



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
First Session

Standing Committee
on
Resource Stewardship

Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act Review

Thursday, September 19, 2019
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 30-1-3

**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)*
Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (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)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (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)
Walker, Jordan, Sherwood Park (UCP)****
Yaseen, Muhammad, Calgary-North (UCP)

* substitution for Rod Loyola

** substitution for Richard Feehan

*** substitution for Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk

**** substitution for Searle Turton

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

Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General

Corrine Carlson, Barrister and Solicitor, Legislative Reform

Public Service Commission

Sarah Carr, Executive Director, Strategic Policy and Integration

Myles Morris, Assistant Deputy Minister, Labour and Employment Practices

9 a.m. Thursday, September 19, 2019

[Mr. Hanson in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. It is 9 o'clock. We will call this meeting to order. The Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship welcomes 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 by phone. We will begin to my right with Mr. Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: Garth Rowswell, MLA, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright.

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

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

Mr. Walker: Jordan Walker, MLA, Sherwood Park.

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

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

Mr. Eggen: My name is David Eggen. I'm the MLA for Edmonton-North West.

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

Ms Dotimas: I'm Jeanette Dotimas. I'm with LAO communications.

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

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

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

The Chair: We'll go to the phones, starting with Mr. Ceci.

Member Ceci: Good morning. Joe Ceci, MLA for Calgary-Buffalo and vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship.

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

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

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

The Chair: Is there anybody else on the phone?

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

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

For substitutions we have Mr. Garth Rowswell standing in for Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk, David Eggen for Richard Feehan, Lorne Dach for MLA Rod Loyola, and Jordan Walker standing in for MLA Searle Turton.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*, and 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 meetings can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website.

The second item on our agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the draft agenda?

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

Member Ceci: I can move that.

The Chair: Moved by Mr. Ceci that the agenda for the September 19, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be adopted as distributed. All in favour? Any opposed? That motion is carried.

The next item is the approval of the minutes. We have before us the draft minutes of our July 22 meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note?

Hearing none, would a member like to make a motion to approve the minutes of the July 22 meeting?

Mr. Sigurdson: I'll move that motion.

Mr. Getson: Sure. I can move that.

The Chair: Everybody is so eager this morning. We'll go with Mr. Sigurdson sitting here today. Moved by Mr. Sigurdson that the minutes of the July 22, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship be approved as distributed. All in favour? Any opposition? Hearing none, that motion is carried.

Item 4 is a review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act. The Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance have a joint technical briefing. Turning now to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act, at our last meeting we agreed to invite a technical briefing on the act from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance.

I would now like our presenters to join us at the table. For the record, joining us today are Ms Corinne Carlson, barrister and solicitor from the legislative reform unit of the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General; Mr. Myles Morris, assistant deputy minister, labour and employment practices, the Public Service Commission; and Ms Sarah Carr, executive director, strategic policy and integration, the Public Service Commission. After the briefing I will open the floor to questions from committee members. Thank you very much for your time today. Please proceed when you are ready.

Ms Carlson: Good morning. Thank you for inviting us to the technical briefing for the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act review. I'm Corinne Carlson, joined by Sarah and Myles. I plan to cover most of the substantive requirements in the legislation and regulations, and Ms Carr's presentation will cover how the act is administered in practice.

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. The government of Alberta first disclosed employee compensation in January 2014, under the authority of a Treasury Board directive, for income earned in 2012 and 2013. In 2015 the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act was passed by the Legislature. The legislation moved disclosure rules for government employees into the act and expanded the disclosure to at that time about 150 government agencies, boards, and

commissions. The first disclosure under the act was in June 2016 for 2015 earnings.

The majority of the disclosure rules are found in the act, which I will get into shortly, but there are also two regulations under the act. The public-sector compensation transparency general regulation sets out the supporting rules for disclosure, including the disclosure of certain contracts, and the public-sector compensation transparency dissolved public-sector bodies regulation sets out rules for disclosure when entities are dissolved or cease to exist. Essentially, disclosure has to be made on dissolution or by the government of Alberta on behalf of the entity when they're dissolving.

As you know, this committee, of course, has been tasked with the review of the act and its regulations.

Before I get into the technical rules of disclosure, I'll briefly outline the entities covered by the legislation. Disclosure rules are in effect for the government of Alberta as well as public-sector bodies, but the rules for each are different. Public-sector bodies include agencies, boards, or commissions governed by the Alberta Public Agencies Governance Act and subsidiaries, independent offices of the Legislature, Covenant Health and its subsidiaries. Other entities may be listed in the regulation, but to date there have been none. The act also authorizes regulations to require disclosure of compensation paid to health care practitioners, including fee-for-service payments made to physicians, but to date no regulations have been enacted under the authority of the legislation. Finally, the act authorizes but does not require municipalities and school boards to disclose compensation if they so choose in a similar manner to public-sector bodies.

I'll now turn to a brief description of the rules for government of Alberta disclosure. Government is required to disclose by June 30 each year the compensation paid to employees who earn more than a threshold amount of base salary or severance in the prior year. The threshold increases annually for inflation. For the June 2019 disclosure the threshold was \$108,784 in 2018 earnings. The threshold for the government of Alberta is based on base salary and does not include overtime or benefits. Severance is measured against the same dollar amount but is dealt with separately. It's listed separately in the disclosure.

Once the threshold is exceeded, all compensation is disclosed in the specified categories. This includes the employer's portion of pension contributions. Disclosure is required to include a variety of information such as the employee's name, department classification, base salary, and benefits. Ms Carr's presentation includes an excerpt from the disclosure, so you can see how it looks. Certain types of employment contracts and all severance contracts must also be disclosed for those over the threshold. Certain personal information must be redacted from contracts such as the employee's home address and any signatures. Limited disclosure is required in December for any severance contracts or payments in the first six months of that year.

9:10

Turning to public-sector bodies, disclosure rules for those entities are different from the government rules. Public-sector bodies are required to disclose compensation paid to employees who earn more than the threshold, but the threshold is different. The threshold for the June 2019 disclosure was \$129,809 in 2018 earnings, and unlike the government, the threshold for public-sector bodies includes overtime, includes taxable benefits. It's essentially what's reported on the T4 slip. The threshold also includes severance, but that amount is disclosed separately in a separate column. The employer's portion of pension contributions is not included in the threshold, but it is disclosed. Disclosure of all compensation paid to

board members is required, and there's no threshold for that amount, any amount over zero.

For contracts the regulation requires disclosure of some contracts for those over the threshold, with similar redactions as those for government contracts. Disclosure of employment and severance contracts for public-sector bodies is required for each individual whose position is listed in column 1 of schedule 1 of the reform of agencies, boards, and commissions compensation regulation, the chief executive officer of Alberta Health Services, the chief executive officer of the Independent System Operator, and each individual listed in column 1 of schedule 1 of the reform of agencies, boards, and commissions (postsecondary institutions) compensation regulation. We've included some examples on the slide of some members whose contracts are disclosed. Now, these lists in the regulation would get updated as entities are created, merged, or dissolved, of course, and that's done by regulation. Contract disclosure is required on June 30 and, if necessary, December 31. Compensation disclosure for public-sector bodies is made both to the minister and to the public.

There are other rules in the act. The Minister of Justice and Solicitor General is responsible for the act. The minister determines the form and manner of disclosure, and that's done by way of a technical guide published online along with other technical material. Ms Carr will be providing more information on those resources. A public-sector body that has no compensation to disclose must notify the minister, and that's done by way of what we call a nil report. Disclosure has to remain online for five years, and public-sector bodies that are being disclosed also have an obligation to disclose, as I mentioned earlier.

The act allows for two types of exemptions. The first allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council by regulation to exempt entities from the disclosure requirements. Three entities have been exempted from the act: the Alberta Investment Management Corporation; Alberta Treasury Branches and its subsidiaries; and the teachers' pension plans board of trustees, which is also called the Alberta Teachers' Retirement Fund Board. Entities described in section 2.2(4) of the funds and agencies exemption regulation are also exempt from filing a nil report. Those entities are corporations that AIMCo uses to hold investments.

The second type of exemption is for individuals' safety. The act allows an individual or their employer to apply to be exempt from disclosure if the disclosure could unduly threaten the safety of the individual. Such exemption is within the discretion of the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, which has been delegated to the deputy minister. To be granted an exemption, an individual must set out facts that demonstrate the potential undue threat to the safety of the individual because of the disclosure. Examples of instances that may justify an exemption include where the person has a long-standing harassment, spousal abuse, or stalking issue; or the person has received specific and credible threats against their personal safety where the disclosure could be linked to the threat. Generally exemptions are less likely to be granted where a threat is purely speculative or it is unlikely that compensation disclosure will contribute to the inherent safety risks a person already faces in their position.

As of last year for the first about three years of the program, approximately 34 to 35 individual exemptions had been granted. That's over the three years. Exemptions are generally valid for five years, and then the individual must reapply.

The Justice minister has a number of other powers under the act in addition to those I've already mentioned. The minister may also establish a process for correcting information after a disclosure has been made, may aggregate the disclosure, republish it, or extend the time for a disclosure. This was done, for example, in 2016 for Fort

McMurray entities that were unable to provide timely disclosure due to the wildfires. The minister has some enforcement and audit powers. The minister may require staff of an entity to provide information to determine compliance, may order an audit, or may do an audit on behalf of the entity. The minister may publish the failure of a public-sector body to comply with the act.

For my final slide, just a brief note on the unique rules for offices of the Legislature. Offices of the Legislature such as the office of the Chief Electoral Officer and the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner are required to disclose under the same rules as public-sector bodies, but they are exempt from some of the minister's powers. In particular, they are not required to disclose to the minister or advise the minister if there is no disclosure for that year. They're only required to disclose to the public. The minister's powers to ask for information to determine compliance or to conduct an audit do not apply to legislative offices. Instead, the Auditor General may audit offices of the Legislature to determine compliance, or if the compliance relates to the Auditor General, the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices may appoint an auditor. These provisions recognize that these offices report to the Legislative Assembly and not to the minister.

In closing, I've covered the major provisions of the legislation. Ms Carr will provide additional information, and then we're happy to take questions afterward.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Carr: Thanks, Corinne. For my part of the presentation I'm going to speak to how the Public Service Commission administers the act. Some of that information will be a bit repetitive to what Corinne informed you about, but I will attempt to provide additional context in that regard. In administering the act, the Public Service Commission, or PSC, is responsible for ensuring disclosure of the Alberta public service and political staff in the Premier's and ministers' offices. We are also responsible for ensuring that public-sector bodies meet the requirements of the act. As a reminder, public-sector bodies include agencies, boards, and commissions; offices of the Legislature; and Covenant Health and its subsidiaries.

The PSC process involves providing advance notice to deputy ministers and public-sector bodies, including offices of the Legislature, about the act's requirements and the disclosure process and the timelines. We also work closely with Justice and Solicitor General to ensure that employees are informed about the exemption process and to ensure that for all employees who've received exemptions, their compensation is not disclosed. We collaborate with Service Alberta to validate the disclosure information and ensure that it is publicly posted. Prior to public disclosure occurring, we brief the President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance on the disclosure information.

With respect to the disclosure process for government of Alberta employees the Public Service Commission works closely with departments to ensure that they have awareness of the following: the disclosure threshold and reporting period, whether that be June or December; the disclosure requirements; the process for validating and confirming employee disclosure data and ensuring that approved exemptions are removed; and the process of redacting employment and severance contracts and uploading them. Once all the disclosure information has been validated, direction is provided to Service Alberta to publicly post the disclosure information to the alberta.ca website.

This slide provides a snapshot of what disclosure looks like for government of Alberta employees. I hope you can see the detail on the slide. For government of Alberta employees, disclosure

information includes the name of the ministry that employs them, the name of the employee, their position title, their classification, and all remuneration received in a calendar year. Remuneration includes a series of elements: base salary; cash benefits, which include payments such as overtime, vacation payouts, allowances, and lump-sum payments. Noncash benefits are also included. These include the employer's share of all employee benefit contributions, including pension and disability plans. Severance is also included. This includes remuneration paid or payable to the employee in lieu of or supplementary to notice of termination of their employment.

9:20

For those government employees who have employment contracts and whose compensation exceeds the disclosure threshold, these contracts must also be disclosed. Examples of employees in this situation include deputy ministers and senior officials, pathologists, and political staff. In addition, severance contracts for all government employees who exceed the disclosure threshold must also be disclosed.

For public-sector body disclosure the process is very similar. The Public Service Commission provides information about the disclosure process and requirements to departments, who are then responsible for sharing this information with their public-sector bodies. There is a series of resources and tools provided to departments to support this process, and these include a technical guide, which identifies the what and how of public-sector body disclosure requirements. For those public-sector bodies that do not have their own website, departments are responsible for providing disclosure information on their behalf. We also provide a step-by-step guide, which is a high-level summary of the technical guide. This is very useful to public-sector bodies who are already familiar with the process. We also provide a list of common questions and answers. Information on the disclosure process is also provided to the offices of the Legislature.

This screen provides an example of what public-sector body disclosure looks like. This information includes the name of the public-sector body, the employee or member's name, their position, and all remuneration paid in a calendar year. For public-sector bodies, remuneration includes all compensation included on an individual's T4 slip, including their base salary, any overtime paid, bonuses, honoraria paid to board members – that includes all honoraria regardless of the amount – and taxable benefits. Nonmonetary or nontaxable benefits are also included in the disclosure. These include the employer's portion of pension contributions, employment insurance contributions, Canada pension plan contributions, and workers' compensation premiums. Severance amounts must also be disclosed.

As Corinne mentioned in her part of the presentation, employment and/or severance contracts for the following positions must also be disclosed: employees who are designated executives under the reform of agencies, boards, and commissions compensation regulation, or the RABCCA regulation. This regulation came into effect in 2017 and sets a compensation framework for CEOs or equivalents in a number of key agencies, boards, and commissions. Requiring these designated executives to disclose their contracts supports government's commitment to transparency. While not part of the RABCCA regulation, the employment and severance contracts of CEOs of Alberta Health Services and the Alberta Electric System Operator must also be disclosed for similar reasons. In addition, the employment and severance contracts for presidents at postsecondary institutions who are subject to the reform of agencies, boards, and commissions (postsecondary institutions) compensation regulation must also be disclosed.

A number of common questions are often asked by the media or Albertans. These include the following: how is the disclosure threshold calculated? The response to this question is that annual thresholds for government employees and public-sector bodies are adjusted annually based on changes in the Alberta consumer price index.

We are also often asked why the threshold for public-sector bodies is higher than it is for government of Alberta employees. As I outlined earlier, salary disclosure for government of Alberta employees is based on their base pay that's provided within a calendar year while public-sector body disclosure is based on an employee's T4 slips. Using T4 amounts makes it easier for public-sector bodies to comply with the disclosure requirements since they are being asked to disclose the same values that are already calculated on their T4 slips.

We've also received questions about the number of employees that are exempt from having their information disclosed. For the recent disclosure period, for safety reasons a total of nine active employees were approved for exemption from having their salary information published.

Sometimes we were asked about which department has the highest number of employee disclosures. The answer to that question is Justice and Solicitor General, due to the department having a significant number of legal officer positions.

Finally, questions have been posed about public-sector bodies that are exempt from the disclosure requirements and why these bodies are exempt. Under the act's general regulation the Alberta Investment Management Corporation, ATB Financial and its subsidiaries, and the teachers' pension plans board of trustees are exempt from application of the act. This is 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.

As the Public Service Commission continues our role in administering the act, we will continue to work collaboratively with Justice and Solicitor General and other departments as well as public-sector bodies to make the process as simple as possible, and we will continue to ensure that the disclosure information is easily accessible to the public.

That concludes my portion of the presentation, and I think we're happy to take your questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Are there any questions from the committee members?

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you for your presentation. Certainly, it's always instructive to look at a cross-jurisdictional comparator when you are engaging in something like this. I was just curious. I think that, say, for example, Newfoundland had some kind of a Supreme Court ruling or high court ruling on public-sector compensation disclosure, and I'm just wondering if you did any analysis as to how that might affect what we're trying to do here in Alberta.

Ms Carlson: Well, we've looked at the Newfoundland court ruling, but I believe that legislative services is doing or did a cross-jurisdictional. We, of course, did one in 2015, when the legislation was developed, but since then in administration we don't look at cross-jurisdictional . . .

Mr. Eggen: Right. But I think the Newfoundland ruling was, like, after that, wasn't it?

Ms Carlson: I believe so, yeah.

Mr. Eggen: So I think that maybe it would be incumbent upon us to perhaps just provide a briefing to the committee on how any rulings or changes since 2015 might affect the work that we're trying to do here today, please.

Ms Carlson: We can certainly look at that and bring that back if we're invited next time.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you. Cool. All right.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Eggen. Any further questions?

Mr. Eggen: No. Those were my two for now.

The Chair: Anybody else?

Mr. Sigurdson: Just a quick question. Right on the very front end, where it says who must disclose, the note about municipalities and school boards as an optional disclosure: is there a rationale behind that?

Ms Carlson: When the act was first enacted, the thought process was that these municipalities and school boards have their own elected representatives, so they were, you know, accountable to the people who elected them. They were welcome to adopt such a disclosure if they so chose, but if they did, they had to follow the rules under the act.

The Chair: Thank you.
Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: Yeah. Just at the very end, Ms Carr, you were saying that AIMCo and the ATB and the teachers' pension plan are exempt from disclosing, and I think you said something along the lines that you thought the people that passed the legislation believed that it would be difficult to find people for their boards. Could you elaborate on that a little bit, please?

Ms Carr: It's not so much, I don't think, for the boards; it's the staff that work in those agencies. I believe that the thinking is that if those salaries were published, it could create a situation where other, similar entities could access that information and use that to poach folks from those agencies. Then they'd get into a situation, potentially, where salaries would have to be increased, which would create issues regarding sustainability. For example, ATB Financial: if the Royal Bank or the Bank of Montreal or that kind of thing were able to find out how much the CEO and senior executives are paying, they could use that information to lure folks over into their organizations.

9:30

Mr. Smith: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ms Carr: You're welcome.

The Chair: Any other questions? Anybody on the phone?

Mr. Getson: This is a two-part question. I guess the first one is a follow-up to Mr. Sigurdson's question on municipalities and school boards. Are all of the school boards and municipalities posting this information that you're aware of? I guess the second question would be: what was the rationale of having people post their names, having the actual names of the individuals posted in the first place rather than just the positions and the job descriptions?

Ms Carlson: As for the first part of the question, to my knowledge there are no municipalities or school boards posting under the act. I

last looked earlier this year, so it's possible that some have come online. But the municipalities and school boards, some of them at least, do post ranges and positions and things like that. Those are not postings under the act.

For the second part, the original postings were under the Treasury Board directive, which posted the names and positions and salaries, so those were just carried over into the act.

Mr. Getson: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions on the phones? Okay.
Further questions? Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: Thank you. I'm not sure who needs to answer this question, but it was just brought up here with regard to the names. I guess the question I've got is: when we're looking at transparency and openness in salaries, I can understand why the position is necessary, but is publishing a name really necessary? It seemed to me that you said that we're publishing the name because that's what we did before.

Ms Carlson: Well, certainly, the committee is welcome to consider that as you go forward in your deliberations. Other jurisdictions do publish names. Ontario, British Columbia, Manitoba, I believe, are examples of other jurisdictions that publish names as well.

Mr. Smith: So of the six, I think, that you had in your report, which ones are not?

Ms Carlson: Well, the ones that have a similar legislative scheme to the one in Alberta generally publish names. Ontario, for example, is one that enacted their legislation prior to Alberta doing so, and they publish names.

Mr. Smith: Would it, in your opinion, create a problem if we did not publish names but we just stayed with positions?

Ms Carlson: That's certainly something that's open for the committee to consider. That's a policy decision. I'm not going to comment on that.

Mr. Smith: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Schmidt: If you could take us back to slide 4, what I notice here in this table is that the number of employees who fall under the disclosure rules decreases steadily over time. I know that we had put in a salary freeze for non bargaining unit employees in the public sector, but the cost-of-living increases for the threshold increased every year. Now, given the current administration's position of possibly legislating wage rollbacks for vast swaths of the public service, you know, in the interest of transparency I'm wondering if there is a way to link the threshold to what public-sector compensation is doing rather than the cost-of-living index to prevent the number of employees from decreasing over time as a result of changes to come. Legislatively, is the cost-of-living increase to the threshold written into the legislation?

Ms Carlson: It is.

Mr. Schmidt: That would require a legislative change, then, to reduce the threshold or to change how the threshold is calculated. Is that correct?

Ms Carlson: That's correct.

Mr. Schmidt: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any further questions?

Member Ceci: Mr. Chair, I have just a couple of questions for clarification. Can I begin?

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

Member Ceci: Okay. I think it was you, Corinne: it is your view that school boards and municipalities are disclosing information, but it's not consistent with the act before us?

Ms Carlson: There are some school boards and municipalities that disclose compensation ranges, classifications, positions. I'm not aware of any that disclose names. I think that if they did, they would have to fall under the act and disclose within the same rules as the rest of the public-sector bodies that disclose. It's the same scheme. But because of FOIP, as soon as you start disclosing personal information, you have to fall under the regime. It's my understanding that there aren't any who do that, but they do disclose some information. I know that school boards, for example, in their union contracts disclose the contracts themselves, so you can see, you know, the steps and the salaries for those steps, but there are no names attached to those.

Member Ceci: Okay. That's one thing.

The next thing is with regard to the exempt public-sector agencies: AIMCo, ATB, and teachers. Though they're exempt, they still have to, in my understanding, follow rules around corporations, disclosing either the top five in a rolled-up way or the top 10 highest paid executives in their corporations. Of course, that doesn't fall under the act at all, but it does fall under corporations' requirements. Is that your understanding as well?

Ms Carr: That is our understanding. That information, I believe, is typically disclosed in those entities' annual reports.

Member Ceci: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Those are just two clarifications I had.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

Are there any other questions from the committee?

Okay. We will move on, then. During previous statute reviews other committees have found it useful to request that department experts on the subject matter attend committee meetings to provide technical assistance as required. Is this a request that the committee would like to make? If so, we would require a motion to that effect. We just happen to have a draft motion prepared if somebody is interested. Is there any member interested in putting forward the motion? Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: I'd move that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship request that officials from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance work in conjunction with Legislative Assembly staff as requested to support the committee during the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act and that officials attend committee meetings and participate when requested in order to provide technical expertise.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Schmidt.

Is there any discussion? Any discussion at all on that? Anyone on the phones?

Hearing none, we will put the question. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Thank you.

That motion is passed.

The next section is a review of research by research services. At our last meeting we requested that research services provide us with a couple of research briefings, including a crossjurisdictional comparison. These briefings were posted to the committee's internal website on Friday for members to review. As well, we requested that communications services examine the discussion on social media over the past few weeks, so we also have a short report from them, which was posted on Tuesday.

I would now like to invite Dr. Massolin to provide us with a brief overview of the reports provided by research services as well. If members have any questions about the social media scan, Ms Dotimas from communications services is here to answer them as well.

Go ahead, Dr. Massolin.

9:40

Dr. Massolin: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. The first of the documents that research services has prepared is the crossjurisdictional comparison, and as you've indicated, the committee requested this at the last meeting. I will just give you a brief overview of the multipage document that was posted to the committee website.

I'll start by indicating to the committee, Mr. Chair, that six jurisdictions have similar legislation to Alberta, so in total six provincial jurisdictions in Canada have public service compensation disclosure legislation. Apart from Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland and Labrador all have compensation disclosure legislation with respect to public-sector bodies.

B.C. actually has two pieces of legislation that it follows. One is the Public Sector Employers Act, which contains a part that relates to executive compensation. In British Columbia they also set compensation disclosure in the Financial Information Act, but these requirements are at a lower threshold level and for public-sector bodies.

Manitoba's act, Ontario's act, and the Financial Information Act in B.C. are the oldest pieces of legislation. All were enacted in 1996. The most recent legislation is from Newfoundland and Labrador, and that act was enacted in 2016 and amended in 2018.

What is being compared in this report? Well, we looked at entities and individuals to which public-sector compensation disclosure legislation applies, broken down as follows. There is core government. There are the offices of the Legislature, which we've heard about and which you all know about – and that comprises, of course, here in Alberta the Legislative Assembly Office and the equivalents across the country, statutory officers, or what we call here in Alberta legislative officers – and other public-sector bodies. This comparison also covers compensation thresholds at or above which disclosure is required; in other words, where the disclosure kicks in, if you will.

There's a section that discusses the type of compensation information that is disclosed – I think we've had questions about that – including the responsibility for compensation disclosure reporting, the deadlines, and public availability of these reports. Just, you know, to add to, to supplement maybe what was said in the previous agenda item and to Mr. Smith's question, on page 29 of the crossjurisdictional comparison, under 3.4 Exemptions, you can see that Manitoba's act provides that the name of a police officer whose compensation is being disclosed is replaced by an identifier number – so the name is not indicated but, rather, just an

identifier number – and of course that is to maintain confidentiality and to protect the identity of the law enforcement individual.

Carrying on here, there's also a section in this comparison with respect to exemptions.

What are the similarities among the jurisdictions being compared? Well, there are many similarities across these jurisdictions. For instance, all the legislation sets thresholds, all the legislation has reporting deadlines, and most of the legislation allows for exemptions. All the legislation applies to organizations that have government employees: ministries, public agencies, postsecondary institutions, health authorities, offices of the Legislature, and school boards. Although Alberta's statute authorizes disclosure with respect to school boards, it does not require it, as we've just heard, but the School Act has some requirements with respect to compensation disclosure, again, as we've heard.

What are the differences? Well, only some jurisdictions require disclosure with respect to law enforcement, as I just pointed out. Some require disclosure with respect to some members of the judiciary, so some Provincial Court judges and some justices of the peace. Some require it with respect to municipalities. Some, a few actually, require it with respect to medical practitioners that are not government employees, and some require it with respect to publicly funded nonprofit organizations.

As a quick reference, in the crossjurisdictional on page 15 you can find table 1, and that is a good sort of point of reference to see which jurisdiction has disclosure for what categories of employment.

Differences as well in terms of the level of reporting. There are also differences among the different legislation with respect to the level of detail in reporting. Alberta, Ontario, and the executive compensation disclosure requirements in British Columbia: all of their reports are relatively detailed. They include employee information: the name of the person, their position, what body they work for, for instance. These jurisdictions also require a breakdown with respect to the type of compensation that receives salary, overtime, benefits, severance, and sometimes employee contracts, et cetera.

On the other side of that, some jurisdictions, most notably in Nova Scotia: that legislation lists only the name of the employee and one compensation amount. They don't list the position, in other words, their department or their public-sector body. It's just a name and what compensation the individual receives.

Also with respect to differences, under the category of access to reporting, most jurisdictions produce their annual compensation disclosure report or reports on one or two government websites that are relatively easy to find. However, there are exceptions to this as well, and Nova Scotia is the exception. In the Nova Scotia legislation it indicates that if compensation disclosure is produced as part of the public accounts, then disclosure does not have to occur in the public-sector disclosure report. Note, again, we have a table to facilitate access to this type of information. In table 3, starting on page 23, it lists by jurisdiction the type of information that is disclosed in each report.

The final thing that I'd like to discuss is thresholds. Each jurisdiction sets thresholds, for the most part, at or above which compensation is disclosed. These thresholds, generally speaking, range from \$75,000 to \$125,000 a year. However, in Alberta, as you now know or maybe knew previously, these thresholds are indexed for inflation according to the CPI, so that amount changes. Recently Manitoba also amended their act to say that they're going to index their compensation threshold to inflation starting in 2023. In addition, the Financial Information Act in British Columbia also sets disclosure thresholds of \$25,000 for payments to service

providers; that is, physicians, lawyers that provide legal aid services, that kind of thing.

One other thing to note is that jurisdictions differ. In fact, even Alberta differs in the two different types of thresholds it has in terms of what components of salary and/or benefits are included in calculating whether salary is at or above a threshold. That's something that the committee may wish to consider as well. If you look at table 2 in the crossjurisdictional, starting on page 17, it lists the thresholds in each jurisdiction and what components are included in calculating that threshold.

The final thing I will note for the committee has to do with medical practitioners. As you've just heard from our technical experts, there is the authority in the regulations to disclose medical practitioner salaries. That has not happened yet in Alberta. It is only New Brunswick and British Columbia that require medical practitioners to disclose salary information.

Mr. Chair, I'll end there, and I will try to answer any questions the committee may have.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Dr. Massolin.

Any questions from the committee? Mr. Dach is first on the list.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Appreciate the work that went into that analysis, Dr. Massolin. I was wondering, sir, in your media scan or in your research you looked at different provinces with similar disclosures – all the provinces publish slightly different information. In your assessment is the different information easy to compare between provinces insofar as they may not be analogous in their categories or level of detail? Are you able to come up with, you know, conclusions that are thematic given those differences in detail and categories?

9:50

Dr. Massolin: Well, I think it's always difficult to compare across jurisdictions, for a variety of reasons. In terms of compensation I think there are different factors involved, of course, in terms of, you know, average pay and that sort of thing when it comes to the general working public but especially for government and public-sector bodies, so that makes it difficult. Also it's difficult in terms of what is being disclosed. You know, thresholds are different, and I guess the consideration as to what the threshold should be set at is different based on a number of factors that are different and are unique to the individual province's situation. And in terms of whose salary is being disclosed, the rationale behind that is different. So, yeah, it makes it difficult. I mean, we try our best. The categories are all similar, and there are many similarities in terms of what is disclosed and the type of individual to which the legislation would apply, but there are a lot of other factors that go into it that make the comparison a bit difficult.

Mr. Dach: Thank you. If I may ask one further question.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Dach: I just wanted to know as a matter of curiosity. In Alberta, of course, disclosure remains online for five years. I'm wondering about other provinces how long disclosure must remain online and public, in comparison.

Dr. Massolin: That is a good question. I don't have the information right at my fingertips on that, so if I can defer that, I'll try to get back.

Mr. Dach: Thank you.

The Chair: Anyone else? Anyone on the phones?

Mr. Yaseen: Yes.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Yaseen.

Mr. Yaseen: Just a question going back to the ranges. I think you said \$75,000 to \$125,000 in British Columbia, but New Brunswick's is \$60,000, I think. I'm just wondering. These ranges: do they take similar factors into account? I'm just thinking because from \$60,000 to \$125,000 is twice as much. Or is it just that the compensation level that we have in different provinces is that much different?

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's an interesting question as to how the thresholds are set in terms of what level of public-sector compensation transparency each jurisdiction wants to have. As you've indicated, there is a range, and you kind of wonder: well, why is it so low, or why is it so high? I've heard arguments that if you're going to do this, do it for each and every one of the public-sector employees; why not make it equal or don't do it at all. You know, I think there are different rationales for that, and I can't speak to all of them across the country.

The Chair: Any further questions, Mr. Yaseen?

Mr. Yaseen: No. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions regarding the crossjurisdictional analysis?

Hearing none, we'll move on to the media scan.

Dr. Amato: Hi. Sarah Amato, research services. I'm hoping you have a copy of the media scan. I'll just go over it very, very briefly. It's a scan of 150 articles from across Canada in jurisdictions where there is public-sector compensation disclosure legislation or jurisdictions where there's some legislative governance of the issue. The intention of the media scan is really to shine a light, if you will, on media coverage of this issue in these different jurisdictions, pointing out some differences in conversations in these jurisdictions and also some similarities. The intention of the article, really, is to be read in conjunction with the very comprehensive crossjurisdictional review, which provides a lot of factual information on the issue.

I'll just maybe make two general points for you, which are, one, that the vast majority of these articles report compensation information. They seem to be more or less in favour of the legislative governance where it is. They report on top salaries, so who topped the list – for example the 10, the 50 people – and their positions where available. In general those newspaper reports were in favour of the legislation or the legislative governance that was in place in those jurisdictions.

Where some discussion and some variance occurs is in other provinces where there are differences. For example, a notable one would be up north in Nunavut and Yukon, where there is some discussion in the media about whether or not, in fact, there should be some public-sector disclosure information. There's also some reporting there on the extent to which and the reasons for why there isn't public-sector disclosure legislation, and that's because of privacy concerns. In those places the media articles seem to be in favour of that point of view.

I'm happy to answer any questions about the media scan, but I hope it's a useful document. Thanks.

The Chair: Any questions from committee members? Okay. Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you. It was very useful, I think. I guess what we always look at with these disclosure documents is where you draw the line and the exemptions and what the public perception is of those exemptions. Certainly, I can see, you know, the court of public opinion finding it easy to see the case for, let's say, law enforcement officials and so forth, but if you could generalize across the country what people's opinion or what the media's opinion was for, let's say, school boards or other entities like that having an option to not be disclosed, did you see a trend in that regard?

Dr. Amato: The answer is that I didn't, and I would also say that I think that the crossjurisdictional simply represents the media's opinion on these things, if I may put that forward, as opposed to general public opinion. I'm not sure the extent to which that might be the case.

There were some articles which discussed the need for increasing transparency, for example, with respect to school boards, and there were also some articles, and recent articles, I would say, from July and August, which talked about the need for a kind of increasing – I'm going to use the words "public education" about what, for example, these salaries mean and the different layers of compensation so that, in fact, the objective of transparency was being met.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. Thank you. I recognize that, of course, your media scan would reflect the media's focus on certain issues and maybe more or less the public as well, but, as you say, it's very important for the public to be educated around compensation from the public service in the broadest possible way, especially in the view of cuts that we expect to see here in the province of Alberta. You know, for people to be analyzing those things in an informed way I think is important, and transparency thus must be paramount, in my mind.

That's not a question. That's okay.

The Chair: Anybody else?

Mr. Sigurdson: Just as far as media goes, were there any articles that you noticed where there were any issues with a name being published as a breach of privacy or problems with their name being published with their related salaries, say, in more remote – like, you were talking about Nunavut, but any other areas that you may have, or just the single article?

Dr. Amato: There is a jurisdiction, and it's sort of mentioned in the body of my narrative, which I can't – there was some discussion about the need for privacy and that, in fact, some individuals' names were not released because of the need for privacy, and in general I think they were just reporting that as kind of a fact.

10:00

There was also a jurisdiction in which – actually, it's Manitoba. No, it's not. Maybe it was Newfoundland. Yes, it's Newfoundland, with respect to police officers, where in their attempts at privacy there had been a kind of breach of privacy there, and there had been a glitch in their system. What that perhaps points out is that none of these systems are a hundred per cent foolproof all of the time.

Mr. Sigurdson: A hundred per cent, no. We respect, of course, the security of our peace officers, and it has to be protected. Would you say that generally the articles focus more on the values of what people are making within their position and less about their names, then? That what they're dealing with overall, when these articles are coming out, is that they're more focused about what people are

making in the position and where they're at than the name itself of who's doing that position?

Dr. Amato: I mean, I think that the vast majority of articles are reporting the information that they have. The vast majority of articles are reporting the top salary earners in all of the jurisdictions, and where they have the names, they are being reported, so name, position. I would hesitate to generalize on that.

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you.

The Chair: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: Yeah. I'm looking at this. I think a lot of the articles are sort of what we would expect: lots of talk about sunshine lists, top earners, health care, doctors. But I'm looking at the top one, Sunshine List Focuses Taxpayers' Attention on the Wrong Salaries. I'm just wondering if you could elaborate, because obviously we don't have the article, on the findings of the article. I'm just curious what argument that top article is making in terms of . . .

Dr. Amato: Sorry. Would you mind pointing out to me . . .

Ms Rosin: Yeah. The very first one on the list of Alberta, Political Interference: Sunshine List Focuses Taxpayers' Attention on the Wrong Salaries.

Dr. Amato: I'm sorry. That's a question for Ms Dotimas in the media scan. That was not mine, so I'm just going to defer to her if that's all right with you.

Ms Rosin: Sure. Absolutely.

Ms Dotimas: Sorry. Could you repeat the question?

Ms Rosin: Yeah. I'm just curious. In that article it's suggesting that the sunshine list is focusing our attention on the wrong salaries. I think right now it seems like we are always looking at the top earners or those above the threshold, so this article just kind of stands out to me as different from the rest. I'm just curious if you could elaborate on the findings of that article or what argument it's making that sort of contrasts with the others.

Ms Dotimas: I don't know that I can. I mean, in terms of his angle on it, I suppose being different is something that he probably wanted, like you said, because you're focusing on the same thing all the time. I suppose as a news reporter . . .

Ms Rosin: Yeah. I'm just curious what – like, he's saying it's on the wrong salaries. I'm just curious, because I don't have access to the article, if it says in the article what is he arguing or what does he think could be done differently.

Ms Dotimas: Which article are we talking about here?

Ms Rosin: Sorry. The top one on the Alberta list. The very first one under bibliography.

Dr. Amato: Oh, it is me. Sorry. I wasn't sure. I'm so sorry. You know what? I apologize. It was the top of the bibliography. I'm going to have to get back to you because I don't have it immediately at my fingertips.

Ms Rosin: Sure. Or even if we could just, like, get a copy of the article or something.

Dr. Amato: I will happily provide you with that.

Ms Rosin: I'm just curious what's in it.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Any other further questions? Anybody on the phones?

Hearing none, I'll thank you very much for your submissions and the research on that report that you've done.

Turning now to written submissions, as part of our review we agreed to invite written submissions on the act from stakeholders and members of the public. In total the committee received 28 responses to our call for submissions. Before turning to Dr. Massolin to provide an overview of the written submissions, I will note that four of the submissions were received after the committee's deadline of September 9. We will therefore need to consider whether to accept them or not. Before opening the floor to discussion on the matter, I will state for the record that the late submissions are a submission from the Calgary and District Labour Council received September 10, a joint submission from the Department of Justice and Solicitor General and the Public Service Commission received on September 11, a submission from a private citizen received on September 12, a submission from a private citizen received September 17. I would just also like to note that this last submission was not received in time for research services to include it within the summary of written submissions that was posted last Friday.

Do members have any thoughts on how they would like to proceed with the late submissions?

Mr. Eggen: Well, considering the very title of this item being a review of the transparency act, I think transparency in its broadest way suggests inclusion. You know, as a teacher I wasn't happy when people submitted late, but I still needed to give them a mark, so let's let them submit, yeah?

The Chair: Okay. Would you be interested in making a motion to that effect, or is there any other further discussion on the matter?

Mr. Smith: Just some clarity on that last question. You said that it had not been able to be reviewed by . . .

The Chair: Well, it was received on September 17, so it was too late to be posted by research.

Mr. Smith: Oh. Just to be posted.

Dr. Massolin: Can I?

The Chair: Go ahead, Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. Mr. Chair, thank you. Through you to Mr. Smith: just to be included in the written submissions summary that we prepared. That's what we're meaning here.

The Chair: Any further discussion on the matter?

Mr. Eggen, would you be interested in . . .

Mr. Eggen: Sure. I would move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship accept late submissions received by Tuesday, September 17, 2019, as part of the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.

The Chair: Having heard the motion, is there any discussion? On the phones?

Mr. Getson: No issues here. It sounds good.

The Chair: Thank you.

Hearing no further discussion, we will put the question. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Thank you.

The motion is carried.

Now that we have considered how to handle late submissions, I will turn to Dr. Massolin to provide us with a brief overview of the written submissions.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you again, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to just give the committee an overview of the summary, a summary of the summary, if you will. I would also add that if committee members haven't done it, I would encourage them to read the summary but also the individual written submissions, especially the key ones.

Anyway, this submission summary that we prepared deals with 27 of the 28 written submissions. Those have been summarized. They are as follows. They come from the following individuals and organizations. There are five postsecondary institutions, three health care/physician organizations, one education body, three additional public agencies, two labour organizations, two public interest organizations, one public administration organization, one government of Alberta employee, the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General, which has provided a joint submission on behalf of the government of Alberta, and eight private citizens. Of those submitters, the following eight submitters also made a submission during the original review, which happened earlier in 2019. We have Alberta Health Services, Alberta Pensions Services Corporation, the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, Alberta Innovates, Covenant Health, the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General, and Patricia Hull, a private citizen. Some of those submissions that were carried over from the previous reviews were simply carried over. Nothing was added to them, it should be noted for the committee.

As you could well imagine, some of the submissions supported the current act. Some of them opposed the current act. For those who oppose the current system, the reasons are the following, among other reasons. One of the reasons was because it is duplicative and therefore unnecessary; secondly, because it's unjustifiable and unfair. There are also privacy considerations, and there are a number of related and unrelated reasons. One of them is that it hinders recruitment, as we heard in the previous presentation, of senior managers and executives or enhances or facilitates poaching of senior managers or executives.

10:10

Also, there were comments to expand the disclosure system to include all public-sector employees. Others of those who made submissions said that reports should include more contextual information, more than just the name and position and the compensation number, just to understand the context within which the compensation is granted, to understand more fully what the job is and why the individual is being compensated as such.

As Justice and Solicitor General argues in its joint submission to the PSC on behalf of the government, the definition of nonmonetary benefit lacks clarity and should be clarified. Additionally, some submitters had questions as to what should trigger requirement for disclosure, possibly severance instead of salary amount, and also discussed the benefits of including vacation payout or special compensation in that threshold. There were submissions that also argued for including gender as an element of compensation reporting as a means of collecting data on human rights legislation and equal pay provisions.

In terms of disclosure reporting, there are several submitters who said that disclosure reporting should be focused on executive

compensation solely. Some of them said that the current act requirements are unnecessarily broad and lead to negative consequences. For example, internal organizational turmoil as lower paid employees access compensation disclosure lists that can include misleading information. It could sort of foster some sort of competition or strife within the organization because everybody knows what each other is making, or at least those who are on the sunshine list.

The focus of compensation disclosure should be on the top executive decision-makers, these submitters argue, in an organization, and compensation should be reported with contextual information. Nonexecutive compensation should be reported more generally.

In terms of public-sector bodies, submissions were made that there needs to be a rewording of section 3 of the PSCTA to clarify that compensation of all members of a public-sector body are subject to disclosure regardless of amount.

Mandatory compensation disclosure for board members who earn very little compensation in their roles negatively affects the ability to recruit and retain because of a lack of protection of their personal information.

The length of time that the reports concerning members of the public-sector bodies remain public should be reduced. That was one other submission.

In terms of thresholds, the Justice and Solicitor General joint submission said that some consideration should possibly be given to adopting a single threshold regime for the government of Alberta and public-sector body disclosure; in other words, a harmonization of those two regimes.

Consideration should possibly be given to increasing the threshold, another submission on that. In terms of severance payments, removing the second annual severance reporting requirements so that all reporting has one deadline was one submission. Focusing on compensation rather than severance amount was another.

Now, in terms of exemptions, of course, there is a provision for organizational exemptions as set out in the regulations, as you've heard. There's a request to exempt particular subsidiaries of a public agency from the application of the act. The importance of individual exemptions where safety of the employees is threatened. As we heard, there is already a means by which to do this, to say, you know: I want to be exempt from disclosure because if that happens, then my safety might be imperiled. I think the argument there, in terms of the submission, is that it should be more broadly available and easier to facilitate or actuate, actually.

Requiring mandatory disclosure is another category where we had submissions, education bodies and municipal authorities specifically. The Justice and Solicitor General submission says that the committee should be careful to understand the education and municipal stakeholder positions when discussing this issue. In terms of health services providers, medical practitioners are concerned about being included. Compensation does not give the full picture of what their operations are. In other words, there's a disconnect between the income and the amount that they're paid for their services.

Finally, I'll end with the review of the act. There was one submission that said that the committee should consider changing or amending the review provision so that it does not coincide with a provincial general election because, as we saw earlier this year, dissolution interrupted the committee's work, and therefore this committee took on that work.

I'll end, Mr. Chair, by indicating that there were a number of submitters who wish to appear before the committee, if the

committee so desires, to make further presentations and to answer any questions the committee may have. Those were the AUPE, NorQuest College, and the Canadian Payroll Association.

That concludes my remarks. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr. Massolin.

Are there any questions for Dr. Massolin on this topic from the committee?

Mr. Eggen: Thanks, Dr. Massolin. Just to your last point – sorry; I'm subbing for somebody – is it the committee's direction to have public submissions, then, to this committee as the next step along the way? Oh, I guess we do.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Eggen, no. What I was just trying to say is that in the written submissions, those are the organizations that indicated that they would like to come before the committee, possibly, if the committee so chooses, to make further submissions. I mean, of course, I think that's on your agenda item next, to consider that.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. Okay. All right. That's cool. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions, clarifications? Anyone on the phones?

Member Ceci: Yes. I do have one for Dr. Massolin.

The Chair: Okay. Please identify yourself, and go ahead.

Member Ceci: Sure. Dr. Massolin, at one point you said that one of the submitters talked about a common threshold, a single threshold regime for government and the public sector. Is that the way other provinces have undertaken this work of disclosure, or did they have similar breakouts for different bodies?

Dr. Massolin: I think it's typically the case that there is one single regime. I just think it's a unique way in which that's been rolled out in Alberta, if I understand correctly from a previous presentation to the other committee on this issue, that, you know, the core government, the GOA, was subject to these legislative provisions initially and then all other public-sector bodies afterwards. So there are two separate regimes here. To answer your question directly, yeah, typically there's just one regime.

Member Ceci: Okay. Can you give me an example under the area requiring mandatory disclosure of publicly funded education support organizations? Does that mean school boards, or what does that mean?

Dr. Massolin: Yes, school boards.

Member Ceci: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Those are all my questions at this point.

The Chair: Thanks. Just for the record could you identify yourself, please.

Member Ceci: Sure. Joe Ceci, Calgary-Buffalo, vice-chair of the committee.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Ceci.
Any other questions from the committee?

Mr. Getson: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Getson.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. Doctor, thanks again for the summary. I really appreciate it. I believe, if it was from the original submissions, there were also some comments around the frequency of reporting and potential redundancies. Did you see that in this next wave or the one we have before us?

Dr. Massolin: Not really, but, I mean, there was that comment I made about severance, the requirement to report on severance, that twice yearly is onerous and an administrative burden and therefore it should be reduced to just once a year.

10:20

Mr. Getson: Okay. So it was just the severance item. There weren't any other acts that were reporting dual reporting or similar report information going to two different departments or acts?

Dr. Massolin: No, not to my knowledge, but there were comments also that this is an administrative burden generally. I'll add that.

Mr. Getson: Okay. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Any further questions?

Okay. Well, moving on, we need to make a decision on making these written submissions public. At this time the committee may wish to make the written submissions publicly available on the committee's external website. If the committee wishes to do this, in most cases the practice has been to make them public after redacting any personal contact information.

I would now like to open the floor to discussion on this issue. Would the committee be interested in making the written submissions public? Any discussion? Mr. Getson, followed by Ms Rosin.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. I would support that if we redact the information as per standard protocol. I think it's good for everyone to see that we are participating and that we've had active participants. As Mr. Eggen had pointed out, even a late submission or two made it through the hopper, that we actually considered and reviewed.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ms Rosin: I'm just curious what constitutes – what information would be redacted on a personal basis? Would that be their name and the organization that they're associated with or just the individual's name who wrote the submission?

Mr. Kulicki: Through you, Mr. Chair, to the member, the name would be public. But e-mail address, any other kind of mailing address: those would be redacted.

Ms Rosin: Thank you.

The Chair: Any further questions?

Is there a member that would be willing to make a motion to that effect?

Ms Rosin: I'd like to move that

the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship direct that written submissions received as part of the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act be made public with the exception of personal contact information.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion? Anybody on the phones?

Okay. Hearing none, we will call the question. All in favour of the motion as presented, say aye. Any opposed, say no.

That motion is carried.

Next steps, a decision on oral presentations. Turning now to the next steps in our review, we may now wish to consider whether we would like to invite any oral presentations from stakeholders. As Dr. Massolin mentioned in his overview, a few stakeholders indicated that they desired to present to the committee in person. However, with the fall session beginning on Tuesday, October 8, we will have a limited amount of time available to receive presentations. Depending on the will of the committee, I would suggest that Friday, October 4, would be the earliest that we could meet with stakeholders, but Friday, October 11, might be another option. I might want to point out that I believe that's the Thanksgiving weekend as well.

With this in mind, I would open the floor to discussion on the matter.

Mr. Getson: In my personal opinion – I guess we'll leave it for more discussion, obviously, with the committee – I think we've got a lot of information here so far. I'm not sure that much more oral presentation would give us any more weighting or relevance than the great information that's already been provided to us.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Getson.

Any further discussion on that? Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. Respectfully, I think that, in fact, it's important for us to get information from the public in the widest possible way and have that as an opportunity for Albertans in the widest possible way. I appreciate the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, but I would suggest quite the opposite, that we leave it open for people to apply to make oral submissions, be they residents of Alberta, organizations based in Alberta, and people will sort themselves out. I don't think that having made a written submission should be the qualification for someone to be able to present orally. I think that in the spirit of transparency and openness that this committee is reviewing right now, we should leave it open for anybody to make an oral submission.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Eggen.

Any further discussion?

Mr. Rowswell: How would we make that known, that we were looking for that?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: I would suggest that there is a way by which you had called for written submissions before. You could use the website or whatever to say that, you know, we're doing oral submissions on these days, and if people want to do it, then they can go ahead and make an application. I think it's a good idea.

Mr. Rowswell: I was just wondering if we want to set any parameters. Like, if there are people that we'd want to let know about that, what would we tell them? That it'd be a half an hour time limit on their submission or 15 minutes or 20 or something like that?

Mr. Kulicki: Through you, Mr. Chair, to the rest of the committee, I would say that certainly it's the will of the committee to decide how they would like to handle their oral presentations. In the past it's generally been the case that after the committee has received a bunch of written presentations, usually the committee has then focused the next stage of their consultation on just hearing oral

presentations from members of the public who have provided written submissions. It's certainly at the will of the committee to consider how broad a call they would wish to make. Again, just to echo what Dr. Massolin said, I think the committee has heard from three stakeholders who would be willing to present before the committee. Aside from that, we have no information as to who would be willing to.

Mr. Getson: I guess I'd put it to the committee: what is the context of our timelines? Again, that's where my question comes back, Mr. Eggen, not to disagree with you on having oral submissions. My understanding was that we already had that period. We had a previous committee that was open to those dialogues. We had many submissions; we had another period where we had more submissions. We've reviewed those now. Is the intent of the committee, then, to go broader and have another submission period than what we're putting on the table or just a follow-up from the folks who have already provided their submissions?

The Chair: Yeah. I would suggest, with the timeline, that it probably isn't feasible to go out and seek new input. But, you know, allowing the opportunity for some of the people that have taken the time to do written submissions: we could put it out to a few of those to see if they would want to come and do an oral presentation, and possibly we could come up with a list today of recommendations from the committee.

Mr. Getson: Okay. Thank you for clarification.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. I'm suggesting that we do put it out to Albertans in general. That's my submission. I can make a motion in that regard if we want to move forward on that.

The Chair: Feel free. We could always . . .

Ms Rosin: Can I jump in?

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Rosin: I think that if you open it up to other Albertans, maybe – but I do think that if we ask the same people to come back and report a second time, we're almost just stalling. I think people had the chance to write a written submission, and they could have made that as thorough as they wanted. It was up to their discretion to be as thorough as possible. I just don't know if asking the exact same list of people to report a second time on what they've already reported to us is necessarily the best use of the committee's time and resources. I think that if we open it up to other Albertans, possibly we can get a wider range of opinions, but I think that to just ask the same stakeholders to report a second time may not actually be in the best interests of the committee. I don't actually know if it is the best use of our resources, personally.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.
Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. For sure, I appreciate that comment. You know, you just want to not only get the best information possible but to be seen to be open to receiving that information in the widest possible way. That's a good way to operate. Can I make a motion?

The Chair: Just one second.

Dr. Massolin, did you have something that you wanted to add to the discussion?

Dr. Massolin: No. I think it was covered.

The Chair: You're fine.
Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Eggen.

10:30

Mr. Eggen: Okay. I would move that all Alberta residents or Alberta-based organizations be invited to make an oral presentation to the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship regarding the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.

An Hon. Member: Could I ask a question?

The Chair: Absolutely. We'll have discussion on the motion.

Dr. Massolin: Can we just say this is a draft motion?

The Chair: Draft motion?

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. In case they needed to . . .

The Chair: Change it? Yeah. We may have to put some timelines on it as well.

Mr. Rowswell: That's what I was just going to say.

The Chair: All right. Mr. Eggen, are you okay if we propose a draft motion at this point and allow some discussion?

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. You betcha. Thanks very much.

The Chair: Awesome. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Getson: Mr. Chair, Shane Getson here again.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Getson.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. Again, back through you to Mr. Eggen. We need to have some parameters and timelines on this. To Member Rosin's point, we could open this up for a year-long discussion if we're not careful here. Again, I'm not sure what more advantage we would have. I'm all about transparency and inclusion and consultation. Absolutely. That's what I signed on for, but the potential of opening this wide open – again, perhaps I'm being a little too hesitant, but I think we need some parameters around what we're exactly looking for. Again, to the point of the individuals that offered to provide an oral presentation, I would suggest that the committee review their information. If they have specific questions, then that's what we'd focus those groups in on as well, or this could be a very lengthy process.

The Chair: Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Getson.

I'd just like to point out that we are tasked to report by mid-January on our findings, so time is of the essence. We do have session coming up starting on October 8 and going into December. We have a budget coming forth, which also means budget estimates, which will take up a significant amount of the committee's time, so please consider that when we are discussing this.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. I wouldn't suggest that you change the timelines or anything. I think it's a measure of the demonstration of transparency and so forth to just put this back to the public. You know, I think that you did do that in terms of written submissions, but of course oral presentations are a different sort of category of interaction. I think that you can still have all the timeline parameters

that you have set out with this committee already and still entertain my motion and use it quite in a useful way.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Eggen.

I'd just like to also point out to the committee that we reached out quite extensively in the previous committees of the spring of 2019 as well as recently for this committee and reached out on multimedia resources to give Albertans an opportunity to present written statements. I think at that time I would say that we probably covered our commitments to Albertans to allow them an opportunity. I'd just like to suggest that because of the time constraints – I'm not opposed to giving Albertans access to the committee at all, but because of the time constraints that we're facing here and our commitment to report by January 15, I would like the committee to consider that in this discussion.

Mr. Sigurdson: Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Sigurdson.

Mr. Sigurdson: How many presentations do we currently have in the queue?

The Chair: We have 28 written submissions that were . . .

Mr. Sigurdson: Written. But is there anybody at this time that wants to come in and do oral? Nothing so far?

The Chair: I believe there were three that have asked to come and present.

Mr. Sigurdson: Three oral so far.

The Chair: So far. Yeah.

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you.

Mr. Smith: Could you refresh my memory? Who are they?

The Chair: Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yeah. This information comes from the written submissions themselves. The following organizations have indicated a willingness to speak further to the committee in an oral presentation format: the AUPE, NorQuest College, and the Canadian payroll organization.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: Yeah. I think that we have to take some of the concerns that have been put forward here very seriously. You know, we do have timelines, and there have been extensive submissions to this point. I would feel very hesitant in supporting a motion that opens it up again. If the motion could be changed to reflect invitations from the committee to specific organizations, I think that would be perhaps a half measure, where we could make a decision as to what we think we could get done and still maintain our schedule. I think that would be a more appropriate way of moving forward rather than just have a wide-open motion that would allow for a whole brand new set of oral presentations that could be quite extensive.

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

Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say that from the 28 submissions that we've heard today, only three, I believe,

suggest that they wanted to make further oral presentations, and there were, I think, a similar number of late submissions that we've decided to accept as a committee. So I don't anticipate given those numbers that we'll be bombarded with a huge number of individuals and organizations wanting to come forward to make oral presentations, but even if we were, that would indicate that there was a huge thirst to come forward and make representations to this committee.

My anticipation is that we may see a handful or a few who maybe didn't get in and make their late submission in written form come forward and join in the oral presentation opportunity that we're trying to provide by this motion, but I don't anticipate being bombarded. That doesn't seem to be the case with respect to the number of written submissions we received. I noticed from that 28 group that only three wish to make an oral presentation. So I think the motion to request province-wide oral presentations is a wise one to ensure that anybody that wants to come forward, organization or individual, has an opportunity to do so within the tight time frame that we are working under, and those individuals who wish to eagerly make presentations will recognize those time frames and giddy-up.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Dach.

Any further discussion? Go ahead.

Mr. Rowswell: Are we saying that they'd have to present by October 4, the oral part?

The Chair: This is something that the committee has to decide on, for sure.

Mr. Rowswell: Okay.

Mr. Eggen: The timeline is the same. Just open it up.

Mr. Rowswell: So that's the timeline right now, and that's . . .

Mr. Eggen: I'm not sure.

Mr. Rowswell: You don't know? Okay.

Mr. Eggen: I'm not apprised of your decisions in that regard, but I'm not suggesting that we change the timelines. I'm just suggesting that we have an open advertisement for the oral presentations. As the hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung suggested, I don't think you're going to be inundated, but I think the public would appreciate the gesture. As I say again, considering all of the talk about the budget coming up, I think people want to talk about compensation as well.

The Chair: Mr. Smith, followed by Mr. Sigurdson.

Mr. Smith: Well, I guess I've got two questions, hopefully, of a practical nature. One, is it even possible for us to have extensive ads seeking people to make oral presentations to the committee and still be able to meet our timeline? I don't see how that can happen. If you've got this out for – what? – a two-week period of time, well, now we're into October, and that's before we've even had a single meeting to have people do their oral presentations. So I don't see how we can keep to the timeline, advertise, and have the presentations.

Then, secondly, what if we get 28? As much as the hon. member may believe that we're not going to get a lot of presentations, what happens if we get 30 that want to have a presentation? How do we manage to do that and maintain the timelines that have been given

to us? I think we need to be very, very careful about supporting this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Dach: Mr. Chair, I can respond.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Dach can respond to the question, and then we'll go to Mr. Sigurdson, please.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just in response to Member Smith's recent comments, I think that if indeed we do have more than anticipated participation rates for oral presentations as anticipated by this motion, that would be a good thing, I guess, because the public would be taking an opportunity to make themselves heard. I don't think we want to in any way, as government members seem to be indicating, muzzle public input on the compensation issue. We'd like to keep it as open as possible, and if there is a need to adjust timelines due to an inundating response, then we can do that as the committee. I don't anticipate that, but I think we should let the opportunity be there for the public to come forward if they so desire.

10:40

Ms Rosin: Chair, if I may.

The Chair: Mr. Sigurdson first, please.

Mr. Sigurdson: Well, all respect to everything, I mean, I thought that's what we'd been doing this entire summer: opening up the door, doing all the advertising, allowing everybody to get the written submissions in. We've allowed that time. If it was a consideration that we were going to do the advertising and everything for oral submissions now, I think that should have been done at the last meeting. We're, like you said, in a short time frame, and we have, I think, done extensive advertising and allowed everybody the opportunity to have written submissions in. It feels like we're headed down the same road that we just did starting at the last meeting, and we're just repeating and restarting over again.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sigurdson.

Ms Rosin: Just a quick question first. The written submissions we just took in were only from a predetermined list of stakeholders – correct? – not from the general public? Or they were from the general public?

The Chair: The general public.

Ms Rosin: Okay. Yeah. I mean, under that context I largely agree with MLA Sigurdson and kind of what I said before. I do think we are under tight timelines, and under the context that this is a transparency act, I think delaying potentially increasing transparency kind of goes against the entire intent of reviewing this. I do think we gave the public full disclosure that they could write in written submissions, like I said, as thorough as they needed to. I don't know if an oral presentation is really going to provide us much different context than a written submission could, aside from, you know, body language. I do think that we gave the public very ample opportunity to write in. We've got a ton of submissions here, 28 of them. I do think we gave the public the chance to write in. Under the context that this is the transparency act and we have timelines, I don't think we want to delay transparency in the transparency act.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Member. Just to clarify, the identified stakeholders as well as interested public.

Ms Rosin: Okay.

The Chair: There was public advertising, but we also had an identified list that we sent out requests to.

Ms Rosin: But the public did have the opportunity.

The Chair: Yeah.

Anybody on the phone? I thought I heard someone who wanted to comment.

Member Ceci: Yeah. That was me.

Mr. Sabir: I think I was just speaking.

The Chair: Sorry. One at a time.

Mr. Sabir: I can go after MLA Ceci.

Member Ceci: Thank you very much. Mr. Chair, members of the committee, in the context of a city council public hearing, you know, we, of course, would allow people five minutes to present and then deal with questions to the presenter after that. Not everybody was good at writing submissions, but I think I'd agree with Mr. Eggen that the opportunity for people to come present – and what we haven't talked about is how long they would get to present. I would suggest that a tight verbal presentation of five minutes is all that would be necessary, and then we could deal with questions after that. Obviously, we've seen that even with the advertising there's not a great broad-based number of people who will come forward, so I don't anticipate the challenges that are brought up by government members with regard to concern about timelines and not being able to complete the work that is before us in this committee. I guess I'm generally supportive of what Mr. Eggen said. If we do go down that road, then people would know that they only have five minutes and have to keep a tight presentation before this committee. We could deal with a huge number in the three hours that we have allotted for this committee every time we get together.

That's my view. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ceci.

Next on the phones.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Chair. I will also be speaking in favour of MLA Eggen's motion. I think six months is enough time. If we are not even asking the public to come speak, what else is left? There is the review. There is the crossjurisdictional scan. That time, whatever time we have, needs to be spent on hearing from Albertans at large: what they think of the existing legislation and what they want to see changed. I think it's pretty much in order and appropriate that we make every effort to include the general public and have their views heard at this stage.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much. I assume that was Mr. Sabir?

Mr. Sabir: Yeah. Yes, it is.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'd just like to ask communications what methods we used and how much effort was made to reach out to the public. What media did we use, and what kind of timeline did we put out there?

Ms Dotimas: Sure. I can speak to that. Following the last meeting we sent out a news release in support, obviously, of the invitation. We used Facebook and Twitter to supplement that news release,

and I can speak to the results of that because that can indicate exactly sort of the reach in Alberta as far as how many publications carried that. With that effort I think about 25 affiliates were able to publish information about the committee's review as well as encouragement for those who were willing to submit written submissions. Then I think it was about four days before the submission deadline that we also supplemented that with another push for those who wanted to submit something through social media as well.

The Chair: Okay. If we were to basically redo those same requests again, how much time do you think it would take to fulfill that?

Ms Dotimas: I would say that it would depend on the deadline. In terms of social media, as you know, it's relatively quick. If the news release needed to go out again in order to have support from the media to get the word out, then that would be the interaction between us and yourself to review.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Do we need to amend your motion, Mr. Eggen, to include some deadline so that we can get perhaps the stakeholders that have requested as well as maybe additional ones that committee members want to add and then maybe a short time frame prior to October 4 on social media to see if there are any interested Albertans that want to come forward?

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. Yeah, I would support that. Absolutely. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. If you would like to adjust your motion to that effect, we might get some consensus.

Mr. Eggen: Okay. Make a presentation as part of the committee's review period, full stop, and then to instruct the LAO staff to set timelines that are in keeping with the established committee timelines that you've already set out somehow, I guess. I'm just making this up, right? Can you help me with that a little bit?

Mr. Rowswell: I'm missing something here. October 4 is the date that we want the oral submissions?

The Chair: Yeah. If we're going to have oral presentations prior to session, which is kind of the recommendation, we would give an opportunity to the folks that have asked to present orally, maybe some further suggestions from committee members of someone that might be interested as well as doing a social media . . .

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. The general public as well.

Mr. Rowswell: How much time before the date, the 4th, would you need to have that in place?

The Chair: Well, we'd probably have to have commitments so we could plan our day, for sure.

Ms Dotimas: We could do a news advisory, and I could draft that today and possibly have it by tomorrow or Monday.

Mr. Rowswell: But to set a date, you have to indicate to us that you want to come by the 28th or something.

Ms Dotimas: Is it the 4th that you're looking to have the deadline?

The Chair: I think we're trying to get a date prior to session start, which is October 8. The other suggestion was the 11th, but I think we would probably get not much participation on the Friday of a

long weekend, especially Thanksgiving weekend, so that kind of narrows us down to the 4th unless the committee has some other ideas.

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. That's fine.

Mr. Rowswell: So then we'd say by the 1st you'd have to have an indication to us? Like, I'm making up dates as well here. You know, if you said: okay; if you want to, you have to tell us by the 1st. Is that too tight?

10:50

Ms Dotimas: Do you want to take a week to consider? Like, if we sent this out . . .

An Hon. Member: Today.

The Chair: If that's the will of the committee, we can put that into the motion as to the dates that we want to push that.

Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think your committee clerk is working on a potential motion here. What I would say about the dates is that I think you work back from the date that you want to hold this meeting with stakeholders, public meeting, whatever we want to call it. If it is the 4th or the 11th, whatever it is, likely the 4th it sounds like, we can work back from that. The notifications would be sent out to the members of the public and then letters, I guess, to the stakeholders that have been identified. That identification process could happen here at the committee, but it sounds more likely that that would happen offline so that the chair and deputy chair could approve that process, and then we could work with other timelines offline. Does that sound acceptable to the committee, to you?

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Ceci, I know you're on the line there. Would it be acceptable if, today being Thursday, that by the end of Friday, say 4:30 Friday, committee members could submit requests to yourself and myself a list of the 28 stakeholders that have replied as to which ones they would like contacted? Is that reasonable?

Member Ceci: That's reasonable to me, and if you're asking me specifically, what I would probably say is that Alberta Securities Commission be invited to present. I know they identified a concern about not being exempted under the legislation in their correspondence. That would be interesting to hear more from. But yes, overall, I think that Friday is fine.

The Chair: Okay. To the committee members, have a look, review that list of 28. If you think that there are any in particular that would like to present that you would like us to contact, please get a hold of myself or Mr. Ceci. We will compile a list and send out those invitations as soon as possible. As well, we will do a public request through social media as well as a news release.

Ms Dotimas: It would be an advisory at this point.

The Chair: An advisory at this point – okay – with specific dates of when they need to respond.

Ms Dotimas: Okay.

The Chair: We're working feverishly on the wording.

Dr. Massolin: Can I just add one other thing?

The Chair: Okay. Absolutely.

Dr. Massolin: Mr. Chair, of course, it's up to the committee, but I think your pool, if you will, from which to choose the stakeholders is not restricted to the 28 written submitters. You can choose others that maybe didn't make a written submission but whom you would like to hear from as well, right?

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

In any case, by the end of the day tomorrow, please, so that we can get this moving.

Go ahead, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: We go through this process of giving you a list of suggestions that we have, and then we send out a public advisory and we get some people responding to that public advisory. The meeting would be on October 4 if I understand correctly. Is there a particular number that we need to consider? If we've got three hours of oral hearings and we have 25 people that are either recommended by the committee or organizations recommended by the committee and reply, can we do 25 in three hours, or is it going to be in order of their applications? Are we going to have first-come, first-served, or how are we going to do that?

The Chair: Dr. Massolin will respond.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Of course, the committee can't anticipate exactly how many – well, I mean, you know, if you have a large number there, I think what I would say is that committees in the past have organized these oral presentations by panel to facilitate the process. You group the organizations that have similar concerns together, and you allocate X number of minutes – five minutes has typically been used in the past – and then each makes a presentation, a four- or five-member panel. Then after all those presentations you have a round of questions and answers. That tends to be the best and most efficient utilization of the time that you have.

Of course, you know, you've got the 4th, and you can sort of try to figure out exactly how much time you need for that meeting once you start getting responses back or understand, first of all, I guess – the first thing, the most important thing is how many stakeholders the committee wants to invite. The members of the public, of course, who may want to present through this process: that's a little bit harder to determine. But you try to make it flexible like that and efficient.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Looking at the calendar, we're sitting on the 19th today. We would like to have the next meeting on the 4th, so the requests for information – I don't think that allows us time to do a mail-out to the stakeholders that have requested. Would e-mail be acceptable to the committee? If we sent out an e-mail to these folks asking if they wanted to submit orally and then gave them a deadline of next Thursday to reply so that we can set up and prepare, would that be acceptable?

Dr. Massolin: We do e-mails.

The Chair: What's that?

Dr. Massolin: Typically we do do e-mail.

The Chair: Yeah. Okay. During the discussion there was talk about a mail-out, so I just wanted to clarify that we weren't going to try the snail mail route, with all due respect to Canada Post, of course.

Mr. Eggen.

Mr. Eggen: Yes. I will look at that. Thank you very much. I move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship (1) invite Alberta-based organizations and individuals to make oral presentations on Friday, October 4, 2019, in relation to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act; (2) direct communications services to draft a media advisory and social media content to invite oral presentations from Alberta-based organizations and individuals to the committee on Friday, October 4, 2019; and (3) authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve a list of stakeholders that will be invited to make oral presentations to the committee on Friday, October 4, 2019, with additions provided by committee members no later than 4:30 p.m. on Friday, September 20, 2019.

The Chair: Any discussion on that?

Mr. Rowswell: Do you want a deadline for when they can respond and say yea or nay that they want to come back?

Dr. Massolin: That's usually not . . .

Mr. Rowswell: That's not required. Okay. Fair enough.

Mr. Eggen: It still is not in there.

Mr. Rowswell: No, it's not. But if that's not usual . . .

The Chair: We can manage that. It would be nice to know how many people are going to be showing up prior to the 4th. Is there any way we could facilitate that?

Mr. Eggen: Yeah. An RSVP.

Dr. Massolin: To accommodate them, like, just by notifying them that they're in?

The Chair: No. If we just open it up and don't have a deadline for people to respond, we could show up here on the 4th . . .

Dr. Massolin: No. Put that in the communication, but it doesn't have to be in this motion.

The Chair: In the communication, but it doesn't have to be in the motion. Okay. Thank you very much. Awesome.

Any further discussion on the motion? On the phones?

Hearing none, we'll put the question. All those in favour of the motion by Mr. Eggen – I'd suggest that maybe Mr. Eggen could read it into the record one more time.

Mr. Eggen: One more time? One more time. I move that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship (1) invite Alberta-based organizations and individuals to make oral presentations on Friday, October 4, 2019, in relation to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act; (2) direct communications services to draft a media advisory and social media content to invite oral presentations from Alberta-based organizations and individuals to the committee on Friday, October 4, 2019; and (3) authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve a list of stakeholders that will be invited to make oral presentations to the committee on Friday, October 4, 2019, with additions provided by committee members no later than 4:30 p.m. on Friday, September 20, 2019.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you.

11:00

Mr. Smith: Because it's Mr. Eggen's motion, I would just point out that "organizations" was spelled incorrectly.

Mr. Eggen: Not when it came from my lips, though, right?

The Chair: That's the teacher in you, Mr. Smith.

Okay. Is there any further relevant discussion on the motion?

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

That motion is carried.

Thank you very much.

Moving right along, we're on item number 5, other business. Is there any other business that committee members would like to

bring forth at this point in regard to the compensation transparency act?

There you go. The date of next meeting: I think we've already established that as October 4.

With that, thank you very much, everybody, for your participation and those in the gallery for attending. We will – Oh. I guess I need a motion to adjourn. I'm getting ahead of myself.

Member Ceci: I'll move it.

The Chair: Joe Ceci moves to adjourn. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? Thank you very much, everybody.

[The committee adjourned at 11:02 a.m.]

