



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

Fifty-Sixth Meeting

Wednesday, November 23, 2016

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Tom Osborne, MHA

The Management Commission met at 9:30 a.m. in the House of Assembly Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER (Osborne): Welcome everybody to the Management Commission meeting.

I will take the opportunity to have Members – we'll go around the table – introduce themselves, starting with the Member for Ferryland.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Keith Hutchings, MHA, District of Ferryland.

MR. P. DAVIS: Paul Davis, MHA for Topsail – Paradise.

MR. A. PARSONS: Andrew Parsons, MHA, Burgeo – La Poile.

MR. BROWNE: Mark Browne, MHA, Placentia West – Bellevue.

MS. MICHAEL: Lorraine Michael, MHA, St. John's East – Quidi Vidi.

MS. COADY: Siobhan Coady, MHA, St. John's West.

MS. KEEFE: Marie Keefe, Clerk's Office.

CLERK (Barnes): Sandra Barnes, Clerk.

MR. OSBORNE: And I'm Tom Osborne; I'm Speaker and Chair of the Management Commission.

We have a guest in the public gallery today as well, Sandra Burke, who is the chair of the MCRC, who presented the report to us, I guess, a couple of weeks ago.

Okay, we'll get right to business. On Tab 1 we need the approval of minutes for August 24. There is a decision required here and I'm trusting all Members had an opportunity to go through and read the minutes.

So the proposed motion is that the Commission approves the minutes to August 24, 2016 meeting. I will open it for any discussion, questions, comments.

MS. MICHAEL: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Lorraine Michael; seconded by Andrew Parsons.

Any further comments on Tab 1 before we move to Tab 2?

Tab 2 is financial information for the Office of the Auditor General. There's no decision required on this. For anybody who is viewing, subsection 32(3) of the *Auditor General Act* requires that the financial statements of the Office of the Auditor General must be submitted to the Management Commission for review.

The statement and the briefing materials is the financial information of the Office of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended 31st of March, 2016, as prepared by Grant Thornton, the independent auditor for the Office of the Auditor General.

As noted, this is for reporting and review purposes only. There's no decision of the Commission required. Any comments or questions?

Okay, moving on to Tab 3; this as well is financial information. There's no decision required. The *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act* require that financial information be reported to the Commission on a regular basis. This agenda item is for reporting purposes.

There are two sets of financial statements provided in the briefing package for the House of Assembly service, caucus offices and statutory offices. The Member Accountability and Disclosure Reports outlining expenditures for each Member are provided for each period. The first statements are for the fiscal year from April 1, 2016 to June 30, 2016. Are there any questions or comments?

The second statements are for the period April 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016; again, any questions or comments?

Okay, moving on to Tab 4, this is Recommendation of Auditor for Fiscal 2016-2017. There is a decision required on this particular item. Paragraph 23(7)(b) of the *House*

of Assembly Accountability, Integrity, and Administration Act requires that the Audit Committee make recommendation to the Commission with respect to the choice and terms of the auditor appointed under section 43 of the act.

As per the letter from the Audit Committee, included in the briefing package, the committee recommends that the Auditor General be appointed the auditor for the House of Assembly and statutory offices for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2017.

Any questions or comments before I read the proposed motion?

The proposed motion: Pursuant to subsection 43(2) of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*, the commission appoints the Auditor General as the auditor of the House of Assembly and statutory offices for the year ending 31st March, 2017.

Do we have a mover and seconder?

MR. HUTCHINGS: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Member for Ferryland; seconded by Mark Browne.

Tab 5, the Audited Financial Information – April 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016; there is a decision required. The statements for the House of Assembly and statutory offices of the House of Assembly for the year ending March 31, 2015 were prepared by the Auditor General and reviewed by the Audit Committee as per the letter from the Audit Committee. The committee has recommended the acceptance of the statements by the Commission.

Any questions or comments?

Okay, the proposed motion – we’ve also got a letter here that myself and another committee Member have to sign, and I’ll ask Marie for the letter.

The proposed motion is that the Commission approves the audited financial information for April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016 for the House of Assembly and its statutory offices, as recommended by the Audit Committee.

Do I have a mover and seconder for that?

MR. P. DAVIS: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Davis; and seconded by Lorraine Michael.

Okay, Keith, you being the lucky person to sit next to me, I will –

MR. HUTCHINGS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me?

CLERK: Probably Mr. Davis can sign (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, I’ll have Mr. Davis sign.

I’ll sign it and –

MS. MICHAEL: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, okay. But so far nobody has voted nay, so all of the votes have been unanimous.

MS. MICHAEL: (Inaudible) wasn’t called for, so just for the book.

MR. SPEAKER: I will indeed.

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you.

MR. P. DAVIS: Just a comment, Mr. Speaker, (inaudible) under Tab 3, we went through very quickly, but these are all documents that are available, of course, online and publicly released information, expenditures of each Member of the House of Assembly, and they’re updated as shown here a couple of times a year.

And the entire agenda I know, just to make the comment, just to point out we’ve had this now for several days and there’s been some discussion and so on about the contents and so on that my colleague and I just conferred before we came to the meeting today, because we’ve both taken the material and referred to it. So it’s not a case that we’re going through –

MR. SPEAKER: Flying through this, no.

MR. P. DAVIS: Just going through a list. We've gone through material; it's materials that are all publicly available as well and been provided to us days before we came here so we could review them before the meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: That's a good point, and I will point out for anybody who's watching over the satellite that these materials have been provided to all Members well in advance. Members read these materials. So the point taken by the Leader of the Opposition is a good point that we're not just simply flying through this. All of this material is available online, and all Members have read the materials – which makes the Management Commission meetings almost seamless.

So the proposed motion: The Commission approves the audited financial information for April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016 for the House of Assembly and its statutory offices, as recommended by the Audit Committee.

We had a mover, Mr. Parsons, seconder –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: That was already voted.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

CLERK: Mr. Davis and Ms. Michael.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Davis and Lorraine Michael.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

Tab 6, caucus funding reports for April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016, there is no decision required, just for reporting purposes.

Section 6.0 of the Caucus Operational Funding Grants Policy requires that each caucus submit a report detailing expenditures on the use of this allocation to the Commission within 90 days after the end of each fiscal year.

Normally, one report is received for the fiscal year. Due to the general election on November 30, 2015 there were two reports for 2015-2016 reporting period. The first report covers the pre-election period and the second report covers the post-election period. Again, this is for reporting purposes. There's no decision required.

Are there any comments or questions?

MR. P. DAVIS: I still have one question, Mr. Speaker.

In the second set of reports, post-election, the first one is on Government Members' Caucus summary of expenditures for the period of December 2015 to January 2016, but the others reflect December 15, 2015 to March 31, 2016. Well, actually, the Third Party indicates December 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 – I assume that's a typo; it should be March 31, 2016.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that's a typo.

MR. P. DAVIS: But the other one says –

MR. SPEAKER: We'll ask that that be corrected – they should read December 15, 2015 to March 31, 2016.

MR. P. DAVIS: And would that be same for the Government Members' Caucus which says December, January?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

CLERK: (Inaudible) based on the fiscal year. That was just a typo. I will confirm it, though.

MR. P. DAVIS: Okay, thank you.

CLERK: To be quite honest, Wanda Lee – the financial operation shop reviews these when they come in. So if it wasn't appropriate, they would have come back and asked them to correct it.

MR. P. DAVIS: Okay, so you'll check the date and make sure that's –

CLERK: Yes.

MR. P. DAVIS: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other questions or comments?

MS. MICHAEL: (Inaudible), please.

Sort of in the vein of Mr. Davis a minute ago, when people go online and read some of this stuff, I think it's good to point out to them, for example, that meals and food services for caucus offices and for anything to do with MHAs does not cover alcoholic beverages. Just so people know that, that's just food.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, absolutely.

Okay, any other questions or any other comments?

Moving on to Tab 7, this is a request from the Office of the Auditor General regarding salary disparity. The implementation of the Job Evaluation System on April 15 for bargaining unit employees has created a salary disparity for two employees of the Office of the Auditor General. It has also resulted in bargaining unit employees having the potential to earn a higher salary than employees on the management plan, or HL, in more senior positions.

The Office of the Auditor General is the only statutory office with bargaining unit employees. To correct this disparity, the AG has written the Commission and asked approval to increase the salaries of two affected employees. The employee's names have been redacted for privacy purposes, effective June 29, 2016. The details are provided in the July 15, 2015 letter from the Auditor General.

I understand that it may only be one of those positions that are now affected. Any questions or any concerns?

Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I'm assuming that the Auditor General does have the money in the budget to cover this change, so I need confirmation of that, I guess.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

Sandra, do you know?

CLERK: I would have to check with the Auditor General on that. I would think yes, but I would have to confirm that. We don't have the administrative oversight of that office that we do over the other statutory offices.

MS. MICHAEL: Because he hasn't asked for any change in budget or anything to be transferred, so I'm making that assumption.

CLERK: No, he would have to absorb it.

MR. SPEAKER: Keith Hutchings.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Mr. Speaker, I'm just curious, this seems to be a timing issue in regard to the implementation of JES. Is this unique to this office and has it happened otherwise?

CLERK: We don't have administrative oversight, but when this did come in, I did call the Executive Branch and asked if similar things had happened in their systems, and it has. It's an anomaly and it is left as is. It's just one of those things. They don't make the correction.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other comments or questions?

The proposed motion is that the House of Assembly Management Commission authorizes the Auditor General to increase the salaries for the two affected employees by five steps on the HL-21 scale effective June 21, 2016.

Do we have a mover or seconder?

MR. A. PARSONS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: We can defer this decision until we get that information.

MR. A. PARSONS: Let's just get the confirmation.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

CLERK: Or we can add it to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk has just made a suggestion that if the Commission wished to proceed and approve it subject to the AG's office having the available funds to deal with it.

MS. MICHAEL: I'm fine with that. That will be in the motion so that means it's all new that that's confirmed, so I'm fine with that.

MR. SPEAKER: So the new proposed motion, Marie, if you could make a note, would be that the Commission approves the audited financial information for April 1, 2015 to – sorry, the House of Assembly Management Commission authorizes the Auditor General to increase the salaries for the two affected employees by five steps on the HL-21 scale effective June 29, 2016, provided the necessary funds are available within the Office of the Auditor General.

MS. MICHAEL: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, moved by Lorraine Michael.

Do we have a seconder?

Seconded by Andrew Parsons.

All those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against?

Carried.

Tab 8; there are 10 items under Tab 8 which are MCRC recommendations. On October 28, 2016, MCRC presented its report on the review of the Members' salaries, pensions, severance and allowances. The report contained 59 recommendations which are required to be brought to the Management Commission for review and decision as outlined in subsections 16(5) and 16(6) of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*.

The Commission shall accept or modify the recommendations. If the Commission wishes to modify a recommendation, it does not have the authority to exceed the maximum amounts recommended by the MCRC.

While all recommendations will be brought to the Commission, they cannot all be dealt with in one meeting. In deciding which recommendations would be added to today's agenda, we considered those with budgetary and

legislative impacts as well as those that have time frames attached to their implementation.

Today, we will be considering the following recommendations; Recommendation 28, the appointment of a sub-committee on IE allowances. The 2016 MCRC made the following recommendations with respect to the determination of intra/extra constituency allowances for all districts.

In Recommendation 28: "The Management Commission shall: a. strike a sub-committee within 30 days of this Report being presented to the Speaker to assess the realistic level of the I&E Allowances for all districts using the assumptions we have identified as well as any other assumptions that may be relevant; b. not secure an independent review of this recommendation but rather utilize public servant resources to assist the Management Commission with this task; d. ensure the sub-committee includes representation from the Economics and Statistics Branch of the Department of Finance, the Clerk of the House of Assembly, the Chief Financial Officer or their designates; e. require the sub-committee shall present its recommendations to the Management Commission within 120 days of being struck; f. within 60 days of the report from the sub-committee, utilize their legislative authority pursuant to sections 20 and 64 of the Act to determine the I&E Allowances for each district."

Are there any questions or comments regarding this recommendation?

MS. MICHAEL: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: I think it's an important move because every year it's almost an embarrassment on the Management Commission – and it was under legislation, so if we were dealing with legislated figures – every year we have so much money not being spent under the I&E. So I think we, by now, certainly know there needs to be an adjustment.

I think it's really good that the committee picked up on this issue and gave direction with regard to doing this. While in one way it's been helpful because there are times when money has been

moved in the budget and it's been able to be moved because there's been this money sitting under I&E, I don't think that's a good way to be budgeting. I think it should be more realistic. This kind of a committee would help us have a more realistic picture I think.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely.

I will make an observation that up until this Assembly, there have been 48 districts. There are now 40.

MS. MICHAEL: And that's another.

MR. SPEAKER: So in reviewing the I&E allowances, we'd also have to take into consideration that districts are larger, populations are larger. And while money has not always been spent, I think part of the component of looking at that is the boundaries have changed as well.

MS. MICHAEL: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other comments or questions?

The proposed motion is that the Commission accepts Recommendation 28 and directs the sub-committee to assess the realistic level of I&E allowances for all districts under the terms and conditions outlined in this recommendation.

MS. MICHAEL: I have another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: The committee recommends that the Commission appoint the sub-committee and then that it would include representation from the Economics and Statistics Branch of the Department of Finance, the Clerk of the House of Assembly and Chief Financial Officer or their designates.

What will be the process for putting that in place because we don't have responsibility for those bodies? Would you be going to those bodies and asking for nominees, et cetera? I think we need to chat about the process a bit.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. My intention is to have the Clerk reach out to those bodies. The Clerk is an independent Officer of the House, so she would reach out to those bodies and form the subcommittee.

CLERK: If I may, the MCRC did meet with the Economics and Statistics Branch and did start a fair bit of work, but there just wasn't enough time in the term of their mandate to complete what needed to be done.

Economic and Statistics is a wonderful resource and works ably with all departments and agencies in accordance with the resources they have. They have assisted us from time to time in getting kilometres and things like that. So I don't think there'll be an issue asking for their assistance.

MS. MICHAEL: Right.

One more follow-up then; once the subcommittee is in place, I think that as a Commission we need to know the names of the makeup of the committee, not just the bodies.

CLERK: Yes. Now, the Economics and Statistics is a branch of the Department of Finance; it would just be that branch, in addition to resources from the House of Assembly.

MS. MICHAEL: But if there's a subcommittee which includes representation, may we assume that – if the committee meets as a committee, there has to be an individual from that branch who sits on that.

CLERK: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, absolutely.

Okay, any other comments or any other questions?

MR. P. DAVIS: In the makeup of the committee, it says ensure the subcommittee includes. Is that intended to be a complete list, what is also intended to include Members of the House or representatives from the Management Commission, as well as the Clerk?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm willing to take direction from the Management Commission on that.

MR. P. DAVIS: Or a component of consultation with the Members or an opportunity for Members to have input.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is a good point and it's probably important to have representation from the House. Nobody understands the needs within a district – and I guess especially with the boundary changes – more than Members of the House. So that is a good point.

If the Management Commission wish to direct that there be representation from the House as part of this subcommittee, we can add that to the –

Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: Yes, I'm not sure which way to go. I think it's a really good point that Paul has brought up.

We could say, let them do initial work and bring interim reports to the Commission to look at and have the Commission deal with interim reports from them. Then, when they finally have proposals in place, the proposal then would have to come to the Commission. But I think checking with the Commission along the way could be the way of doing it rather than just having an individual on the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, Keith –

MS. MICHAEL: I'm not speaking – I'm just putting out another option.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeah. I've got three people identified to speak.

Keith Hutchings followed by Mark Browne followed by Paul Davis.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Yeah, I respect Ms. Michael in regard to bringing it to the Management Commission, but I think, first and foremost, it's important to have that on-the-ground knowledge and expertise with the subcommittee when they're having a discussion on what the framework may look like. That the information is available from an elected official, as you had said, who's fully versed in the allocations, what's needed and what the environment is on the ground. So I think it'd be

very important to have that knowledge with the subcommittee, however we decide that would be represented.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr. Browne.

MR. BROWNE: I think Mr. Davis and Ms. Michael raised some good points. I agree with Mr. Hutchings that I think it would be important to have representation from the Commission on that subcommittee, but perhaps to also to follow Ms. Michael's suggestion to have interim reports brought here for all of us to consider. I think it's really important to have somebody on that subcommittee.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr. Davis.

MR. P. DAVIS: Again, we're thinking and discussing this as we move along. I realize that there are great differences in expenditures and how Members operate and travel and so on. It would vary from a district such as Mr. Parsons here versus myself or the Member for St. John's West. We're very close to the House of Assembly.

For me, currently, my constituency office is here. I'm generally centered where your circumstance would be very different. So I think it's important to have that ability to have a broad range of input from different experiences depending on the geographic location and demands on the Member's time.

So if I may suggest, it might be worth our while if we were to take some time after the meeting, and maybe if we had either a representative from each caucus, if we were going to do that – at least a representative from each caucus to sit on the subcommittee or at least a component of consultation with Members. We could suggest, instead of us here trying to figure out who might be good representations or how to – you might have rural Members who can provide that rural representation where we can provide urban or vice versa or whatever the case may be. Maybe that's something we could have a discussion with of how we do that consultation process.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. P. DAVIS: We really can't have 40 Members sit on it and everyone bring their own, but to have that diversity of circumstances would be valuable, I think, to the considerations being given.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Siobhan Coady.

MS. COADY: Thank you very much.

I'll pick up on a lot of good commentary, I think, on this very important issue. I think we're all supportive of the recommendation. I would suggest that we ask for a mandate in composition. Perhaps we could leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to liaise with the Committee and come back with a mandate and composition of that subcommittee; along the lines of what you're discussing, but really flesh out what it is exactly we want to review and the composition thereof.

Adding Economics and Statistics, the chief financial officer and the Clerk of the House are acceptable, but I think we have to broaden – as we've discussed around this table, broaden some representation.

MR. SPEAKER: A couple of things to keep in mind as well. I think the only Members in the House now that remain from the days that Justice Green presented his report are myself and Lorraine Michael. So the further we get away from the presentation of that – there was some shell shock directly after the report.

I've made a conscious decision, I haven't claimed on that allowance. If you look, I've got the means; I don't need to claim on that allowance. That doesn't mean that's fair to everybody else. Fifteen or 20 years from now when I decide to retire, whoever runs in my district may need to claim on that allowance. So you can't always look at what I've spent in my district and determine that should somebody else be representing that district down the road, that they have the expectations on making those claims.

So I think input from Members of the Legislature is valuable. We've got 20 new Members in the Legislature now who have no recollection of why Justice Green had made his recommendations and why that legislation was put in place. Members who were in the House at that particular time, even though some of them didn't have the financial means to not claim, simply didn't claim because they would rather err on the side of caution and spend money out of their own pocket as opposed to put a claim in and be viewed under the microscope.

I think there are a number of aspects and a number of reasons why representation from a Member of the House would be valuable here. I would recommend, Lorraine, that probably you sit as one of the Members on that. It probably wouldn't be appropriate for me, as Speaker, but being one of the Members who has been here since Green presented his report, maybe –

MR. HUTCHINGS: I was elected in February, 2007.

MR. SPEAKER: So you were here as well?

MS. MICHAEL: Yes, he was.

MR. SPEAKER: So maybe Lorraine and Keith. We can decide after, but I think we need a mixture of people with that experience, as well as maybe one or two newer Members, at least to provide some guidance to that committee.

Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: Once we do that right away.

Just to make a point which goes back, I guess, to what you say. I remember well, and it's written in the report, one of the principles that Green worked on with regard to I and E expenditures, the amount being named, et cetera, was exactly what you said. It doesn't matter who's in the position, you don't know, there could be a by-election in the middle, et cetera, but there has to be some way of knowing there is money that is designated and how much that amount is.

I think one of the things the current MCRC pointed out was they could not really find what the criteria was for setting. And I think Green did have something with regard to (inaudible)

amount of travel that went on. There were different things that were put in, but I think it might be important – and this comes to us. Siobhan was saying it might be important that that is the formula.

I think it's in the recommendation that there actually be a formula or mechanism that comes up, because we do have to ensure there is always money there and it's not based on the individual who is there and how that individual spends, but a formula that indicates there is money that needs to be there for an MHA to their work.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely. It has to be fair to the district as opposed to the individual representing the district who may decide to spend or may not decide to spend, or even if they spend may decide to claim or not claim. The allowance has to be fair to the district.

MS. MICHAEL: And then to your proposal, if the Commission asked me to sit on the subcommittee I'd be happy to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MS. COADY: So just to go back to my last suggestion, I do think that we need more of a flushed out mandate and composition of that subcommittee. I think that would be prudent, that we all take that moment to reflect on what it is we're asking these people to do and whom we're going to ask to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Well, it may very well be, as Mr. Davis suggested, that either the three bodies within the House – the government, Opposition and the Third Party – decide that maybe one or two people is enough and represent all parties, or maybe each party would like to have a representative. But that's something, as you suggested, Mr. Davis, that we can discuss after and determine whether there's one or two or three representatives of the House to sit on that subcommittee.

Okay, any other comments or questions?

The proposed recommendation is that the Commission accepts Recommendation 28 and directs that a subcommittee be appointed to assess the realistic level of the I and E allowances for all districts under the terms and

conditions outlined in this recommendation, keeping in mind that we wish to have representation from the House of Assembly on that Committee.

Any movers or seconders?

MR. A. PARSONS: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Lorraine Michael.

All those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against?

Carried.

Recommendations 19 and 20 are an RFP for accommodations in the capital region. The 2016 MCRC made the following recommendation regarding accommodations for Members when the House is in session or when the House is not in session:

“19. Within 60 days of the receipt of this report, the Management Commission shall place a request for proposals (RFP) for hotel and apartment-type accommodations in the Capitol Region. The RFP shall provide for the Member keeping his/her room available for the duration that the House is in Session (as that term is defined in paragraph 28 (c) of the Rules).

“20. Members who wish to occupy a hotel or apartment-type accommodations, whether the House is in Session or whether the House is not in Session, will be required to use the accommodations acquired through the RFP process.”

This recommendation was made to ensure that the best rate for Members who wish to occupy a hotel or apartment-type accommodation, whether the House is in session or whether the House is not in session, will be required to use the accommodations selected through the RFP process.

Are there any questions or comments?

Mr. Parsons.

MR. A. PARSONS: I have two points I would make; one is more general about all these topics on the rest of the page here, this one included, which is we've got a number of people in caucus who haven't – they've looked through this, they have questions.

I think they actually had a briefing lined up with Ms. Burke and the Committee last week and it got cancelled. I think they need to have that because they've got questions. I can't answer them because I'm not the Committee. I don't want to go ahead and be voting on this without them having at least had that opportunity. It's the same one that we had, which I really appreciated. It was a great chance for us to sit down and ask questions.

I mean I can look at something like the RFP and say, well, is there any harm in putting that out, is there a cost to that. But when it comes to a lot of this, they need that opportunity to have that discussion. We can reconvene I think very quickly. We're all here in the House. I don't know when that meeting is scheduled. I think it might be next week.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tuesday.

MR. A. PARSONS: Tuesday. I mean we can meet Wednesday after the House closes at 5, or whatever works for this Committee, but I just think that's the prudent thing to do from my perspective.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I've got no issue with that, with the concern you've raised. This issue is time sensitive, within 60 days, provided the Management Commission can meet again.

MR. A. PARSONS: When is the 60 days up?

CLERK: The 28th of December.

MR. A. PARSONS: The 28th of December?

MS. COADY: Yes, 60 days in receipt of the report.

MR. A. PARSONS: This is something that we want done this session while the House is in session. There is still time left. This is not something we're going to put off and deal with Christmastime. I think this is important work

that the Committee did, and it's also important, though, that the Members that it affects have this.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, as long as – I know Lorraine Michael has raised her hand – we have a commitment that the Management Commission can meet again in time to pass this recommendation, I have no problem postponing this recommendation for the next meeting.

Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: I just want to back up what Andrew was saying, because while we only have two caucus Members, my colleague did say to me yesterday, Lorraine, we haven't had a briefing yet. It shouldn't be in my hands to be briefing my caucus. I let her know it was happening today and we talked about the recommendations, but they haven't had a briefing.

I really back up what Andrew was saying. If all six of us can say, yes, we're committed, any time we want to have a meeting next week I'm up for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, a very fair point.

So it sounds like everybody is fine with postponing this recommendation.

MR. A. PARSONS: Yes, and I'll just add, one of the things is that a lot of these, even while they might seem unique or individual, they are linked in some ways. You might question the rationale for A and how it linked to B. I think they want that opportunity. So I'm glad to hear that we're seeing on the same page.

I think there's a commitment from everybody around this table, we'll meet again. We meet every week, and it's better for us to do it while we're all here in session.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Well, in fairness to all Members of the Management Commission, I had that very discussion with the Clerk when we were trying to determine what recommendations to put forward. We put this one forward knowing that Members would have questions but knowing that there were time constraints to

this recommendation as well. But if we're going to meet again, absolutely, we can postpone this.

All Members are in agreement to postpone this until the next meeting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, all right.

So this item, we will postpone until the next meeting. We'll set a date for the next meeting prior to the conclusion of this meeting if we can.

Recommendation 3.

MS. MICHAEL: I have a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: Has it publicly been announced when the briefing with the caucus Members is because I know that Gerry didn't know, up to last night, when the next meeting was.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, there was an email that went out.

MS. MICHAEL: Monday?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you.

MR. A. PARSONS: Is that meeting for all caucuses? One –

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. A. PARSONS: Okay. So that meeting is Tuesday?

MR. SPEAKER: Next Tuesday it is.

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

So Recommendation 1 and 2 – MHA Salaries.

MR. P. DAVIS: The same points for all of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The same points? Okay.

I have no issue with – it's only fair that Members have an opportunity to ask questions and be briefed by the chair of the MCRC on this.

MR. A. PARSONS: Further to what you said about setting a meeting. I know it might be hard right now, but next Wednesday we know the House ends at 5 p.m. Do we want to sit then? That gives us an opportunity, our caucus will meet and maybe if we all talk to our caucuses and we'll all meet right after the House closes. We're all here.

Does that work?

MR. BROWNE: It's good for me.

MR. SPEAKER: So we'll set for 5 p.m. next Wednesday. The briefing is on Tuesday. That's give a full day for –

MR. A. PARSONS: I know our caucus meets on Wednesday mornings.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. MICHAEL: The same as ours.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. A. PARSONS: That's a good chance for us to have that conversation then and we'll all be able to come in prepared. We know that it has to be done in a timely fashion but this allows for us to cover all bases.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. So the government and the Third Party meet on Wednesdays. I don't know when you guys meet, but are you okay with Wednesday as well?

MR. HUTCHINGS: That's good.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

CLERK: Okay. The meeting will probably have to start at 5:30 because Broadcast need time to set up after the House. Everything has to be re-cued.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. A. PARSONS: So 5:29 p.m.

MS. COADY: As quickly (inaudible) as possible.

MR. A. PARSONS: That's perfect.

CLERK: They can usually do it within 15 minutes but –

MS. COADY: So 5:15, is that what you're telling me?

CLERK: If they don't run into any trouble, we can do it at 5:15 p.m. We can try for then and we might have a wait a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: So the same thing for Recommendation 4? Okay.

Recommendation 5, the same thing? Okay.

Recommendation 6? Okay.

Did we want to deal with Recommendation 7: Definition of Private Accommodations or are we going to –

MR. A. PARSONS: We'll deal with every one of these next Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

That being the case, I mean if we're going to postpone the rest of the items from the MCRC until next Wednesday that concludes the agenda items.

Are there any other issues?

CLERK: I think probably we should have a motion to defer those items to the next meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, so the motion to defer these items to the next meeting at 5:30 p.m. next Wednesday.

Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Lorraine Michael; and 'thirded' by Mr. Davis.

Any other comments or questions before we vote on the motion?

Okay.

All those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against?

Passed.

Any other comments or questions by any Members of the Management Commission outside of the items on the agenda?

Lorraine Michael.

MS. MICHAEL: Just one comment. I mean it is our first public meeting, I think, since the report with Ms. Burke here publicly. So I think it would be good for us to make a motion of gratitude to the Committee for the great work they did. I think they really put great thought into their report. I'd like to move a note of thanks to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely.

We can have correspondence sent to Ms. Burke from the Management Commission thanking her for her work.

Excellent.

All right, any other questions or comments?

Okay. Thank you very much to all Members of the Commission for today. We will see you 5:30 p.m. next Wednesday.

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. A. PARSONS: I'll make that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Parsons; seconded by Mr. Davis.

Okay, thank you, folks. We shall see you at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

On motion, meeting adjourned.