



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MINUTES AND VERBATIM REPORT

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Glenn Hagel
Speaker



No. 2 — TUESDAY, MAY 7, 1996

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Hon. Glenn Hagel, Chair
Moose Jaw North

Bill Boyd
Kindersley

Hon. Joanne Crofford
Regina Centre

Myron Kowalsky
Prince Albert Carlton

Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Prince Albert Northcote

Harvey McLane
Arm River

Grant Whitmore
Saskatoon Northwest

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Room 10 Legislative Building
3:07 p.m. Tuesday, May 7, 1996

Present:

Members of the Board of Internal Economy

Hon. Glenn Hagel, Chair
Mr. Bill Boyd
Hon. Joanne Crofford
Mr. Myron Kowalsky
Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Mr. Harvey McLane
Mr. Grant Whitmore

Staff to the Board

Marilyn Borowski, Director, Financial Services
Robert Cosman, Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk
Gwenn Ronyk, Clerk
Janis Patrick, Financial Services
Deborah Saum, Secretary

AGENDA

Agenda, as delivered, proceeded with.

MINUTES

The Chair informed the Members that amendments have been added to the Minutes printed in the Verbatim of Mtg. #1/96, to include the reductions and deletions made to the 1996-97 Legislative Assembly Office Budget as follows:

Budgetary Estimates

- 1) Hansard Miscellaneous supplies (Code 278, p. 24) reduced by \$4,500
- 2) Visitor Services B-Budget Item request for Qu'Appelle Gallery seating was not approved - \$10,200
- 3) Reduce printing budget for Votes, Orders and Journals (Code 319, p. 19) - \$15,000

And, that the McDowell Report date on the last page of the Hansard Minutes has been corrected to 1995.

Moved by Mr. McLane, seconded by Mr. Whitmore, ordered, that the Minutes of Meeting #1/96 be adopted. Agreed.

ITEM 1

Table Item - The Chair Tabled the September 6, 1995 Recommendation for the Implementation Report on MLA Compensation (Salaries and Allowances) - McDowell Report

ITEM 2

Decision Item - Review of the Implementation/Recommendation Report of the Independent Committee on MLA Compensation (Salaries and Allowances) - McDowell Report

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky:

That the proposed directives in the September 6, 1995 Report of the Independent Committee on MLA Compensation be adopted.

A debate arising, an amendment was moved by Mr. McLane:

That the motion now being considered be amended as follows:

By adding the following after the words "be adopted":

"except for Directives:
1.1 Per Diem Sessional Expense Allowance - Non-Regina Members,

2.0 Telephone and Telephone-Related Expenses;
 3.0 Annual Travel Allowance;
 5.0 Constituency Office and Services;
 21 Annual Indemnity and Allowances; and
 23(4) regarding the Employee Severance Reserve Fund, which shall be reviewed by all Members of the Board of Internal Economy and amended to reflect agreement by consensus of the Board.”

The amendment was ruled out of order on the grounds that under *The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act* the Board does not have the authority to not consider some of the recommendations.

The debate continuing and the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to.

Minute #1370

Directive #1.1

Moved by Mr. McLane:

That Directive #1.1 be amended by deleting subsections (1) and (2) thereof and substituting the following therefor:

“(1) Effective July 1, 1996, pursuant to s.50(3)(b) of *The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act*, every Member who represents a constituency wholly outside the city of Regina shall be provided living expenses for each day the Legislature is in session on the basis of reimbursement without receipts by way of a per diem sessional expense allowance at the rate of \$75 per day, to be paid weekly in arrears.

“(2) The per diem sessional expense allowance set out in subsection (1) shall be increased or decreased on April 1 of 1997, and April 1 of each thereafter, by the annual change in the Consumer Price Index for Saskatchewan.”

The motion dropped for lack of a seconder.

Moved by Mr. Whitmore, seconded by Mr. Lautermilch:

That Directive #1.1 be amended:

- (a) by deleting the words “Effective January 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (1) thereof and substituting “Effective July 1, 1996” therefor;
- (b) by adding the word “parking” after the words “including gratuities, laundry” where they occur in clause (1)(a)(iii) thereof;
- (c) by deleting the words “to be paid bi-weekly in arrears, determined in advance as the Member may choose upon a month-to-month basis” where they occur at the conclusion of subsection (1) thereof and substituting the following words:
 “to be paid as the Member claims”;
- (d) by deleting the words “April 1 of 1996” where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting “April 1 of 1997” therefor.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1371

Directive #1

Moved by Mr. Kowalsky, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That Directive #1 be revoked, effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1372

Directive #3

Moved by Mr. Kowalsky, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That Directive #3 be amended:

- (a) by deleting the words "effective April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (1.1) thereof and substituting "July 1, 1996" therefor;
- (b) by adding the word "parking" after the words "including gratuities, laundry" where they occur in clause (1.1)(c)(iii) thereof;
- (c) by deleting the words "(Because of GST implications, Members are encouraged to submit bill for direct payment rather than opting for a reimbursement of expenses.)" where they occur in subsection (1.2) thereof;
- (d) by deleting subsection (5) thereof.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1373

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That the MLA TRAVEL ALLOWANCE – EXPENSE CLAIM form, as handed out, be adopted provisionally.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1374

Directive #4

Moved by Mr. Whitmore, seconded by Mr. Boyd:

That Directive #4 be amended:

- (a) by deleting subsection (3) thereof and substituting the following therefor:
"(3) No Member shall claim an expense related to:
 - (a) the utilization of party logos;
 - (b) an announcement of or attendance at party, or party constituency association, meetings and events;
 - (c) a solicitation for party membership;
 - (d) a solicitation of contributions, monetary or otherwise, for the Member or the Member's party;
 - (e) a request for re-election support, including election campaign material, enumerator's lists, party and constituency workers' lists and poll activities;
 - (f) the promotion and/or conduct of personal election nominations or party leadership campaigns; or
 - (g) the conduct or commissioning of surveys about voting intentions."
- (b) by deleting subsection (4) thereof and substituting the following therefor:
"(4) No Member shall claim an expense under this allowance for items, services or activities that are:
 - (a) of a personal nature;
 - (b) hospitality (meals and beverages other than drinks as referred to in clause (5)(e));
 - (c) donations, gifts, or novelty items other than those items named in clause (5)(e); and
 - (d) office furnishings or equipment other than those furnishings or equipment specified in subsection (5)."
- (c) by deleting subsection (5) thereof and substituting the following therefor:

(5) Communication expenses may also include:

- (a) information technology expenses, including rental or purchase of computer hardware and software, printers, peripheral equipment and supplies, and related services for installation, operation and maintenance of a computer system;
- (b) photocopier expenses, including rental or purchase of a photocopier, and related services for operation and maintenance, per-copy charges and related supplies;
- (c) fax supplies;
- (d) books and subscriptions for the constituency office;
- (e) provincial pins and flags, drinks and photographs with tour groups, wreaths, flowers and plants;
- (f) halls and meeting rooms for events pertinent to the duties of an MLA.”

(d) by deleting the words “for printed communications with constituents” where they occur in clause (8)(a) thereof and substituting the following words:

“for bulk printed communications with constituents
(e.g. leaflets, newsletters, etc.”);

(e) by adding a new subsection immediately after subsection (11) thereof as follows:

“(12) Any Member may apply to have a communication item approved in advance of its distribution by providing a written request and a sample or detailed description of the item to the Speaker’s office. The Speaker’s office must respond in writing within seven days of receiving the request by either approving the item, or disapproving it and providing the reasons it has not been approved.”

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1375

Directive #5

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky:

That Directive #5 be amended:

(a) by deleting subsection (4) and renumbering the subsequent subsections;

(b) by deleting the following from subsection (6):

“A Member may rent or lease equipment or furnishings from a supplier, or he/she may purchase these items with loan proceeds. However a Member who enters into these arrangements must ensure that such obligations do not extend beyond the Member’s term. Wherever possible, such agreements should include an escape clause.”

(c) be deleting subsection (9) and substituting the following therefor:

“(9) Any equipment, furnishings or supplies purchased with public funds, will become the property of the Crown.”

(d) by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (11) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997 therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1376

Directive #6

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #6 be amended:

(a) by adding the words “Disability Income Plan” after the words “Group Life Insurance” where they occur in the last paragraph thereof;

(b) by adding the following sentence before the last sentence in the last paragraph thereof:

“Constituency assistants will be enrolled in the Public Employees Dental Plan.”

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1377

Directive #7

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky:

That Directive #7 be amended by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (3) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1378

Directive #8

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #8 be amended by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1379

Directive #10

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #10 be amended by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1380

Directive #11

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky:

That Directive #11 be amended by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1381

Directive #14

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #14 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1382

Directive #15

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Boyd:

That Directive #15 be amended by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1383

Directive #16

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That Directive #16 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1384

Directive #16.1

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #16.1 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1385

Directive #17.1

Moved by Mr. Whitmore, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That Directive #17.1 be amended:

- (a) by deleting clause (2)(b)(i)(C) and substituting the following therefor:
“(C) for petty disbursements, including gratuities, laundry, parking etc. or”
- (b) by deleting the last two lines of subsection (2) as follows:
“to be paid bi-weekly in arrears, determined in advance as the Member may choose upon a month-to-month basis.”
- (c) by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (3) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1386

Directive #17

Moved by Ms. Crofford, seconded by Mr. Lautermilch:

That Directive #17 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1387

Directive #18

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That Directive #18 be amended:

- (a) by re-numbering the directive as Directive #18.1;
- (b) by deleting the words “Effective on and after the election of the Speaker of the Twenty-Third Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan” where they occur therein and substituting the words “Effective July 1, 1996.”

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1388

Directive #18 (cont.)

Moved by Mr. Whitmore, seconded by Mr. Lautermilch:

That Directive #18, adopted by the Board of Internal Economy April 18, 1990, and subsequently amended, entitled "SPEAKER'S PER DIEM AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE", be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1389

Directive #21

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky:

That Directive #21 be amended:

- (a) by deleting the words "or serious illness related to the member's immediate family, or" where they occur in clause (4)(c) thereof;
- (b) by re-lettering existing clause (4)(d) thereof as clause (4)(e) and adding a new clause (4) (d) thereof as follows:
 - "(d) serious illness related to the Member's family, or";
- (c) by adding the following words immediately below the Table of Positions set out in subsection (6) thereof;
 - "A Member may assume any number of the extra duties enumerated above; however, no Member shall claim more than one annual allowance for extra duties pursuant to this subsection";
- (d) by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (7) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor;
- (e) by deleting the words "in arrears" where they occur in the last line of subsection (5).

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1390

Directive #21 – Form

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Crofford:

That the handout form titled, MEMBER'S DECLARATION OF ATTENDANCE PURSUANT TO DIRECTIVE #21 be provisionally adopted.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1391

ITEM 3

Decision Item - Consideration of Directive #2 – Telephone and Telephone-Related Expense

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Whitmore:

That Directive #2 – TELEPHONE AND TELEPHONE-RELATED EXPENSES be amended:

- (a) by adding the word "either" following the words "must be charged to" in subsection (2)(c) and adding "or the communication allowance" at the end of (2)(c) [previously agreed to in principle];
- (b) by adding to section (2) the following:

- (e) The costs associated with subscribing to and using the Internet Service [previously agreed to in principle].
- (f) The costs of other telephone services, including but not limited to, message manager, name and number display, call return, call forwarding, call waiting and 1-800 telephone service. To be eligible expenses, these services must be connected to the Member's constituency office telephone system and/or the Member's cellular telephone system.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1392

Orientation of the New Directives

It was agreed that orientation sessions on the new directives will be held for Members of the Legislative Assembly, and Constituency Office and Caucus staff.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

The Chair: — Okay, if we can proceed. First of all, I'd like to call the meeting to order and deal first of all with the minutes of meeting no. 1/96. As you will know of course, the verbatim minutes have been previously circulated. And I want to bring to your attention a couple of changes that would be different from your verbatim minutes, and then to ask for a motion from you to adopt the minutes as amended.

The official minutes of meeting no. 1/96 — these have been amended from the verbatim minutes. On page 2 of the official minutes, the reductions and deletions made to the 1996-97 Legislative Assembly Office budget have been added into your minutes. They wouldn't have been listed that way in your verbatim but they've been added into these minutes for purpose of official record.

And you'll also note that on the last page, the McDowell report date has been corrected to 1995. It had been incorrectly listed as 1996, the first time it was listed. So I draw those two changes from the previously circulated verbatim minutes. And is there anything else that anyone would like to raise by way of error or amendment?

Mr. Kowalsky: — A question with respect to item on page 6, decision item, travel expenses for constituency assistants. The third bullet identifies that PSC (Public Service Commission) travel rates be regarded as the maximum amount that can be reimbursed for travel, then it states the mileage .2838. Now that has been adjusted since then. So would it automatically adjust? I believe that that would be our interpretation, but I think it should be made clear.

The Chair: — That would be the correct interpretation. The minutes showing that it is the PSC travel rate, and then as at that date is the figure. But the application of it very clearly is to be adjusted in the PSC rate, would be adjusted.

Any further clarification or error? If not, then it would be in order to have a motion to adopt the minutes of number 1/96 as amended, if someone would care to move that. Harvey, and seconder, Grant. Discussion? In favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay.

We move then to item no. 1. And item no. 1 then are the recommendations of the McDowell report dated September 6, 1995. And these are then tabled. There's no decision required here, that's simply a tabling.

And with that then noted, we'll move to item no. 2, decision item which will be the bulk of our attention here today.

And I think before we start to proceed, I want to open the floor to members who may want to comment by way of content or process or objective before we start to work through a series of decisions that I see us doing here today.

And if I may make some initial remarks to members of the board. First of all what I want to do is to commend the members of the board for your cooperation in coming together this soon. As we had agreed when we last met, it is extremely important

for us to develop, flowing out of the board decisions, the procedures that will contribute directly to the objectives that the McDowell commission wanted to achieve. And that's that those things related to allowances and privileges of pay and funds for the carrying out of duties of members of the Legislative Assembly, that they will become more transparent and that they will become simpler, easier to understand, and hopefully as a part of that process, that what it would do is to contribute to an increase in public trust for the credibility and the validity of the system used by members in carrying out their duties.

And in order to do that, having decided that July 1 was implementation date, it is extremely important for you as members of the board to make those decisions so that the Legislative Assembly Office can prepare then to conduct orientations, most importantly for the members and for your staff.

So that those things required by way of report and submission of information to the Legislative Assembly Office are done consistently and openly, and that they will enhance the public trust and the credibility of the spending of members related to carrying out the duties and resources you have.

So first of all I want to commend all members of the board for your cooperation in being able to get back together this quickly to do this. Now as we proceed today, from discussions that you've had during the orientation on the McDowell report — and I quite recognize that for all board members but one this has been the first time through, and hope and trust that your understanding of what McDowell recommended is clear in your own mind — we come to this point.

And what I'm going to recommend to you today is that we follow this kind of a process. If you are ready to deal with all of the items at this sitting, then I think the simplest way we can proceed is, I will propose to you one motion for the moment, to adopt the McDowell recommendations, which gives us then the items from which we will work as we go through the formalization of adoption of directives. And there will be, by necessity, several amendments that will have to occur, because of circumstances or decisions already made by the board.

There are three kinds of amendments that have to be considered and that I would recommend to you that would fall into the housekeeping category. One is there are some amendments based on previous board decisions that the Legislative Assembly Office recommends your incorporating into the directives to bring the directives up to date. These are decisions past made; they change nothing in essence.

Then there are, related to the decision to implement July 1, there will be many of the McDowell directives that will have to be amended to incorporate that housekeeping requirement, that they become effective July 1. So they have a clear starting date. And the current directives remain in force until that time.

Thirdly, McDowell recommended in some cases that amounts in grants or allowances will be adjusted according to cost of living on April 1, 1996. And by not implementing till July 1

obviously that couldn't occur until, the first time, April 1, 1997. That's a housekeeping amendment again, would be required to make the directive meaningful and consistent with a previous decision.

Then based on your considerations of the McDowell directives, you have indicated that there are some amendments to the content of the McDowell Committee commission directives that you would like to see considered in the finalization of the directives. And as you have indicated those, we've attempted to draft the proper wording that would achieve what you'd like to do there. So those are provided for your use.

And if you're ready today to go through the whole bunch of them, then my advice is first of all, adopt McDowell so it's in place temporarily for the purpose of our work this meeting, and then move our directives from there. And I think that's the clearest and most expeditious way for us to proceed.

So with the objective of, from our decisions today, enhancing public trust, through increase in transparency, increase in simplicity, and increase in accountability for the use of funds by members of the Legislative Assembly, then, members of the board, I want to turn to you. If there's any comments that you would like to make before we start to proceed by way of decision making, then I'll turn the floor to you. So if there is any comments you'd like to make.

Mr. Boyd: — Before we go into voting on each of the recommendations and each of the directives, I want to just reiterate my position that we believe and I believe that the start-up should have been in January as it was originally recommended. We think it could have been done, and it should have been done, and probably still could be done.

My intention, however, is to support the start-up, as it now seems that the government is not prepared to change its mind in the start-up date. I guess I'm resigned to that fact. Now that we are going to start up in July 1 '96, rather than voting against each of the directives because of the start-up date, I will just want to register my opposition to the start-up of the entire package.

As I say, I would not want anyone to think that I voted against each directive based on any opposition to the directive, but based on the start-up date as it originally was, because I certainly do support the recommendations of the McDowell commission as written. We are just not prepared to accept the original start-up date.

The Chair: — Any other comments the members would like to make before we proceed?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I just want to say that I think that the work that McDowell has done has been very helpful to members of this board. I know that we've struggled with these issues for months, years even, and in terms of attempting to improve the accountability and the transparency and the way we operate as MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly), I think it's going to go a long ways in terms of helping us.

I'm not as optimistic to believe that the directives that we will adopt today will be there in perpetuity and be pertinent for a long time to come because it's just not the nature of things. I guess this board is well aware of the fact that change does happen on an ongoing basis.

And so I think, and I can speak on behalf of my colleagues from the government side, that we would like to give McDowell an opportunity to function for some time so that members will gain an understanding of the new requirements with respect to accountability on travel, and the new requirements in terms of what's acceptable and appropriate communications expenditures.

I think as well it's going to put some pressure certainly on Gwenn and her staff in the Legislative Assembly Office, and we've attempted to reflect that in her budget this year so that we could give her some flexibility with staffing. And so I'm certainly hopeful that that will be a smooth implementation for all of us.

There's going to be certainly some impact on our constituency assistants because in a lot of cases those are the people that do the front-line work for us, do the initial work in terms of our communications with our constituents. And so I think it's going to put a little pressure on them and be a little bit of a learning curve for them as well.

And I want to say as well that members on the government side are certainly well aware of the fact that . . . and we do support and I want to say that we support McDowell and its implementation.

It's going to mean less take-home dollars for them and for their families over the term of this government. In spite of the fact that the implementation date will be July 1 as opposed to January 1, the fact remains that MLAs will take home less dollars. And so I think all of them have shown that they're willing to make a bit of a sacrifice, as cabinet has done by taking a 5 per cent decrease. There's been a freeze in MLAs' salaries, as I understand it, since, I believe it's 1990 or '91. So I mean it's . . . 1990. And so I think elected officials have been willing to show a bit of sacrifice as well.

And so I just want to commend all of my colleagues in the legislature for showing leadership in that regard. I guess it's not easy for any single income breadwinners to take home the news that in fact there's going to be fewer dollars at the end of each month.

So I just want to make those points, Mr. Chairman. I would be more than willing to move the directives that are before us, as you have requested.

The Chair: — Well maybe I'll wait . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — . . . but I would wait until other members have a chance to speak.

The Chair: — Okay, thanks. Are there any other comments that anyone would like to make before we proceed? Then if I

can just respond just briefly to that.

If we are able to handle all of this business today and complete it, then through Legislative Assembly Office it will become a priority for us then to prepare to provide orientation training for members, and for your constituency assistants, who are obviously important to all the elected members in ensuring that these things are carried out properly.

Okay. Then if we're prepared to proceed and if it is your intention — if I can refer you to item 2 — then if it is your intention to proceed to deal with all of these in today's meeting, then I will recommend to you that you adopt the motion. That is, the first item . . . first page and item no. 2:

That the proposed directives in the September 6, 1995 *Report of the Independent Committee on MLA Compensation* be adopted.

Which will serve then as our working, starting point for our meeting. So if someone would like to move that. Mr. Lautermilch. Is there a seconder? Mr. Kowalsky. Is there discussion on that?

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . . or Mr. Chairman. I guess, as I indicated at the last meeting, the Liberal caucus does have some concerns with the McDowell report and I laid some of those out last meeting. I'll just go over them very quickly again.

And what I am proposing, I guess, in order that our thoughts on some of the directives are on record, or are in the minutes, is propose an amendment to this motion, if I could, stating the areas that we have some concern with.

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. McLane: — As I mentioned last time and have many times, that we don't think that McDowell actually went far enough with some of his recommendations in order to really look at the whole picture regarding MLAs and how they're compensated — urban versus rural, all those types of things — and we feel that some of the directives maybe haven't gone far enough in doing that. And we certainly want the opportunity over the next two or three years to be able to go back and look at these and try and readdress them and get to that point.

We also have some concerns about the amount of money that it's going to cost to implement some of these directives in terms of the paper trail, the immense paper that will be have to be used for MLAs as well through the system so that staff at the legislature here can process these claims.

We also have a problem, I guess, in the area of being penalized the \$200 a day. We don't think that that's an appropriate role to take, given that there are some differences again with the urban and those in close proximity of Regina as opposed to MLAs further away. Of course an MLA from Regina or in close proximity can come into the House for a few minutes, be accounted for, and doesn't have to be penalized for that, and can go back into their constituency and do their business,

whatever it may be.

We also feel that MLAs must be able to keep in touch with the day-to-day operations of the real world out there. And if we tie MLAs into this House for extended lengths of time, they're going to get out of touch. And certainly many of us have businesses to look after as well.

If I might, Mr. Speaker, with that note, I will pass around a copy of the amendments and I'll just read it off, if that's . . . With the motion as being proposed . . . are being considered, we would propose an amendment:

By adding the following after the words "be adopted":

"except for directives:

And I'll just list the directives, Mr. Speaker, and I won't read them out to save some time: 1.1, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0, 21, and 23(4), which will be added. I maybe shouldn't have that amendment to that particular one in here because it hasn't been actually adopted yet. It's not part of the package if I understand that rightly.

And ending:

which shall be reviewed by all members of the Board of Internal Economy and amended to reflect agreement by consensus of the board.

The Chair: — You're moving that, Mr. McLane?

Mr. McLane: — Yes.

The Chair: — Okay. That's moved. Is there a seconder for the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I guess I'd like some clarification. I'm just . . . You're looking for a seconder?

The Chair: — I'm looking for a seconder. If there is no seconder, then we won't debate it.

Mr. Boyd: — Well maybe you could explain your positions on them prior to us seeing whether you can gain a seconder or not.

The Chair: — If you want to follow the rules of the House where we permit explanation before moving, sure.

Mr. McLane: — In the first one, the per diem sessional expense account and allowance, there again, as I stated, the problem with that will be with the paper trail. And that is proposed in here as an option to what we have. Moving to a \$75 flat rate as opposed to the receiptable remuneration, which I understand could be a neighbourhood of 85 or \$90 a day on an average.

Section 2.0, the telephone and telephone-related expenses . . .

Mr. Boyd: — Can we ask you some questions before? You're thinking a 75 a day unreceipted allowance?

Mr. McLane: — That's right.

Mr. Boyd: — Okay.

Mr. McLane: — Section 2.0 is just the telephone, and that's the 1-800 number.

The Chair: — That won't be in this package; that's item 3 on our agenda.

Mr. McLane: — Yes. Are we going to deal with that separately?

The Chair: — Yes. That would be dealt with separately. It wouldn't be dealt with as a consequence of the motion before us now. Just a second; let me check.

Perhaps if I may intervene just for a moment. Procedurally I think what you're wanting to achieve here is to provide notice of desire to have an amendment. I think it's quite correct to say that it would be out of order for the Chair to accept a motion to have some directives that we don't deal with.

The board is required to deal with the McDowell directives, and perhaps your objective is better achieved by providing notice to members that these are areas you'd like to see amended. I think I'm going to have to rule out of order your motion to exempt from consideration at this meeting these specific directives.

We're previously bound by previous board decisions to consider the McDowell directives that have been tabled.

Mr. McLane: — Just a question, Mr. Speaker. What aren't we dealing with, I guess would be the question that I would have.

The Chair: — What are . . .

Mr. McLane: — What aren't we dealing with in McDowell?

The Chair: — We will be dealing with all of the McDowell directives that have been tabled here. And so the board will need to make a decision related to each one of those individually. Okay?

Now McDowell did not make a recommendation on telephone. That wasn't in the McDowell package. But it is on your agenda here as item no. 3. That's why it's not included in the McDowell items that are in item 2 on your agenda. Am I confusing? McDowell didn't address the telephones directive.

Mr. McLane: — Mr. Speaker, delete no. 2. Does that cure the problem?

The Chair: — It really doesn't, because it would be my procedural decision, Harvey, that the board doesn't have the freedom to not consider. What I'm recommending by way of our procedure here today is to start with the simple motion, which just momentarily adopts the McDowell directives, to simplify our procedure for dealing with them. But it is not my interpretation that the board has the freedom to not deal with some of the McDowell directives. We can certainly amend —

within limits — can make amendments. And certainly at future times can make changes.

So it's on that grounds that I would rule your amendment to be out of order on the motion that's before us here now. I think your intention is to serve notice about the desire to see changes, and perhaps you can do that informally, without by way of amendment. But I'm going to rule the amendment itself as not in order.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, could he not move an amendment to each one of the directives as we get to it?

The Chair: — Yes. Yes, as we go through each of them individually. Yes.

Mr. Boyd: — Not the overall implementation, but an amendment to each one as you get to it. He could do it that way.

The Chair: — Yes. And that would be procedurally acceptable.

Mr. Boyd: — The same thing, only Glenn just won't allow you to do it now.

The Chair: — Okay, so I'll rule the amendment out of order. And the question before us then is the motion moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Kowalsky. Is there further question? Question then. Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? That's carried. Okay.

So that being our starting point, we can then move to directive 1 dealing with per diem sessional expense allowances for non-Regina members. Now what the McDowell directive is recommending here then is that there will cease to be per diem sessional expense allowances for Regina members; that the expense allowances will apply to out-of-Regina members only.

And also it seeks to provide the expense provisions so they will be more publicly acceptable than the previous per diem system; that they are intended to speak specifically to the coverage of expenses. They would be eligible to be claimed for each sitting day. These apply only to sitting days of the House, then.

And they provide for two choices, where the McDowell commission says there can be two options. One, where following the Public Service provisions, members will be able to claim a per diem to a standard amount of \$60 that'll cover living expenses for the day. Or in circumstances where the expenses are receipted as higher than that, that members would have the option then of submitting, with precise receipts, for expenses for accommodation and meals and petty disbursements, and those would be consistent with the Public Service regulations.

So that is the essence, what McDowell proposes here. And there are some amendments then of course that will be required in order to approve the directive. And as per your directions to develop draft amendments, there are two options that are available for you there. And the floor is open now for movement of an amendment.

Mr. McLane: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendment of option 2 for directive 1.1.

The Chair: — Okay. And would you like to read that into the record, if I can ask you to do that.

Mr. McLane: — Okay. Effective July 1, 1996, pursuant to . . .

The Chair: — Section . . .

Mr. McLane: — Section 50(3)(b) of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act:

Every member who represents a constituency wholly outside the city of Regina shall be provided living expenses for each day the legislature is in session on the basis of reimbursement without receipts by way of a per diem sessional expense allowance at the rate of \$75 per day to be paid weekly in arrears.

The Chair: — Okay, and did you want to move the second part of that as well?

Mr. McLane: — Part two is:

The per diem sessional expense allowance as set out in subsection (1) shall be increased or decreased on April 1, 1997 and April 1 of each year thereafter by the annual changes of the consumer price index for Saskatchewan.

The Chair: — Okay, and it's moved. Is there a seconder? There not being a seconder, then the amendment is not in order. Does someone wish to place the amendment then to directive 1.1?

Mr. Whitmore: — Mr. Chair, I would like to move amendment to the McDowell on directive 1.1, simply to change the effective date and adding a couple of things in terms of . . . changes in terms of what is receivable.

The Chair: — For purposes of the record, can I ask you to move the amendment.

Mr. Whitmore: — That's what I'm about to do:

That Directive #1 be amended:

(a) by deleting the words "Effective January 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (1) thereof and substituting "Effective July 1, 1996" therefor;

(b) by adding the word "parking" after the words "including gratuities, laundry" where they occur in clause 1(a)(iii) thereof;

(c) by deleting the words "be paid bi-weekly in arrears, determined in advance as the Member may choose upon a month-to-month basis" where they occur at the conclusion of subsection (1) thereof and substituting the following words:

"to be paid as the Member claims";

(d) by deleting the words "April 1 of 1996" where they occur in subsection (2) thereof, substituting "April 1 of 1997" therefor.

I so move.

The Chair: — Okay, and is there a seconder? Mr. Lautermilch. Discussion?

Mr. Whitmore: — If I might, Mr. Chairman, this simply clears up, in terms as I was saying before, the question of the dates, when it becomes effective. I think too in terms of discussion in terms of members — the addition of parking is one as a receiptable expense to be included in the maxim eighty dollar a day, and also the last one, the question of the cost of living adjustment to take place April 1, 1997.

The Chair: — Any further discussion to the amendment? Ready for the question? Those in favour please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? And that's carried.

If I can move us back then to . . . we need to revoke directive 1, old directive 1. Okay? And there is the recommended amendment there then . . . or motion that directive 1 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Move:

That directive #1 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The Chair: — Kowalsky, seconded by Crofford. Discussion? Question? Favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Directive #2, which is telephone and telephone-related is there for information purposes. It's not part of the McDowell package, and as you'll see on your agenda, we will come to the telephone-related amendment proposed. This is really carried forward from our last meeting. It's not a McDowell consideration.

We can move to directive #3 then — annual travel allowance. This is an item that had a fair amount of attention from the McDowell commission and the purpose of the new directive is to reimburse members for travel expenses which are incurred in the course of their duties as MLAs and also to strengthen the accountability provisions of the travel allowance.

It's noted that although it will require members to become accountable for their travel expenses, which can be for living expenses in addition to actual kilometre travel or reimbursement of use of public transportation, that although members can only be reimbursed or paid for expenses incurred in claim, that what does not change is the cap. As members will all be aware, there has been a formula in place for a number of years which provides the maximum amount available to members depending how far your constituency is from Regina and the size of your constituency, which provides your cap for a maximum amount of claimable. And this does not change.

So members will have to claim, if they reach their cap — and I expect that many members would, actually — after that point

they will no longer be eligible to be reimbursed by the Assembly even though they're incurring travelling expenses. This will involve a fair amount more paper flow, as I think has been mentioned, and I think we are prepared to accommodate that in the Legislative Assembly, but this will obviously have to have some attention in the orientation for members and your constituency assistants to ensure that this is done properly, because it will also be publicly available to your constituents or to anyone who would request it through the Legislative Assembly Office if you adopt one of the new directives.

So that summarizes — there's more detail — but that summarizes the McDowell directive # 3. And the floor is then open. As you've got it listed in front of you, the bold print is the McDowell changes to the current directive 3, and that's what we're working from, and then the floor is open for amendment.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Chair, I move that directive 3 be amended today:

- (a) by deleting the words "Effective April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (1.1) thereof and substituting "July 1, 1996" therefor;
- (b) by adding the word "parking" after the words "including gratuities, laundry" where they occur in clause (1.1)(c)(iii) thereof;
- (c) by deleting the words "(Because of GST implications, Members are encouraged to submit bills for direct payment rather than opting for a reimbursement of expenses.)" where they occur in subsection (1.2) thereof;
- (d) by deleting subsection (5) thereof.

The Chair: — Okay. I guess the ceasing of the bells answered my question as to whether we wanted to break to vote, but too late. We have the amendment as moved. Is there a seconder? Ms. Crofford. Discussion? Mr. McLane . . . Sorry, did the mover want to speak first?

Mr. Kowalsky: — I just want to point out, Mr. Chair, that what this directive does, this new directive, is makes all mileage by MLAs totally accountable and quite transparent. And I think that was the objective that we set out to begin with, and I think with the passing of this directive we will have met that objective.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll not be making an amendment to it. I'll just make a couple of comments. As I stated earlier, one of the main problems as we see it with this directive, is the massive paper trail that will be involved. I there again rely on your wisdom when you talked about that many members will reach the cap, and we don't have a problem with the cap. The problem that we have is simply the amount of money that will be spent, I guess, on clerical work to implement this, both on behalf of the MLA and in the Legislative Assembly.

We don't think that this directive does address the problem of

MLAs' accountability. It simply causes a horrendous paper trail, and each and every one of us will have to keep track of every cup of coffee and every piece of pie that we have in order to get reimbursed, which in many cases will not happen. So I would just speak against this directive, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: — And I certainly freely acknowledge the point that you make about the paperwork that will be involved in implementing this. There is no question that accountability is not necessarily simple or inexpensive sometimes.

Mr. Boyd: — Yes, while I certainly recognize that the amount of paperwork will increase, I'd be very much interested in knowing what Mr. McLane would propose in its place.

Mr. McLane: — If that's a question directed to me, I would be happy to answer it.

The Chair: — Sure.

Mr. McLane: — Certainly I think we have a system in place now where even Revenue Canada doesn't request our receipts for anything under \$19,000. I think we've got a system, as far as I can tell in the short time that I've been here, that works. Certainly I did keep track of mileage and my expenses for the first time, and it actually was considerably more than what I was allowed to claim for. So I don't think that's a problem. I think we have a system that works now, and considerably cheaper. And I think that we could stay with that.

Mr. Boyd: — While that may be the case, the spirit and intention of McDowell was primarily to provide more accountability. And that accountability means essentially justifying your expense allowances. And if that means providing receipts, I think that's what the public was calling for. We are supportive of that call. We believe that there should be more accountability in the system. I couldn't support something like you're suggesting because that certainly goes against the spirit and the intention of the McDowell report.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I think the mandate that McDowell and his committee was given was pretty clear, that we were trying to tighten up some of the expenditures and be more accountable in terms of the expenditures. I don't think anyone ever suggested that the cost to the people of Saskatchewan in terms of putting together a process whereby that accountability can happen was going to be less, because it's not going to be. And I think we all recognize that there is going to be an incremental cost.

But I think what . . . and in discussion with our caucus, members of our caucus would . . . you know, we're all going to be new. Those of us that have travel allowance are going to have to be dealing with these expense claims. And I think what we would like to do is give this an opportunity to work itself through, see how members cope with the . . . whatever paper flow and paperwork there's going to be as a result of the recommendation.

And I think, as with all of these directives, we need to give them some time to work their way . . . you know, to work

themselves through, to allow members to get used to them. If we find that they're not workable, cumbersome, and, you know, puts members in a position where they're so busy doing paperwork that they're not doing their jobs as MLAs, then we would want to have a look at that.

But I think it would be responsible for us to accept the intent and the spirit of McDowell. This does increase accountability and I think we have to give it an opportunity to work.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make maybe a little more of a personal observation. It's often hard when you come in on a situation that has a whole bunch of history, but you come in at the end, to understand what all the fuss was all about. But I can assure you that there was many and heated debates around all of these issues.

And one of the reasons why many of us, even though we probably share some of the reservations about the extra cost, the extra paperwork, feel that from a public point of view, given the debate that took place around this whole thing, that it's just necessary to attempt to implement McDowell as fully as we can, unless something is just unworkable.

And so for those reasons, I think, and the history of it, those of us who lived through those moments, even though we may agree with some of your thoughts that it may not be the most efficient or what not, it seems like where we've arrived at. And I think most people who work in a job keep these kind of travel details and therefore don't understand why we can't or shouldn't. So I would just support this.

The Chair: — Thank you. Any further discussion? Okay. You have before you the amendment moved by Kowalsky, seconded by Crofford. Are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? That's carried.

Just if I can draw your attention, before we move along then, you will have in your package the proposed form to be used . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. Or Deb has just distributed to you just now. Okay. I'm not going to recommend to you at today's meeting that you adopt this form yet. This is Legislative Assembly's best version of how we take the directive and translate it into a form to collect all these numbers that are going to be required on a regular basis from members.

But with your agreement, what I'd like to recommend to you is that we take this, we use this as part of the orientation materials for you, for your members, for your constituency assistants, so that they can get some experience working together with it, and that we wait and see if we get some feedback as to whether this is workable as is or not, before the board actually adopts our ongoing official form.

So is that acceptable, just to accept it in that context at this point in time, is the form we'll use but not the one officially adopted? And we will at a later time officially adopt a form.

On the other hand, it perhaps, if it is your wish . . . I am easy on this. If you don't want to have a motion, I think we will agree with that too because I think we've got consensus around the

table. If you want to have a motion to just provisionally adopt this as the . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — If we have to come back, I mean if there's some requirement to have it adopted, why don't we do it.

The Chair: — Yes, I'd hate like heck to have to call a meeting next November just to say listen, boys and girls, here's a form, how do you like it? So if somebody wants to move to provisionally adopt the MLA travel allowance expense claim form. Lautermilch, Crofford. Okay, discussion? In favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay, thank you.

As usual the advice of the Clerk is welcome.

If we can then move to directive #4 — communication. And there have been a couple of options drafted here related to suggestions or requests to put into draft form amendment. This was a significant item of attention after the McDowell commission met with the board the first time last spring, and then went back, did some reconsideration, and drafted recommendations with some direction from the board at that time.

I think when the . . . if I recollect accurately, the concerns of the members raised at that time were in the area of accountability for expenditure of communications allowance, and so the McDowell recommendation gave that a lot more attention and it came back with the recommendation.

Now the purpose of the new directive is to reimburse members for expenses incurred in communicating ideas and information in respect to duties as an MLA. And it also is intended to clarify as clearly as possible the prohibition against party, promotional, and campaign-related expenses. And finally, to strengthen and support the accountability requirements for claims. All of those are very, very significant in the objective that the McDowell commission is wishing to achieve.

So let me just run through those again. Because this is one I think is deserving of a fair amount of attention. To reimburse then for the communication of ideas and information respective of duties as an MLA; to clarify the prohibition against party, promotional, and campaign-related expenses; and thirdly, to strengthen the support and the accountability requirements for claims.

Now there's no change — although the reported requirements have changed substantially — there's no change in the amounts of resources, financial resources, available to MLAs over the course of a fiscal year. So that cap stays in place. There is substantial change in the documentation required to support claims. And there is substantial change in what's eligible to be claimed under the expense allowances.

So having said those things, again there would be much detail, but I think that captures the essence of the objective. The floor is open then for amendment.

Mr. Whitmore: — Yes, I would like to move an amendment to

directive 4, to fine-tune it a little bit in terms . . . And may I read the amendment then?

(a) by deleting subsection (3) thereof, submitting the following therefor:

(3) No member shall claim an expense relative to:

- (a) the utilization of party logos;
- (b) the announcement or attendance at a party, or party constituency association, meetings and events;
- (c) a solicitation for party membership;
- (d) a solicitation of contributions, monetary or otherwise, for the member or the member's party;
- (e) a request for re-election support, including election campaign material, enumerator's lists, party and constituency workers' lists and poll activities;
- (f) the promotion and/or conduct of personal election nominations or party leadership campaigns; or
- (g) the conduct or commissioning of surveys about voter intentions.

(b) by deleting subsection (4) thereof, substituting the following therefor:

(4) No member shall claim an expense under this allowance for items, services, or activities that are:

- (a) of a personal nature;
- (b) hospitality (meals, beverages other than drinks as referred to in clause (5)(e));
- (c) donations, gifts, or novelty items other than those named in clause (5) (e); and
- (d) office furnishings or equipment other than those furnishings or equipment specified in subsection (5).

(c) by deleting subsection (5) thereof and substituting the following therefor:

(5) Communication expenses may also include:

- (a) information technology expenses, including rental or purchase of computer hardware and software, printers, peripheral equipment, supplies, and related services for installation, operation, and maintenance of a computer system;
- (b) photocopier expenses, including the rental or purchase of a photocopier, and related services for operation and maintenance, per-copy charges, and related supplies;
- (c) fax supplies;
- (d) books and subscriptions for the constituency office;
- (e) provincial pins, flags, drinks, photographs with tour groups, wreaths, flowers and plants;
- (f) halls and meeting rooms for events pertinent to the duties of an MLA.

(d) by deleting the words "for printed communications with constituents" where they occur in clause (8)(a) and thereof substituting the following words:

"for bulk printed communications with constituents (e.g. leaflets, newsletters, etc.)";

(e) by adding a new subsection immediately after subsection (11) thereof as follows:

(12) Any member may apply to have a communication

item approved in advance for its distribution by providing a written request and a sample or detailed description of items to the Speaker's office. The Speaker's office must respond in writing within seven days of receiving the request by either approving the item, or disapproving of it and providing the reasons why it has not been approved.

I so move.

The Chair: — Is there a seconder? Mr. Boyd. The floor is open for discussion.

Mr. Whitmore: — As I said earlier, this carries on with the nature of McDowell on directive 4, simply some fine-tuning in terms of making the directive work a little more effective, and I think recognizing a few items that needed to be polished up in that area.

I think too, the last subsection is important for members who are unsure about literature that they should mail out, and this provides for them an opportunity to do so. And I think that's good too. A procedure has been established then to do this.

The Chair: — Thanks, Grant.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we agree with the recommendation here and the changes. We are pleased to see that the government has accepted the recommendation with regard to asking for written approval, or requesting the written approval of the communications item before it is printed up and distributed and then found not to be acceptable. So we certainly are very much in agreement with the government members on that issue . . . the government member I guess it would be at this point.

The Chair: — Thanks, Bill. Any further discussion?

Mr. Whitmore: — Well there's at least two of us in favour.

The Chair: — Are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? And that's carried.

Okay. Moving to directive 5, constituency office and services. And the only . . . there are some housekeeping things attached to this of course. And the only item of significance that McDowell commission addressed related to constituency office and services is that, when adjusting the grants available annually, that it is open to . . . if the cost-of-living index is an actual reduction, that that would happen to allowances as well, where previously that hadn't been contemplated. The floor is open for amendment.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That directive #5 be amended:

(a) by deleting subsection (4) and renumbering the subsequent subsections:

(b) by deleting the following from subsection (6):

A Member may rent or lease equipment or furnishings from a supplier, or he/she may purchase these items with loan proceeds. However, a Member who enters into these arrangements must ensure that such obligations do not extend beyond the Member's term. Wherever possible, such arrangements should include an escape clause.

(c) by deleting subsection (9) and substituting the following therefor:

(9) Any equipment, furnishings or supplies purchased with public funds, will become the property of the Crown when the Member ceases to be a Member.

(d) by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (11) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

I so move.

The Chair: — If I could recommend a slight adjustment — according to advice I get here, which strikes me as wise — and that's on item (c) to, "... will become the property of the Crown ..." Period. Because I think the intent here is that it is the property of the Crown, not just when a member ceases to be a member. And I think there was an error in the drafting here, for the intention.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Agreed.

The Chair: — So that (c), it will finish with "... will become the property of the Crown"; striking out "when the Member ceases to be a Member."

It's moved by Lautermilch. Is there a seconder? Kowalsky. Discussion? Are you ready for the question?

Okay, are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Opposed? Carried.

Directive 6, constituency assistant. Again this one didn't have McDowell attention but there is recommended by the Legislative Assembly some housekeeping to update the directive consistent with previous board decisions.

Does somebody wish to move an amendment to directive 6? Lautermilch. Is there a seconder? Whitmore. Would you like to move that, Mr. Lautermilch?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of words before I move an amendment, that the constituency assistants have been, I think in the past, sort of ignored in that they weren't allowed to be part and parcel of the Saskatchewan government employees' dental plan, the insurance plan, or the disability income plan. And I think members will all agree that they are very hard workers on behalf of the people in Saskatchewan and deserve the benefits that other government employees get.

So I would move:

That directive #6 be amended:

(a) by adding the words "Disability Income Plan" after the words "Group Life Insurance" where they occur in the last paragraph thereof;

(b) by adding the following sentence before the last sentence in the last paragraph thereof:

Constituency assistants will be enrolled in the Public Employees Dental Plan.

The Chair: — Thank you. Is there discussion, further discussion? Those in favour? Opposed? And that's carried. Thank you.

Directive 7, caucus grants, and this changes nothing in terms of formula. What McDowell recommended is that the caucus grant could be decreased if the cost of living reduced, which the previous directive didn't contemplate.

Is there an amendment to the directive? Crofford. Is there a seconder? Kowalsky. Do you want to move that, Ms. Crofford?

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Yes, I'll move:

That directive #7 be amended by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (3) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

The Chair: — Okay, is there further debate, further discussion? Are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Opposed? That's carried. That was Crofford, seconded by Kowalsky.

Directive 8, caucus grants, secretarial expenses. Again McDowell recommended that it should contemplate the possibility of being reduced if the cost of living should be reduced, and that's the only change. There's no change in formula.

Is there ... moved by Crofford, the amendment. Is there a seconder to the amendment? Whitmore. If you'd like to move that, Ms. Crofford.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'll move:

That directive #8 be amended by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

The Chair: — Okay, discussion? Those in favour, please indicate. Opposed? That's carried.

Directive 9, caucus grant, research services. Exactly the ... no, there is no change required there. Okay. There's no adjustment required. So that's there for information purposes only.

Directive 10, grants to independent members. Again McDowell recommended no change in formula but contemplated the reduction, if cost of living suggested that.

Is there an amendment someone wished to move? Crofford. Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitmore. And if you would like to move that, Ms. Crofford.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'll move:

That directive #10 be amended by deleting words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

The Chair: — Okay. Discussion? Ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? That's carried.

Directive 11 — Grant to the Office of the Leader of the Opposition. Again, McDowell recommends no change in formula, but contemplates the possibility of reduction if cost of living would indicate. Is there a desire to move an amendment? Ms. Crofford. Is there a seconder? Mr. Kowalsky. If you'd like to move that.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'll move:

That directive #11 be amended by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

The Chair: — Discussion? Ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? That's carried.

Directive 14 — per diem caucus expense allowance. And this is then attended to by a later directive where McDowell commission recommended a blending together of all the means of income, and therefore recommended that the per diem caucus expense allowance be eliminated. And the recommendation here then to incorporate is that directive #14 be revoked effective July 1, 1996. Is there a mover? Crofford. Is there a seconder? Whitmore. Anybody like to move that? Ms. Crofford.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Okay, I move:

That directive #14 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The Chair: — Is there discussion? Ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? And carried.

Directive 15 — grant to the Office of the Leader of the Third Party. And again here no change in formula, just to contemplate the possibility of reduction if cost of living would indicate. Is there a desire to move an amendment? Ms. Crofford.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — In replacement of what I'd like to move, I'll move that . . .

The Chair: — Is there a seconder? Well first of all, go ahead and move if you like.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'll move:

That directive #15 be amended by deleting the words "April 1, 1996" where they occur in subsection (2) thereof and substituting "April 1, 1997" therefor.

The Chair: — Is there a seconder to that amendment? Mr. Boyd. Is there a discussion? Ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? And that's carried.

Directive 16 is an old one related to the Malone Committee report and it simply needs to be put to bed. The recommendation here is that directive 16 be revoked effective July 1, 1996. Then it would cease to have any future application. Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, and is there a seconder? Ms. Crofford. Mr. Lautermilch, would you like to move that?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I would move:

That directive #16 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The Chair: — You're moving directive 16 be revoked. Is there a discussion? Question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? That's carried.

Then directive 16.1 — the roll-back of MLA 1991 compensation increase, which really is . . . that in effect is incorporated into the McDowell recommendations on salaries, and this becomes redundant. But to formalize the revoking, is there someone who wishes to move that? Mr. Lautermilch. Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitmore. If you'd like to move that, Mr. Lautermilch.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Moved:

That directive 16.1 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The Chair: — Discussion? Ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? And carried.

Directive #17, committee per diem and expense. And the McDowell recommended that this be addressed in 17.1, so let us move to 17.1. No, I guess we revoke first. Yes. Can we move to 17.1 and then after we've decided on that, then we'll come back and revoke the 17.

Okay, the McDowell recommendation on the committee per diem and expense allowance. The purpose of the new directive then is to compensate members for legislative committee duties outside of the session through a taxable per diem. That's a significant change. And to reimburse members for the travel and living expenses incurred through attendance at those committee meetings. It is a significant reduction then from the per diem, the previously existing \$155, to \$75, which is now taxable.

And it provides the same two options for expenses, the reimbursement of actual with receipts as within the limits of the Public Service rates, or the flat per diem of \$60 without receipts.

Those are the key provisions of the committee per diem and expense allowance. And if someone would like to move an amendment to that. Mr. Whitmore, which are you moving?

Mr. Whitmore: — I'm moving directive 17.1 to be amended.

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. Whitmore: — In the spirit of dealing with also the expense allowance regarding sessional allowances, I would move:

That directive #17.1 be amended:

(a) by deleting clause (2)(b)(i)(C) and substituting the following therefor:

“(C) for petty disbursements, including gratuities, laundry, parking etc., or”

and

(b) by deleting the last two lines of subsection (2) as follows:

“to be paid bi-weekly in arrears, determined in advance as the Member may choose upon a month-to-month basis.”

and

(c) by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (3) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

The Chair: — Okay. Is there a seconder for that amendment? Ms. Crofford. Did you want to speak to it any more, Mr. Whitmore?

Mr. Whitmore: — As I said, this is simply bringing into line the amendments we had done earlier in terms of legislative expenses, and that they both were following the same tune in terms of what members would be eligible for and such like this. As I said, it deals with just simply fine-tuning McDowell.

The Chair: — It makes it consistent. Okay, any further discussion? Are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? And that's carried.

Before we move along, I just want to draw members' attention to two directives that you're not dealing with by way of amendment because they aren't impacted by the date, implementation, or by annual adjustment.

One is the directive #13.1, and by passing the first motion, then you pass this. The transition allowance puts in place a new provision to assist the member who is defeated in an election in order to help make the transition back to private life. That was a recommendation of the McDowell commission. And it provides a maximum four-month indemnity for a member who is defeated in an election. That's at the rate of an MLA, not with extra duties. And any member who voluntarily resides . . . retires I should say, is not eligible for that. And also if a

member is receiving MLA pension, they are not eligible for that.

So that is adopted as per the McDowell directive. And direction #14 was also adopted as per your first motion. The per diem caucus expense allowance . . . and that was simply abolished as per the McDowell directive, so that would no longer exist as well.

Okay, we can move along to directive #18 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh my, yes, thank you very much. Then if we can move back to 17 and ask that we have a motion to revoke the previous 17. If someone would like to move that. Ms. Crofford. Is there a seconder? Mr. Lautermilch. Ms. Crofford, if you'd like to move that.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Move:

That directive #17 be revoked effective July 1, 1996.

The Chair: — Okay, are you ready for discussion? The question. Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed. And carried.

Okay, directive #18, the Speaker's expense allowance, and this is . . . what in the world does this do? Oh yes — order, order, order, order. I think it's straightforward with the amendment if someone would like to move that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — The benevolent person that I am, I would like to move that directive #18 be amended:

(a) by re-numbering the directive as directive # 18.1;

(b) by deleting the words “Effective on and after the election of the Speaker of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan” where they occur therein and substituting the words “Effective July 1, 1996.”

The Chair: — Okay, is there a seconder? Crofford. Is there discussion? Question. Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed. And that's carried.

This is to revoke the previous directive #18 then. Would someone like to move that? Mr. Whitmore. Is there a seconder? Mr. Lautermilch. Mr. Whitmore, would you like to move that.

Mr. Whitmore: — Yes, I would like to move:

That directive #18 adopted by the Board of Internal Economy, April 18, 1990, and subsequently amended, entitled “SPEAKER'S PER DIEM AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE”, be revoked effective July 1, 1996.”

The Chair: — Okay. And this eliminates the Speaker's per diem. Is there discussion? Question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed? And that's carried.

And if we move to the annual indemnity and allowance, this had a fair amount of attention from the McDowell commission and it was one of the areas of focus. Clearly what the McDowell

commission was attempting to do was to simplify a very complex combination of means of income that currently exist for members of the Legislative Assembly and to make it more simple; to make it more transparent.

And in the process of eliminating the sessional per diem, replacing it only with an expense per diem, eliminating the caucus per diem, and making some assumptions of the annual income, which would be almost entirely taxable, then the McDowell commission recommended what is before you here then by way of the salary component of the members' remuneration — that a member would have a taxable income of \$55,000 per year and a non-taxable expense allowance of \$4,500 per year.

This does some other things as well. It's intended to address the public concern for the non-taxable allowances, and it substantially reduces that across the piece in a number of different ways, as it affects members.

It also introduces here a new concept to our jurisdiction, and that's that then when there is no considered income as a result of attendance at the session in the form of the per diem — because that's now eliminated entirely for Regina members and reduced substantially for non-Regina members — it introduces the concept of a deduction of \$200 per day for members who are not in attendance for a legitimate reason, from when the House is in session. So it introduces that concept, which is new.

And finally, what it does as well, in the area of additional duties, as has been previously pointed out, members have been frozen; MLAs have been frozen since 1990. And there has been since either 1990 or '91 — I guess it was '91 — a reduction that has been taken voluntarily by members receiving pay for extra duties. The list there, from the Speaker and cabinet and so on through the long list. And what the McDowell commission is recommending is that roll-back that was done then, become entrenched and not be considered a voluntary roll-back but the new level of payment for extra duties.

So that is the essence of what is found in these changes brought by the McDowell commission. And then the floor is now open for amendments to that, for directive #21. Mr. Lautermilch. Is there a seconder?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Joanne, did you . . .

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Well what we're trying to figure out, Mr. Chair, is whether or not the directive amendment that we're planning to propose actually reflects the change we intended to make.

The Chair: — Okay.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — And what it does I think is in (4)(d) it ends that sentence at the end of . . . oh, pardon me, no it would be (4)(c) that would essentially allow bereavement a little broader than the member's immediate family. That's right?

The Chair: — Yes, that's correct. That's what this would do.

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Yes, and that's what you're wondering about. Yes, it's a little complicated.

The Chair: — By separating them out as separate instead of combining the two, the serious illness and the bereavement . . .

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — It's just hard to sort of track your way through this, but that's the intent. Okay.

The Chair: — Yes, that's what would be achieved.

Mr. Boyd: — Sort of following the one that was handed out.

The Chair: — That's right. Yes, what's been distributed to you here then is what I'll ask is a provisional. If you adopt this, I'll ask you to provisionally adopt this form, and with this amendment in place, this would be the appropriate form to use, in my judgement.

Mr. Boyd: — So, Mr. Speaker, under item no. 3, the \$200 a day, had it been implemented, McDowell been implemented, the little stunt that Mr. Gantefoer pulled today would have cost him 200 bucks rather than 155?

The Chair: — The answer to the factual question is yes. I mean that's a hypothetical question. What it would mean is if this is . . . and the Speaker won't, or the chairman won't, comment on the use of the description. But what this means is that after July 1, that if a member in the House is named and required to remove him or herself from the Assembly, then the price for that would be \$200. That's the cost.

Now is there a mover and a seconder here? I've got Lautermilch as a mover. Seconder? Kowalsky. Okay, just hang on for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Would you like me to move that?

The Chair: — Yes, but before you do, if I can ask for consideration of one additional amendment as a housekeeping. We have, if you will look at item no. (5), we have an extra arrears here. And just in the interest of the Queen's English, if I could recommend that there be an additional item, Mr. Lautermilch, if you're moving this, which would add the words — (e) by deleting the word "in arrears" where they occur in the last line of subsection (5). It's simply housekeeping for purposes of proper English.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay, I would then move that in addition to:

That directive #21 be amended:

(a) by deleting the words "or serious illness related to the member's immediate family, or" where they occur in clause (4)(c) thereof;

(b) by re-lettering existing clause (4)(d) thereof of clause (4)(e) and adding a new clause (4)(d) thereof as follows:

“(d) serious illness related to the Member's family, or”;

(c) by adding the following words immediately below the table of positions set out in subsection (6) thereof:

“A Member may assume any number of the extra duties enumerated above; however, no Member shall claim more than one annual allowance for extra duties pursuant to this subsection”;

(d) by deleting the words “April 1, 1996” where they occur in subsection (7) thereof and substituting “April 1, 1997” therefor.

and the housekeeping amendment that you asked . . . were:

(e) by deleting the words “in arrears” where they occur in the last line of subsection (5).

Who did this writing?

The Chair: — It’s not my writing. Okay, that’s moved, and seconded by Mr. Kowalsky. Discussion?

Mr. Boyd: — The only discussion is, is I note that in the motion that wasn’t accepted earlier by Mr. McLane, he had some concerns about the annual indemnity and allowances, and I just wondered whether he wanted to explain any concerns.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you. I very much appreciate the member, the Leader of the Third Party, for looking out for us today. There’s a couple of comments I’d like to make before he rushes out and comments on the extra \$50 that Mr. Gantefoer probably owes the Crown.

A Member: — We hadn’t thought of that.

Mr. McLane: — Oh, I’m sure you haven’t. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I applaud the direction of McDowell in this instance in moving to a base salary and moving away from allowances which, of course, we all know got many members of the Conservative Party in trouble over the last number of years.

The people out there want to know what MLAs are being paid up front. People who are running for the position need to know that. And this is a step in the right direction.

The only part that we do not like about this directive is the \$200 deduction per day for a member being absent for reasons other than stated. I think that the people to best judge whether an MLA did his job are the people that elected us, Mr. Speaker, and they’re the ones that will have the final say.

The Chair: — Is there further discussion?

Mr. Whitmore: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, regarding the . . . as the member who had brought up in terms of discussion of bereavement, it felt that it was important to split it off. Where it was stated in McDowell, it was bereavement or serious illness related to members of the member’s family. I think in this occupation that we’ve undertaken as MLAs is that there are many funerals that we need to attend out of respect. I think it has to be recognized as one that is a function of our job as MLAs.

I think though too, beyond that, that for some of us that come from rural communities, a funeral is a sign of respect to a family and doesn’t deal with the question of duties as an MLA, but simply respect to that family. And I think it’s support for that family through their time. And I was glad to see that the committee today had accepted that amendment because I think it’s an important amendment particularly in Saskatchewan, the way we operate.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I just wanted to ask a question of the Clerk about how she envisions this being applied. Would this form be signed monthly in addition to the weekly or biweekly declarations that we now make?

The Chair: — There would be no biweekly declaration anymore because there is no per diem based on attendance. There will be the expense. There will have to be the expense claim . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, yes.

So there will be no per diem based on attendance and there will not be . . . It is assumed that a member is in attendance. And if they’re not in attendance, then they would be required, by the 15th of each month for the previous month, to provide a statement of explanation for absence.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Well how would a member . . . Pardon me. How would a member put in a claim for expenses then? Or would it be assumed?

The Chair: — That won’t be an attendance statement, but it’ll be a separate process that there will have to be a form developed for that, that will provide two options. And I think, by decision already, that can be submitted by members as they determine. It’s not on a regular, prescribed basis. Okay. So it may be on a . . . well technically, on a day-by-day basis.

Mr. Kowalsky: — That helps.

The Chair: — Okay. As determined by the member. Okay. Is there further question or discussion related to directive #21? If not, are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? And that’s carried.

Moving then to directive #22, members’ accountability and disclosure. There will be no amendments that flow from this, but by virtue of your first motion to adopt the McDowell directives, what this does then is it . . . This is a brand-new item that is recommended by the McDowell commission. And this is intended specifically to address, in a very significant kind of way, the issue of accountability of members and also the requirement for disclosure of expenditures related to allowances that they receive.

So it’s a brand-new item. And it will require then that there will be an annual report that members will have to file. That report . . . And the Legislative Assembly Office will assist in the composition of the report, but it will be extremely important for members and your constituency assistants, in the handling of the paper flow to the Legislative Assembly Office, that it be consistent with the standards being used.

And there may have to be some discussion as we go along as to exactly what categories are used, and that's not finalized yet. But some of that I think will become clear starting with the orientation of yourselves and your members and your constituency assistants.

The report then would be made available. It would be required by members for their travel, their telephone, their communications, and their constituency office services. It will include details about suppliers, amounts paid, brief descriptions of the items and the services purchased. That'll all be required in it.

It'll be submitted to the Speaker, to be tabled in the legislature, and will be available for examination in the member's constituency office and in the Clerk's office. So this is a substantial increase in both transparency and accountability and requirement for disclosure by all members.

And that system then will come into place for the fiscal year in which we are currently in at this point in time. So come the conclusion of the fiscal year, next spring, then this will become a requirement of all members.

Oh, right. I'm reminded here. If I could just ask us to go back and ask if we can have a motion to provisionally approve . . . to approve the provisional use of the member's declaration of attendance, pursuant to directive 21, form.

Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Crofford.

Is there discussion? Question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down. Hands opposed. That's carried. So I appreciate that.

Okay, so the members' accountability and disclosure will become a new item, and this one I ask that when you go back to your caucuses that you draw attention to that to all members because this will be very, very significant for every single MLA.

Finally then, directive #23 — the caucus accountability and disclosure — is a detailed requirement.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — With respect to directive 22, are there going to be forms put together so that there will be a standard reporting mechanism by all members?

The Chair: — Yes. There was in your previous package, there was a list of what are thought to be the appropriate categories at this point in time. It wasn't distributed here today, but that is the one that we see at this point in time of using with the orientation for members and their constituency assistants.

What we'll welcome as part of that orientation as people look at that as to whether those are the right categories . . . and I think it just makes sense. We will have to at some point in time prior to the requirement of that report by members, this board will have to approve the format that's used.

But I'm not asking for something provisional at this point in time because I think the odds of adjustment having to be made

are quite great. And what we really will want to have is the input from the people who have to work with that — for most of us that means our constituency assistants — before we finalize, so the board will have to . . . That's why I'm not asking for provisional approval at this point in time.

Now on directive 23, this is also then a new requirement of the caucuses. And what the McDowell directive requires here then is that there will be the requirement for an annual tabling of audit for the year by each of the individual caucuses and also then at the end . . . after an election there will be the requirement to table an audit for the entire term.

Now what McDowell is recommending is that this comes into play for the fiscal year in which we currently exist. So the 1996-97 fiscal year is the first one that would be required for the audit to be tabled. And then it would be this complete term, following the next election, that caucuses will be required to table their audit for the term — stating expenses, revenues, expenditures, and assets.

This will also — correct me if I'm wrong — this would have to be made available for scrutiny through both the Clerk's office, as well as in the caucus offices, and therefore is intended to speak to again the transparency and the accountability of caucuses *per se*. So those are the . . . that's the purpose and the key provisions of the caucus accountability and disclosure directive 23. And if someone would like to move an amendment to that McDowell directive. Does someone wish to move an amendment? No. Okay. Then that directive will be in place as I've described.

Again the categories for that, we'll have to come back to at a future board meeting and we'll require at that time approval for the format that the caucuses will be required to provide their audited financial statements. Obviously that's something we will have to do before the end of the fiscal year of next year, because that will be the first time that an audited annual statement will be required to be tabled.

Now that concludes item no. 2 on our agenda — the consideration of the decision items flowing out of the McDowell recommendations. And if I can ask then if we can move to item no. 3, and this flows forward. This is telephone and telephone-related expenses, the directive there.

This was not addressed by the McDowell commission, but this is carried forward from our last Board of Internal Economy meeting, and from some discussion. And if you wish, an amendment has been drafted that would meet the wishes and the intentions of some of the discussion related to telephone. If someone wishes to move an amendment there.

If you wish to implement it with the intentions of this amendment, the appropriate procedure would be to move that item 2(c) be rescinded and replaced with (c) and then adding (e) and (f). If someone wishes to move that. Mr. Lautermilch. Is there a seconder? Mr. Whitmore. If you would like to move that, Mr. Lautermilch, that item 2(c) be amended to read . . . and then that items (e) and (f) be added.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I would move that, Mr. Speaker.

The Chair: — Okay. All right. So item (c) has already been agreed to by the board and this is simply amending a directive to put it in place.

Therefore reading as follows:

Fax expenses, including the purchase, installation, maintenance, repair, and leasing costs of the machine; line rental and long distance costs are also allowed under this allowance but other operating costs such as fax paper, toner, must be charged to either the constituency office allowance or the communications allowance.

And adding item:

(e) the cost associated with subscribing to and using the Internet service; and

(f) the costs of other telephone services including, but not limited to, Message Manager, name and number display, call return, call forwarding, call waiting, and 1-800 telephone service. To be eligible expenses, these services must be connected to the member's constituency office telephone system and/or the member's cellular telephone system.

Okay, so (c) and (e) have been previously agreed to; (f) is new and this would be incorporating all of that into the directive. Is there discussion? If not . . . a discussion? Okay.

Mr. Whitmore: — I think, in terms of expanding the services in terms of telephones, is recognizing out there how things are changing in terms of how people are communicating. I think in the area too of 1-800 telephone service, it's important to include that now.

In terms of . . . in looking in the environment that we're in, this could even be a cost-saving versus traditional long distance charges. So I think it's better in terms of communications with one's constituents.

Doubting too . . . that I think it has to be within reason that a 1-800 service is, you know, is not a thing that somebody applies in an urban riding to have a 1-800 number, particularly those areas rural-urban, larger rural-urban constituencies, and rural constituencies.

The Chair: — And I would certainly assure the members that the Legislative Assembly Office will monitor this as well. And if we see significant change in expenditure then we'll bring this to the attention of the board. Any further discussion? Those in favour then? Question? Those in favour, please indicate. Down hands. Opposed? And that's carried.

That was moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by . . . I didn't write it down. Was there a seconder? Was there a seconder? Mr. Whitmore? Okay. I'm sorry. You're on record now. Okay. Not only did you speak to it, you also seconded it. Okay. Moved by Lautermilch, seconded by Whitmore.

That brings us then to the end of our meeting agenda. And I want to thank the members for your cooperation in bringing to a conclusion the McDowell report. And hopefully your intentions will be the result of this, in terms of increasing transparency, simplicity, and accountability, not only for members, but in the minds of Saskatchewan public.

I thank you for your attendance and I declare the meeting adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.