



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Standing Committee
on
Families and Communities

Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act Review

Friday, March 15, 2019
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-4-14

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

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP), Chair
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP), Deputy Chair

Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (NDP)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (AP)
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Conklin (UCP)
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (NDP)
Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (Ind)
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)
Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (NDP)
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)*
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (NDP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)

* substitution for Annie McKittrick

Support Staff

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

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Participants

Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General

Corinne Carlson, Barrister and Solicitor, Legislative Reform

Public Service Commission

Sarah Carr, Executive Director, Strategic Policy and Integration, Strategic Services and Public Agency Secretariat

10 a.m.**Friday, March 15, 2019**

[Ms Goehring in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. I would like to call this meeting to order. Welcome to members, staff, and guests in attendance for this meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities. My name is Nicole Goehring, and I'm the MLA for Edmonton-Castle Downs and chair of this committee.

I would like to start by expressing my condolences to everyone affected by the terrible act that happened in New Zealand yesterday. To those at the mosque and around the world: Albertans stand with you. For those of you here, I know that you share the sentiment that we are all standing with the victims and people affected by this terrible act. There is hate in the world, but never forget that love is stronger. We are stronger together. Please join me in a moment of silence. Thank you.

I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. I will then call on those joining us on the phone. I'll start to my right.

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

Mr. Orr: Ron Orr, MLA for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Ms Carlson: Corinne Carlson, Justice and Solicitor General.

Ms Carr: Sarah Carr, Public Service Commission.

Ms Renaud: Marie Renaud, MLA for St. Albert.

Mr. Hinkley: Good morning. Bruce Hinkley, Wetaskiwin-Camrose.

Ms Woollard: Good morning. Denise Woollard, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

Mr. Shepherd: Good morning. David Shepherd, Edmonton-Centre.

Ms LeBlanc: Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary Counsel.

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

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

Ms Rempel: Jody Rempel, committee clerk.

The Chair: And on the phones?

Mr. Fraser: Rick Fraser, Calgary-South East.

Ms Goodridge: Laila Goodridge, Fort McMurray-Conklin.

Ms Luff: Robyn Luff, Calgary-East.

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

Dr. Swann: Good morning. David Swann, Calgary-Mountain View.

Mr. Yao: Tany Yao, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

Drever: Good morning, Deborah Drever, MLA for Calgary-Bow.

Ms Miller: Barb Miller, MLA for Red Deer-South.

The Chair: I'd like to note for the record the following substitutions: Mrs. Schreiner for Ms McKittrick.

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

Approval of the agenda. Does anyone wish to propose amendments to the draft agenda? On the phones?

Hearing none, would a member be willing to move a motion to approve the agenda? Go ahead, Ms Woollard.

Ms Woollard: I approve the agenda.

The Chair: Perfect. Moved by Ms Woollard that the agenda for the March 15, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities be adopted as circulated. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Approval of the meeting minutes. We have the minutes from our last meeting. Are there any errors or omissions to note?

Can I have a member please move adoption of the minutes? Moved by Mr. Shepherd that the minutes of the February 5, 2019, meeting of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities be adopted as circulated. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. The motion is carried.

Review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act. As we move on to our primary item of business today, I would like to quickly acknowledge and thank the officials from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General and from the Public Service Commission office who have joined us today not as stakeholders but to provide us with technical support as we proceed with our review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.

We'll now move to research services, the crossjurisdictional comparison. Two research briefings were prepared for the committee and were distributed to committee members in mid-February. As indicated on the agenda, we will review the crossjurisdictional comparison information first, and I will invite Ms Robert to start things off with an overview of this document. Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay. I'll just give you a quick overview of the crossjurisdictional comparison that research services prepared for the committee's use. There are six provincial jurisdictions in Canada that 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, and they also have in their Financial Information Act compensation requirements at a lower threshold level for public-sector bodies. Manitoba's act, Ontario's act, and the Financial Information Act in B.C. are the oldest legislation. They were all enacted in 1996. The newest is in Newfoundland and Labrador. That act was enacted in 2016 and amended in 2018.

I'll just briefly turn your attention, if I can, to the table of contents in the document. That might be the simplest way to start the overview. There's an executive summary, and following that, the breakdown of what research services looked at is listed. We looked at the entities and individuals to which public-sector compensation disclosure legislation applies, broken down by core government offices of the Legislature, which includes the Legislative Assembly

Office and offices of statutory or legislative officers, and then other public-sector bodies. It also covers compensation thresholds at or above which disclosure is required. There's a section that talks about the type of compensation information that is disclosed, including the responsibility for compensation disclosure reporting, the deadlines, and public availability of those reports, and then there's also a section with respect to exemptions that are available to be made to the act.

Now, there are a lot of similarities to the legislation across the country. For instance, all legislation sets thresholds, has reporting deadlines, most of them allow for exemptions. All of the legislation applies to organizations that have government employees, so ministries, public agencies, postsecondary institutions, health authorities, offices of the Legislature, which I described before, and school boards. Although Alberta's act authorizes disclosure with respect to school boards, it does not require it, but the School Act has some requirements with respect to compensation disclosure.

Now, having said all of that, there are also some differences in terms of what bodies are covered under the different legislation. Only some jurisdictions require disclosure with respect to law enforcement, so police. 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, require it with respect to medical practitioners that are not government employees, and some require it with respect to publicly funded nonprofit organizations. There's a table in the crossjurisdictional called table 1, which starts on page 14, and it lists all the different entities that are covered under the various legislation and breaks it down by the different jurisdictions that require disclosure with respect to those entities.

10:10

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: their reports are pretty detailed. They include fairly detailed employee information: the name of the person, their position, what body they work for. Those jurisdictions also require a pretty substantial breakdown with respect to the type of compensation that's received: you know, salary, overtime, benefits, severance, sometimes employee contracts, different things like that.

On the other side of that, some jurisdictions, most notably Nova Scotia, list only the name of the employee and one compensation amount. They don't list their position, their department, their public-sector body, what the compensation includes. It's just a name and an amount of money that's received.

Another difference that research services noted is with respect to access to reports. Most jurisdictions produce their annual compensation disclosure report or reports on one or two government websites that are pretty easy to find. The differences, though, in some jurisdictions – for instance, Nova Scotia indicates in its legislation that if the compensation disclosure is produced as part of the public accounts, then that disclosure does not have to also occur in the public-sector disclosure report. So you have to look in a couple of different places to try to find that information.

In B.C., probably most notably, while their executive compensation disclosure is all sort of listed on one site and you can find it on one site or it links from one site, their compensation disclosure under their Financial Information Act with respect to public-sector bodies, so municipalities as an example, is not listed on one site. You have to go to each body's site, and you have to find the information. Research services didn't look at all of them, but it wasn't the easiest task. It wasn't that easily accessible. That's just something to note.

There is a table in the crossjurisdictional, table 3, starting on page 22, that lists by jurisdiction the type of information that is disclosed in each report.

The final thing I will quickly talk about is thresholds. Each jurisdiction sets thresholds for the most part at or above which compensation is disclosed. Those thresholds, loosely speaking, range between \$75,000 and \$125,000 a year. However, in Alberta, as you know, those thresholds are indexed for inflation, so that amount changes. Recently Manitoba also amended their act to say that they're going to index their compensation threshold starting in 2023.

In addition, the Financial Information Act in B.C. also sets disclosure thresholds of \$25,000 for payments to service providers: physicians, lawyers that provide legal aid services, that sort of thing.

One other thing I'll 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 a 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 16, it lists the thresholds in each jurisdiction and what components are included in calculating that threshold.

I think I'm going to stop there, but I'd be more than happy to try to answer any questions anybody might have. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Robert.

Does anyone have any questions or comments? Ms Woollard, go ahead.

Ms Woollard: After hearing your presentation – and thank you very much; very thorough – and reading the briefing documents and the written submissions, I see that security and safety are common concerns with personal information being posted publicly. Can you speak to any incidents where there were issues of safety and security which caused the legislation or practice of disclosing salary information to change, if it had an impact anywhere, safety and security?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. Are you asking, then, about the media scan that was done with respect to public-sector compensation disclosure? The legislation, of course, won't address instances like that. I'm just wanting to . . .

Ms Woollard: No. I just wondered if you were aware of any incidents in which issues of safety and security had an impact on legislation in various jurisdictions being changed.

Ms Robert: I don't know about being changed. I do know that in some jurisdictions, for instance Manitoba, when police officer compensation is disclosed, it's done with a number as opposed to a name in order to protect identity. There's also a regulation under Ontario's act that provides an exemption with respect to compensation disclosure with respect to corrections employees and police officers, but I don't know how that came about. I just know that it exists.

Ms Woollard: Thank you. That's good information.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Thank you for the presentation. I notice that New Brunswick posts physician incomes. Is there a general trend across the country to disclose by individual physician . . .

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dr. Swann: . . . as opposed to by specialty?

Ms Robert: As opposed to by specialty? Oh, I see. Okay.

Dr. Swann: Are some specialties exempt in the medical profession? The first question is: how widespread is medical practitioner income posting?

Ms Robert: Right. Okay. It's not that widespread. I know that, yes, New Brunswick's Medical Services Payment Act was amended to allow for the disclosure of information with respect to medical practitioners and oral and maxillofacial surgeons. I would stress that it authorizes; it does not require that disclosure.

The only other jurisdiction that I'm aware of that discloses medical practitioner compensation information is British Columbia, under the Financial Information Act. It discloses payments made to a service provider – and one of the service providers is considered to be a medical practitioner – but it doesn't specify certain specialties of medical practitioners. Neither of those does, and those are the only jurisdictions that I'm aware of that disclose with respect to medical practitioners that are not government employees.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Yeah. Thank you for the report. I guess I'm just curious a little bit whether your review of the legislation, particularly with regard to Alberta but maybe other provinces as well, went so far as to look at any of the debate in the House surrounding the passage of these bills because issues both for and against would be raised there. I'm just wondering if you actually went that far in any of it.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. In the review of the legislation, no. But in the next thing I'm going to talk about, which is the media scan, I'm not sure if debate was what caused these articles to be written, but articles got written about legislation that had been enacted, that hadn't been enacted, that type of thing.

Mr. Orr: Okay. I appreciate that. I think it might be interesting, though – and I'll probably just do it on my own – to look up some of the debate and see what the discussion was. I mean, you know, if they're completely unanimous, that's one thing. If there were issues raised, that's a good place to find it, I think.

Anyway, thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Anyone on the phones?

Are there any other questions or comments? Ms Woollard.

Ms Woollard: Thank you. There are different opinions on how this information should be disclosed and whether names should be included in the disclosure. I see that Newfoundland had a Supreme Court case over names being included in the disclosure process. Stakeholders have requested a range of changes: taking names out, taking positions out, creating ranges for salaries instead of exact salary numbers. To your knowledge, have any jurisdictions considered making any of these changes, or are they pretty much sticking with established procedures, process?

10:20

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. No legislation has been changed that I'm aware of other than – as I mentioned earlier, you know, in Manitoba, police officers' names aren't listed, that sort of thing. But I'm not aware of anything other than that.

Ms Woollard: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments for this portion? On the phones?

Okay. We will now go into views of public-sector disclosure legislation. Based on questions raised in an earlier meeting, a briefing regarding views of public-sector compensation disclosure legislation has been prepared by research services. I would like to again invite Ms Robert to give us a brief summary of this research document. Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. At the request of the committee, research services conducted a media scan to gather information on public views and perceptions of compensation disclosure legislation in Alberta and other Canadian provincial jurisdictions. The document that we prepared summarizes findings in media articles with respect to the six jurisdictions that have compensation disclosure legislation – Alberta, B.C., Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland and Labrador – and it also summarizes information found in media articles with respect to discussions about compensation disclosure in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Nunavut, and the Yukon Territory.

For the most part these articles report on sort of who topped the list, the compensation disclosure list, and who was excluded from the list. That was a general theme throughout. The only other thing I'll really say is to just sort of offer a reminder that, you know, media discussions are not always accurate. They indicate the attitudes in the jurisdictions they represent, and they reflect the opinions and views of the authors.

That's all I'll really say, but I'd be happy to try to answer any questions. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any questions or comments?

Ms Woollard: I'll jump in here. Just a quick one. How does the reporting process in Alberta compare with other jurisdictions? Anything notably different?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sorry, Ms Woollard. I just want to clarify: the compensation disclosure reporting process or the articles that were reported?

Ms Woollard: I think the process.

Ms Robert: The compensation disclosure process. Okay. I'll just refer you back to the crossjurisdictional survey. You'll find, starting on page 19 of the report and specifically on page 22 in table 3, that we broke down the type of information that is disclosed in each of the reports. Alberta's along with Ontario's and executive compensation in B.C.: they're fairly detailed. They offer a fair amount of information about, you know, the name of the employee, the position, the body they work for, and a fairly substantial breakdown of the type of compensation and benefits that they receive. Sometimes it includes employee contracts; sometimes it

includes severance contracts, nonmonetary benefits, all of that sort of stuff. They probably offer the most detailed reports as compared to I think I mentioned Nova Scotia, which offers simply a name and one single amount.

Ms Woollard: Wow. Okay. Quite a variance. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions, comments? On the phones?

Okay. Thank you, Ms Robert.

On to the consultation process and written submissions summary. At our last meeting the committee agreed to invite written submissions on the act as part of our review and set a response deadline of March 5, 2019. The committee received 12 submissions that have been incorporated into a summary document. However, as committee members are aware, two written submissions were also sent in after the submission deadline. Therefore, a decision needs to be made by this committee as to whether or not it will accept these late submissions. Does anyone have any comments in this regard? On the phones? Go ahead, Mr. Hinkley.

Mr. Hinkley: No comments, but I would like to make a motion, though, with respect to that.

The Chair: Absolutely. Go ahead.

Mr. Hinkley: Okay. I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Families and Communities accept written submissions regarding the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act received no later than March 14, 2019.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hinkley.

Are there any questions or comments about this motion? On the phones?

Moved by Mr. Hinkley that the Standing Committee on Families and Communities accept written submissions regarding the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act received no later than March 14, 2019. All in favour of this motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you.

This motion is carried.

With that decision made, we can now turn our focus to the written submissions summary. Ms Robert, would you please take us through this document?

Ms Robert: Sure. Thanks, Madam Chair. Okay. The summary of written submissions. This summary includes information with respect to the 12 written submissions that were received by the deadline that was initially set by the committee. Of the 12 submissions eight came from public agencies. There were also submissions from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees; from the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General jointly with the Public Service Commission; one from the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, the Calgary region; and one very short submission from a private citizen, simply offering her support for the practice of transparency and compensation.

I would say that four submissions – from the Alberta Pension Services Corporation; the AUPE, the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees; Keyano College; and the Institute of Public Administration of Canada – spent a lot of time talking about the disclosure system generally, and some made recommendations for change.

They talked about concerns with respect to using people's names in disclosure and whether that was beneficial or not beneficial. They talked about concerns with respect to having their very specially trained employees poached, if I will, by other organizations because

those organizations are aware of the compensation that these employees receive. They also talked about internal difficulties with disclosure because at the end of the year, when the disclosure report comes out, some of them seem to spend a fair amount of time talking to current employees, explaining why X employee's salary appears to be quite large, maybe for a variety of reasons: maybe they had overtime, maybe they had retroactive pay, that sort of thing.

They made some recommendations for change with respect to that. Some talked about perhaps singling out true executive compensation and providing more contextual information with respect to that compensation and then only providing maybe general information about lower levels of compensation that still are above the threshold but perhaps aren't truly executive compensation. So those sorts of comments and issues were raised by submitters.

10:30

The other types of issues that were raised were, you know, with respect to the content of disclosure reports and possibly expanding it to include a lot more information. There were also some issues raised with respect to members, so nonemployees: members of public-sector bodies, so board members as an example. The committee is aware that the compensation threshold does not apply to members. All compensation of members is disclosed. One of the stakeholders suggested that perhaps that's not really clearly laid out in the legislation and that perhaps it should be more clearly laid out.

There were also some issues raised with respect to thresholds and the possibility that the committee may want to consider adopting one threshold regime in Alberta rather than having a separate one for government employees and another for public-sector bodies. Another stakeholder suggested the possibility of maybe increasing the threshold in Alberta.

There were also a couple of issues raised with respect to the disclosure of severance payments and the effect that disclosure can have on an employee's reputation and their ability to find other employment.

Then there were also some issues raised with respect to exemptions. One of the stakeholders requested that their subsidiaries be exempted from the legislation and offered a number of reasons why. There were some issues raised with respect to the time frame for applying for exemptions, that the deadline for applying for exemptions occurs well before an employee's T4 arrives, so they're not sure if they're going to be above the threshold or not and they're not sure if they need to apply for an exemption, that sort of thing.

There were also some issues raised with respect to perhaps changing the legislation so that mandatory disclosure is required with respect to education bodies and municipal authorities and also health services providers, medical practitioners.

There was also an issue raised with respect to the review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act and how it, at least this year, is aligning with the Election Act and that therefore it's possible that the Legislative Assembly will dissolve before the review will be completed.

Then just one other comment, from a public agency with respect to where their funding comes from. You know, I think what they were possibly alluding to is that since their funding doesn't come from the government, should they be subject to the application of the act? But I'm not certain about that.

I'll stop there, and I'd be pleased to answer any questions you might have. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any questions or comments? Ms Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Thank you. Just a couple of quick questions for clarification. You said just a minute ago that a stakeholder requested that subsidiaries be exempt. Could you just remind me of an example of who that was?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Robert: Thank you. That was Alberta Innovates. They have three subsidiaries that they believe for competitive reasons should be exempted from the application of the act.

Ms Renaud: Okay. Just to follow up, you were talking about poaching and that competitive advantage for some of their employees, and that makes sense. I think Travel Alberta also talked about maybe some safety concerns for some of their employees that were in other areas or overseas perhaps delivering programs, that they would be targeted. As you were doing your scan, did you note any work or any concerns that have come out in other jurisdictions, that they've taken steps to maybe address some of those risks?

Ms Robert: I don't recall that specifically in the media scan. There was, you know, the court case in Newfoundland where the union, I believe, went to court to say that names should not be disclosed, but the appeal court, I believe, ruled that indeed names should be as a matter of course disclosed. That's all that's coming to mind at the moment.

Ms Renaud: I just had a technical question. Because the stakeholders were so diverse, actually, I'm wondering if it's possible just to remind us a little bit about what those nonmonetary disclosures would be in different areas. I imagine that in Alberta Innovates they would be very, very different from, say, just another body. I'm wondering if you could sort of give us some examples of what those were.

Ms Robert: Sorry. Just to clarify, what constitutes a nonmonetary benefit?

Ms Renaud: Yeah, the term, I guess.

Ms Robert: Okay. I will have to just have a little peek at the crossjurisdictional if I could.

The Chair: Go ahead, to our guests at the table.

Ms Carlson: Thank you. For Alberta, nonmonetary benefits are any amounts that are provided in respect of an employee that aren't, like, taxable or appear on the T4. Our government has prepared the list of frequently asked questions, and they've got some of the items that are on there, and those are things like the employer's portion of Canada Pension Plan contributions, WCB contributions on behalf of an employee. Some things that are not included in the nonmonetary benefits are things like the health spending account – those don't have to be accounted for – earned vacation not yet taken. These are things that are in the frequently asked questions, but they're not in the definition of the nonmonetary benefits.

Ms Renaud: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Carlson.
Anyone on the phone with a question or comment?

Dr. Swann: Thanks again. Under Health Services Providers it is indicated here that Alberta Health Services indicated that it discloses information with respect to compensation paid to physicians that are employees if their compensation exceeds the established threshold. It recommended

that a regulation should be established to extend mandatory disclosure to other health services providers pursuant to ss. 5(2) and (3).

What do you think they were referring to there, other service providers that are not currently included?

Ms Carlson: I've seen the written submission summary but not the submission from Alberta Health Services, but I think what they're referring to is that no regulation has been enacted under section 5. Currently the act provides a regulation-making power to allow physician compensation under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act to be disclosed, but to date no regulation has been enacted, so there is no disclosure of those amounts.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Are they also going to other service providers that are currently not covered? I'm thinking of – I don't know – the head of maintenance, certain levels of administration. Are there others that are exempt currently?

Ms Carlson: Section 5 talks about health services provided and refers to the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, and I believe that that act refers to health practitioners other than physicians. There are a couple of other ones. I don't know who they are off the top of my head, but there are physicians and other health care practitioners that are covered under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act.

The Chair: Thank you.

Dr. Swann: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: Yeah. I just wondered: do we have any data or information about who accesses the actual disclosure data, how many people a year, any information at all about who those people might be? I mean, it's published, it's out there, but do we know anything at all about who actually uses it and for what?

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm very sorry, Mr. Orr. I missed the first part of what you were saying.

Mr. Orr: Okay. I'm just wondering: do we have any data or stats with regard to who actually accesses public disclosure information? I mean, it's on the website. Websites can track traffic. Do we know anything at all about who's using it and how often it's accessed, that kind of thing?

10:40

Ms Robert: I would actually defer that to the ministry because that's not information that I would be able to have access to.

Thank you.

Mr. Orr: Yeah.

Ms Carr: That's not something that we are currently tracking. We may be able to give you some information about, like, the number of hits to the website – we could pursue that – but in terms of who specifically is accessing the information, I'm not sure we could do that.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments? Ms Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Thank you. I'm not entirely sure who this question goes to; I apologize. The lists are difficult to access. I mean, you know, like you mentioned, there are a number of places you would have to search to find information specific to a body that you were looking for, whether it was, I guess, a school board or things like that. It's not a very searchable list. It's not easy to search through the list of disclosures. I'm wondering if any other jurisdictions have made progress, I guess, with their list in its simplicity or ease of people to search or in maybe consolidating the information.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms Robert.

Ms Robert: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would say that Alberta's isn't bad. You know, you go to one website, and it has information with respect to government employee disclosure. You click on a link, and it's there, and it's pretty searchable. Then you can go to another link, and that takes care of all the public-sector bodies. So compared to some other jurisdictions, it's actually not too bad. Ontario's is excellent. Everything is on one website, and you can sort it based on pretty much anything you want. It's excellent. But, personally, I didn't find Alberta's too difficult to get through.

Ms Renaud: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Anyone on the phones with questions or comments? Any other questions or comments in the room?

Seeing none, we'll move on. Thank you. Now we are at the handling of submissions. Having thoroughly reviewed the contents of the written submissions, this may be a good time for the committee to consider whether or not it wishes to make the submissions public. Does anyone have any thoughts or comments on this? Mr. Hinkley.

Mr. Hinkley: Yeah. In this part we're going to be concerned about people's privacy, their contact information, yet also about enhancing and supporting transparency. I just wanted to check if all of those people and organizations that made submissions realize that their submissions would be made public. Was that an issue at all, or they all knew?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Madam Chair. I can advise that any time we send out these stakeholder notifications, it does indicate in there quite clearly that submissions may be made available to the public. Also, you know, with the committee's direction, of course, should these be posted publicly, it is standard practice that signatures, if they exist, are blacked out, not the electronic ones but anything that's a handwriting kind of signature, as well as potential personal contact information.

Mr. Hinkley: Personal information?

Ms Rempel: Yeah. If it's an organization, you know, I mean, their phone number, e-mail, and so on would stay available, but if it was possibly a private individual's personal contact information, we would take that out before it was made public.

Mr. Hinkley: Okay. Well, maybe you've already done that, but I guess I'm eventually going to want to make a motion about that. Basically, I did not see any major issues with the information or the contents, but there were a couple of places where we saw personal contact information. I'm just curious if other people are concerned about that as well. Eventually I'd like to make a motion that

personal, private information definitely not be made public, but it sounds like you may already have erased it or covered it.

Ms Rempel: Well, you know, the committee members see exactly what is received. We don't make any changes to the documents.

Mr. Hinkley: Yes, but when it goes public, is it . . .

Ms Rempel: You know, if it was the committee's direction to do so, it is standard practice that, yes, private phone numbers, e-mail addresses, that kind of thing, would be removed before it was posted.

Mr. Hinkley: Okay.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hinkley: Well, Madam Chair, do you think I should make a motion to that effect, then, so that it's on record that it would not be made public?

The Chair: If you wish to make a motion.

Mr. Hinkley: Okay. Then if there are no other comments, I would like to make the motion that

the Standing Committee on Families and Communities 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 questions or comments regarding the motion? On the phones?

Moved by Mr. Hinkley that the Standing Committee on Families and Communities 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. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you.

The motion is carried.

Next steps. Having reviewed all of the information that we have received to date, the committee is now in a position to consider the next steps in its review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act. Specifically, this committee should consider whether it wishes to seek additional input, perhaps by inviting oral presentations. At this time I would like to open the floor to discussion and comments relating to the next steps of our review.

Anyone with questions or comments? Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Certainly, I think this is an important part of the process, our next stage, but I did just have a question for the representatives we have from Justice and Solicitor General and the Public Service Commission. I'm certainly in favour, I think, of inviting all of the stakeholders that we have on the regional list, getting everybody involved who's been part of things. But I did just wonder: in your opinion, if we were to have a bit of a targeted list, if we wanted to pare that down a little bit or focus, I guess, on who else we might invite, do you have any recommendations from that original stakeholder list of folks who maybe didn't get a chance to make a written submission to the committee but that might be worth reaching out to? I guess we've got our stakeholder list; we've got our list of folks that submitted. There are some folks that didn't submit that we reached out to. Are there any, do you think, we should go back to for the oral submission?

Ms Carlson: We haven't seen the stakeholder list, but I think that's pretty thorough, from what I understand, the people that were invited to submit. I don't know if the Information and Privacy

Commissioner was invited to submit, but that's somebody who I would recommend be invited to come and speak because privacy is obviously a big issue on this. But I think, as I understand it, the stakeholder list was pretty broad and covered most of the main people that would be interested in this.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you.

Ms Carr: My thinking would be aligned with Ms Carlson's. I haven't seen the list either but understand that it was extensive and that public agencies had the opportunity to participate in the process.

The Chair: Ms Robert. Sorry; I thought you had wanted to speak.

Ms Robert: No.

Mr. Shepherd: Excellent. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments on the phone?
Ms Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just had a question. I'm wondering if it would be appropriate at all, when we're, you know, sending out invitations or asking people to come and speak to us, if we could ask them to specifically address some of the safety issues that have been raised. I noticed in the summary document, for example, that law enforcement had a number of good suggestions and talked about some of the issues, but they didn't go too deeply into the concerns around safety. I'm wondering if we could ask a bit of a targeted question, if that would be appropriate.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, certainly, if that's the will of the committee, I could include some text to that effect when we draft the invitation, absolutely.

Ms Renaud: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Orr: Yeah, I do.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Orr.

Mr. Orr: If I'm not mistaken, I do not see – please correct me. Do we have the Alberta Medical Association on this list of stakeholders? I don't think we do. It seems to me that since doctors are arising in the conversation quite often here and in some of the reports, we should be inviting them to hear what their point of view might be on it.

10:50

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Madam Chair. Right offhand here, you know, I couldn't let you know whether they were included or not, but we could certainly make . . .

Dr. Massolin: No, they're not.

Ms Rempel: They're not. Okay.

Mr. Orr: If I need a motion, I would like to move that they be included or asked.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Orr: Do you want a motion for that?

The Chair: I think we should just continue discussing the list in general.

Mr. Orr: Fair enough.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments or additions to the list? On the phones?

At this point I'm looking at drafting the motion with the list. Are we at a place to decide who we would like to invite? We have the Medical Association from Mr. Orr. Anyone else we would like to invite?

An Hon. Member: The Information and Privacy Commissioner.

The Chair: The Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Was there a decision made on whether or not to invite the previous submissions, the people that submitted written submissions, to make oral presentations? I don't know if that was formalized or not as a decision.

Mr. Shepherd: If I may, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Shepherd, absolutely.

Mr. Shepherd: Absolutely, I think we should certainly invite anyone who made a written submission to come in, then, if they'd like to provide additional comment with an oral presentation.

The Chair: Any other submissions or other presenters that we would like to invite for the oral presentations?

Ms Rempel: Could I ask a question?

The Chair: Go ahead. Absolutely.

Ms Rempel: Thank you, Madam Chair. If I could just confirm my understanding of Mr. Shepherd's remarks just now and at the beginning of this conversation. Did you mean everyone who was included on the stakeholder list or just those who made written presentations?

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Clerk, for that question. At this point I'm just suggesting those who sent written submissions though I'm certainly open to discussion if members feel that we should expand that to all stakeholders.

The Chair: Any questions or comments regarding Mr. Shepherd's comments?

Mr. Orr: I'll just add that I think that's a perfectly reasonable and right approach to it, so I'd be prepared to support that.

The Chair: Okay. If you could go ahead and read the draft at this point, please.

Ms Rempel: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. If a member was looking to make a motion, some potential wording would be something along the lines of: moved that the Standing Committee on Families and Communities invite all individuals and organizations who provided a written submission plus the freedom of information commissioner – sorry; I didn't get that quite right – the Information and Privacy Commissioner and the Alberta Medical Association to

make oral presentations in relation to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.

The Chair: Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to make that motion.

The Chair: Perfect.

Would you go ahead and read it one more time?

Ms Rempel: Sure. We'll see if I can do better this time. I believe that Mr. Shepherd has moved that

the Standing Committee on Families and Communities invite all individuals and organizations who provided written submissions plus the Information and Privacy Commissioner and the Alberta Medical Association to make oral presentations in relation to the committee's review of the Public Sector Compensation Transparency Act.

The Chair: Well done.

All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you.

This motion is carried.

We are now at other business. I would like to thank everyone. Are there any other issues for discussion before we conclude our meeting? On the phones?

Thank you. The date of the next meeting will be at the call of the chair.

I would now call for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Orr. Moved by Mr. Orr that the meeting be adjourned. All in favour of the motion, please say aye. On the phones? Any opposed? Thank you. This motion is carried.

[The committee adjourned at 10:56 a.m.]

