



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature  
Third Session

Standing Committee  
on  
Privileges and Elections,  
Standing Orders and Printing

Tuesday, May 31, 2022  
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 30-3-1

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

**Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections,  
Standing Orders and Printing**

Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UC), Chair  
Reid, Roger W., Livingstone-Macleod (UC), Deputy Chair

Aheer, Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Strathmore (UC)  
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Jackie, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UC)  
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)  
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)  
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UC)  
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)  
Neudorf, Nathan T., Lethbridge-East (UC)  
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)  
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UC)  
Williams, Dan D.A., Peace River (UC)

**Also in Attendance**

Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (Ind)

**Support Staff**

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

**10 a.m.****Tuesday, May 31, 2022**

[Mr. Smith in the chair]

**The Chair:** Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing.

I am Mark Smith, the MLA for Drayton Valley-Devon and chair of the committee. I would ask the members and those joining the committee at the table to introduce themselves for the record, and we'll start to my right.

**Mr. Reid:** Good morning. Roger Reid, MLA for Livingstone-Macleod and deputy chair.

**Mr. Stephan:** Jason Stephan, MLA for Red Deer-South.

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

**Mr. Williams:** Dan Williams, MLA for the Peace River constituency.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Good morning. Leela Aheer, Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Mr. Deol:** Good morning. Jasvir Deol, MLA for Edmonton-Meadows.

**Ms Dean:** Good morning. Shannon Dean, Clerk of the Assembly.

**Ms Robert:** Good morning. Nancy Robert, clerk of *Journals* and committees.

**Dr. Massolin:** Good morning. Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and director of House services.

**Mr. Roth:** Good morning. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Hon. members, section 6 of the Legislative Assembly Act authorizes members of the committees of the Legislative Assembly to participate by teleconference or other methods of communication if unanimous consent is granted. As members are aware, the committee rooms are equipped to facilitate meeting participation by teleconference and videoconference. For members to participate at this meeting using one of these methods, the committee either must pass a motion unanimously to allow for teleconferencing and videoconferencing today or members may instead pass a motion to approve attendance by teleconference or videoconference for the duration of the committee's mandate. This would not preclude the committee from determining that members' attendance in person at specific committee meetings is required. Do members have any questions about this issue?

Would there be a member willing to move a motion to authorize participation by teleconference or videoconference? Okay. I see Member Armstrong-Homeniuk. I'll read out the draft motion here.

Moved by Member Armstrong-Homeniuk that

for the duration of the 30th Legislature the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing pursuant to section 6 of the Legislative Assembly Act permits committee members and invited guests to participate in committee meetings by teleconference or videoconference subject to the provision that the committee may require members' attendance in person at a particular meeting upon passage at a previous meeting of a motion to that effect.

As this motion requires unanimous consent, I will ask only if there's anyone opposed to this motion. Is there anyone opposed to this motion? Thank you.

The motion is carried.

I would invite those members joining the meeting via Microsoft Teams to now introduce themselves. So let's start with . . .

**Ms Ganley:** Good morning. Kathleen Ganley, MLA for Calgary-Mountain View.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Richard Gotfried, MLA, Calgary-Fish Creek.

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

**Ms Renaud:** Marie Renaud, St. Albert.

**Mr. Barnes:** Drew Barnes, MLA, Cypress-Medicine Hat. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is there anyone else on that we're not aware of? Okay.

A few housekeeping items to address before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard* staff. Committee proceedings are live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. The audio- and videostream and transcript of the meeting can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website. Those participating by videoconference are asked to please turn on your camera while speaking and to mute your microphone when not speaking. Members participating virtually who wish to be placed on the speakers list are asked to e-mail or send a message in the group chat to the committee clerk, and members in the room are asked to please signal to the chair. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of this meeting.

Would a member move adoption of our meeting agenda?

**Mr. Reid:** So moved.

**The Chair:** Okay. Moved by Mr. Reid that the agenda for the May 31, 2022, meeting of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing be adopted as circulated. Any discussion?

Okay. All those in favour in the room? Any against? In favour virtually? Any against? I call that carried.

Hon. members, before we begin this meeting, I would like to briefly review the mandate of the committee. The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing is established by Standing Order 52(1)(a). The committee is mandated to meet only when a matter has been referred to it by the Assembly such as the matter of interventions, which we will be discussing today. Therefore, unlike other committees of the Legislature, this committee is not mandated to generate its own work. Are there any questions about the committee's mandate?

Maybe before we move on, we should recognize that MLA Neudorf is here. Mr. Neudorf, maybe you could introduce yourself to the committee.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you, Chair. Nathan Neudorf, MLA for Lethbridge-East.

**The Chair:** Thank you for joining us today.

Hon. members, on June 7, 2021, the Assembly agreed to Motion Other than Government Motion 518 as amended. As members are aware, with the passage of this motion the five-minute question-and-comment period under Standing Order 29(2) that was available following speeches on government business was struck out and in its place is the new Standing Order 29.1, which allows members to make short interventions during members' speeches in debate on government bills and motions and private bills with the permission of the member speaking.

In accordance with Motion 518 the new interventions rule came into effect on the first day of the fall sitting in 2021, which was October 25,

2021. Part B of Government Motion 518 directed the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing to conduct a review of the interventions rule. The motion as amended directed that the review commence within a year of Standing Order 29.1 coming into effect and that the committee table a report to the Assembly in relation to this review, which may include any amendments recommended by the committee within one year after the committee commences its review. Do members have any questions or comments about the mandate of this review before we proceed?

Seeing none, hearing none, as we begin our review, I would like to call upon Nancy Robert, clerk of *Journals* and committees, to provide an overview of what supports the committee has available to it as we proceed. Ms Robert.

**Ms Robert:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning again, everyone. For this committee's review, obviously, you're reviewing a rule of the Assembly, so I would say in this case that the stakeholders are the members of this committee and all the other members of the Assembly. That being the case, the committee may wish to seek input from the stakeholders, from the members, so it's possible that the committee may wish to perhaps survey members on what they think of the interventions rule and any recommendations for change they might have for it. If that's the case, the Legislative Assembly Office could certainly provide a summary of any information gleaned from the survey and report back to the committee on that information.

As members may know, Alberta is the only Canadian jurisdiction that employs an interventions rule in their Assembly. This rule, I believe, was based on the interventions rule in the U.K. Parliament. When committees are doing reviews of matters, research services will often do crossjurisdictional work to provide to the committee. In this case perhaps work could be done to provide a comparison of the U.K. rule versus the Alberta rule with respect to interventions.

10:10

Of course, the Legislative Assembly Office could also help, and would typically help, the committee in drafting its final report with recommendations back to the Assembly. So just some ideas of some of the things that the LAO could do to assist the committee with this review.

**The Chair:** Okay. Are there any questions for Ms Robert?

We've been called to go through the interventions and to look at interventions as a committee and to make recommendations to the Legislature. The LAO and Ms Robert are open to providing us with services to help us in making those recommendations.

Hon. members, as we've reviewed the mandate of the committee and have a sense of what supports are available to the committee, I would now like to open the floor to any comments or motions as to how the committee would like to proceed. We stand open.

Mr. Stephan.

**Mr. Stephan:** Sure. I'd like to make a motion. I'd like to move that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing requests research services to compile a crossjurisdictional analysis on the use of interventions in Westminster-based parliamentary systems for submission to the committee.

**The Chair:** We'll give them time to write that out and put it on the screen. We'll see if it captures what you said. Moved by Mr. Stephan that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing requests that research services compile a crossjurisdictional analysis on the use of interventions in

Westminster-based parliamentary systems for submission to the committee. Does that represent what you said?

**Mr. Stephan:** It looks great.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any discussion on the motion that is before us? Mrs. Aheer.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you, Chair. I was just wondering, in our discussions and with respect to the survey that will be done with a crossjurisdictional check, are we going to also be looking into – I actually really enjoyed the interventions; I thought that it brought a lot of interesting conversation into the Legislature. I'm just curious about convention around interventions with respect to having to take an intervention, or there were discussions around people being able to finish their thoughts before an intervention can come in. Just, I suppose, the equality of how it is that we intervene, to make sure that the conversations flow as they should.

**The Chair:** Is that directed to . . .

**Mrs. Aheer:** Just as a discussion point, Mr. Chair, and just in respect to how we'll be asking the questions for the crossjurisdictional. As we look in scope and find out, I think it might be interesting maybe to even look at the *Hansard* of other Westminster models that use this to see what's the polite – you know, there are probably ways we could improve the interventions that we've done, so I'm just curious about that as well, how we can improve our interventions.

**The Chair:** Okay. Can we direct research services through this motion to do something like that? I'm not sure how that works.

Go ahead, Ms Robert.

**Ms Robert:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes. The discussion that's being held with respect to this motion will be taken into consideration when research services or committee services undertakes the task.

**The Chair:** Okay. So we can make sure that that's a part of their research.

**Mrs. Aheer:** That's great to know. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I believe Member Ganley . . .

**Ms Ganley:** Pardon me. Yes. I mean, I don't strongly oppose this. I feel like my understanding was that the member who proposed it had sort of done a crossjurisdictional in advance of proposing it. It seemed like the Assembly was generally supportive of it. I'll admit to having been a bit skeptical, but I think it's worked fine. So I feel like maybe we don't need to, like, overprocess this. That's just my comment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Anyone else? Mr. Deol.

**Mr. Deol:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah. I'm pretty much of the same view as Ms Ganley has said. You know, I was under the impression that there has been quite a bit of work done before these proposals were brought in. So if we are just going back to the same place where we started, then probably this seems unnecessary to do, but if we are trying to do something different than the work we had done before bringing these proposals in, that's a different story. In my view, I think that there would have been a thorough process to do a crossjurisdictional analysis before bringing these proposals in.

I also wanted to see similarly – it was quite, you know, that we didn't know which way it was going to go. We were thinking it was

going to impact the speaking time of the members, but definitely it has provided slightly better improvements in building relationships between members and, in a way, better communication, and it worked.

So we have the committee wanting to do the survey. We have the tools. The caucus can do the surveys with their members, and they can bring back the feedback. Then the LAO can speak to the independent members in other ways. But if the member really knows something he's proposing other than that but has already done it, then that's a different story.

**The Chair:** Mr. Stephan.

**Mr. Stephan:** Sorry. I wouldn't mind just speaking. The purpose of the motion is not only to identify the jurisdictions that use the practice of interventions, but perhaps there are nuances that they've developed in terms of best practices. Perhaps there are things that the committee could discover from those other jurisdictions through experience, nuances in terms of how they go about the practice of interventions that we could consider. So that's where I think that there could be some value from a crossjurisdictional analysis, looking at the nuances of how interventions are used.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Member.

Is there anybody else? Mr. Williams.

**Mr. Williams:** Thank you. As the member that proposed it, happily, I'm glad to see a lot of interest in it now. Also, I'll take credit for having the no-meet committee get a little less vegan, a little more meat on it, for the first time in many years. I'm very proud of that fact.

I think that there could be some value. I appreciate Member Ganley and Member Deol's position. We shouldn't just rehash what we already know. Let's get to surveys; I think that that's substantively very helpful. But, I mean, there are things that I think aren't going perfectly smoothly with interventions in my own impression. The mechanics of how to recognize someone: sometimes it might be a cultural thing. It could be something that we could ask to come back in this crossjurisdictional report to us: how do other jurisdictions, the U.K., recognize members when geographically speaking you can't see them stand up, right? How does that work smoothly?

I think sometimes declining an intervention is something that we don't do as smoothly as perhaps we could in the Chamber. I've noticed sometimes I'll stand up, hoping to intervene, and then I stand there. I'd be very happy to sit down if I was waved off or told, "I'm not accepting an intervention right now," but it kind of ends up stalling out. So maybe there are those nuances, if we plan on keeping it or at least we're open to keeping it, to see how we could refine it to serve even better.

I agree; I think it's done some good for substantive conversation and debate in the Chamber, but I still think it could be improved upon. That might be a cultural thing of how we as a Chamber react to the standing order. It's very new. The U.K. has had this for decades and decades, so maybe it'll take time. But I'm hoping this conversation can inform our research team in the LAO office on exactly what kinds of questions we have, and then that might help them on what they're going to bring back to us.

So those are my thoughts. Yeah.

10:20

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there any other member that would like to speak to the motion at hand? Online? Then let's call the question. We'll start with members that are in the room. All those in favour of the motion – I suppose we should read it first. Moved by Mr. Stephan that

PESOP requests that research services compile a crossjurisdictional analysis on the use of interventions in Westminster-based parliamentary systems for submission to the committee.

All those in favour? All those in the room – I'm sorry. All those online in favour? All those in the room against? Online against?

That motion is carried.

Are there any other motions or discussions that we would have on today's – Mr. Neudorf.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you, Chair. I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing requests research services to conduct a survey of members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta for suggestions for improving the intervention system as currently outlined in Standing Order 29.1.

**The Chair:** Okay. We're going to give Aaron some time, and you may have to read that again a little more slowly.

**Mr. Neudorf:** To move that

the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing conduct a survey of members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta for suggestions for improving the intervention system as currently outlined in Standing Order 29.1.

Do you need it one more time?

Mr. Chair, if I might provide some rationale.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Is this what you were looking for? Moved by Mr. Neudorf that PESOP conduct a survey of members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta for suggestions on improving the interventions rule as outlined in Standing Order 29.1.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Yes, I believe it is.

**The Chair:** Okay. Go ahead. Speak to it.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think there are some very engaged and practical individuals within the Legislative Assembly on all sides of the House, and I look forward to seeing what they would say to provide some of that input for what works here.

As Member Williams stated earlier, sometimes it's about culture or the society in which we live, and I think we are that culture and society at this time. I know that I have two ideas that I'd like counsel to hear, that they could take forward and use maybe as a conversation starter with other members. I'm willing just to put these as soft asks, but I would like to see there be consideration of requiring members to accept interventions by people other than their own party. I think that would move towards increasing the level of debate, particularly if it's brought forward; 29(2)(a) used to do that. There was no option to decline that speaking time. It was set out in convention, and some of that has been lost. Whether it's that the first intervention must be received or all three or two out of three, I would just like that to be one of the considerations.

The second is that – maybe it works in tandem; maybe it works separately – unless you receive an intervention from an opposing member or an independent member or someone not from your party, your time for speaking is not actually extended, as that could also motivate the reception of interventions by someone other than from your own party.

Those are just two very soft considerations, and I use those as examples to argue the motion put forward, that I think there could

be many other positive suggestions that could work with the intent of Member Williams when he brought this forward.

I will leave it at that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I believe Ms Ganley . . . [interjection] Not Mr. Deol; it's Ms Ganley.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes. Sorry. So many buttons. I can only see the motion; I can't see the room, so it's an interesting camera angle.

My thoughts were just these. Specifically, what do we intend to send out? Like, are we looking at a multiple-choice survey, or are we just going to send sort of a general question that asks, you know: what are your thoughts on this? Are we going to allow people – you know, if our caucus chooses to submit sort of all as one, are we going to allow that to happen? I mean, my view is that the best way to move forward is just sort of with an open-ended question. If we just ask, "How do you think it's working? Do you have any suggestions for changes?" I think that's the best way to get a natural response from the membership. I think that if we start asking specific questions about "What do you think about this?" or "What do you think about that?" it's going to prompt certain responses that maybe – there's a technical term for that, when you ask one general question and then ask a specific question about one thing, where it sort of prompts a response to that one thing and you kind of lose the nuance of everything else.

I'm a little concerned about just asking one general question and then asking a specific question about sort of requiring someone to take an intervention, because then you're speaking, someone can jump up in, like, literally the middle of your thought and cut you off and totally kind of derail you and ask a completely random question. I mean, personally, I think I've only ever declined one intervention, and it was for exactly that reason, that I was clearly, literally mid-thought and they were just trying to kind of derail what I was saying.

So, yeah, I think we should make a decision on whether we just want to ask a general question and get a general response, and if we don't want to do that, if we want to ask, like, a series of very specific questions, I think that in that case it would sort of have to come back here for us to kind of look at the survey and look at what's being asked and consider whether that's, you know, getting a prompted response on some aspects but not other aspects. Personally, I think it's much better just to ask the general question. Those are my thoughts.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I believe Mr. Williams wanted to – no. Mr. Deol. Okay.

**Mr. Deol:** Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah. Very brief comments on this. You know, I agree with the mandates of this motion, and I do support it. No amendments, but I have some suggestions in my mind. Going forward, if that helps make the work of the committee a little bit easier, if you could include the words "to work with caucus," that would probably provide help. The members have opportunity to debate all of these things with their caucus, and probably the caucus can help speed up the process. Other than that, I have no questions or anything, but I think the caucus can also play some role in this, providing the feedback, speed up the pace in a better way, or help with this.

**The Chair:** Is there anyone else that would like to speak? Go ahead.

**Mr. Williams:** Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I would agree with Member Ganley's comments, that it should be a general question. I think that really is the intent that my colleague was trying to put forward, a general question. Leave it open. Don't try and – unless it's certain responses, I think that we should be pretty sincere in

wanting to hear where members are coming from on it. I'm sure there will be a slew of very, very thoughtful suggestions.

**10:30**

I will say that if we do that, which is, I think, the better option, we will then have the task as the committee of trying to categorize these and interpret maybe what they're trying to get at. Obviously, we can't recommend by committee of 87 – that would be a very difficult thing for us to do – so we're going to have to interpret, in a sense, what folks are saying, get a gist of their concerns, and see if maybe they suggested X but Y gets the same point done and solves some other problems.

I just want to make sure that members going into this understand that we'll have that job to do afterwards of trying to make sense of what are probably multiple suggestions from many, many members, but I would agree that I think that's smart. I think that Member Neudorf's suggestion was just to give an example of the kind of thing he would like to put forward when he's asked the question in the survey.

**The Chair:** Just before we get to you, Mr. Deol, we could go to Ms Robert or to Dr. Massolin here and see if you have an understanding of what we're looking for in the survey and how you think you might be able to put it together if we pass this motion.

**Ms Robert:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. Yes, I think we have an understanding of what the committee is looking for. I wonder, since you've given me this opening, if I might suggest that the committee might wish to see a draft survey before it's sent out and have it approved. I don't know how you'd want to accomplish that. Perhaps you may wish to amend the motion to allow for something like that. I'll just leave that with you.

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Okay. The committee has been given a suggestion. Mr. Neudorf, you can think about that while I go to Mr. Deol, and then if you want to make an amendment to the motion, that would be fine.

Oh, yes. Somebody else will have to move the amendment, so maybe someone else in the room can be thinking about how they would like to amend that to reflect that suggestion.

Mr. Deol.

**Mr. Deol:** Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair, once again. You know, I just wanted a little bit more clarity. As I heard the suggestion, probably I can come up with some better wording on this. As it says, this question is about suggesting on improving the intervention rules as outlined in Standing Order 29.1. It means, like, we are not questioning the rule of interventions at all. We are just getting the feedback around it as it is, and regardless of the feedback the intervention is going to remain. So this is the question? Okay. Yeah.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do we have someone that's prepared to make a motion, or should I present, perhaps, a draft? Can we make up a draft?

Mr. Neudorf.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Chair, just for clarification – sorry. With that motion, I don't think that we have to prescribe, necessarily, how Parliamentary Counsel comes back to the committee. I'd like to leave the motion as it is and then allow them to post a draft on the internal website, and then committee members could be polled as to whether they approve it. I don't know if that would be simpler rather than changing the motion just to have that information flow through the internal committee website as it could be used.

**The Chair:** We're going to have to ask if that's a good way of doing it. Personally, I'm wondering if we should be looking at that, because if we're going to have something going out to the members, I think it probably should have the approval of the committee, not just "Well, I'd like to see this" or "I'd like to see that" as feedback. I think that puts the research team in a difficult position.

Maybe I can just get a recommendation on that. Go ahead, Aaron.

**Mr. Roth:** Thank you, Chair. In other circumstances where, say, for instance, you know, a committee has agreed to draft a report, part of the motion has traditionally said that the report be drafted and that the committee have an opportunity to review the report, with final approval often, not always but often, by the chair and deputy chair. There are mechanisms such as that, possibly.

**The Chair:** Yes. Go ahead.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. In that spirit, which is, again, that the motion doesn't necessarily need to change – it goes to the chair and deputy chair – should, then, the wording be: moved by Mr. Neudorf that PESOP draft a survey of members and then return it to the committee?

**The Chair:** Can he change his motion? Somebody is going to have to make an amendment to that effect. Can we have somebody? Mrs. Aheer.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you. I would propose an amendment to the motion to suggest – and I apologize for my wording; I hope I get this right, Mr. Neudorf – that PESOP conduct a draft survey . . .

**The Chair:** Draft a survey?

**Mrs. Aheer:** Pardon me?

**The Chair:** That PESOP draft a survey?

**Mrs. Aheer:** Yeah, draft a survey that they conduct with the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Then do we also have to put in there – sorry, Mr. Chair – that we return to this committee to approve the survey?

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll let Aaron draft those thoughts and put them all together.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** As soon as he has them up, then we'll get straight to you, Mr. Deol.

**Mr. Deol:** Mr. Chair, thank you . . .

**The Chair:** No. Just wait. We'll let him put it up on the screen first, please. It always helps to be able to see what we're talking about before we start talking about it.

Okay. The suggestion has been made that we do this. Mr. Neudorf, if you would be so kind as to rescind your motion, and then we'll put forward a draft motion that we've already got made up, and then we can discuss that. Okay?

**Mr. Neudorf:** I'm very happy to do that.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Neudorf has requested to withdraw the motion. We are going to have to ask the committee for consent on that. All in favour in the room of rescinding Mr. Neudorf's motion? Okay. All in the room against? All in favour of rescinding the motion online? All against online?

The motion is carried, and that motion is now withdrawn.

**Ms Ganley:** I'm really sorry. I'm just wondering if whoever has the camera could just zoom it out a little bit, because we can only see the middle of the motion online.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Roth will put it on the chat screen. For those of you online who need to be able to see the whole motion, you can go to the chat.

Okay. We have some proposed language here for a motion. It reads: moved by Mr. Neudorf that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing direct committee services to prepare a draft survey to invite feedback from Members of the Legislative Assembly on the interventions rule, Standing Order 29.1, as part of the committee's review, to be approved by the chair after committee members have had an opportunity to review the draft survey.

Wow. I'm not sure what's happening today, but Mr. Neudorf [not recorded]

Any other discussion?

**Mr. Stephan:** Member Ganley seems to have lost audio.

**The Chair:** Just one second, please.

Okay. We've been asked if we could recess for a few minutes because some of the people online have lost their audio, so we're going to do some work on this. So a recess for – what? – five minutes. Okay. We'll return at a quarter to.

Thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 10:39 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Thank you for your patience. We are looking at the motion moved by Mr. Neudorf that

the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing direct committee services to prepare a draft survey to invite feedback from Members of the Legislative Assembly on the interventions rule, Standing Order 29.1, as part of the committee's review, to be approved by the chair after committee members have had an opportunity to review the draft survey.

As I read that, we're asking them to put together a survey; it's going to be going back to the committee. If you have feedback on that survey, it's directed towards me. Once I approve the survey, then it would be sent out to the members of the Assembly.

We'll need a motion, Mr. Neudorf.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Moved.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I believe, Mr. Williams, you were cut off there before we recessed. Did you have any comments?

**Mr. Williams:** No. Only to make the point that some members had lost audio.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you.

Are there any other comments or questions before we vote on this motion? In the room? Online?

Okay. I'm calling the question. All those in this room in favour of the motion as it reads, please say aye. All those against in this room, please say no. All those in favour online, please say aye. Any against online, please say no.

That motion is carried.

Now, it's been suggested to me that we should probably have another motion that comes right after this, so we'll put that motion up. Then we'll read through it, and then if somebody would like to put forward that motion, put their name to it, that would be great.

Moved that

the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing direct the committee clerk to distribute the survey pertaining to the interventions rule to all Members of the Legislative Assembly, with a submission deadline of June 10, 2022, and direct research services to compile the results of this survey for the committee.

Is there anyone that would be prepared to put that motion forward? Mrs. Aheer would be prepared to put that motion forward. Discussion?

**Member Loyola:** Hello, Mr. Chair. This is Rod Loyola.

**The Chair:** Yes. Mr. Loyola, go right ahead.

**Member Loyola:** Yeah. Sorry. I'll turn my camera on here so that you can see me as well.

June 10 seems like a pretty quick turnaround; I'm wondering why that date is chosen. Like, can we not give ourselves a little bit more time so that people can reflect on it a bit more and maybe extend that?

**The Chair:** Okay. I guess that to a certain degree that's going to be dependent on research services. Well, first, I guess the question that I would have for research services is: can you work within that deadline?

Yeah. Go right ahead.

**Dr. Massolin:** I'll speak to that, Mr. Chair. I think it's just a matter for the committee to consider, simply the time in which MLAs would need to respond to this survey. Once the survey results are in, that's when research services would do its work, so it wouldn't involve research services at this point. You've got two elements. You've got the drafting of this survey, I guess, and I can tell you that we've got something pretty close to being distributed to the committee, and then the committee has to approve it. Then, Chair, ultimately, you have to approve it yourself. Then it would have to be distributed to members for their feedback, all within this time frame.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mrs. Aheer.

**Mrs. Aheer:** I would agree with Member Loyola that it might be worth while giving a little bit more time. Do we have any suggestions in discussion? Maybe, like, the end of June, if that's suitable to all members.

**The Chair:** Mr. Deol.

**Mr. Deol:** Yeah. Similarly, I was thinking, you know, session has just ended, and a number of members will probably not be around, and, you know, after two years of the situation that we were in, the timeline seems a bit tight. If we can work on that, give some more time for the members to look at it and provide their thorough feedback, that would probably help with this, to do better work.

**The Chair:** Any other discussion? Mr. Neudorf.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Mr. Chair, just for clarity I would like to propose the date of June 30, 2022.

**The Chair:** Okay. So you're making an amendment?

**Mr. Neudorf:** I would like to make a friendly amendment, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. June 30.

Are we ready? Give us another second or two here. We're good? Okay. Mr. Neudorf has moved that the motion be amended by striking out June 10, 2022, and substituting June 30, 2022. Discussion? Mr. Neudorf.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Mr. Chair, I just agree with Member Loyola and MLA Deol and, of course, the hon. Madam Aheer. I just put that forward as a starting point. I'd love to hear if anybody has a problem with that, but I think that that extension of 20 days, almost three weeks – and it's still good to get it done before summer. I think that if we dispense for summer – the traditional holiday is July and August – it might not be fresh in people's minds, and then it would be difficult to have those recommendations in place prior to the fall session, which I think is the intent, to get this review done, allow the appropriate amount of time, whatever that might be, make those changes so that in the fall session, if they are adopted, they could be instilled in good time. That's my rationale for choosing that date. Happy to hear concerns or other suggestions.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Any other discussion on the amendment? Ms Ganley.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. My question was just – I mean, I think that the June 30 timeline is fine, but my understanding was that we had, like, an entire year to commit to do the review. I don't see that we necessarily need to have it in before the fall sitting. Am I confused?

**The Chair:** Yeah. We do have a year to complete, but I think that probably what Mr. Neudorf was suggesting is that it would be nice to have it done and ready before we sit again in the fall.

Mrs. Aheer.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I also think, too, like, we're fresh off a session where the interventions are also, you know, right there. I think that our ability to process and understand information right now will be great. I would love to see us be able to go into the next session with whatever improvements that we see. I'm really, actually, looking forward to seeing how folks respond to this survey. I think the sooner we can get it done, the better.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Any other discussion, questions?

Hearing none, I will call the amendment: moved by Mr. Neudorf that

the motion be amended by striking out June 10, 2022, and substituting June 30, 2022. All in favour in the room, please say aye. All against in the room, please say no.

All in favour online, please say aye. All against online, please say no.

That amendment is passed.

We are back on the motion as amended. Any discussion?

Okay. Let's call the vote. Moved by hon. Member Aheer that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing direct the committee clerk to distribute the survey pertaining to the interventions rule to all Members of the Legislative Assembly, with a submission deadline of June 30, 2022, and direct research services to compile the results of the survey for the committee.

Any discussion on the motion as amended?

Okay. All in favour in the room, please say aye.

**Mr. Stephan:** Sorry.

**The Chair:** Oh. Is there somebody . . .



**Mr. Stephan:** I think Member Ganley had a comment.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I didn't see that.

Member Ganley, did you have a comment on the motion as amended?

**10:55**

**Ms Ganley:** No; I already made it. It was on the amendment.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you.

Then we're back to the motion as amended. All in favour in the room, please say aye. Anybody against in the room, please say no. Anyone online in favour of the motion, please say aye. Anyone against the motion online, please say no.

That motion as amended is carried.

Are there any other comments, discussion, questions, or motions that this committee needs to consider? None?

Okay. Then on our agenda I believe we are at other business. Do members have any other business that they wish to bring forward, realizing that the scope of this committee is directed by the Legislature? None?

Okay. The date of the next meeting will be at the call of the chair. Would a member like to move a motion to adjourn this meeting?

**Mr. Reid:** So moved.

**The Chair:** So moved. All in favour of adjournment? Online? Anyone against? We are adjourned.

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





