drivers as well.

**Mr. Linder:** Are you saying things like the Law Society sort of surveys and that kind of thing?

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. I can specifically speak to APEGA. Anyone who is a geologist or an engineer or even a technologist, we would be inquired on what our wages are, our compensation, and then we would submit that information to the organization, which they then post to all their members. So depending on your experience, which industry you're in, we essentially have our own type of sunshine list, I guess, where it would come down to bracketing for your professional designation and what your compensation is.

**Mr. Linder:** Well, I'd have less bluster if what the government was asking us to put out was a general, average survey number as opposed to an exact amount of money that a particular individual is making.

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. And that's what was going to lead into my next question. If we were to modify – and this is just off the record, so to speak, thinking outside of the box. If some of the concerns that you had came down to individual names being listed, if we had the position rather than the specific name, would that alleviate some of the internal issues?

**Mr. Linder:** I think it certainly would. I think putting ranges towards positions as opposed to actual people would be an improvement. Yes.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. Perfect.

The other one was: I have never been in any organization where you didn't have the coffee talk, where it came around to compensation or wages, so I really appreciate your efforts in that, sir, in managing a group. Again, my background running major capital projects, regardless of who was involved, whether it was the engineer or the legal staff, the physical people on the tools, invariably some of that dialogue comes down to reasons for compensation on their packages. I really appreciate your efforts on that and, again, providing colour on the sunshine list.

**Mr. Linder:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Getson.

Anybody else with questions from the committee? Mr. Smith.

**Mr. M. Smith:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Linder. I truly appreciate it. You said that a fair bit of time is spent on putting the figures together. Do you have any idea what that cost would be?

**Mr. Linder:** I don't actually know the numbers. Obviously, I have a number of accountants. I have people in HR that go through the numbers. It does involve verification, but I can't give you an exact sort of figure or time frame.

**Mr. M. Smith:** I guess just more at a 50,000-foot level, the thing that's going through my head is that, you know, we've passed the transparency act here, the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, because there was a belief by those that did so that there was a value to the government in having some sort of accountability for the wages and the contracts that were being agreed to by the government and in trying to make sure that the taxpayers' dollars are being spent wisely and efficiently, that that was a part of that equation. I guess the question I've got is – you know, it's hard to make a judgment as to whether that goal is a good goal if you haven't got some understanding of the kind of costs that are going into that and getting that information. So it would be valuable for us if you had that, at some point in time, to pass on to the committee.

I guess I would finish with this last question, and that is just: from that 50,000-foot level, do you think your concerns with regard to



compensation and the sunshine list override the public interest that results from having the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act?

**Mr. Linder:** I guess I might quarrel a bit that the compensation act is necessarily in the public interest. My view of the disclosure of – I know they don't have telephone books anymore, but in essence that's what it is – lists of reams and reams of numbers and individuals' names: it's hard to see how that's meaningful disclosure. At the Securities Commission we know something about disclosure, and if somebody provided a public document with that sort of information in it, we would say that that is not useful nor transparent, because you're lost in a morass of information.

9:30

**Mr. M. Smith:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Feehan, you had another question?

**Mr. Feehan:** Yes. Thank you. I was just wondering. This is kind of a bit of an outside question, but there's often concern in compensation that there's a gender disparity and that women are often provided with fewer dollars for the same job as men. I'm wondering whether or not it's your sense that having a sunshine list has brought to light any of that, that is then enhanced or used by women in the ASC or other organizations to identify that, in fact, they're being paid less than their compatriots.

**Mr. Linder:** I haven't ever seen that particular matter identified either in the press or otherwise. I can tell you that at the ASC most of our senior team are women, and their salaries are equal to the men's, if not more, depending on their position, and it's all based on the job they do.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any questions from anyone on the phones?

**Member Ceci:** I have a question, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Ceci.

**Member Ceci:** Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Linder, for your presentation, too, and for the submissions. I just wouldn't mind knowing some general background. For instance, how long have you been with the Securities Commission in Alberta?

**Mr. Linder:** Only since August 1996.

**Member Ceci:** Since '96. Twenty-three years. All right. And how long have you been in your current role?

**Mr. Linder:** Since December 1997.

**Member Ceci:** So most of that time. Does every province and territory have a securities commission?

**Mr. Linder:** Yes, although not all of them are agencies. Some of them are part of government departments. But, yes, there are 13 securities commissions or securities agencies.

**Member Ceci:** Across the country?

**Mr. Linder:** Yes.

**Member Ceci:** Where would you stack the ASC relative to those 13 in terms of maybe I'll just say effectiveness in managing or in regulating the securities markets in their jurisdictions?

**Mr. Linder:** You know, that's not really a question that I can sort of comment on without bringing my own sort of bias to it.

**Member Ceci:** I recognize that.

**Mr. Linder:** I would see us among the best. Certainly, there are four big jurisdictions: Quebec, ourselves, Ontario, and B.C. As you know, Mr. Ceci, from your previous job, we work a lot together under the auspices of the CSA.

**Member Ceci:** Right. So amongst the top four, for sure.

Has it always been that way? I know this is subjective again, but has the ASC really come into its own under new management, or has it always been that way?

**Mr. Linder:** I think that when we first came out of government, we were a small organization. Our budget was \$6 million; today it's \$40 million. Obviously, things have changed dramatically. I think we have become known at the CSA as someone who punches above their weight. We're not as big as any of the other bigger jurisdictions, and I think the various chairs have done a good job in advancing the reputation and the ability of the Alberta Securities Commission.

**Member Ceci:** Right. You, of course, regulate all private-sector investment, I think, in the province. Is there anything, besides what you've mentioned already, that we can learn from the private-sector disclosure practices that would benefit us in the committee?

**Mr. Linder:** I would urge the committee to look at national instrument 51-102, which deals with the public company disclosure of the named executive officers, which is the top five. I think that's a good comparison to look at.

**Member Ceci:** I guess, Mr. Linder, I hear, on one hand, that the ASC is performing its role extremely well, and on the other hand I hear you saying that you believe this is an irritant in terms of the sunshine list disclosures. I guess the struggle I have is that even in spite of the sunshine list disclosures, the ASC is punching above its weight. I think that's a good place to be in terms of the size and the budget and the ability of the ASC. I'm just not sure why we should change if things are going well for the ASC at this time. I guess I want to give you one last opportunity, from my perspective, to make that pitch.

**Mr. Linder:** I think that the ASC can and should always try and be better. I think the sunshine list interferes with our ability to do that, and I can also say that there are probably some who say that we aren't as outstanding as perhaps we would like ourselves to be.

**Member Ceci:** Okay. Thank you, and thank you for your presentation.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ceci. Anyone else on the phone?

**Mr. Sabir:** Chair, this is Irfan Sabir.

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

**Mr. Sabir:** I have a couple of questions, more in line with what my colleague MLA Richard Feehan was asking. Thank you, Mr. Linder, as well for your presentation. I think a couple of assertions were made that it interferes with your ability to do your work, that it has impact on your internal work, but we didn't see anything concrete that the ASC has done, any kind of research or any kind of data, evidence. As MLA Feehan was mentioning, I think there's

enough discussion, academic discussion, that these disclosures do protect against different kinds of biases like gender biases, racial biases. Also, they do kind of push companies, push public-sector parties, entities to go for equal pay for equal work. They also push them to publish well-defined, I guess, compensation metrics within the organization.

Considering that all that is in the public interest and that more recently we saw, I guess, private companies' disclosure about women in board positions in Alberta – only 14 per cent are represented on those boards – such disclosures do, I guess, provide data, do provide information for better public policy. For instance, your disclosure about private companies, that women hold only 14 per cent of board positions: I think that as a society we need to think about it. Why is it that women hold only 14 per cent of board positions? Similarly, when we have these published things, the published information about salary, that pushes us to look for similar issues, public policy issues like equal pay for equal work, for better and well-defined compensation metrics, and to look for those biases like gender, racial biases.

I don't think that you have made the case that your concerns should override the public interest. Again I would ask the same question, that the ASC provide more details on how this disclosure is interfering with their ability to do their work. In general, when they will prepare a budget, they will have all that information compiled: who is getting what, how much is paid in salaries, how much is paid in expenses. It's just a matter of making it public according to the legislation.

9:40

**Mr. Linder:** Is there a question, sir? I'm sorry.

**Mr. Sabir:** I think the question was that in light of what I mentioned about public policy objectives like defending equal pay for equal work, pushing for well-defined compensation metrics, protecting against gender biases, racial biases, these are important public policy concerns. All we have heard is that you said that turnover was high, but you said that there is no correlation, that there is no evidence. You said that it interferes with your ability to do the work. Can you expand on both of these to make a case that your concerns should override the important public policy concerns that I outlined?

**Mr. Linder:** Okay. I guess what I would say, sir, is that the sunshine list doesn't address the matters you have raised in terms of gender or race bias. I mean, you would need a research team to go through scads and scads of information. Could you tell from somebody's name? I mean, those aren't matters that are asked to be disclosed under the sunshine list. The sunshine list is bare information on compensation and people's names.

**Mr. Sabir:** I think it may or may not address those issues, but it gives you information on those important issues. I referenced the ASC disclosure about women holding board positions, and in your ASC report it stated that only 14 per cent of women hold board positions. So that report itself didn't address that gap, but we now have important information in front of us based on which we can address that and take steps, encourage companies to take steps to make that representation better. Similarly, when we have public-sector disclosure, I think we then get information that can be used to address these important public policy concerns.

**Mr. Linder:** I guess, sir, my view would be that if you really want that information, then ask us to disclose that, not a list of people's names and compensation.

**Mr. Sabir:** I think you can make those suggestions – you are open to do that – but I didn't hear that the disclosure list has interfered with the ASC's ability to do its work. I am not convinced, and I didn't hear evidence that it has any impact or bearing on the turnover at the ASC. So again I'm asking if you can expand on that, give more clear evidence, something to back that up so that I can, I guess, have a better understanding of your concern.

**Mr. Linder:** I can probably go back and spend time determining how much time is spent putting together the sunshine list, et cetera. In terms of people's departures, as I previously explained, that is not something, unless people are volunteering, we are going to know. So all I can say is that if you look at the statistics, our turnover has gone up since the sunshine list came in. I would see that as a contributing factor. You, obviously, are free to disagree with me.

**Mr. Sabir:** I think, surely, you can provide more information on turnover and how it relates to the disclosure list and how the disclosure list interferes with your ability to do the work. I would be happy to look at that information.

**Mr. Linder:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Sabir.

Any further questions from the committee?

Hearing none, thank you very much, Mr. Linder, for your input today and for presenting and taking the time to bring your comments forward.

**Mr. Linder:** Thank you for hearing me.

**The Chair:** Okay. Our next presentation will be from Mr. Guy Smith, the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. At this time I'll call for a short recess to allow Mr. Smith to join us via teleconference.

[The committee adjourned from 9:44 a.m. to 9:49 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Okay, folks. Welcome back.

Joining us now via teleconference is Mr. Guy Smith, the president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. Before hearing from Mr. Smith, I'd once again ask that we each introduce ourselves to our guests joining us on the phone, including those who are also on the teleconference. I think that for ease I'll just list those folks.

My name is David Hanson, MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul and chair of the committee. On the line we have Mr. Joe Ceci.

**Member Ceci:** Yes. Joe Ceci, MLA for Calgary-Buffalo, NDP committee member.

**The Chair:** Okay. I've been corrected. We'll start with the introductions of the folks that are here at the table, starting with my right.

**Mr. Turton:** Thank you. Searle Turton, MLA, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

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

**Ms Husband:** Allison Husband, compensation specialist with the Public Service Commission.

**Ms Jackson:** Charlene Jackson, compensation manager with the Public Service Commission.

**Ms Carlson:** Corinne Carlson with Justice and Solicitor General.

**Mr. Schmidt:** Marlin Schmidt, MLA, Edmonton-Gold Bar.

**Member Loyola:** Rod Loyola, MLA for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

**Mr. Feehan:** Richard Feehan, MLA for Edmonton-Rutherford.

**Mr. Getson:** Shane Getson, MLA, Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland.

**Ms LeBlanc:** Stephanie LeBlanc, Clerk Assistant and Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

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

**Mr. Kulicki:** Good morning. Michael Kulicki, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** And for those on the phone, we've already heard from Mr. Ceci. Thank you, Mr. Ceci. Nate Horner, are you still there?

**Mr. Horner:** Nate Horner, MLA, Drumheller-Stettler.

**Mr. Singh:** Peter Singh, MLA, Calgary-East.

**Ms Rosin:** Miranda Rosin, MLA, Banff-Kananaskis.

**Mr. Sigurdson:** Mr. Sigurdson, MLA, Highwood. Thanks.

**Ms Lovely:** Jackie Lovely, MLA, Camrose.

**Mr. Sabir:** Irfan Sabir, MLA, Calgary-McCall.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much for joining us today. Mr. Smith, you will have five minutes to make your presentation, followed by up to 40 minutes of questions from the committee members. If you're ready, please proceed.

### Alberta Union of Provincial Employees

**Mr. G. Smith:** Yes. Thank you. I'm Guy Smith, president of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, and I'm joined by Lauren Montgomery, one of our research staff and the principal author of the written submissions that we provided to the committee. We thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning. I will sort of be doing a bit of an overview from the AUPE's perspective, and Lauren is available to answer any questions specific to the submission that we put in.

Historically we've had an interest in what is euphemistically known as the sunshine list ever since its inception a few years ago, and really that comes out of the fact that for many years the whole question of public compensation and how public dollars are used to provide compensation to those in the public sector have targeted unionized workers. We've seen in the past a number of claims made by groups like the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, the Fraser Institute, the University of Calgary School of Public Policy which, quite honestly, vilify the front-line workers that we represent and target them in terms of issues around public compensation.

It was originally the Canadian Taxpayers Federation in Alberta which ensured that the sunshine list would be brought into being, and it proved that point. We knew that a minuscule number of front-line workers would be exposed, if you like, on the sunshine list, and it's really, for us, underlined the fact that when it comes to public compensation issues, which are important – and we believe that the government of Alberta should be accountable for those funds going to compensation and open about it. They should be used in the most effective way. I think Albertans expect that. But, for us, it proved a

point that we have to constantly defend publicly, in the public realm and also with employers, including the government of Alberta, when it comes to public compensation.

It should be no secret to anybody in this committee that it's often unions that are targeted and union members that are targeted when it comes to issues around public compensation, especially in times of impending cutbacks, which is what we're hearing at the moment. It always seems to be those hard-working women and men on the front lines which are exposed to those kinds of arguments and will likely be targeted.

We think it's important that Albertans are fully aware of where public funds go in terms of compensation to those working in the public services and the agencies funded by government, and again it underlines the fact that, you know, our members who actually deliver the services to the people of the province are pretty much not exposed on the sunshine list.

9:55

There's a bit of a historical or philosophical context in that we've actually supported the introduction of that and through our submission wanted to make recommendations on the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act. As I've said, although we believe that it's a good tool for accountability and effectiveness, certainly for Albertans, we do believe that there are necessary changes that need to be made, and those you have seen in our written submission to you.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.

We will turn to questions from the committee.

We're getting feedback here. If you're on the phones, could you put your phones on mute, please?

Okay. Any questions for Mr. Smith from the committee? Mr. Feehan.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you. Mr. Smith, we appreciate both your written submission from the spring, which you resubmitted, and, of course, your oral presentation this morning. I see that the major emphasis of your presentation is a shift away from identification of individuals to a description of job classification. I wonder if you could identify for me any particular incidents or examples of the identification of individuals that you found to be problematic or if you feel that this is a larger level concern around general privacy.

**Mr. G. Smith:** Thank you for the question, Mr. Feehan. I don't believe that any of our members specifically have raised that concern. As I said, there are a minuscule number of AUPE members on the list. I do believe, though, if I recall correctly, that when the first sunshine list came into being, the Crown prosecutors, who obviously are not AUPE members, raised a concern and may even have taken it to [inaudible]. I'm not sure.

The underlying recommendation on that is the fact that inasmuch as there need to be transparency and accountability, I think that can be easily achieved without, you know, naming names. It is uncomfortable for anybody regardless of their role and their compensation to be named or called out. Really, it meets no purpose if the goal is to dispose transparency and accountability on names, specific positions, and compensation attached to those. It's not necessary, and it may – it may – put the whole process in jeopardy if there are enough claims made against the fact that individuals feel that their privacy is being compromised. We wouldn't like to see the good work done through this piece of legislation undermined by someone having a legitimate complaint about their privacy being compromised.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Sorry. We're having a little difficulty hearing your responses. I don't know if you could be a little closer to your microphone or not.

Let me go on as well to just ask about the idea that has been floated in a number of submissions about including information that would be particularly useful such as identification of gender of position occupants or self-identified racial status – minority status, for example – or self-identification of having a disability. Would those kinds of pieces of information provide any extra information that would be helpful in terms of making the disclosure list more useful in bringing a certain amount of equity into compensation in future?

**Mr. G. Smith:** That's a very interesting perspective and one that we hadn't actually looked at in detail. Lauren Montgomery and I have discussed this, and I would actually like her to respond to that in her role as a researcher with our organization.

**Ms Montgomery:** Thank you for the question.

Sorry. Can you hear me? Is this loud enough?

**The Chair:** If you could speak up just a little bit, that would be great. Thanks.

**Ms Montgomery:** Okay. It is always very important to ensure pay equity and gender equity, of course. That is something that we strive for. I wonder about the nature of sort of including it on this list in the sense that, you know, somebody may self-identify according to a certain gender, but then it becomes public nature. I guess the question ultimately becomes, then: do you balance that by not including somebody's name or if you keep their name and then include all of these other identifying characteristics, sort of ensuring their privacy along with that, if that sort of makes sense? I definitely think it's always a way for us to strive toward greater pay equity, and that is extremely important.

I wonder, though, if there may be other government mechanisms or other pieces of legislation where we can also strive and push for that gender and pay equity, so something like pay equity legislation addressing things like an adequate minimum wage, because we know that a low minimum wage has disproportionate impacts on folks of colour as well as women in the province of Alberta. I definitely think there are other avenues for us to be able to address pay equity and equity broadly speaking in Alberta. I think that if it were to be done on this type of list or through this legislation, we would have to ensure that it is balanced through other mechanisms on the list.

**Mr. G. Smith:** If I can also add to that, I think it would be extremely enlightening, actually, you know, again, as Lauren was saying, protecting personal privacy but to get a good picture, if you like, of what the Alberta public service and its agencies and other publicly funded organizations look like when it comes to equity issues, whether it's gender, racial equity, and those issues, because I think that has not been looked at. If this can be used as a tool to gain some insight into that, I think that would be very useful moving forward. So I'm interested that the committee is not only asking these questions but maybe also looking at including that somehow. But, again, along the same lines as not naming individuals to certain compensation lines, I think of the fact that private, personal information also needs to be protected.

**Mr. Feehan:** Okay. One last question for you, Mr. Smith. I'm just wondering about the effect on the sunshine list with regard to negotiations for salaries. I know you're presently in the position of negotiating with the provincial government around salaries. I just

want to know if there's any impact in terms of those negotiations in having this disclosure or not having this disclosure list.

**Mr. G. Smith:** I don't know if it's been used directly in negotiations. I mean, we are currently on a hiatus from an arbitration process dealing with, yes, specifically wages in the third year of a negotiated collective agreement, so part of our submission [inaudible] data and forecasting and that sort of thing. I don't know if we referred specifically to the sunshine list, but what I can tell you – and this may resonate with the committee, or it may not – is that, as I said in my opening remarks, it shines a light on the facts about public compensation.

I can tell you that when any government or any minister of the government talks about the need for freezes and cutbacks, the first person that the media phones is me, you know, representing those front-line workers. I have utilized the fact that our members do not appear on the sunshine list as an example of where – and I'm not saying that anybody should receive freezes or cutbacks – the other side of the public compensation envelope goes to non-union employees. In fact, the vast majority of this does. So I think, for us, it's been a useful tool in explaining publicly, especially in situations where oftentimes our members are targeted either by the media, by government, or by the public in some cases. It has been helpful that way as well. But in terms of direct correlation with bargaining, I don't believe it's necessarily useful in that regard although it is of massive interest to our members when they see it and they see that their managers and their managers' managers are on the list. I think they take a bit of pleasure out of seeing that and maybe a bit of shock sometimes as well. But I don't know if we've necessarily used it sort of specifically as it relates to negotiations although that might be a good idea, and thank you for it.

10:05

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Getson, you had a question?

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah, I sure did. There were a couple of them here. Thank you so much for, you know, your submitting this, Mr. Smith. I guess you had mentioned that there were a minuscule number of your members that are on it. I guess that if you could just say, for some background colour: about how many members do you have, and how many actually appear on that list?

**Mr. G. Smith:** Lauren, do you want to go? I'll pass it over to Lauren. She actually pulled up those numbers in preparation.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. Thank you.

**Ms Montgomery:** Yeah. Thank you so much for the question. The AUPE has roughly 95,000 members across the province of Alberta. When I did these calculations, just so you know, I pulled the most recent list, and I looked most specifically at the most recently published list, which was published, I think, in June 2019 but represented the numbers from January 1, 2018, until December 31. So these numbers reflect that. There were roughly 108 AUPE members who made it onto the sunshine list. That represents roughly .1 per cent of our membership. In the 2018 list that you see for government employees, there were 2,661 employees who had their salaries disclosed, and that was, again, .1 per cent of our membership that ended up on that list. When we look just at the 2,600-plus disclosed and we look at our 108 folks who made it onto that list: roughly 3.9 per cent. Just based on our best calculations that we could sort of base on these lists and from, you know, ever-

changing numbers, that was roughly 3.9 per cent. These numbers are very, very small.

**Mr. Getson:** Where would you say the bulk of your membership falls if we were to put brackets on that? Are they the \$50,000, the \$60,000, the \$70,000, the \$80,000 per year? And what would those percentages be?

**Ms Montgomery:** I would have to go back in to [inaudible]. I wouldn't be able to do sort of the really, really average calculations of their wages, but I'm looking at the list that we've pulled. The bulk, the biggest number of folks who end up on this, are standards, safety, and compliance 7 folks as well as our scientist 4s. When we look at a scientist 4, that individual could be doing anything from – they could be an aquatic scientist. We've got folks on here who do environmental health, and their salaries are – you know, I'm looking at it here – just from what was reported, \$119,000. Of course, this is their base salary plus their overtime, and as you will have seen in our submission, we asked very specifically that base salary be pulled out from overtime because of this sort of difficulty that it causes when doing calculations like we were just asked about, right? So their salary, again for scientist 4, \$119,000, ranges from that to \$113,000.

When I look at standards, safety, and compliance 7, specifically 7 and 6, those classifications, we've got folks on there who are senior occupational hygienists. We've got safety specialists. We've got fire administrators, radiation specialists, and again their salaries are ranging from \$118,000 to \$111,000. Again, these are all very complicated numbers with the cash benefits and the noncash benefits, so we're not able to do the sort of quick averaging calculations, but that's sort of where the bulk is. I will also say that there are possibly some folks who are IT analysts as well, and then some of the other classifications that are on the list, although there are not as many, are folks like scientist 5s. Again, those are folks like a dairy research scientist, a beef research scientist, provincial fish science specialists, and grizzly biologists. Again, like, \$128,000 – I'm looking at the list here. Yeah. Those scientist 5s: roughly \$128,000 plus their cash and noncash benefits. I'm also noting that some of these here don't include severances. On the list, I think, for this year there are roughly only three that reported severances, and I don't think, from my recollection, that any of those were our employees.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. Thank you for that. That's very good.

The other one, just back to Mr. Smith again – or maybe I didn't understand it correctly. You were suggesting that a lot of the front-line workers are receiving feedback from the public, negative feedback from the public, or inquiries based on folks that are listed on the sunshine list. Did I understand that correctly?

**Mr. G. Smith:** No. I apologize if I didn't characterize that properly. Our members, when they have access to the sunshine list or have an interest in seeing, you know, what their managers and senior officials above them make, just out of interest – and I think we were talking about it in the context of how we utilize the sunshine list. I want to re-emphasize the fact that we use it as good information when protecting the interests of our members in the public realm, so when they're targeted for wage freezes or cutbacks or other things that will be detrimental to them and the service that they provide, the sunshine list is a tool that we use to clarify publicly where our members are in relation to those that do appear on the sunshine list. I hope that helps.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. Understood. Yeah, that's perfect. That puts it in context.

The other thing I would caution. We have some good ideas, but we seem to bolt on or think we can bolt on a few more things, and we end up going into scope creep, so all of a sudden one tool becomes this catch-all for everything else, and then we have potential redundancies. I'm glad you're taking it and utilizing it for your own purposes, not suggesting that we bolster or bolt on additional items. I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any questions from folks on the phone? Any other committee members wishing to ask a question?

If there are no further questions, I'd like to once again thank Mr. Smith for presenting today.

This brings us to the end of our scheduled presentations. We will now turn to the next item of business on our agenda.

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

**Mr. G. Smith:** Thank you. Have a good day, everyone.

**Mr. Getson:** Take care.

**Mr. G. Smith:** You, too.

**The Chair:** Okay. At the last meeting members had a couple of requests for some additional information with respect to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act. One of these requests had to do with whether there have been any court rulings or changes since 2015 that would be relevant to the committee's deliberations while the other request was for information on the length of time that disclosures must remain public in different jurisdictions in Canada.

First, I will turn to Ms Carlson from Alberta Justice and Solicitor General to provide a brief update on the first matter, and then we'll hear from Ms Robert on the second. Thank you.

**Ms Carlson:** Thank you. At the last meeting, as you indicated, Mr. Eggen asked about a Supreme Court ruling from Newfoundland on public-sector compensation disclosures. I have a summary of that case. The case is Newfoundland and Labrador versus Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers Association, 2018 NLCA 54, from CANLII. The citation and parties are different at the other levels of court, so that's the Court of Appeal reference. The case relates to the interpretation of Newfoundland and Labrador's Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015, not the compensation disclosure legislation.

It started in March 2016, when a local journalist requested the name, job title, and income for the 2015 tax year for all English school district employees earning more than \$100,000. The school district gave notice that it intended to comply, but the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers Association appealed the decision. At the Newfoundland and Labrador Supreme Court, general division level, the court looked at whether access to information legislation required the release of the employees' names in conjunction with their salary information. The judge at that level held that it did not.

The province then appealed to the Court of Appeal, and in a 2 to 1 decision in 2018 that court reversed the decision and ruled that the legislation – that's the access to information legislation – requires the disclosure. But in the interim Newfoundland and Labrador passed their own Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, which was assented to in December 2016. That act requires disclosure of names and various compensation elements for those earning more than \$100,000. More information on that legislation is set out in the research paper that research services provided, the crossjurisdictional.

10:15

One of the questions that the Court of Appeal had to address was whether the appeal under the access to information legislation was moot since the passage of their public-sector compensation legislation. The court held that it was not moot and that the access to information legislation could apply to the release of information for those earning under \$100,000.

Then the case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, and earlier this year the Supreme Court of Canada dismissed leave to appeal, so the Court of Appeal's decision stands.

That's it in a nutshell for that case, the Newfoundland and Labrador case. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms Carlson.

Now we'll hear from Ms Robert.

**Ms Robert:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes. At the last meeting Mr. Dach asked a question with respect to how long disclosure reports are required to remain online or public in other jurisdictions. In Alberta it's five years. The only other legislation that actually specifies how long the reports need to remain public is the Financial Information Act in British Columbia. In that act, reports need to remain online or public for three years after the end of the year that they were reported.

All of the other legislation is silent on this issue, so I had a look at the online access to these reports in these other jurisdictions, and the reports in British Columbia under their Public Sector Employers Act, which of course is their compensation disclosure regime with respect to executive compensation, seem to stay on almost indefinitely. The oldest one I found was 2007-2008, which I believe is around the time that that executive compensation requirement came into play. Now, in Manitoba and for core government in Nova Scotia the reports are published as part of the public accounts, so as long as the public accounts are available publicly, that information will be available publicly. In Ontario the oldest report I could find is 2010, eight years, nine years. In Newfoundland and Labrador the oldest report I could find was 2016, which was when that legislation, I believe, was enacted.

That's what I found. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms Robert.

Any questions or comments?

Okay. Thank you.

Having received feedback from stakeholders and members of the public through written submissions and oral presentations, the committee is now in a position to proceed to deliberations on the act. Since this is the first statute review conducted by this committee during this Legislature, I would like to provide members with a brief reminder of the purpose of the committee's deliberations at this stage of the review as well as an overview of the process. In accordance with Government Motion 25 and section 14(3) of the act the committee must next prepare a report to the Assembly that contains the committee's recommendations on the act and its regulations, including any recommendations for amendments. The purpose of our deliberations at the committee's next meeting will therefore be to decide what recommendations will go into the committee's report to the Assembly. If committee members have any recommendations that they wish to bring forward, they will need to be brought forward as motions for the committee to consider. Prior to and throughout our deliberations on the act Parliamentary Counsel will be available to assist members with drafting of motions.

After the committee has finished considering all motions that have been brought forward, the committee can then direct research

services to prepare a draft report that includes the committee's recommendations. To avoid the need for an additional meeting, the committee may also wish to authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve the draft report after it has been made available for all committee members to review. After the draft report has been approved, I as the chair of the committee will table it in the Assembly, which will conclude the review process. Finally, I would remind members that although the report will be the report of the committee as a whole, minority reports may be included pursuant to Standing Order 68(2).

That's a brief overview of the purpose of our deliberations and the process. Do members have any questions about the process at this time?

**Mr. Getson:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Getson:** If we have a motion in advance, can we submit that prior to next meeting, or does it have to be tabled at the meeting?

**Mr. Kulicki:** Through you, Mr. Chair, to the member, it could be submitted in advance.

**Mr. Getson:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any other questions?

Okay. In order to assist with deliberations, other committees have found it useful to direct research services to compile an issues document summarizing the input received through the written and oral submissions. At this point I would ask Ms Robert to explain in a bit more detail the purpose of this document.

**Ms Robert:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes. Typically at this point in a review by a committee, the committee will sometimes ask research services to prepare a document that we call an issues and proposals document. What it does is that it organizes by issue the various issues and, maybe, proposals or recommendations that stakeholders or members of the public have put forward. We put it into a document, as I say, organized in categories and by issue, and we also include columns for any – if there are relevant sections of the act, like specific sections of the act or the regulations, that would be affected by this, we would note that for the committee. Also, we have a note section, and in that note section we might draw the committee's attention to, say, a section or a table in the cross-jurisdictional comparison that they might find useful in reviewing these issues and proposals.

We provide that to the committee, and it's certainly provided as a resource. It's for the committee to do with what it wishes. The committee can pick and choose issues that it wants to bring forward and discuss. The committee can also just disregard it and bring whatever issues forward the committee wishes to bring. It's just supposed to be used as a tool. We try to make it as useful as possible. We try to also include, maybe, some of the rationale that we heard from submitters on why they're making certain recommendations, and we'll note that type of information in the issues document. We'll also maybe refer to the submissions summary document that we prepared. Taken all together, hopefully those documents will be useful to the committee as it goes forward.

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

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any questions from committee members?

Okay. Hearing none, thank you very much, Ms Robert.

Would there be an interest in requesting an issues summary from research services? It would allow for – I just happen to have a motion prepared here. Would somebody like to make that motion?

**Mr. Getson:** Sure, I'd make that motion.

**The Chair:** Moved by Mr. Getson that  
the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to prepare an issues summary for the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.  
Is that sufficient?

**Mr. Getson:** Yes, sir.

**The Chair:** All in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Thank you very much.  
That motion is carried.

We'll move on to other business. Are there any other issues for discussion before we wrap up today's meeting? Anyone on the phones?

**Member Ceci:** Yes. Have we set a time for the next committee meeting?

**The Chair:** We're just about to get to that, sir.

**Member Ceci:** Oh. I'm sorry.

**The Chair:** Okay. If there's no other further discussion, we will move on to the date of the next meeting, which is item 6. The next meeting will be at the call of the chair, likely after Thanksgiving. Members will be polled for a number of dates and times. We are trying to endeavour to – because we are going back into session next Tuesday, we will do our best to make accommodation so that we can have these meetings while folks are in town here so we can get good attendance as well. We will try to do that.

If there's nothing else for the committee's consideration, I will call for a motion to adjourn.

**Member Ceci:** Move to adjourn.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ceci.

All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. This meeting is adjourned.

Thank you very much for attending.

[The committee adjourned at 10:25 a.m.]











