



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

One Hundred and Third Meeting

Wednesday, October 21, 2026

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Paul Lane, MHA

The Management Commission met at 11 a.m. in the House of Assembly Committee Room.

SPEAKER (Lane): Good morning, everybody.

We're going to be having a meeting now of the Management Commission. The purpose of today's meeting is to receive a briefing from the Review Committee on the MCRC.

I'd like to welcome this morning, Heather Jacobs, KC. She's the committee chair. She's a former deputy minister with the Department of Justice. Also, Sandra Barnes, welcome. Sandra is a former Clerk of the House of Assembly and a former deputy clerk of the Executive Council. As well, Maureen McCarthy, former director of Pensions with the Department of Finance.

Before we get into the briefing, I just want to recognize my colleagues here this morning: MHA Jim Dinn, MHA Jamie Korab and MHA Riley Balsom, as well as Kim Hawley George who is the Clerk of the House of Assembly. We also welcome our Deputy Speaker, Jeff Dwyer.

Again, just for the information of those who may be watching, this is the report of the Members' Compensation Review Committee. There is a process which has to be undertaken every General Assembly. It stems from the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*. The legislation's roots date back to the Green report and was a result of the Green report that this legislation was put in place. In this piece of legislation, one of the things that is covered off would be remuneration and various benefits for Members of the House of Assembly.

Written into the legislation, it basically says that sometime during each General Assembly – so after an election occurs in the province and there's a new government in place, a new General Assembly – the Speaker is required to meet with the

Government House Leader, the Opposition House Leader and the Leader of the Third Party and we are to put a mechanism in place to have an independent review of Members' salaries, benefits, allowances and so on.

We did that at a previous Management Commission meeting. Subsequent to that, there was a motion that was adopted by the House of Assembly during the spring session that appointed Ms. Heather Jacobs to do that body of work. Of course, Ms. Jacobs also, as part of her team, she had Ms. Barnes and Ms. McCarthy. So they have done that body of work and that is what's required of us by legislation.

The report was subsequently handed over to me a couple of weeks ago and I immediately provided a copy of that report to the Management Commission. Members have had the report for about a week or so now. I also released the report publicly because it is a public document and it's important that we have transparency.

So the process here today is we will now receive a briefing from the committee as to the contents of the report. Members who are here today will have an opportunity to ask the committee questions about the report, about the recommendations, about the rationale that was used to make said recommendations. That's what we will do here today.

We will not be making any decisions here today as it relates to how we decide as a Management Commission to move forward on the report and on the recommendations. That will be a discussion for another day. But I will say while we haven't got a date set yet, it will be in the not-too-distant future that we will meet and, at that point in time, decisions will have to be made by the Management Commission as to how we move forward.

That will possibly involve at some point in time recommendations or, I should say,

possibly involve at some point in the future a requirement, if we're going to adopt some of these changes, there would be a requirement then for the government to bring forth a bill to the House to make changes to the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act* which covers these benefits. We're a far ways from that right now. This is just simply receiving a briefing on the contents of the report.

I hope that clarifies it for anyone who may be watching because I know there is a fair bit of confusion out there in the public. I've certainly seen a lot of commentary, heard from some people who don't necessarily understand the process or how it works, and why it's done and so on. I hope that brings a little more clarity.

I will now hand it over to Ms. Jacobs to provide us with the briefing. I believe the format we will use is Ms. Jacobs is going to go down through the various recommendations. At any time if a Member has a question about any of the points made, I will recognize you and once I recognize you, your mic will be turned on and then you can ask your question and so on, as we would do in a standard meeting.

Ms. Jacobs, I hand it over to you.

Before I move on, I want to thank the committee for the work because I know there was a lot of work that went into this, a lot of research and jurisdictional scans and so on. I appreciate the volume of work and certainly the quality of the report. It's very good and we certainly appreciate the work that you've done.

Now, Ms. Jacobs.

H. JACOBS: Thank you, Speaker.

Good morning. I am Heather Jacobs and I was appointed by the House on June 2, 2026, to be the sole committee member for the 2026 Members' Compensation Review.

Joining me today are my two advisors for the review: Maureen McCarthy and Sandra Barnes. At this time, I wish to express my gratitude to Sandra and Maureen for their expertise and commitment. Thank you.

As I go through the presentation, as the Speaker mentioned, please feel free to ask questions as we go along.

My mandate was adopted by the House on June 2, 2026. It essentially directed a review of salaries, pensions, severance and allowances as set out in subsection 16(1) of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*. It further directed that I use the 2024 MCRC report as the basis for my review.

In today's presentation, I will cover the approach I followed in conducting the review, an overview of the recommendations in each of the categories studied, then I will briefly comment on other matters that came to my attention during the review process. I did not make any recommendations on the other matters as I considered them to be beyond the mandate of an MCRC, but I thought them important enough to bring to your attention.

This presentation is a summarization of our research and conclusions. The report, however, is detailed and thorough and includes the particulars of the information considered and assessed and the conclusions reached in arriving at the recommendations.

On June 15, 2026, I started the 2026 review process as directed by the House. On October 8, 2026, I delivered my report to Speaker Lane. On June 15, a website was established and a news release was issued announcing the start of the review. On June 24, a release was issued requesting input either through email submission or interviews.

Emails were sent to all MHAs requesting their input. This was followed by a weekly

social media campaign, a further press release extending the deadline for public participation to August 7 from July 31, and repeated emails to MHAs to encourage participation.

So how did we do? We had very limited public participation, no media inquiries; however, we had 90 per cent participation from MHAs.

We consulted with a number of officials: the Clerk, Kim; the Principal Clerk of Committees, Bobbi; the CFO, Wanda Lee Mercer, and her team of Corporate and Members' Services; Ann Chafe, the Commissioner for Legislative Standards; the secretary of the Treasury Board Secretariat, John McGrath; staff of Pensions and Human Resources; Philip Churchill of Eckler Ltd, who are the actuaries for the pension plan; and the Clerks of all the Canadian provinces and territories.

In addition to the input we received, we studied commentary on the 2024 MCRC report, the budget and associated documents; the Public Accounts; previous MCRC reports; the 1989 Morgan Report and the 2007 Green report; the legislation and policies relating to remuneration and allowances of all Canadian legislatures; compensation reviews of other Canadian legislatures, particularly those released since the 2024 MCRC report from Alberta, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, PEI and the Northwest Territories; finally, remuneration and expense data for the period of 2016-17 through to 2025-26, which is about 70,000 transactions reviewed by Sandra. The analysis and assessment of all this information resulted in the 28 recommendations in the 2026 MCRC report.

This is Recommendation 1: I am recommending that the base salary be increased to \$117,000, an increase of \$21,673. This is a decrease of \$3,000 from the 2024 recommendation. You might ask why? I recommended the lower amount in an attempt to find a more palatable solution

based on feedback to the MC 2024 recommendation to what is a critical problem for our democracy. The impact on the institution of a continuing low salary has to be considered. Appropriate compensation is an important element in attracting skilled and diverse representation.

Dr. Morgan said in his 1989 report, "(if) we want good and effective government and decisions that affect our daily lives to be made by competent and well qualified men and women, we must be prepared to pay for it."

The \$117,000 base salary is less than the national average and median of approximately \$119,500. It is 17 years since the base salary of MHAs has increased. What other professions do we know of that has gone that long without an increase?

During this 17-year period, the core public service received salary increases in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2015, 2016, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025 and 2026. If MHAs had received these same increases, then their base salary would be just over \$137,000. That's almost \$42,000 more than they currently make. The increase I have recommended is half that amount.

All Canadian jurisdictions have increased the salaries of their legislatures since 2024. In particular, Nova Scotia and Ontario, both of whom had frozen the salaries of their legislatures, have addressed their salary deficiencies since 2024.

In 2025, Nova Scotia increased the salary from \$89,235 to \$115,000. Ontario increased its salary from \$116,550 to \$160,000. On April 1, 2026, both these jurisdictions applied their salary adjustment formulas so that currently the salaries are \$117,300 and \$163,275 – both sizeable increases.

I note that Nova Scotia made the following comment in its recent report: "The Province may wish to consider whether this increase

should be implemented as a one-time measure, or gradually over multiple years. Based on Deloitte's experience, adjustments of more than 10% are regarded as significant, and are often phased over multiple years. However, we note that it is rare for organizations to have wage freezes for a decade, which may influence the relevance of such comparatives."

Further, all provinces and territories have increased their salaries in 2025 and 2026 by their adjustment processes, leaving only this province without any increase.

I'll just stop if anyone has any questions.

J. DINN: Public engagement?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: (Inaudible.)

H. JACOBS: Very limited. I mean, I think we had three in-face meetings and probably 10 email and Facebook submissions. Only about, I'd say, at most 13.

S. BARNES: Which was more than 2024.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: I have a question.

So when you say if we received the same as everybody else, it would have been like \$43,000. Are you referring to say NAPE employees, CUPE, doctors or all of it? What were you talking about?

H. JACOBS: So it'd be like General Service.

SPEAKER: General Service workers.

H. JACOBS: Workers that the executive of government usually receive – say if a General Service agreement is at 2 per cent on April 1, the executive in government usually receives that amount on July 1, three months later.

So we use that formula of what executive receives, based on the General Service, and then you get up to the 140.

SPEAKER: So the average worker, say, working in the Confederation Building, as an example, you're basically saying that they would have, over that period of time, received around 43 per cent or –?

H. JACOBS: It would depend on what their salary is.

SPEAKER: Yeah.

H. JACOBS: Yes, but they had received all those increases – General Service employees.

SPEAKER: But Members didn't receive anything for that period of time.

H. JACOBS: And the Members didn't receive anything.

SPEAKER: Okay. I guess it would be similar if you had looked at, say, RNC, nurses, teachers? It would all be in that same ballpark?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

Now, we didn't look at RNC because they are done by arbitration and they had, like, a really big jump one year.

SPEAKER: Okay.

Nurses and teachers?

H. JACOBS: Nurses are probably –

S. BARNES: We didn't really look at them.

H. JACOBS: We didn't really focus on those, Speaker, so I can't really speak to it.

SPEAKER: Okay.

H. JACOBS: We really just focused on the executive in government, and their salary

increases are based on the General Service agreement.

SPEAKER: Okay, so the average government worker.

H. JACOBS: Yes, the average government worker.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

J. DINN: Just one last question.

H. JACOBS: Sure.

SPEAKER: MHA Dinn, if you could just –

J. DINN: (Inaudible.)

SPEAKER: Yes, so that they can turn on the mic inside.

MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: With regard to public submissions, there was no, I guess, town hall approach or anything like that where you would invite people? It was just people were invited to make submissions one way?

H. JACOBS: No, MHA Dinn.

In the past, I know some of the MCRCs had travelled around the province, on the Island and in Labrador. My understanding was that there was limited or no attendance at these meetings.

J. DINN: Okay.

H. JACOBS: So we felt that it wasn't good usage of taxpayer dollars. We had done the media blitz and, like Ms. Barnes said, we did receive more this time than we did last time.

J. DINN: Okay, thank you.

H. JACOBS: Yes, thank you.

Recommendation 2 addresses compensation for the positions that are part of our parliamentary system and are currently compensated. These are often referred to as additional salaries. As can be seen in the chart on the slide, I have recommended increases for all positions currently compensated in our Legislature. These positions are integral to the Westminster parliamentary system and there is information in the 2026 report regarding how they are remunerated in other Canadian Legislatures.

On this basis, I assessed the positions against the other jurisdictions. Given that they have the same duties and responsibilities, the substantive differences are in the size of the various legislatures and the practices in each jurisdiction. These salaries have also not increased since 2009. In fact, in 2026, they were actually decreased by 10 per cent. It is interesting to note that when the base and additional salary are combined, currently, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition are the lowest compensated in the country.

Recommendation 3 addresses compensation for parliamentary positions that currently do not receive any remuneration. I recommend that these positions be compensated. This is based on the concept that additional work should be valued and appropriately compensated. Additional work is recognized for the positions on the previous slide and, in my opinion, should also apply to these positions, except for the Government House Leader and the Deputy Government House Leader, which are new add-ons on my part. All of these positions were compensated prior to 2016.

I also note that all other jurisdictions increased the compensation to these positions since 2024. Therefore, I have adjusted my 2024 recommendations to reflect current compensation levels. I have added the Government House Leader and

Deputy Government House Leader as compensated positions.

Currently, the Government House Leader and the Deputy Government House Leader roles are filled by ministers and there is no additional compensation. Although the practice is to assign the role to ministers, just over half of the Canadian legislatures provide compensation for these positions, should they be filled by a Member who is not a minister.

Since salaries can only be established by an MCRC recommendation, I have recommended salaries for these positions. This is consistent with my 2024 recommendation.

I will stop there to see if there are any other questions.

SPEAKER: I just have a question.

I'm just going back to my recollection, I guess, and institutional knowledge. These positions, I believe they used to be paid and then in the 2016 budget where the levy and all that stuff happened, that was when government stopped paying those salaries. Is that what happened? Prior to that they were paid?

I'm going to recognize Ms. Barnes. Wait, your light is not on.

Okay, go ahead.

S. BARNES: In 2016, as a budgetary measure, the Premier decreased the salary of the ministers and eliminated the salaries for the parliamentary secretaries in the Executive Branch. Those decreases could not apply to the Legislature, of course, because it has its own process.

In the 2016 MCRC review, the same reductions were applied to all of the additional salary positions in the Legislatures, and then the salaries for a

number of them were eliminated altogether. So all that change happened then.

SPEAKER: Therefore, prior to 2016, the positions that are here now were paid positions?

H. JACOBS: Except, Speaker, for the Government House Leader and the Deputy Government House Leader.

SPEAKER: Okay, I just wanted to get clarity so we're painting the whole picture of what –

H. JACOBS: Yes, thank you.

Compensation for Committee work is addressed by Recommendations 4 to 7. Prior to 2016, Committee Members were compensated on a per diem basis for Committee meetings they attended while the House was not in session. This included Members of the Management Commission.

In 2024, I recommended that compensation be reinstated, as per the previous practice, with a cap on compensation. My 2026 recommendation, again, recommends compensation be reinstated to a cap of \$5,000, but further refines the revision of compensation as follows: Committee work requires preparation time in addition to the time spent in the meeting. Compensation should be provided whether or not the House is in session. This is based on the concept that additional work should be valued.

Should a substitute attend a meeting, if a Member cannot attend, the compensation should be provided to the substitute and, finally, should a Member and the substitute each attend a portion of the meeting, the per diem is to be paid to the person that attends the majority of the meeting.

Any questions?

SPEAKER: So what you're suggesting here then is that – we'll just use this meeting by

way of example. Right now, there's no additional compensation for being here. You're suggesting that it would be \$150 per person to come to the meeting. Is that —?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: The same would go for, I guess, other Committees of the House and so on?

H. JACOBS: Currently, many of these Committees receive no compensation. It takes time away from their constituency and there's time to prepare. We just thought that that extra work should be valued. It was valued before 2016. It was the 2016 MCRC that eliminated that compensation.

SPEAKER: Oh, so like the other one, this was here before as well?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Again, I just want to make sure that we're clear.

H. JACOBS: No, I appreciate it.

Thank you, Speaker.

SPEAKER: MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: Just to make sure, I think in the report it talks about — well, actually the next line — only one additional salary.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: So that applies to, I would assume, if you were the House Leader but also the minister, you wouldn't get the House Leader on top of. Would this be the same then for Committee work; that if you're a minister or you're getting the additional salary, would you be compensated with \$150 per meeting or would that be separate?

H. JACOBS: No, MHA Dinn. You get the single one for the highest, which the minister would obviously —

J. DINN: The minister, if he or she were Chair, then it wouldn't. Okay.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

Recommendation 8 addressed the long-standing practice that an MHA can only be compensated for one additional role. This recommendation was also made in the 2024 MCRC report. This is a consistent approach in Canadian legislature and is codified in most legislative assembly acts but it's not currently provided in our act, MHA Dinn, so the recommendation is to codify that practice.

Recommendation 9 addresses the salary adjustment formula. This is the same recommendation put forward in 2024. Most MHAs expressed discomfort that they had to vote on their own increases. A salary adjustment formula is a mechanism to provide annual salary increases in legislation that are applied automatically without requiring a vote in the House. This is a standard practice in most Canadian jurisdictions. These legislatures generally use either an adjustment based on public sector salary increases or an adjustment based on the annual CPI for that province or territory.

I decided to recommend a blend of using CPI and executive increases based on executive increases follow on any increases negotiated under the General Service agreement, and they typically go into effect three months after the General Service increase. Several MHAs thought that basing the adjustment formulas on public service increases could be perceived as a conflict of interest. CPI was considered a more objective indicator and if the CPI exceeds the public sector increase, that would be problematic.

So if you look at the slide, the adjustment formula will work as follows. If the CPI is 3 per cent and the executive increase was 4 per cent, the MHA would receive 3 per cent. If the CPI was 3 per cent and the executive receive 2 per cent, the MHA increase would be 2 per cent. If the CPI was 2 per cent and the executive was 2 per cent, the MHA increase would be 2 per cent. If the CPI was 1 per cent and the executive increase was 2 per cent, the MHA increase would be 1 per cent.

I know this may be confusing.

If the CPI was 1 per cent, the executive increase was zero, the MHA would receive zero. If it was negative and the executive increase was 1 per cent, the MHA increase would be zero. So, basically, the MHA increase is never more than whatever is the lowest.

SPEAKER: MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: Out of curiosity, on page 44, under Analysis, I noted the blended formula. There are two things there, right? They are in the two bullets.

Now, it says the most common adjustment formula is the percentage change in the consumer price index, and then I think you say other provinces link their salary adjustments to public service increases. When I look at it, you said the most common adjusted formula, but this seems that there are five provinces that use the CPI and five provinces that link it to the public service.

I'm just wondering where the most came in? Because it seems to be equal. There's a balance; there is not one preferred method.

H. JACOBS: Yes, I see there, but then PEI has a different way of doing it.

I see what you're saying there. Maybe that was –

J. DINN: Of the two, right?

H. JACOBS: Yes, and Ontario sets theirs as 75 per cent, but I see what you're saying there. I probably misspoke there.

J. DINN: Yes, okay.

Can I ask then, with regard to Alberta and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Nunavut and Quebec, who link their salary adjustment to the public service increase, has there been any indication that there has been a conflict of interest in that MHAs or MLAs vote or support salary increases in the public service so that it can benefit their salary increases? Has there been any studies on that?

H. JACOBS: I'm not aware of any, MHA Dinn. I didn't hear that but I'll ask Sandra because she spoke to all the clerks across Canada.

Did you hear anything?

S. BARNES: No, no issue.

J. DINN: Okay.

Right now, I'm just looking at here, in terms of a public vote, that has certainly been one of my concerns about voting on my own salary. I have no issue with, let's say, even for that matter, voting on this for whoever forms the next government after the next general election. Is there any discussion of that? I know it was mentioned once or twice here in the report.

H. JACOBS: Yes, and later in my deck, we'll discuss that.

J. DINN: Okay, good enough. I'll save it until then.

H. JACOBS: Perfect.

Thank you.

J. DINN: Thank you.

SPEAKER: Ms. Jacobs, if we can just go back again, just so we're clear. Basically what I'm seeing here then is that MHAs are going to receive the CPI unless there's a situation where someone in the public service received less than the CPI, then you would get the lower amount.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: But in the case where it went the opposite, then you still get the lower amount.

S. BARNES: You always get the lower amount.

SPEAKER: You're always getting the lower amount.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: So I guess just the observation would be that, theoretically then, you're not necessarily going to keep up with the CPI because if the CPI is the lowest, you're with the CPI. But if it happens to be a year where the raise for workers was less, they're taking less.

So in that case, you don't catch up with the CPI; whereas, arguably, the worker catches up because they might have went low this year but then they went above the CPI next year. So the average of two years keeps them in the CPI; whereas for the MHAs, they're not keeping up with the CPI in theory, right?

H. JACOBS: Yes, I agree. I guess one of the concerns is exactly as MHA Dinn pointed out, was that it's government who is negotiating the General Service agreements. I like that because that also takes into account the fiscal position of the province. But then if you kind of link it to the CPI, it takes away some of the perception of a conflict of interest. So that's kind of where that –

SPEAKER: Yeah, and I guess I was just wondering why the thought process wouldn't have been just go with the CPI. That way, it's always cost of living and you're never having to vote on it again and so on. But at least you're keeping up with the cost of living as opposed to under this, theoretically, everyone else will keep up with the cost of living because they have a bad year this year, but a good increase the next year and they average out, but they won't for MHAs.

I'm just wondering if there was any thought process around that at the time.

H. JACOBS: I think our thought process was that I like the General Service linkage simply because that looks at the fiscal position of the province. So that, and then also the fact that using the CPI then kind of took away, that if government was going to – like, the perceived conflict that they may give more of a General Service increase than they should have, that's removed with using the CPI.

So I hear what you're saying. I don't know if you have anything to add, Sandra?

S. BARNES: If you're using CPI, you need to cap it. Saskatchewan has capped theirs at 3 per cent.

However, I mean, CPI has increased a lot in the last few years and, for example, if there was no increase to the public sector but the CPI was 3 or 4 per cent, I think you would deal with a whole other issue at that end.

SPEAKER: That's true.

Anyway, I'm just asking the question. That's all.

MHA Korab.

J. KORAB: Just one comment and, I guess, kind of one question. It is very uncomfortable voting on your salary. I did it at the city for seven years as a councillor.

I'm sure MHA Balsom did something similar in his municipal days. It is very uncomfortable. The legislation says we have to do it. We have to do it and here we are.

Given less, whether it's CPI or executive increases, I just feel if we picked one or the other, it would have been better, like the other provinces have done, with all respect. I just feel in 20, 30, 40 or 50 years' time, as the Speaker had said, if we're not keeping up, a future group of MHAs around this table are going to be back in this exact same situation, which I was hoping to avoid.

I can't predict the future, but I just feel, if the salaries aren't keeping up, we're going to put a future group of 40 or however many Members in this same situation. I think that's actually a little unfortunate from this perspective.

Anyway, that's just my comment there.

SPEAKER: Ms. Barnes.

S. BARNES: I appreciate your comments. Thank you.

If I might say, there still will need to be reviews of the salaries. That would be the opportunity to catch up, if they had fallen behind.

SPEAKER: MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: On page 47, "Executive pay plan increases are based on increases negotiated by public sector unions in good faith"

So just to make sure I'm understanding it, if unions negotiate 2 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent, let's say, over three years, that's what executive gets?

H. JACOBS: Yes. Three months later.

J. DINN: Three months later, okay, but they still get the same increases?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: So, in a way, I guess, the plan is still based on what the public sector unions negotiate. I know we're trying to separate, but it's still directly connected to what public sector unions negotiate if management or the executive get the same increases, which would be, to me, fair because they don't negotiate as such.

H. JACOBS: No.

J. DINN: Okay. Good enough.

H. JACOBS: Thank you.

Recommendation 10 addresses severance. The 2024 recommendations regarding severance were implemented so the 2024 policy was, in effect, following the 2025 general election. Approximately 30 per cent of MHAs completed their service between April 2024 and October 2025. Corporate and Members' Services advised that there were no problems administering the policy.

Very few MHAs spoke about the severance during the 2026 consultations. It did not express any concerns with the current policy. The 2024 policy provided an allowance of \$2,500 for career counselling, training and education but there has been no uptake. Therefore, I see no reason to increase the amount.

Consequently, I recommend that the current policy continue. I also recommended that severance be retitled transition allowance. The legislation still refers to severance. The Clerk has advised that the change can be accommodated by a consequential amendment the next time the legislation is amended in the House.

Recommendations 11 and 12 address MHA pensions. I have recommended that the

pension provisions for MHAs elected after November 30, 2015, continue as is. However, I have reiterated that the 2024 recommendation to restore the pension provisions for those MHAs elected on November 30, 2015, to those that were in effect at the time of their election. The current pension provisions are consistent with the policy objective of aligning the MHA Pension Plan more closely with the Public Service Pension Plan.

This slightly higher accrual rate for the MHA pension plan recognizes the generally shorter tenure of MHAs and that they pause other careers to serve in the Legislature, which can potentially impact in retirement growth.

Recommendations 13 to 27 address allowances. I note that approximately \$1.3 million is spent annually across the various allowance categories. The main concerns raised in 2024 were again raised in 2026: mileage rates, the 60-kilometre rule and the meal per diems.

Another issue was the inability to transfer funds, particularly between the constituency allowance and the office operations allowance. Several MHAs noted that they used all the funds in their constituency allowance but had not exhausted funds under office operations. I recommend that these two allowances be combined.

During the consultation process, MHAs indicated that if the 2024 recommendations were in effect, that would have helped alleviate their concerns. The 2026 recommendations are similar to those made in 2024, with adjustments that are predominantly editorial to provide clarity.

A recommendation that changed slightly is the 2024 recommendation that provided for a \$75 per day meal allocation that could be a combination of per diems and receipts for MHAs staying in temporary accommodations without cooking facilities. Temporary accommodation is defined in the

Members' rules as accommodation in hotels and motels.

The 2026 recommendation removes cooking facilities as a condition, as many MHAs pointed out that such facilities are limited and not conducive to meal preparation. It also clarifies that this provision applies to House in session and House not in session travel.

There were a number of relatively minor recommendations in the 2024 report, specifically the ability to claim parking expenses; expansion of the \$200 a month car allowance to two more districts; provisions for the Management Commission to authorize extraordinary travel; meal rates for Canadian and international travel; and providing for the district, which has the Confederation Building, to establish a constituency office outside the building even though there would likely be space available in the building.

These are not brought up in the consultations but were re-examined and found to be valid and brought forward into the 2026 recommendations.

A new recommendation added is the ability to claim expenses for caucus meetings. Many caucus meetings dealing with Legislature matters are held while the House is in session. Consequently, no additional travel and living costs are incurred; however, it is reasonable to expect that caucus will need to meet outside sittings to discuss Legislature matters. While caucus funding is provided, there is insufficient funding for an entire caucus to travel to a meeting.

The recommendation includes several conditions: Expenders will be charged House not in session expenditures but will not count towards the 20 House not in session trips provided; meals and accommodations will be subject to existing policies; travel must be by the most economical means; the caucus chair must

inform the Clerk and the CFO of the date and location of the meeting in order to authorize the MHA claims; and the meeting must be related to the Member's legislative responsibilities and not political matters.

I don't know if there are questions?

The final Recommendation 28 addresses implementation dates. I recommended that the increase to the annual salary come into effect on April 1, 2027. I have recommended that the salary adjustment formula come into effect on July 1, 2027. This is the date that the executive increases come into effect; therefore, that information is required to make the determination for the MHA salary adjustment.

Allowances should come into effect at a date to be determined based on advice from the Clerk and the CFO. This is because of preparations that need to be made before allowances can be implemented. It is possible that allowance recommendations could come into effect on different dates.

SPEAKER: MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: The pensions recommendations –

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: – that's only for those that were elected on November 30, 2015?

H. JACOBS: Yes, it's 11 MHAs.

Thank you for the question.

SPEAKER: Ms. Jacobs, I'll just say, the implementation date of April 1 – I wish you had chosen a different date. I've seen a few comments out there about that date you chose.

CLERK (Hawley George): Fiscal year.

H. JACOBS: I never thought about that, Speaker.

SPEAKER: It will make good fodder for a few Facebook posts, I think.

MHA Korab.

J. KORAB: I guess that's a good segue into the allowance part that the Commission will determine, but it would make sense to line up with the fiscal year just to make it cleaner, I think. Anyway, just to make that comment.

SPEAKER: Yes.

H. JACOBS: Implementation of the recommendations will require amendments to policies, the Members' rules, legislation and the Legislature's budget.

Recommendations that affect policy can be approved and implemented by the Management Commission.

Recommendations that require amendment to the Members' rules are approved by the Management Commission and then follow a process whereby they are circulated to Members and tabled in the House before they can be adopted. The amendments are not a bill which requires introduction, debate and adoption. Recommendations that affect salaries, salary adjustment and pensions require changes to acts. Therefore, an amended bill must be introduced in the House, debated and voted on before the changes can take effect.

Several recommendations also have financial implications. The amendments to the allowances should be able to be absorbed within the existing budget. The amendments to the pension to restore the pension entitlements for the MHAs elected for the first time on November 30, 2015, will require expenditures from the consolidated revenue fund, which is managed by the Department of Finance.

Finally, I want to address the amendments affecting salaries, which is the focus of attention of this report. I would like to put this amount in context. The increases to the base and additional salaried positions are

estimated to cost approximately \$1.04 million. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is an almost \$12 billion entity based on the 2026 budget documents. The salary increases represents approximately 0.009 per cent of the provincial budget.

The budget of the Legislature, which includes the House of Assembly and its statutory offices, is approximately \$35.3 million or 0.31 per cent of the government's budget. Approximately half of this \$35.3 million is allocated to the House and the other half to the statutory offices.

Within the \$16.9 million required to operate the House, approximately 25 per cent of this amount, or just over \$4 million, is needed to compensate the Members on an annual basis. This is about 0.035 per cent of the total provincial budget. The recommended increases would bring this amount to approximately 0.04 per cent of the provincial budget.

SPEAKER: Ms. Jacobs.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: Just for clarity, again, especially for anyone who might be watching and so on, can you just explain the pension issue for the 2015 MHAs?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: I know you said adjustments, but specifically so people understand what it is that's being changed and what happened and why it's being changed for those MHAs.

H. JACOBS: Yes, sure.

I'll answer it and then I'll probably have Maureen McCarthy jump in because she understands it a lot better than I do.

We had 11 MHAs that were elected on November 30, 2015. When they were elected, there was a specific pension provision and maybe when they decided to

run, they said, oh, I'm going to get this pension benefit, so they ran. Then the 2016 subsequently MCRC report made a recommendation, retroactively, that these MHAs would not receive the pension that they thought they were going to get. They were going to get the new pension formula. So we felt that this was not fair and we recommended that just for those 11 MHAs that should be rectified.

Maureen, you can probably do a better job.

M. MCCARTHY: I guess, historically, when changes were made to the MHA pension plan, they were always meant to apply to the next group. They were never meant to apply to folks who were actually elected at that point in time. Those arrangements would stay the same. In this particular case, when those 11 MHAs ran for office and were elected, the pension accrual rate under the MHA plan was 3.5 per cent, so for every year of service, they would get a pension based on 3.5 per cent of their salary.

The MCRC in 2016 reduced that to 2.5 per cent for all Members, including those who had been elected, and I guess the premise is, when they ran for office, there was sort of an unwritten promise that their pension would be based on the 3.5 per cent.

So that is the intent of this particular change is to remedy that so that they would get what they understood to be the pension entitlement at the time they ran for office.

H. JACOBS: Is that clear?

SPEAKER: I appreciate that but, again, it's just important, I think, in the name of transparency so that anyone who would be watching, the public, understands exactly what it is that's being recommended and why. Basically, that's a good explanation.

I mean, it comes down to, I think, anybody applies for a job and you glance through a job ad or something and it says we're going

to be paid this amount of money and these are your benefits. You accept the job and then a year later someone says, we changed our mind, now we're going to just do whatever.

I guess it's the element of fairness and that's what happened to that group of MHAs back in 2015, you said?

H. JACOBS: Yes, November 30, 2015.

SPEAKER: I guess they're all gone now, I would imagine, are they?

H. JACOBS: No, there are still some.

SPEAKER: Some of them are still here?

H. JACOBS: Yeah, some are gone but some are still sitting.

SPEAKER: All right, thank you.

MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: With that is also the eligibility for unreduced pension. I think it was moved from 55 up to 60, but now that's moved back to 55, correct? In that case, I'm assuming in the Eckler report, they talk about the benefit obligation, but anyone who would've been expecting to receive it at 55, let's say they're retiring now at 60, that would be backpay as such?

H. JACOBS: Yes, it has retroactive effect.

SPEAKER: Have we put a cost on what it would be to do that?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: Sorry, if I may, that's included in the \$2 million benefit change, the costings one, and then that would be the total amount I take it?

H. JACOBS: Yes, the costings are there, Speaker, in the report.

SPEAKER: Yes.

J. DINN: If I may, Speaker, sorry, that would affect survivors as well who are —?

H. JACOBS: Yes.

J. DINN: Okay.

SPEAKER: Thank you for that.

Do you have a question, Deputy Speaker?

J. DWYER: I have two small questions, I guess. The MCRC, does it have to be accepted in whole or can it be accepted in part?

H. JACOBS: No, it doesn't have to be accepted in whole. You can decide what recommendations to accept and you can modify the recommendations, but you can't increase the benefit.

J. DWYER: The only other question I have is, if we have two indicators that are looking at the increases, would it be more prudent to take the average of the two instead of taking the lower of the two so that it's tied to both CPI and executive compensation?

SPEAKER: Ms. Barnes.

S. BARNES: The recommendation is the Commissioner's recommendation. The Management Commission does have the authority under the act to vary recommendations, as long as it doesn't create a greater benefit. So you would have to look at that to see, if you made that change, would it create a greater benefit.

I will point out that in 2016 there was a formula for salary adjustments and it was an average of a number of different collective agreements. Unfortunately, the timing is different for every one of them, so it was years before there would have been an increase. One of those was the RNC agreement, and by the time an increase would have been applied, the increase for

the MHAs would have been over 5 per cent; whereas, I think the executive and the general service would have gotten 2 per cent. Notwithstanding that the MHAs hadn't had an increase for a while, the government came in and removed that provision from the Legislature before any increase could take effect.

So you have to be careful with some of that stuff. It's just a thorough analysis of the impact, right.

SPEAKER: Do you want to say something?

CLERK: Yes, please.

SPEAKER: Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Speaker.

Just to add to the conversation, the reference to the idea that there can be a modification but it can't be to a greater benefit, that's not just a nice idea, it's actually in the law. So I wanted to point that out. I appreciate what you're saying, Deputy Speaker, in terms of the average and so forth.

We have before us the Commissioner's recommendation and an analysis would have to be done individually, case by case, with that idea, in particular, of whether or not that would result in a greater benefit than what the MCRC has recommended.

Thank you.

J. DWYER: Thank you.

I appreciate the clarity.

SPEAKER: MHA Korab.

J. KORAB: Just for clarity then, if you were just to – MHA Dwyer, I almost had to look for a second, you have the wrong name plate.

J. DWYER: I don't have any name plate.

J. KORAB: Don't have any name plate; not the wrong one.

By that basis then, I agree we shouldn't be able to increase ours, just to be clear, above, but if you were then to, say, take the average of CPI and executive, that is more than what you recommended. So the answer then is no, we wouldn't be able to do that, if we wanted to. Not saying we want to, but you wouldn't be able to because it's more.

H. JACOBS: On the face of it, it certainly appears that way.

J. KORAB: It would be, yes. Just for clarity. That's it.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Okay, Ms. Jacobs, continue on.

H. JACOBS: I call this section Other Matters. These were matters that arose during the review process. While I don't consider these issues within my mandate with respect to making recommendations, I felt they were important enough to bring them to the attention of the Management Commission.

The first was voting on the increase. This was a huge issue for most MHAs we interviewed with many expressing their discomfort and what they perceived as a conflict of interest in voting for their own increase.

The 2007 Green report stated: "*Once during each General Assembly, the House of Assembly should cause an independent committee to conduct an inquiry and prepare a report respecting salaries, allowances, severance payments and pensions to be paid to Members during the next General Assembly*" – which is what MHA Dinn brought up. However, this provision recommended by Chief Justice Green was not put into the *House of*

Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act.

While this concept has a lot of merit, MCRC recommendations to date have not typically been forward-looking and non-implementation of recommendations have caused substantial lags that really should not be deferred any longer.

Some MHAs suggested that recommendations should be binding, which can come with its own set of challenges.

I just suggested in my report that the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act* is almost 20 years old and may be able to benefit an examination of the review process sections without a recommendation.

Secondly, a number of MHAs raised the salaries of ministers and parliamentary assistants and secretaries. We advised them that salaries were outside our mandate and that recommendations would not apply to those salaries. In other Canadian jurisdictions, the Executive Council salaries are codified in either the legislative assembly act or the *Executive Council Act*. These salaries are often tied to the Legislature salaries as a percentage of the base salary and included in salary adjustments and compensation reviews.

I note that, similar to the legislature additional salary positions, the salaries of the premiers, ministers and parliamentary assistants in all other Canadian jurisdictions have increased between 2024 and 2026. Similar to the Newfoundland Legislature, additional salary positions for the Premier and ministers of this province are the lowest paid in the country.

With respect to the frequency of reviews, the current legislation requires a review of compensation and allowances every General Assembly. While a General Assembly typically lasts four years, it can be shorter, as was the case of the 49th

General Assembly which lasted less than two years. The act doesn't specify when in a General Assembly a review should occur and there is some risk that the General Assembly could dissolve prior to or even during a review taking place.

The act does not provide any flexibility to determine whether or not a review is necessary. It also requires a resolution of the House to appoint the committee. This limits the window in which to establish a review committee. Several jurisdictions that are required to conduct regular reviews have provisions in their legislation that provide more flexibility and this may be useful for the Commission to consider.

MHA Dinn, did I answer the question you –?

J. DINN: The only comment I would make, I guess, I know the comment you raised and it was in the report about pushing it further down the road. However, I guess that everyone here, when we ran, we ran based on the compensation that was in front of us. I agreed to the point with having stripped away retroactively is unfair if you make those assumptions.

I guess my thing is if we vote on this so that it comes into effect the next time, we're not retroactively affecting us because we signed on for this knowing what the compensation was, but it would take that conflict of interest of voting on something for ourselves. Really, it doesn't exist for a public service or anyone else for that matter. Even the executive pay, they don't vote on it or get to see what their increase is going to be, but it's also based on the increases negotiated by the public sector unions.

I do have some questions on that, in general, if that's okay.

H. JACOBS: My only comment to that is that there has not been an increase from 2009, so then if there's another three years out, you're up to whatever that is – 2029 – because there has been such a lag.

You said you had more questions, MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: If I may, Speaker.

SPEAKER: Yes, you go ahead.

J. DINN: How does the executive pay here in the levels compare to let's say – I'm looking at it for those people who are in key decision-making positions, and not only here in Newfoundland. If I look at one chart, would it be fair to say that most people who are in the Executive Branch, they're probably making more money than some Cabinet ministers, or would that be –?

S. BARNES: We didn't do an examination of executive pay in other jurisdictions.

J. DINN: No, no, but here within the province?

S. BARNES: Oh, here?

J. DINN: Yes.

H. JACOBS: Oh, definitely.

S. BARNES: Oh my gosh, yes.

H. JACOBS: So there's the chart – I think it's Appendix B.

J. DINN: Yes, that's where I was looking.

S. BARNES: We changed the numbers of the appendices.

H. JACOBS: Sorry. What page is that on, I wonder, Appendix B?

S. BARNES: It was upfront. Yes, it's on page 114.

H. JACOBS: Okay, 114.

J. DINN: Yes, I was looking at the numbers there. I would assume, then, you didn't do that jurisdictional scan, but would that be the case for other jurisdictions? Would you

suspect that we're out of alignment in terms of that?

H. JACOBS: I honestly don't know the answer to that, MHA Dinn, without doing the analysis.

I, more or less, was just noting here the executive makes significantly more than MHAs.

J. DINN: The only thing I would say, I guess, in many ways, as minister and I'll refer to ministers regardless of political stripe, since they are the front-facing people in the government, they are the ones who are going to get the grief. They are the ones who will answer for all decisions, good or bad, regardless of whether they made them or came up with it.

In many ways, I think there should be something. Certainly, the pay should be commensurate with that and it should probably be more, in many ways, since they're going to get the grief on social media and so on and so forth. I'm not just talking about all MHAs as such, but I am talking about the people whose name is signed to whatever decision who has to go out and promote it.

Anyway, that's just a thought.

H. JACOBS: Outside my mandate.

J. DINN: That's fair enough.

SPEAKER: But Ms. Jacobs, before we move on, on that point though, because there is a recommendation there for the Speaker's salary to increase. Again, I guess to be clear, so we're painting a full picture, the Speaker's salary used to be higher and it got reduced when the minister's salary got reduced subsequent to the 2016, the budget and all that stuff, right? So there's a 10 per cent rollback, I think it was, in that salary, as well as what happened with ministers.

So I'm guessing because Speaker has always been on the same level as Cabinet minister, I'm sort of thinking that the amount recommended here for Speaker, theoretically, government might look at that and say that's what our ministers' salaries should be, the same, that same amount. Would that be the thought process? I would think.

H. JACOBS: I didn't put any thought process into it, other than recognizing that, when I did my report, it didn't include ministers, premiers, parliamentary secretaries, but almost all other jurisdictions included in a review, but it's not in my review.

SPEAKER: Okay.

S. BARNES: There is a chart in our document and it does show what other jurisdictions are compensating the ministers, the premiers and the legislative assistants. I will also note that most – not all, but most – jurisdictions, the Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition and the ministers make the same amount of money. That's pretty standard across jurisdictions.

H. JACOBS: But our recommendations don't automatically result in that happening.

S. BARNES: Right.

SPEAKER: No, but in theory, that's what could be used as a guide if they were to look at the ministers' salaries, I guess is what I'm saying.

The other point I just want to point out here as well, the reason why the Speaker is in this report while Cabinet ministers aren't in this report is because the Speaker is the head of the Legislature, not in the Executive Branch.

I just wanted to make sure for the information of the public who might watch this, because of some of the feedback you hear, it's not about the Speaker saying, I

want an increase, and the Speaker looking for an increase per se. It's about the only reason why the Speaker ends up in this report is because the Speaker is the head of the Legislature, not part of the Executive Branch, which would be the government, right?

S. BARNES: The report covers all of the positions listed in the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act* so the Speaker and the Leader of the Official Opposition are included in those positions, the Deputy Speaker and, of course, the ones we recommended we add back, the Third Party Leader. They're all there. The report requires we review those positions and recommend the salaries for them.

H. JACOBS: The act does not cover the Premier, ministers and parliamentary secretaries. That was outside our mandate, but we did note that other jurisdictions do allow for that process in their reviews. It's simply an obiter decision, by the way, just so you know, other jurisdictions allow this type of committee to make recommendations on those salaries.

SPEAKER: The Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Ms. Jacobs.

Just to be clear on that, and I understand that it was not within your mandate, but I believe you mentioned earlier that in your research you did note that in many of the legislative assembly acts or their Executive Council acts those salaries were reflected – that is the salaries of the Executive Council and any parliamentary secretaries or so forth – in the legislation, as well as the reviews.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

Sorry, Clerk, Appendix J codifies where it's found, all the links that do that.

CLERK: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER: The final thing I just want to say just for the record as well, for clarity, for anyone who might be watching, that the Speaker already receives additional remuneration, equal to that of a minister, which is common practice.

H. JACOBS: Yes.

SPEAKER: What's being recommended here is an increase to the Speaker's salary, which would total \$61,000. It's not an increase of \$61,000, as has been put out there by some people I've seen.

H. JACOBS: No.

SPEAKER: Again, for anyone who might be watching, just to clarify that point, it's not a \$61,000 increase; it's taking the current \$48,000 or whatever it is and increasing it to \$61,000.

H. JACOBS: That's correct, Speaker.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

J. DINN: (Inaudible.)

SPEAKER: It wasn't directed to anyone in this room, but no –

S. BARNES: If I might, Speaker, all of those salaries are currently codified in the legislation. All anyone has to do is look at the act, it's online and you can see who gets what.

SPEAKER: Correct.

MHA Dinn.

J. DINN: The only thing I had, just out of curiosity, on page 61, it's not part of your recommendations or anything else, I'm just curious. There is support for consolidating the five pension plans into a single pension plan. I guess they were referring to the MHA, provincial court judges, public service, teachers' pension?

S. BARNES: No.

J. DINN: What plans were they talking about?

S. BARNES: All the MHA plans.

H. JACOBS: Maureen correct me, I think there are five different MHA pension plans.

M. MCCARTHY: Five versions.

H. JACOBS: Five versions, yes, which depends on when you were elected.

SPEAKER: Deputy Speaker.

J. DWYER: Just for clarity purposes, for the people who are watching, this is an automatic function of the Executive Branch of the House. For people to understand, there's a Legislative Branch, a Judicial Branch and an Executive Branch. Is this being put forward by the Executive Branch or the Legislative Branch?

H. JACOBS: No, this is being done under the Legislative Branch, under the *House of Assembly Act*.

J. DWYER: That's what I was hoping for, but the other thing is that this wasn't recommended or this is not MHAs going out looking for a raise or anything like this. This is a function of the House.

H. JACOBS: Yeah, we were appointed by the House, or I was appointed by the House, to review this independently and I've done so. But I consulted with 90 per cent of the MHAs, with their input, minimal input from the public, but Sandra engaged all clerks and I know she had long conversations with them about what they do, their policies. We looked at a number of factors before we arrived at our recommendations.

J. DWYER: Thanks for the clarity and thanks for all your work.

SPEAKER: The Clerk.

CLERK: Thank you, Speaker.

Just to be clear, Deputy Speaker, this process was required under section 16 of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*. That is the act that governs the Legislative Branch administration. It's not related to the operations of the Executive Branch. As the Commissioner was saying, in terms of the Premier, the ministers and so forth, that's not within their mandate. It was required to be done once every General Assembly, so usually every four years, could be more, could be a little bit less. That's why we are here today because the resolution appointed the committee.

SPEAKER: I guess to add to that, it would include ministers in their position as MHA, but not as ministers.

H. JACOBS: Correct.

CLERK: Correct.

SPEAKER: Yeah.

S. BARNES: There was a lot of questions about the ministerial salaries.

SPEAKER: Yeah, so there are questions about the ministerial salaries, that would be something that the Executive Branch would have to deal with through a different process, right?

H. JACOBS: Correct, Speaker. It's not involved in this document at all. Other than that I mentioned it, simply because there seems to be a lot of confusion.

SPEAKER: Yes, there is a lot of confusion.

H. JACOBS: And because other jurisdictions do combine it into this or have the positions – like, for example, if a Speaker gets a raise, in the legislation it may say that the minister may get the same

raise. They're all different, but it's codified that there are actions to be taken.

SPEAKER: Yes.

All of the things that we are doing is all stemming from the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*, which finds its roots in Chief Justice Derek Green and his work and the Green report.

H. JACOBS: Correct.

SPEAKER: That's all we're simply doing is following a process that was outlined by Chief Justice Green, codified in legislation and we are just simply following the legislation as is written.

S. BARNES: Exactly.

H. JACOBS: Yes, Speaker.

SPEAKER: Yes, thank you. I know that, but it's important for anyone who may be listening to understand that.

H. JACOBS: I understand, absolutely.

SPEAKER: Are there any other questions? MHA Dinn, do you have any questions? MHA Korab? MHA Balsom? Deputy Speaker? Clerk?

Hearing no more questions, I certainly want to thank you, Ms. Jacobs, and your team for the work that you've done. As I said earlier, I know there was a lot of work, a lot of research went into it and I think that you did a great job. It's a quality report. Regardless of the recommendations and whether one agrees or disagrees with it, that's something that will be the role of this Commission now to consider in a future meeting.

As I indicated at the beginning, I'm going to be shooting to have another meeting of the Management Commission in the not-too-distant future – the sooner, the better – to deal with it one way or the other. That may

or may not result in something at some point coming before the House of Assembly and then all Members of the House of Assembly, if that were the case, would have the ability to debate and vote on whatever the recommendations may be. The recommendations may be as per the report. It may be versions of it, some of it. It may be modifications. As long as it does not increase any of the recommendations, that's a possibility, but those were matters that would have to be discussed here at the Management Commission at a later meeting.

So, with all that said, do we have someone to move adjournment?

J. KORAB: So moved.

SPEAKER: MHA Korab.

I don't think we need a seconder for adjournment.

Meeting is adjourned.

On motion, meeting adjourned.