



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

Forty-Eighth Meeting

Tuesday, February 24, 2015

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Wade Verge, MHA

The Management Commission met at 9:00 a.m. in the House of Assembly Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER (Verge): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Welcome back to another meeting of the Management Commission. We will take a minute to do some introductions. I am Wade Verge, Speaker of the House of Assembly and Chair of the Management Commission.

MR. BALL: Dwight Ball, MHA, Humber Valley.

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

MR. HUTCHINGS: Keith Hutchings, MHA, Ferryland.

MR. KING: Darin King, MHA, Grand Bank.

MS KEEFE: Marie Keefe, Clerk's Office.

MS BARNES: Sandra Barnes, Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Our legislation requires that the substance of any decisions taken in camera be reported at the next public meeting of the Management Commission. At the in camera meeting held on December 15, 2014, the Commission made a decision on a personnel issue as provided for in section 19 of the House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act.

Tab 1, the Approval of the Minutes of the last Commission meeting which was held on October 22. I would invite a motion to approve the minutes.

Moved by Minister Hutchings; seconded by Mr. Ball.

On motion, minutes adopted as circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: Continuing in Tab 1 – past your yellow sheet there – we have a report on authorizations that are made by the Clerk since the last time we met, where the Clerk did approve some equipment for the MHA for

Humber East. No decision is required; that is just for reporting purposes.

Tab 2, we have Financial Information from April 1, 2014, to September 30, and also from April 1, 2014, through to December 31. Our legislation requires that we report this information on a regular basis, and this is a reporting only. There is no decision to be made, but if anybody has any questions.

If not, we will move to Tab 3. It is a Budget Transfer Request to the Official Opposition caucus. The transfer is required from Members' Resources and Allowances to Grants and Subsidies for the Official Opposition caucus to provide operational funding for the period November 5, 2014, through to March 31, 2015. The information is provided, but essentially what happened is there was an increase in the members in the Official Opposition caucus which necessitated the transfer.

I do believe we need a motion to that effect.

Moved by Mr. King; seconded by Mr. Hutchings.

I am not sure, Marie, if this needs to be signed on camera or can be signed after.

I will move to Tab 4, where we have Letters of Appeal from members. We have seven letters of appeal. We will start with the Member for Conception Bay East – Bell Island who has written three appeals. We will need to deal with them separately.

The first one we will deal with is outlined in your material. My understanding is there was a bill for \$51.28 for an allowable expense. The member paid \$25 with a gift card and the remaining balance, \$26.28, with his credit card. There was no evidence on the bill that a gift card was used, no documentation; therefore, the personnel in finance could not approve this. The member is appealing to the Commission for a decision.

Minister King.

MR. KING: Twenty-five dollars paid by gift card, but there was a receipt for \$26.28?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. KING: Why would we not reimburse that receipted amount and not reimburse the other portion?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the finance people could not reimburse part of it, which could be a decision that the Management Commission may make. We can make a decision to reject the whole amount, pay the whole amount, or just pay the amount that the receipt was for.

MR. KING: If I may ask, why were they not permitted to reimburse? They cannot adjust claims or –

MR. SPEAKER: I can ask the Clerk to speak to that.

CLERK: The claim's full amount is \$51.28; \$26.28 is allowable. If that had been submitted on its own it would have been paid. The issue is there is no indication of the \$25 gift card that the member is claiming. They cannot split a claim that way.

MR. KING: They cannot split a claim, okay.

CLERK: Depending on the circumstance, there is certainly no problem with reimbursing for the \$26.28.

MR. KING: I will make a motion, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Commission can get into reimbursing unsubstantiated claims. I would make a motion that if the \$26.28 is a substantiated receipt, that we reimburse that eligible portion.

MR. SPEAKER: All in favour?

Seconded by Mr. Parsons.

We will move to the next claim by the Member for Conception Bay East – Bell Island. This one was not submitted in the sixty-day time frame. The financial people have said it is an allowable expense; it is just that it was past the sixty-day deadline. Claims of this nature the Commission have approved in the past.

A motion to pay?

Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Mr. Hutchings.

The next one is a claim for \$73.45. Again, it is past the sixty-day deadline, but it reaches back into last year's budget timeline. What we have done in the past with these is we have approved them with the understanding that the money would have to come out of this year's budget.

Agreed?

Moved by Mr. Ball; seconded by Mr. Parsons.

We will move into an appeal for the Member for Harbour Main for \$224.87. Again, it is an allowable expense. It has all been checked. It is just that through some late filing practice or something that was outlined there that it was past the sixty-day deadline.

I will entertain a motion to approve.

Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Mr. Hutchings.

The next one is for \$35 for the Member for Burgeo – La Poile. Again, it is an allowable expense.

Moved by Mr. King; seconded by Mr. Hutchings.

Another one, the Member for Port de Grave; again, past the sixty-day deadline, therefore the finance people cannot approve it, but we can. It is in the amount of \$452.86. It is an allowable expense.

Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Mr. Hutchings to approve.

The Member for The Straits – White Bay North, it is the same circumstance: \$100 past the sixty-day deadline.

It is moved by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Ball to approve.

The last one is the Member for Trinity North. It is two claims but it is the same circumstance, past the sixty-day deadline. One is for \$592.51, and one for \$143. Again, it is an allowable expense.

It is moved by Mr. Ball, seconded by Mr. Parsons to pay.

In accordance with the legislation, the Speaker has the authority to approve claims of this nature. Basically, the appeal comes from the Speaker.

I have looked at the legislation. I have looked at what past practice has been. What I have decided to do in the future with claims that are over the sixty-day deadline – it is obvious it is something that the Management Commission will approve. So I would undertake to approve them rather than have it hung up for a long period of time for members. Then I would be required to report those decisions to the Management Commission which still has the right to overrule the Speaker if you so choose.

AN HON. MEMBER: The details and correspondence (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, absolutely.

MR. KING: (Inaudible) is it a policy?

MR. SPEAKER: I could not speak to it.

MR. KING: I am just curious as to why we have that. It seems like every meeting we are spending inordinate amounts of time – and I do not think most of this is unreasonable. We are all MHAs here, and I know what it is like.

We all go long periods of time, sometimes with travel and stuff, before you get to doing claims and that. There has been lots of talk about streamlining processes. Why would we not consider having MHAs subjected to the same process of government? If government does not have to be a sixty-day timeline, why do MHAs have to? Is there a reason for that?

MR. SPEAKER: I really do not know, Mr. King.

CLERK: We would have to change the legislation.

MR. KING: The legislation.

CLERK: Yes.

MR. BALL: Mr. Speaker, I guess one word of caution – and I have no problem at all with you doing that and bringing it to the meeting. One word of caution would be the ones near the end of the year that are beyond the sixty days, yet would require a budget allowance coming from let's say 2015, so those time frames. Even though it is the same argument, I would –

MR. SPEAKER: The legislation allows the Speaker – basically, the first appeal is to the Speaker. Then if the member does not like the Speaker's ruling, they can appeal to the Management Commission.

What has happened in the past is that Speakers have brought it directly to the Management Commission. I suspect that in the era following Green, in the absence of some precedent, that maybe the Speakers wanted to bring it right directly to the Management Commission rather than possibly approve something and then have it overturned. I still am very comfortable with that, but I look at what the Management Commission has decided in particular with the sixty-day rule.

Sometimes members have – because they are seventy days, and then they could be waiting two or three months for a Management Commission meeting and they could have \$300 or \$400 tied up on their credit card or whatever. So I am taking the position that I would approve just those very straightforward sixty-day time limit ones. Anything else I still plan to bring to the Commission for discussion. Even those, obviously, they are brought to the Commission to be reported on and the Commission still has the right to ask questions or to overturn the Speaker's ruling.

MR. KING: So, Mr. Speaker, they would still appear in the minutes of the next meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Let's go to Tab 5. In accordance with subsection 43(9) of the House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act, the Auditor General is required to complete a compliance audit at least once during every General Assembly. The Forty-Seventh General Assembly Compliance Audit Report for the period October 11, 2011 to March 31, 2014 is

attached. The report is for information purposes only – so the Commission can see the audit has been completed. The Commission does not need to approve the report, so no decision is needed.

The Audit Committee met with the Auditor General at its January 8, 2015 meeting, to discuss the results of the Compliance Audit Report. The Auditor General did identify some weaknesses relating to the administration of the operational funding grants of the caucuses and Speaker and made recommendations on actions which should be taken to address these weaknesses. The Audit Committee endorses the recommendations of the Auditor General and, in a letter to the Commission dated January 8, 2015, makes recommendation accordingly.

The letter is in your briefing note, and I refer to it. In February 2010, the Commission approved the Caucus Operational Funding Grants Policy. Grant funding is provided to each caucus to cover the cost of miscellaneous purchases in the area of \$100 a month.

Basically, what the Compliance Audit concluded is that the House of Assembly is compliant and there were no issues. The only thing the Auditor General did suggest is that in the area of the caucus operational grant there should be some strengthening of the accounting policy with respect to that fund. What we are proposing – what I am proposing – is that the Commission, in respect to that, would direct the House officials to draft amendments to the Caucus Operational Funding Grants Policy to reflect the recommendations of the Auditor General and the Audit Committee. The revised policy would be brought back to a future meeting of the Commission for consideration and possible approval.

Discussion? Is somebody prepared to make the motion?

Moved by Mr. Parsons.

You look like you are thinking Mr. Ball.

MR. BALL: It is okay to think.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Moved by Mr. Parsons; seconded by Mr. Hutchings.

All in favour?

Approved.

The last item, item 6, deals with MHA pensions. There is some detail in your briefing package. In response to recommendations from the 2009 Members' Compensation Review Committee, amendments to the MHA pension plan were approved by the Commission in its December 2, 2009 meeting.

The required legislative amendments were approved by the House on December 15, 2009. The amendments at that time included a reduction of the pension accrual rate, a reduction in the amount of pension accrual, and also changes to the pension plan eligibility criteria. That was in 2009.

In 2012, the Members' Compensation Review Committee made several recommendations with respect to pensions. At a meeting on February 27, 2013, the Commission deferred a decision on two recommendations respecting the composition of the next MCRC and the resources that will be provided to it. The Commission felt that these decisions were more appropriately the responsibility of the Management Commission in place at the time of the appointment of the next MCRC.

So what happened was the Commission endorsed the following recommendation and directed the Speaker to develop a strategy for undertaking a thorough review of the proposal. The recommendation was: Immediately upon receipt of this report, the Management Commission should adopt recommendation 78 of the Green Report and develop a proposal that either converts the MHA pension plan to a defined contribution plan or significantly modifies the existing defined benefit plan. The proposal should be submitted to the next MCRC and then that Committee should be given the necessary time and the resources to conduct a thorough review of the proposal and of the existing MHA pension plan.

The Commission directed that the proposed strategy be brought to a future meeting for

review and approval. The strategy has been developed in consultation with officials of the Department of Finance. In anticipation of the approval of the strategy, I have written the Minister of Finance requesting that the Department of Finance undertake an actuarial review of the MHA pension plan.

So in your briefing note turn to Strategy to Review MHA Pension Plan. You will note that the first, almost three pages, really gives some background into what has happened since May of 2007. It talks about how the pension plan was actually changed after the first MCRC in October of 2009. The accrual rate was reduced from 5 per cent per year for the first ten years to 2.5 per cent per year after, to 3.5 per cent for each year up to a maximum of twenty years. Basically, the maximum pension accrual rate was then reduced from 75 per cent to 70 per cent. Those changes were approved back then. The next MCRC, of course, was suggesting some further action and this is what brings us to where we are today. The Commission directed the Speaker to develop a proposal – a strategy, rather.

The strategy begins really on the bottom of page 3. I will go through that with you: “In accordance with CM 2013-014, an Advisory Committee comprising officials from the House of Assembly and the Pensions Division, Department of Finance has been established” They include: the Clerk of the House of Assembly, Sandra Barnes; Policy and Communications Officer, Marie Keefe; the Director of Pensions, Maureen McCarthy; and the Manager of Pension Benefits in the Human Resource Secretariat, William Noftall.

“The Committee will conduct and review the pension provisions for elected Members in all Canadian provinces and territories, as well as the federal government. The data will be updated as needed to ensure the most current data is provided to the next MCRC.”

You will note, “The public sector pension plans in NL were modified in 2014 based on the following criteria: Current retirees’ pensions would not be impacted; A defined benefit pension plan would be maintained; Accrued benefits would be protected; and Joint sponsorship would be provided by a professional

Board of Trustees.” These were the amendments to the Public Service Pensions Act, and received Royal Assent on December 16, 2014.

“The Advisory Committee will review the criteria adhered to in the modification of the public sector plans to determine their relevant applicability to the MHA Pension Plan.

“The Department of Finance has been requested to do an actuarial review” I received a response from the Minister of Finance that that undertaking will be done.

“The Committee will do an analysis of all compiled information and provide both the analysis and the information to the next Members’ Compensation Review Committee.”

If I might elaborate just for a second before I open it up for discussion. The recommendation by Judge Brazil that an actuarial person be placed on the next MCRC was our thinking, and the thinking of the Management Commission, that to actually provide for that and expect that the MCRC would have their work done in the sixty days that they are required to do it would be a pretty difficult task. So our thinking was to have all of that information done by actuaries and have that information ready to provide to the next MCRC. So they do not have to start from scratch. They would have the information, and it would be current, a jurisdictional analysis, along with the actuarial review, and put them in a position to make a more informed decision in the time frame that is allotted.

Discussion?

MR. KING: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: I do believe we would have to have a motion to approve this strategy that we proposed.

MR. KING: Endorsing the strategy, we are making the decision here that we will have the information available so that as soon as the Members’ Resource Committee is called or established, that the pensions will be able to be reviewed. There will not be an opportunity for somebody to say: Well, it is six or eight months work to do the actuarial work, so we can’t do it.

That is the decision we are making today, right?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the intent.

MR. KING: If we do this.

MR. SPEAKER: The intent, Mr. King, was to have the information ready. That is why we are asking for the actuarial review to be done now in advance of the next MCRC being struck, and the Minister of Finance said he has undertaken to do that.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Mr. Speaker, the actuarial analysis you said is done by the Department of Finance or subsequently done by an outside agency, would it? How does that work?

MR. SPEAKER: Again, my understanding is that the Department of Finance would take ownership of seeing that it is done and they would actually engage actuaries from outside.

Would that be correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. HUTCHINGS: When the committee is struck there will be no need, or could they desire to do their own actuarial analysis? We do not want to be repetitive here. Is there something to say that when finance does their work that will be the work that will be flowed into the committee work when it is struck?

MR. SPEAKER: That is the plan.

Of course, when the Members' Compensation Review Committee – in accordance with legislation, they have sixty days to report, or 120 to report. So providing them with that information, which they will be considering pensions, along with all other benefits to members, any financial benefits.

Is there something to prevent them from engaging further actuarial analysis? Not to my knowledge, but they would have to be resourced to do that. I cannot really imagine if we provide them with the information that they would need, why they would want to go out and do the same work over again.

CLERK: Mr. Speaker, the House would have the right to set the terms in the resolution to –

MR. SPEAKER: Sandra, do you want to speak?

Go ahead.

CLERK: In putting this information forward to the Members' Compensation Review Committee, the House could set the terms, utilizing the recently completed actuarial review. Now, they can still engage. Obviously they have the independence to engage other advice on it, but if you have the review in front of you, the House could make sure that it is provided as part of the terms of reference to the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Does that better answer your question, Mr. King?

MR. KING: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hutchings.

MR. HUTCHINGS: I agree with it. It is just to make sure that the information collected is going to be used.

MR. BALL: So that it is understood by, obviously, the people who are watching now and doing the transcribing and reading this in the future, would you just give us a timeline on how you see this feeding into the next MCRC?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the legislation says that an MCRC has to be struck at least once during a General Assembly. So, whenever the election takes place, it will be up to the Management Commission and the Speaker at the time to decide when the MCRC would be struck. I cannot really say when that would be, but that is what the legislation requires.

To any of the staff, if I am saying anything that is absent from your understanding, please correct me.

CLERK: No, the only thing is in order to establish the committee we do need a resolution of the House.

MR. BALL: Then the criteria, the four pieces of criteria that are mentioned here now, when you

develop this current strategy, or a strategy that is developed, what is the impact of these four conditions are you suggesting within this strategy, or is it just there for information?

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. KING: (Inaudible) not to answer your question, but to add commentary.

My interpretation would be on this that we are just giving some parameters around the statistical analysis of the finances, but it would be the House and the Commission that will actually set the parameters within legislation for the actual Members' Compensation Review Committee. The Compensation Review Committee cannot be held to this. The parameters here only guide this piece of work.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, that would be my understanding, is that when the next Members' Compensation Review Committee is struck – when government did their changes to the civil service pension plan, they had these principles that there would be no impact on retirees, accrued benefits would not be lost, the defined pension plan would continue. These parameters are listed here, not that the next MCRC will be bound by them, but whenever the next MCRC is struck it will be given parameters by the government of the day.

MR. BALL: Okay, good, but I think it is important to realize that when the actuaries come in and do their work, as an example there, a defined benefit pension plan would be maintained. When the actuaries are doing their work, if you are going to continue with that idea, how would you actually – it would be very difficult for them to do their work knowing that there needs to be kind of a stop date.

If the defined benefit pension plan, as they do their calculations, was not something that the next MCRC or the House of Assembly were willing to change, as an example, well then those numbers are going to be very different. So there almost would need to be two things done. One, the defined plan end date with this session – because there has to be some flexibility to put into – let's say we could do something similar to what we see in other jurisdictions where you would have a two-tier plan, members who are in

place or participating in the plan prior to this date as opposed to those for the future. The actuaries are going to need to take that into consideration.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Yes, the principles that are going to guide the next committee review are going to feed into the actuarial analysis. You are going to run a bunch of models based on what you perceive are possibilities for how the next pension is defined. That is all I am saying. There could be a whole lot of models and a whole lot of iterations run –

MR. BALL: That is my point.

MR. HUTCHINGS: – based on the elements of what you think it may look like. There could be a vast amount of work done – we do now – and then when the committee is struck they may come in and define four or five or six principles which you need a whole range of actuarial analysis done based on those. That is just an issue I put out there.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. King.

MR. KING: Yes, I agree with both Mr. Ball and Mr. Hutchings. I think what you are proposing here works. If we have not done it here, we need to make sure the analysis is comprehensive enough that it gives flexibility to the Commission, government, and the review committee of the day. If they want to eliminate pensions totally, if they want to go to defined contribution, if they want to grandfather in everyone who is there and start fresh with all new members elected and so on.

The data, I think Mr. Hutchings probably phrased it best, models need to be worked, four or five different scenarios; otherwise, as Mr. Ball said, we are in a spot where we have half the data. Come October or November, we might have to start over again anyway.

I guess my suggestion is if we could adjust some of the language or for the record ensure we are all agreeing on what we are asking for, make it comprehensive so that the actuarial gives options to the next government and Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The letter to the Minister of Finance basically asked him to do an actuarial review of MHA pension plans, our MHA pension plan. The principles that are noted in this strategy were not noted in that letter. It was asking him to undertake to do that actuarial review. My understanding is that you would want, or are you suggesting that I write the Minister of Finance again to ensure that the actuarial review is all encompassing?

MR. BALL: That would be my preference, with the understanding that the commitment and the liability, let's say of government right now, is understood as part of – when the actuary does his work, let's say as of 2015 or whatever, that number can be discussed. It will probably be a couple of sets of numbers.

I think the one that concerns me the most would be the defined benefit pension plan. That is probably something we are going to want to see some considerable discussion on in the future. As Mr. Hutchings said, what other kind of hybrid models could be out there that would be available, because a lot of it is going to be based on the information that comes from other jurisdictions.

MR. SPEAKER: Marie, can you speak to what you understood of the analysis that we have asked the Department of Finance to actually do?

MS KEEFE: My understanding in terms of the actuarial review is basically when they do that they are actually evaluating the status of the plan in terms of its sustainability. So when they do the actuarial review, they are looking at: Is the plan properly funded? Where are the areas that might be areas of weaknesses that might exist with respect to the plan that might be causing any unfunded liabilities to accrue? What they would do is then they would make recommendations accordingly in order to address these weaknesses, deficiencies, whatever you choose to call them. Then they would not say well you may need to do this, or you have an option to do this, you might increase contributions, you might reduce benefits. You do a number of things.

They would not come in and say you should have this plan. They will identify any deficiencies that are there and identify the

measures that would be needed to correct them. Ultimately, what gets decided in terms of what is accepted in terms of: do we go with this, this, or this? The MCRC would look at that information that is provided. They would make the recommendations and then ultimately it would be up to the Management Commission to say yes, we agree with this model, we agree with these recommendations. Then any amendments that were needed in terms of legislation, subsequently, would go to the House.

In terms of the criteria that are there, the Advisory Committee, we were asked to just look and say, will these four criteria fit appropriately in terms of the review of the MHA pension plan as they were applicable to the public service pension plans? Because there are some differences in terms of –

MR. BALL: That answers the question on the existing model and how you deal with that, but then how do you develop the new models? Are they going to be involved in that process as well? Is that the mandate?

MS KEEFE: Both MCRCs in the past have had access to the actuarial services. The Department of Finance always have actuarial services contracted to provide ongoing support with respect to the pension plans. Both 2009 and 2012 MCRCs took advantage of the actuarial expertise that existed within the Department of Finance.

My understanding is once they had the actuarial review information, the MCRC would be able to go back to the actuaries and say, okay, well if we want to recommend this, what impact would this have? That is when that discussion would take place, is my understanding.

MR. BALL: At the next MCRC.

MS KEEFE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Michael has joined us, just so that everybody knows you are here now. Did you have something you wanted to say this morning?

MS MICHAEL: Well, obviously I am just coming at the end of this discussion. I have

certainly read through everything carefully and understand what the discussion is talking about.

One of the things that I think is obvious, listening just to the last piece here and to my own reading of the briefing notes, is that we are going to have to – when the MCRC is put in place, it is going to have to be more important than ever that we have people on that committee who really understand the stuff that we are talking about with regard to the pensions. The work they have done in the past around the pensions has been very limited. The first one made just recommendations for minor kind of changes, and the second one said they would put it back in the laps of the House Management Commission.

It is going to be urgent in putting the next committee together that there are people on it who know what they have to take on, on that committee. They cannot come back and say, sorry, it is back in your lap again, especially knowing that they will have access. As Ms Keefe has said, they will have access to everything they are going to need to do the work. So, we have to make sure it is a committee that is ready to do that work, because it is going to be so important for openness and transparency for people to see that the external committee that was set up really dealt with the issue, so that when it comes back to us and to the House of Assembly it is not based on our work but based on the work of the external committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ball, with respect to your question that you had earlier, does Marie's commentary provide enough clarification there for you?

MR. BALL: That will be fine.

MS MICHAEL: I found what Ms Keefe said very, very clear. It is helpful.

MS KEEFE: Basically, as the Advisory Committee, what we would do is make sure that all the information was compiled, that information and the analysis given to the MCRC to do with as they see fit. We would not be making the recommendations or any such thing. It would just go to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hutchings.

MR. HUTCHINGS: So what you are saying from an actuarial point of view, the baseline would be given assessment based on the current model. Then as the MCRC proceeds with their work, they would have access to the actuarial expertise to look at models they may suggest or may want to go down, and with that process they will be able to generate actuarial information to make their decision. So that is fine with me as long as you have the continuity and they have access to that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Ms Michael, with respect to your point about the membership of the next MCRC, we could make note of that, but of course the members on the next MCRC will be decided on – whenever that is struck – by whatever Management Commission and Speaker is in place at that time, but your point is well taken.

Further discussion?

Mr. Ball.

MR. BALL: Just one question about the timeline now. Your committee is struck, so how do you see this all unfolding within the next four or five months?

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Keefe.

MS KEEFE: I do not have a timeline for the actuarial review. I do not know if the minister indicated how long that might –

CLERK: No. We know the work has commenced, but we can check with Finance and get that information. That is the most critical element that we are doing. We will check with Finance and try to get some kind of estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: The goal here is to have all the information needed after – whenever the next election takes place and a new MCRC is struck, that there would be really no undue delay in having all of the information that they would need at their disposal to make an informed decision.

Any further commentary?

With that in mind, I would entertain a motion to approve the strategy.

Moved by Ms Michael; seconded by Mr. King.

Thank you for your attention, and I would entertain a motion that we adjourn.

Moved by Mr. Hutchings; seconded by Mr. Parsons.

On motion, meeting adjourned.