



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act Review

Monday, July 22, 2019
1 p.m.

Transcript No. 30-1-2

**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)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)*
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (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 Rod Loyola

Support Staff

Shannon Dean	Clerk
Stephanie LeBlanc	Acting Law Clerk
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee 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>

1 p.m.

Monday, July 22, 2019

[Mr. Hanson in the chair]

The Chair: Good afternoon, everybody. We will be prompt and call it to order right at 1 o'clock here. 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 that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then I will call on those joining in via teleconference. We have quite a few. We'll begin to my right.

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

Mr. Yaseen: Muhammad Yaseen, MLA, Calgary-North.

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

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

Ms Armstrong-Homeniuk: Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk, MLA, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

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

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

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

Ms Sorensen: Rhonda Sorensen, manager of corporate communications with the LAO.

Ms Robert: Good afternoon. Nancy Robert, research officer.

Ms LeBlanc: Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

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

Mr. Kulicki: Michael Kulicki, committee clerk.

The Chair: For the record, those on the phone, could you please state your name and where you represent? [interjections] Maybe we should do this another way. I'll start with my list and I'll go over it and you can just confirm, please.

Mr. Ceci.

Member Ceci: Yes. Joe Ceci, Calgary-Buffalo.

The Chair: Mr. Getson.

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

The Chair: Mr. Rehn.

Mr. Rehn: Yeah. Pat Rehn for Lesser Slave Lake.

The Chair: Mr. Sabir.

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

The Chair: Mr. Singh.

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

The Chair: And Mr. Smith.

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

The Chair: Very good. Thank you very much.

For the record, I will also note the following substitution: Mr. Lorne Dach for Member Rod Loyola.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*, so you don't need to press the buttons. 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 stream and transcripts of the meetings can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website.

First on our agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the draft agenda, and if not, would someone like to make a motion to approve? Mr. Feehan, I'm assuming you're making a motion to approve.

Mr. Feehan: I am making the motion to approve the agenda.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

All right. Mr. Feehan has moved to accept the agenda as written. I would like to ask: all in favour? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

Approval of the minutes from the June 25, 2019, meeting. We have the draft minutes of our June 25 meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note, and if not, would a member like to make a motion to approve the minutes?

Mr. Turton: I'll make that motion, Mr. Chair, to approve the minutes as presented.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Turton.

All in favour of accepting the minutes? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

We are here to review the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, and we've been given a mandate by Government Motion 25. As members will be aware, on July 2, 2019, the Assembly approved Government Motion 25, which referred the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act to this committee for review. This act was initially referred to the Standing Committee on Families and Communities in December, but due to the dissolution of the 29th Legislature in March that committee was unable to complete its review. However, as we'll discuss later on, this committee may wish to make use of some of the materials that were prepared earlier this year for the review of this act.

This act came into force on December 11, 2015, and this will be the first comprehensive review of this legislation. Pursuant to section 14(3) of the act the committee's report may include recommendations "for amendments to this Act, the regulations made under this Act or any other enactment." The act also currently provides for regular reviews at four-year intervals after this review has been completed.

I'd also note that this committee has only six months starting from this date, so we must have completed and filed the report by somewhere around the middle of January 2020. We have six months to complete this review. Therefore, the timeline will be tight, particularly considering that we will likely be dealing with the main estimates later this fall, so the committee will need to remain focused throughout its review. Are there any questions regarding the mandate of this committee in reviewing this legislation? Anyone on the phones?

Hearing none, we'll carry on to the decision items. The technical briefing. The Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General is responsible for the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act while the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance also works closely with Justice and Solicitor General to administer the legislation. To

ensure that the committee has a solid understanding of the act, it may be beneficial to request a technical briefing from individuals in these ministries with expertise in this matter. Would members wish to have a technical briefing at the next meeting? Mr. Feehan. It looks like we might have some consensus there. We'd need a draft motion to invite ministry officials to provide a technical briefing.

Member Ceci: Mr. Chair, can I speak to this at some point?

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

Member Ceci: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just agree, of course, with the desire to have a technical briefing from officials from the two ministries. I think that would benefit everyone on this committee as we're new. I would just ask that in that technical briefing – and it may already be contemplated – a crossjurisdictional scan of other provinces and any background research that has been done to this point also be part of the technical briefing provided by those officials.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, do you have anything to add to that?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think later on in the agenda there's an item under research. I think at that point the committee was going to decide on what to do with the research, including a crossjurisdictional comparison, so I think that's on its way.

The Chair: Yeah. We'll cover it at that point.

Member Ceci: Okay. Maybe premature. Thanks.

The Chair: Okay. Seeing the motion on the board – unfortunately, those folks on the phone can't see it, but we can read it out to you. Moved by Mr. Feehan that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship invite representatives from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance to provide a technical briefing on the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act at the next meeting of the committee.

I guess I could have let you read it.

Mr. Feehan: So moved.

The Chair: And so moved.

Any discussion on the motion?

Hearing none, we'll put it to the vote. All in favour? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

Next we'll move on to stakeholder and public consultation. As I mentioned earlier, the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act was initially referred to the Standing Committee on Families and Communities late last year. As part of its review the committee contacted over 170 stakeholders, including the government departments and public-sector bodies directly impacted by the legislation, to invite them to provide written submissions.

As well, the committee invited written submissions from members of the public. In total 14 written submissions were received, 13 of which were from stakeholders while one was from a member of the public. The committee decided to make those written submissions public, so we are all able to access them through the committee's external website. I believe everyone should have received the link to the submissions. Hopefully, you had a chance to review them. However, due to the dissolution of the 29th Legislature the Families and Communities Committee was unable to meet in person with any of the stakeholders or begin

deliberations on the act. As we begin our own review of the act, one of the questions that we'll need to consider is whether to contact those who have already provided written submissions to ask if they might wish to provide us with updates to what they had previously submitted. Another question is whether to call for additional written submissions from stakeholders and members of the public.

At this time, then, I would like to open the floor to discussion on how the committee would like to proceed.

Thank you, Mr. Getson, for joining.

Is there any discussion on how we would like to proceed with the stakeholder consultation on this matter? Mr. Feehan.

1:10

Mr. Feehan: Thanks. I think at this point I'd just like an opportunity to take a few days for consultation and have a date for submissions from people we would like to see perhaps by the end of the day on Wednesday.

The Chair: Okay. Any other discussion on that? Go ahead, Mr. Getson.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. I provided some initial feedback, I guess, on the initial commentary from the groups. Do we feel we need more discussion from the groups that have already reviewed it and submitted? Is that what you're saying, Mr. Feehan?

Mr. Feehan: Yeah. I think it would just be nice to have a couple of days to consider other people who we might wish to have in, just a 48-hour period. It's not an unusual thing at committee to take a few days for invitations.

The Chair: Okay. Yes. Considering the timeline that we have to work with, I'll note that if the committee is interested in calling for written submissions from other stakeholders, the committee may choose to direct research services to put together a draft stakeholders list and authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve it after allowing committee members to propose additions or changes. This could be done within the next couple of weeks, allowing for stakeholders to be contacted at the beginning of August. If the committee chose to give stakeholders around five weeks to provide written submissions, we could then review them during a meeting held in September and decide whether to invite any of the stakeholders to meet with us in person for further consultation.

What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. Getson: Actually, it sounds fair, considering. Some of us had a chance to review the commentary. I'm not sure if everyone has had a chance to review it themselves and comment back, but given the timelines it might not be a bad idea.

The Chair: Okay. I'll just open it up and ask for . . .

Mr. Getson: Yeah. Any chance for the ones that had already commented on it, again, to update their items and, again, coming back to reviewing any further external stakeholders, keep the list short, and then within that five-week timeline.

The Chair: We're talking about rereaching out to the previous 170 plus any additions that somebody may have within the next few days to submit to research. Is that fair?

Okay. We'll just need a motion. We have a draft motion to that effect written up. If you want to put it up so we can see if it's suitable.

Mr. Kulicki: Sure. It will just be one moment.

Dr. Massolin: Actually, while . . .

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, while the committee clerk is putting up the motion, maybe I can just seek clarification from the committee. I think that what I heard is that in addition to this new stakeholder list, the committee would also like us to reach out to those stakeholders who submitted for the last review to ask them if they would like to update their submissions.

The Chair: I believe that was part of their request as well.

Dr. Massolin: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Then, again, part of that discussion was: are you okay with the chair and deputy chair reviewing that list and giving them the go-ahead? Okay. Just so we're clear on that.

Member Ceci: Yeah.

Mr. Kulicki: If I may, Mr. Chair, I think, if I understand the will of the committee correctly, I'll break this down into two separate motions. The first would just be moved that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship contact stakeholders and members of the public who previously provided written submissions on the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act to ask if they would like to provide updates to their submissions as part of this committee's review of the act. This would just be the first motion, which would authorize the committee to kind of reach out to those who have previously submitted and ask for any updates.

Ms Rosin: Can you just confirm: when were the previous submissions submitted by? Like, how long ago was the final date for submissions?

The Chair: March.

Ms Rosin: Okay.

The Chair: What kind of a deadline did they give them at that time?

Mr. Kulicki: It's roughly the same, if I may, Mr. Chair, about five weeks.

The Chair: Okay. Yeah. Like I said previously, out of 170 requests only 14 submissions came in. But I think it's only fair to reach out again now that there's been a change in government. It might be of some interest.

Shall I read the motion?

Member Ceci: Sure.

The Chair: Actually, we need to ask for a mover of that motion if everybody is happy with it. Go ahead, Mr. Yaseen. Could you read it for us?

Mr. Yaseen: I wish to move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship contact stakeholders and members of the public who previously provided written submissions on the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act to ask if they would like to provide updates to their submissions as part of this committee's review of the act.

The Chair: Any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Sabir: Can I please ask you to repeat the motion?

The Chair: Okay. I can.

Mr. Turton: Sorry. Can Mr. Yaseen just maybe put the microphone closer to him. That might help the issue.

Mr. Yaseen: I move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship contact stakeholders and members of the public who previously provided written submissions on the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act to ask if they would like to provide updates to their submissions as part of this committee's review of the act.

The Chair: Those on the phone, did you hear that okay?

Member Ceci: I did.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you. Yes, I did.

Mr. Singh: I did.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Seeing none, all in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is carried.

The committee will also need to set a deadline for receiving written submissions. Taking into account the amount of time available to us, I wonder whether the committee would consider a deadline of 4:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9. Is there any discussion on that date and time?

Member Ceci: It seems fine.

The Chair: Did you also have a second question?

Mr. Kulicki: I did, but we should be able to vote on this one question about the deadline.

The Chair: Okay. I got a little ahead of myself there. We'll go back to the second portion of the motion as it was being submitted. We'll have that up shortly.

Mr. Kulicki: There it is.

The Chair: Okay. Would we have somebody interested in moving the second part of this motion?

Mr. Sigurdson: Moved that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to prepare and draft a stakeholders list to be used to invite written submissions from stakeholders as part of the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act and authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve the list after allowing committee members to propose additions or changes.

The Chair: Perfect. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll pose the question. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is carried.

Now we will approach the deadline for submissions. Like I said previously, the committee will also need to set a deadline for receiving written submissions. Taking into account the amount of time available to us, I was wondering whether the committee would consider a deadline of 4:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9. That would mean that we would have the requests put out in the first week of August, give them five weeks, and hopefully have everything in by the 9th. Any discussion?

1:20

Member Ceci: I'll move that.

The Chair: Mr. Ceci, you will make that motion?

Member Ceci: I will.

The Chair: Okay. Moved by Mr. Ceci that the deadline to receive written submissions as part of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act be set at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 2019.

Any further discussion on the motion?

Hearing and seeing none, I will ask the question. All in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is carried.

In addition, is there any desire to reach out to the public via multimedia or social media, any other aspects? I believe it was done previously. There wasn't much response, but is that something that we want to do as a committee? Any discussion there?

Mr. Feehan: Yeah. Can I just ask: is there a place online somewhere where the public can submit right now on these types of items if they choose to do so, or do we need to specifically designate a process for that?

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms Robert.

Ms Sorensen: Mr. Chair, I can speak to that. Mr. Feehan, typically what we would do is alert the public that this is taking place so that they can participate. During the last review I believe we sent out a news release which let people know that this was happening as well as some social media posts. Both were nonpaid initiatives, and that just alerted the public to where they could go to participate.

Mr. Feehan: I think that sounds satisfactory to me. I don't know.

The Chair: Would you like to make a motion that we proceed in that fashion?

Mr. Feehan: Do we need to make a motion to have that happen?

The Chair: Yes, we would.

Mr. Feehan: Okay. Then I will make a motion to alert the news media. Maybe you can write . . .

The Chair: We just happen to have a draft motion.

Mr. Feehan: Happen to have one, do you? Okay.

The Chair: It will be up shortly, and you can let us know if you agree with it.

Mr. Feehan: I move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct communications services to draft a news release and social media content regarding the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, including the opportunity for the public to provide written submissions, for approval by the chair and deputy chair.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on the motion?

Hearing and seeing none, we'll put the question. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is also carried.

Moving on to research requests. I believe this is where we'll get into the crossjurisdictional. Turning now to research requests,

typically committees will request that research services compile a crossjurisdictional comparison for a statute review. Such a comparison would analyze the statutory requirements for public-sector compensation disclosure in different jurisdictions across Canada. Would members be interested in reviewing a cross-jurisdictional comparison? Now, I believe that Dr. Massolin might have something to add.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you very much again, Mr. Chair. I just would like to offer that for the previous review, research services did undertake a crossjurisdictional comparison, which could be updated for this committee's review.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Any further discussion on that? I believe we would need a motion to proceed with that as well.

Mr. Dach: I so move.

The Chair: Mr. Dach. I believe it will be up shortly here as well. Go ahead, Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Moved that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to prepare a crossjurisdictional comparison for the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act for consideration at an upcoming meeting of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dach.

Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Mr. Getson: I guess just one question back to Dr. Massolin. Did you find any issues with the crossjurisdictional comparison? Do you foresee any more if you did this same exercise?

Dr. Massolin: Well, I guess it depends, Mr. Chair, through you to Mr. Getson. Like, what do you mean by "issues"? I mean, there are some similarities and differences in terms of who's included, who's left out, and the way that that's handled across the jurisdictions. I can tell you as well that not every jurisdiction has – in fact, only a smattering of jurisdictions throughout Canada have this type of legislation. Anyway, I mean, yeah, there are a few things, and there are some significant differences, thresholds, or a consideration is one example. Anyway, we could provide that research to you in a written form, and then Ms Robert would provide an oral briefing as well to the committee, when the time comes, and field questions.

Mr. Getson: Okay. I guess the second part of the question I have: would you foresee any changes from your previous research versus now?

Dr. Massolin: Well, we would just, Mr. Chair, through you to Mr. Getson, have to see if any of the legislation that we've already looked at has been updated or any additional legislation has come on stream to compare. That would be the essence of this task.

Mr. Getson: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you. No more further questions.

The Chair: Any further discussion, anyone?

Member Ceci: Could I just raise something, Mr. Chair, briefly?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Ceci.

Member Ceci: With respect to the previous item, the stakeholder and public submissions that will be coming in, will there be an

attempt to help us overview those in written form? Will somebody do some work in advance of the individual submissions coming our way to put together a synopsis of what the issues are in those that are received?

The Chair: Dr. Massolin will answer that.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can offer that, yes, it's a standard practice for research services, upon sort of the request by the committee, of course, to summarize submissions. It's done exactly in the way Member Ceci has indicated in terms of presenting themes and issues and considerations for the committee and grouping the submissions in that way.

Thank you.

Member Ceci: With that said, Mr. Chair, when the time is appropriate, I would like to make that request of research services.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you. We will deal with that, I think, right after we vote on this motion that we have proposed forward by Mr. Dach.

Member Ceci: Appreciate it.

The Chair: Any further discussion on the motion by Mr. Dach?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll call the question. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is also carried.

We can now move on to Mr. Ceci's motion if he would like to put it into words for us.

Member Ceci: Sure. I think the support there may have some better words, but I'm looking for an overview of the public submissions and stakeholder submissions that will be forthcoming with a view to looking at themes and issues therein.

Mr. Kulicki: Just give me one moment.

The Chair: We'll give a minute and have this written up and see if it's something you agree with, Mr. Ceci.

Member Ceci: Great. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. We have: moved by Mr. Ceci that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to provide an overview of the written submissions provided by stakeholders and members of the public for the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act with a focus on summarizing the overall themes and issue.

Member Ceci: That works for me. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on the motion by Mr. Ceci?

Well, we have a slight change, so I'll have to read it in again. Moved by Mr. Ceci that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to provide an overview of the written submissions provided by stakeholders and members of the public for the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act with a focus on summarizing the overall themes and issues.

Does that meet your needs, Mr. Ceci?

1:30

Member Ceci: Yeah. It's still acceptable, of course. I'm not sure what the change was, but I can tell you that the research folks will

not be making any decisions. They'll just be providing an overview of the content that we receive, and the decisions will be up to us.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Ceci. The only addition was the addition of an "s" at the end of "issues," so it was dealing with more than just one issue.

All right. Is there any further discussion on the motion by Mr. Ceci?

Mr. Sigurdson: Is there any way under this, when they're compressing it, that we're going to have an idea afterwards of how many submissions were brought together? I mean, if we see an overwhelming submission on one issue that they've compressed, I think it's important that we understand the number, so that it's not just that we're seeing the issues one by one; we can see the number of submissions that were compressed into that.

Member Ceci: I think we'll see the original.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. That's exactly the point. You'll see, like, you'll have access to, of course, the original submissions, but even in terms of the prominence of an issue by sort of quantity, that will be indicated if necessary and just the actual issues themselves. The stakeholders making the submissions will be identified as well in that submission summary.

Mr. Sigurdson: Okay. Perfect. Yeah. That's all I was asking.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sigurdson.

Any further discussion?

Seeing and hearing none, we will call the question on Mr. Ceci's motion. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is carried.

One other research item that members may be interested in. During its review the Families and Communities Committee directed research services to provide additional information on public views and perceptions of compensation disclosure legislation in Alberta and other Canadian jurisdictions. To fulfill this task, research services prepared a media scan that looked at over 100 media articles from across Canada, which helped to provide a sense of what issues related to compensation disclosure are most frequently brought up in public discussion. If members are interested, research services would be able to prepare a similar, updated briefing to the committee for consideration during its review.

Any discussion on that item or further clarification if you need it?

Okay. Are you interested in pursuing that line? If so, we just happen to have a motion prepared for that. We just need someone to make that motion. Mr. Turton.

Member Ceci: I'm just guessing what a media scan is or to what extent it is used to undertake this work. I don't know.

The Chair: Who would like to answer that?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I can help there. With the assistance of the Legislature Library, we looked at news media accounts from other Canadian jurisdictions with respect to public-sector compensation with a view to understanding, as you indicated earlier, just what the public perception of this type of legislation is; you know, its usefulness or lack of usefulness, that sort of thing.

Thank you.

Member Ceci: Okay. Thank you. That's clear.

The Chair: Okay. Any further discussion?

Mr. Turton, if you'd like to make the motion.

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct research services to provide a media scan of articles on compensation disclosure legislation in Alberta and other Canadian jurisdictions for consideration at an upcoming meeting of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Turton.

Any further discussion on the motion?

Seeing and hearing none, we will call the question. All those in favour of Mr. Turton's motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

That motion is carried.

Do members have any other research requests that they would like to bring forward at this time?

Mr. Schmidt: It may not be a separate request; it could probably fit in with just the crossjurisdictional scan. Section 5 of the act deals with the disclosure of information by health providers, so I'm hoping that our crossjurisdictional scan can provide an overview, some focus on what kinds of disclosures occur for health providers in other jurisdictions, if any, and what kind of information has been disclosed and may be required to be disclosed here in Alberta under the act. I don't know, Mr. Chair, if Dr. Massolin can comment on whether or not that will be included.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin, would you like to?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Certainly, I mean, if the committee wishes for us to pursue that – and it sounds perfectly reasonable – we'll do that.

The Chair: Okay. Would that be considered as part of the cross-jurisdictional?

Dr. Massolin: Yes.

The Chair: Does that meet your needs, Mr. Schmidt?

Mr. Schmidt: Yeah. As long as everybody is under the same understanding, then, yeah, that's fine.

The Chair: Okay. Sure. Thank you.

Other business. Are there any other issues for discussion before we wrap up today's meeting? Go ahead, Ms Rosin.

Ms Rosin: I have a question. I'm not sure if there's a formal process for this that's doable. I know we just approved a motion to do a media scan, which is important, but I'm wondering if there's a way to also do a scan of social media perception. I mean, a lot of times media are people who sit, obviously, by an editorial desk whereas I think social media provides really interesting and grassroots commentary on what people actually think, and it kind of gives the average Albertan a platform. Is there a formal way that the LAO can do a review of social media commentary?

Ms Sorensen: I can speak to that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Sorensen: Yes. If the committee wishes, we can add that into the news release and the social media posts that we're putting out there and do a scan to see what the discussion is out there on the social media channels.

Ms Rosin: I personally think that that would be really beneficial.

The Chair: Okay. Any other discussion? Go ahead, Mr. Feehan.

Mr. Feehan: I'm just curious, MLA Rosin, about sort of the parameters of that that you would be interested in in terms of how far back you want people to go. Or is it a current review, and if so, what sort of aspects of social media are we talking about? Are we talking about Facebook and Twitter, or are there others? I'm just curious as to how it might be.

Ms Rosin: I would think to keep it current. I'd maybe go back to when the initial review was done, which I suppose was in March, but I guess pick a time frame that is relatively current. I personally would think Facebook and Twitter would be the most active platforms and, I suppose, just reading through comments, shares, anything on actual media articles that were shared.

Ms Sorensen: If I may, Mr. Chair, in the past what we've done is that, yes, we've focused just on the messages that we're putting out and then the commentary related to those messages. So it would be current, and it would be on the channels that we're putting out, which typically would be Facebook and Twitter.

Ms Rosin: Is there a way of checking comments that are made, say, by the *Edmonton Journal* or the *Calgary Herald*? I mean, have there been news articles written on this act by external media outlets that there may be commentary on? Or has there not been much actual media coverage and we would just use our own if that makes sense?

Ms Sorensen: Well, we can actually work with the library on that as part of the media scan to see, between us and them, what's going on in the media as a part of the social media scan.

Ms Rosin: Okay. Cool.

The Chair: Would you be happy with just leaving that as part of the media scan in the motion that we put forward?

Ms Rosin: Yeah. Is there a way to include it in the motion, or do we need to? Or is it more of just an informality that is naturally included.

The Chair: Go ahead, Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: You know, Mr. Chair, I think that if you've got consensus around the table here, there's no need.

The Chair: Okay. Everybody is okay with that?

Mr. Getson: If I can, just to make sure we're clear, or that I'm clear at least, for the current post that we're going to put out, we're going to give it the five weeks to run, and we'll monitor the physical media and then some of the outlets that you're choosing based on the feedback. Correct?

Ms Sorensen: Correct.

Mr. Getson: Okay. Good. Thank you.

The Chair: If I might, just to clarify, did you not want to go back to, like, a time frame from March, when the initial request was put out? How far back do we want to go?

Ms Rosin: I'm just wondering. I guess I'm not sure of the proper process – obviously, I'm new to this – and I'm just thinking. Like, I initially said March because I'm not sure if there's going to be much media coverage on this in the next couple of weeks. Maybe there's previous media coverage that's still relevant. I'm admittedly not sure what the proper process is.

Ms Sorensen: I don't know that there's a proper process, but if it's the will of the committee or the wish of the committee, we can take a look at what was said in relation to the post we put out last spring as well as do what we're about to do and the same with the media scans. So we could do it on the social media – Facebook posts and tweets – that we had put out both in March and will put out now, and then we can also add it to the social media scan.

1:40

Ms Rosin: Okay.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. I'd be more comfortable keeping it current and relevant. The social media seems to go down a rabbit hole, and you don't know where the other stuff was. So if it's a current posting, keeping it relevant for the next five weeks, I would be supportive of that. Going back further in time: I couldn't get behind that.

The Chair: Any further discussion?

Mr. Feehan: I just want to support MLA Getson's comments. I think that we should keep it to the work that we're doing presently.

The Chair: Okay. We don't need anything further on that, so we'll just move to keep it current. Are you accepting of that, Ms Rosin?

Ms Rosin: Yeah.

The Chair: Any discussion on the phone?

Member Ceci: I agree with the current.

The Chair: Thank you very much.
Do we have any other new business? Is there anybody else?

Member Ceci: When is our September meeting? Sorry; I'm jumping in.

The Chair: That's the next item on our agenda, sir.

Member Ceci: Okay.

The Chair: I'm assuming it'll be some day after September 9. The next meeting will be set at the call of the chair, probably during the

second week of September. The committee clerk will poll members for a number of different times when we come to that point. Just like we did with this last meeting, you'll be sent an e-mail with some possible dates and times. Once we get a consensus of who's available, we'll call a meeting for that point.

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

Member Ceci: Can I just ask one other thing, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Member Ceci: One of the decision items was that you and I would review a list of stakeholders for submission. When will we be doing that? Do you have any idea?

The Chair: Sometime before the first week of August so that we can get them out in time to give them that five-week time frame for September 9. If we move back five weeks from September 9, it will definitely be before then. I'm sure we'll get the list by e-mail, and then you and I can have a call on the phone and just make a decision to accept it and move forward.

Member Ceci: Good. I'm going to poll the caucus in this committee as well and see if they have any additional ideas once I get the list that you provide.

The Chair: Yeah. That is the time so that we will be given some time to reflect with caucus as well.

Member Ceci: Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Anything further?
Can we get a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Getson: I move the motion to adjourn.

The Chair: Mr. Getson. All in favour of the motion to adjourn, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no.

Thank you very much, everybody, for taking time out.

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

