Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HANSARD VERBATIM REPORT



No. 3 — November 9, 2026

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Hon. Todd Goudy, Chair
Melfort

Hon. Lori Carr
Estevan-Big Muddy

Brad Crassweller
White City-Qu'Appelle

Matt Love
Saskatoon Eastview

Hon. Tim McLeod
Moose Jaw North

Nicole Sarauer
Regina Douglas Park

Kevin Weedmark
Moosomin-Montmartre

Published under the authority of The Hon. Todd Goudy, Speaker

[The board met at 08:28.]

Chair Goudy: — All right. Well I would like to call this meeting to order on the 3/26 at 8:28. And joining us today from the executive government are Hon. Tim McLeod and Hon. Lori Carr; from the government caucus are MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly] Kevin Weedmark and Brad Crassweller; and from the opposition caucus we have Nicole Sarauer and Matt Love.

Approval of the proposed agenda? Need a member to move that.

Hon. Lori Carr: — I'll so move.

Chair Goudy: — Hon. Lori Carr moves that. And a seconder? Matt Love. All in favour? Carried.

For the minutes, approval of the minutes from meeting 2/26. Would someone move that? Mr. Weedmark. Seconder? Nicole Sarauer. All in favour? Carried.

[08:30]

I'd like to table the following, which you have all seen:

Item 1, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for fiscal year 2026-2027 for the Office of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, Registrar of Lobbyists.

Item 2, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for the fiscal year of 2026 and 2027 for the Legislative Assembly Service.

Item 3, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for fiscal year 2026-2027 for Elections Saskatchewan.

Item 4, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for fiscal year 2026-2027 for the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner.

Item 5, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for the fiscal year of 2026-2027 for Ombudsman Saskatchewan and Office of the Public Interest Disclosure Commissioner.

Item 6, the first- and second-quarter financial reports for fiscal year 2026-2027 for the Saskatchewan Advocate for Children.

Item 7, (a) members' accountability and disclosure reports for the year ended March 31st, 2026; Saskatchewan Party caucus audited financial statements for the year ended March 31st, 2026; and the New Democratic Party caucus audited financial statements for the year ended March 31st, 2026.

Item 8, audit letter from the Provincial Auditor to the Board of Internal Economy and a letter of response from the Board of Internal Economy to the Provincial Auditor.

Item 9, audit letter from the Provincial Auditor to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and letter of response from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to the Provincial Auditor.

Item 10, (a) MLA printing and advertising exemption memo dated March 19th, 2025; and (b) advertising exemption memo dated June 4th, 2025.

So moving through the agenda. Item 11, an update of public losses for Legislative Assembly, vote 21. This item was tabled with the board at the last meeting on June 29th. Iris, the floor is yours.

Iris Lang: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker and board members. As you recall, as the Speaker said, in June 2026 at that meeting I reported that a cybercrime was committed that resulted in $112,800 of public funds being diverted to an inappropriate bank account. The funds were earmarked for four invoices that had been split between 27 members.

The timeline that I'm aware of is: February 2025, the first valid invoice was submitted by a supplier. March 2025, three additional valid invoices were submitted by the supplier. And then during that same time, March 2025, a bad actor provided fraudulent banking information. April 2025, payments were made then to that bad-actor bank account.

And then a year later, April 2026, the actual supplier that we were aware of inquired about payments of the invoices. And at that time it became clear that there was some fraudulent activity, and the Regina Police Service was contacted. June 2026, the Regina Police Service advised that 75,596.96 had been frozen in that fraudulent bank account. Subsequently funds were returned to the Government of Saskatchewan. However 37,203.04 has not been retrieved.

So following this incident, the Legislative Assembly Service member services has made several changes to mitigate future risks. Regarding process, there is reinforcement of existing procedures and also amendments to current procedures that include but not limited to following up and confirming supplier information and financial information by various means; careful review of supplier information; additional steps required for any request for changing bank account information; checklists were developed to provide guidance on how to identify potential fraud; new alerts that alert constituency offices to potential fraudulent activity.

Member services has also provided caucuses with proactive fraud-awareness tips to help them stay vigilant in their daily operational activities. And then with regards to training, member services team has completed security awareness training. The team is currently also completing the Government of Saskatchewan fraud-awareness training. That's my report, Mr. Speaker.

Chair Goudy: — Thank you, Iris. Any questions from the board members? Hon. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — First of all thank you for the update. With regard to further collection of the 37,203.04, what steps are being taken to pursue that?

Iris Lang: — My understanding is the Regina Police Service was able to access the one bank account to retrieve the initial $75,000. There is no further funds that they're likely to be able to retrieve, and so it's rather unlikely that we'll ever receive or find the

additional $37,000.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — When you indicated that the bad actor, I think you referred to them as, had supplied a fraudulent email address or bank account, had that been supplied to Legislative Assembly Service? Or to the, I think you said, seven members that had shared the invoices? Who was the fraudulent information provided to?

Iris Lang: — What typically is the process if several members are . . . In this case 27 members were splitting various invoices. The banking information was sent directly to LAS [Legislative Assembly Service]. But I mean the fraudulent named supplier would have somehow intercepted who the account manager was and sent that forward to LAS via the caucus because otherwise they wouldn't know who to send it to. So it would have gone to the caucus first and then to LAS.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — You're referring to the opposition caucus, the 27 members?

Iris Lang: — Yes.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Can I ask then, with regard to the further pursuit of the $37,000, would it be your opinion that the opposition caucus, the 27 members, are responsible for pursuing that as against the bad actor? Or would that be the responsibility of the Legislative Assembly Service?

Iris Lang: — I would suggest the police would be trying to pursue. You know, we don't have the investigative tools. It's the police services that would investigate fraud.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Sorry, I should have been clearer. You're talking about . . . On the criminal investigation, obviously the police are doing that. I was referring with respect to a civil claim or an attempt at a civil claim against the bad actor to try and recover those taxpayer funds.

Iris Lang: — We haven't proceeded with that at this moment in time, and I'm not certain whether it would be the caucus office, LAS, or the Government of Saskatchewan, Ministry of Finance.

Hon. Lori Carr: — So just to follow up on that. So I guess is there any intent to pursue that, to try and retrieve the funds through civil litigation with any one of those parties? And if the intent were, which I think is probably the responsible thing to do, who would actually head up getting the ball rolling on that?

Iris Lang: — If the board wishes the LAS to pursue it, we could pursue that on behalf of the board.

Kevin Weedmark: — Can I ask just to clarify, it was March of 2025 when the first fraudulent invoices were submitted, and it wasn't until April of 2026 that the party that was legitimately owed the money raised the issue? Is that correct?

Iris Lang: — That's when LAS became aware of it. I don't know if the actual supplier contacted the caucus; I would assume that they may have. But that's when we became aware of it.

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — I'll just add that part of this issue was canvassed at the last BOIE [Board of Internal Economy] meeting, but just to reiterate, we were in communication with who we thought was the vendor. By "we" I mean a staff member at our caucus office. We understood that that bill had been paid because of that communication. It wasn't until the actual vendor had reached out, which was spring of 2026 I do believe, indicating that they had not been paid.

The staff member looked through the invoices through LAS who had proof of payment to what we thought was the actual vendor, ended up being the fraudulent vendor. And as we had discussed at the last meeting, that staff member realized that it was a fraudulent vendor when ultimately he looked at the email address and there was one letter that had been changed. As soon as that was discovered, it was immediately reported to the police and immediately reported to LAS.

Chair Goudy: — Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Ms. Lang, you had indicated that LAS has changed some of their processes to protect or guard against this type of thing from happening again. Are you aware if the NDP [New Democratic Party] caucus has changed their processes, if the fraudulent email had flowed through their office?

Iris Lang: — I'm uncertain as to what processes they may or may not have changed. But certainly as we are the paymaster, we're certainly more vigilant on our end.

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Yeah, thank you. I'm happy to answer that question on our behalf. In conversation with our caucus, especially the staff who are usually involved with this type of invoicing with third-party vendors and LAS, we have improved our processes in terms of ensuring that there is a secondary process of verification of any type of banking information, especially if that banking information has changed from what we originally thought it was.

Chair Goudy: — Any other questions? Okay. Item 12, other business. Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two items that I want to discuss briefly, and motions as well.

First of all, Mr. Chair, there was a letter sent to you on October 14th. In it, there were several questions brought to your attention by Ms. Conway, one of them being whether or not there are any additional directive exemptions granted to any other MLAs other than the two documents that were tabled at the beginning of this meeting.

I'm wondering if you can answer that question. Otherwise I will move a motion, and I'll move that motion:

> That the Speaker table with the board all exemptions to the directives granted by the Speaker to the members of the Legislative Assembly.

Kevin Weedmark: — I will recuse myself from this discussion.

Chair Goudy: — Thank you, Mr. Weedmark. So yeah, the answer to that is no. There aren't any other exemptions.

Nicole Sarauer: — Okay. Thank you. I will rescind that motion.

I have a second motion, Mr. Speaker. There was a letter sent to you by my colleague Mr. Love on October 20, 2026 requesting that, because of concerns that were raised about the exemptions provided to Mr. Weedmark, that the board members be given the opportunity to examine and debate these exemptions and determine whether they should continue.

That next board meeting would have been this board meeting. That wasn't on the agenda. To facilitate that discussion I will move a motion:

> That, effective immediately, the Speaker rescind all exemptions to the directives that have been provided to the member from Moosomin-Montmartre.

[08:45]

Chair Goudy: — Any discussion? Okay so the motion here is moved by Nicole Sarauer, seconded by Matt Love:

> That, effective immediately, the Speaker rescind all exemptions to the directives that have been provided to the member for Moosomin-Montmartre.

Any discussion on that? Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would just say that there was a time when we all came to this place to debate policy, not people. And hon. members who were elected by their constituents set down whatever work they had, whether that was . . . Maybe they were a preacher or a lawyer or a teacher, or maybe they had their own small business. Perhaps that business was a newspaper business; perhaps it was a photography business, whatever it may be. And they set aside those businesses, often leaving family members to operate them in their absence, to come to this place.

And when they get to this place, they serve their constituents honourably. There are procedures and processes in place through the directives, through the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, other independent officers, to guard against any overlap of any work that they may have left behind and their work that they're doing in this place.

Those procedures and processes have been followed by the MLA from Moosomin-Montmartre. Any challenge to a ruling by the Conflict of Interest Commissioner — or by yourself, Mr. Chair, as the Speaker of this Assembly — is tantamount to a challenge of the Chair, which is contemptuous in this place. I don't think it's appropriate at all that the board be sitting here challenging the Chair on a ruling that was previously made.

I find it particularly interesting that one of the members bringing forward the motion — as the first motion that was rescinded addressed — did not receive any exemptions for a family business that he left behind, whereas the member from Moosomin-Montmartre went through the exercise of ensuring that all of the appropriate letters and exemptions were granted. For that reason, Mr. Chair, I would be opposing this motion.

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate Mr. McLeod's remarks with respect to this motion. I just have a few points I would like to add in addition to what he's said.

First of all, the allegations that Mr. McLeod is making with respect to my colleague, and in particular my colleague's spouse and my colleague's spouse's business. No exemption was sought for the directives because everything that that business has done is in compliance with the directives. The directives are there for a reason. Should we need to change them in the future, then we have a process for that and a conversation that should be had.

When there are exemptions to directives that are granted by the Speaker — and to be frank with you, this is my first knowledge that exemptions can be given and are given pursuant to the legislation in the 10 years that I have been here, and that is well within your authority to do so — there is no mechanism for reviewing those exemptions that are granted.

In no way am I questioning the exemption that you had made at the time. I think our argument here is that there is new information that has been brought to light by my colleague Ms. Conway. There are other non-MLA-owned media entities that these MLAs can use to communicate with their members on. And frankly I think, because of the importance of media and the strength of an independent media has on the integrity of our democracy, we should be particularly careful when we are talking about media entities that are owned by sitting MLAs.

Chair Goudy: — Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Thank you. Just a couple of points arising out of those comments.

Ms. Sarauer indicates that the member from Saskatoon Eastview didn't receive exemptions because they were not required, but to my knowledge no opinion to that effect was ever sought or received. So that would be a presumption on their part that they're in compliance with the directives because the rulers of those directives, the overseers — yourself and the Conflict of Interest Commissioner — were never given an opportunity to opine about whether or not in fact they are in compliance. And so it's a little bit presumptuous to say that they are in compliance if they've never asked the arbiter to even give an opinion on that.

The indication from Ms. Sarauer that other forms of media were available was considered by yourself and the Conflict of Interest Commissioner in this matter, and it's your decision to make as the arbiter of these exemptions.

Conversely, looking at the member from Eastview's family business, it would be difficult to suggest that there's no other photographers available in Saskatoon. Now NDP opposition members have used public funds to have their photographs taken by this member's family business — not only Saskatoon members, Mr. Chair, but Regina members. So to say that there's no other alternatives available for photography services in Regina, that these two members had to seek out photography in Saskatoon, defies logic, Mr. Speaker.

So I would say that, you know, to Ms. Sarauer's points, firstly the suggestion that they're in compliance when they haven't sought an opinion is presumptuous. And secondly the suggestion that where the exemptions were granted for the member from Moosomin-Montmartre, because his family business that he left behind and that he got exemptions for is a limited service in southeastern Saskatchewan, and one that ensures that the people of that region receive the same information that people in the rest of the province get in a timely way, flies in the face of the suggestion that photography services had to be obtained by the member from Saskatoon Eastview's family business by members in Saskatoon and Regina. Because there are quite certainly other photography services available in both of those communities.

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure Mr. McLeod and I could go back and forth on this all morning. Just a few points to clarify again. Mr. McLeod continues to call this business a family business. It's not. It's his — my colleague's — spouse's business. He had sought advice from the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. That question had not been brought to us by government members until this meeting, and he is very comfortable that it's compliant with the directives.

Should members opposite wish to amend the directives in the future, I think that's a conversation that we should perhaps have. And there's a process for amending those directives. In the meantime, the work that's ongoing continues to be in compliance with the directives.

Colleagues on the other side continue to try to muddy the water about an MLA on their side who has had to request exemptions to the directives, which means that he was not in compliance with the directives until the exemptions were granted, and wants to conflate or compare an MLA whose spouse owns a photography business with an MLA who owns a media company. I would argue that those two are quite different. However if there is a conversation that needs to be had in the future about amending directives, we are open to those conversations as we always are.

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Carr.

Hon. Lori Carr: — Just a quick question around the comments made that MLA Love actually received an opinion from the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. Could we get a copy of that correspondence where he did receive that?

Chair Goudy: — I could . . . Ms Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — That conversation was verbal.

Chair Goudy: — Any other comments? Okay, so yeah, I don't know, do we need to vote on the motion? Like it's kind of my decision, isn't it? Okay, so the motion . . . So the board can tell the Chair to rescind? Okay, so I wasn't sure. I had almost . . . So the directives would . . . Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Well just as a question of a point of order, I'm not sure that we can. This is challenging the Chair, Mr. Chair. To ask the Speaker to rescind a motion is, as I indicated in my comments, tantamount to challenging the Chair. And there are specific processes set out in the Legislative Assembly for challenging the Chair. And as for our part, we're certainly not going to participate in the contempt that is challenging the Chair.

Chair Goudy: — So I would just like to know — not that I don't want to have input; of course I want to have input and hear from the board — but I just want to know, is it the Chair's decision to make, or is it not the Chair's decision to make? Does the Chair have the responsibility to make that decision?

Like certainly I need to hear the board out, but I just would like to get Iris's . . . Let's just read that, how it's worded. Because, yeah, it's not that I wouldn't want to submit to the board — for sure, 100 per cent. But if that's not what it says, then this motion is a strange motion.

It says here, 68(5) in *The Legislative Assembly Act, 2007*, "The Board may delegate any powers and duties that it considers appropriate to the Speaker." And so that would be a debate. Would they rescind the responsibility of the Speaker and say, we would ask that you rescind the exemptions? I certainly want to have the input, but I would like to say, I did give a rationale to why I did what I did and why I granted that exemption.

So yeah, just if you wanted a vote, like certainly let's have a vote. But I would like to know for sure is that, would there be any discussion on whether or not the board has that authority to ask me to rescind this? Like, or tell me, not request that . . . I don't know. Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Well as you just indicated, Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation is quite clear and the advice you received from the Clerk is quite clear that this is a delegated authority to you by the BOIE. Therefore this is . . . Is it a novel process? Yes, but it's not challenging the Chair and it's a motion that's in order.

Chair Goudy: — Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — I would differ with Ms. Sarauer on her conclusion there. I think that quite clearly this is a decision within your jurisdiction that has been delegated to you for good reason. As you indicated, it was a decision that you made and provided rationale for. And I would actually point to the letter from the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel dated March 19th, 2025 that's part of the materials today. At the bottom of the first page it says:

> Mr. Weedmark approached the Speaker with this request in good faith and on the advice of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, who would be the arbiter of any eventual appeal of a decision declining the request.

[09:00]

So the Law Clerk, the parliamentary Law Clerk for this Assembly, has indicated that the Speaker and the Conflict of Interest Commissioner are the arbiters of a request like this. And I would again indicate that it is our position that to ask the Speaker to rescind a decision that was made and rationalized and communicated is the equivalent of challenging the Chair. And for that reason, I believe the motion is out of order.

Chair Goudy: — So point no. 5 . . . Like at the end of the day, I certainly want to hear everybody's perspective, but at the end of

the day, "The board may delegate any powers and duties that it considers appropriate to the Speaker" — and also remove those powers and duties, I guess. But like you'd said earlier, it would have to be . . . like you have the ability to change anything that you want as a board.

But I find that when I'm trying to be impartial and just, you know, make decisions — and I was very clear on the rationale behind it — and when that letter went to the public and it all of a sudden became a little bit like . . . We could have these private conversations any time in my office, in the hallways, in our board meetings.

Like we could certainly have a vote, but I don't know if we can vote based on this, whether that's even the ability. In my perspective — I may be wrong — you could vote that we change the powers and duties of the Speaker. And that wouldn't be at this table. That would, you know, certainly be a larger question.

I just really . . . So what's the thought? Do we vote on this motion? Like it seems to be a motion like . . . I don't think it's . . .

Nicole Sarauer: — Well, Mr. Chair, you have to either rule it in order and then put it to a vote, or rule it out of order.

Chair Goudy: — One side feels that it's out of order. The other side feels it's in order.

Hon. Lori Carr: — Mr. Speaker, you just said that to make a decision like this, it would be at a different table that we would have that discussion. So for that reason alone, it should be out of order.

Chair Goudy: — Oh, sorry . . .

Nicole Sarauer: — There is no process for these exemptions. Like we're speaking specifically about this exemption. There is no process for these exemptions. In fact we didn't even know that this exemption had occurred initially, right. We've had that conversation. We don't need to rehash that. This is the process that makes the most sense from our perspective. We believe that this motion is in order and we hope that you will allow it to go to a vote.

Chair Goudy: — So I just have to rule whether this motion . . . or do we vote whether this motion is in order or not?

A Member: — You rule whether it's in order or not.

Chair Goudy: — I have to rule. Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Mr. Chair, I just wanted to propose that perhaps you need time to consider how you're going to rule on whether or not this motion is in order.

Chair Goudy: — So let's . . . We can vote to adjourn debate. Like honestly I would like . . . Can someone move to adjourn debate on this motion?

We would have to adjourn the board, and then I can consider this. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this. So basically it would be the adjournment of the board meeting. Would someone move to adjourn the board meeting? Or is that everything? Unless there is any other business. Any other business? Any other business before we . . .

Hon. Lori Carr: — Mr. Chair, we're of the opinion that you need to rule whether the motion is actually in or out of order. And if you say it's out of order, then it's dead on the floor. And if you say it's in order, then I guess we'll go to a vote.

Mr. Speaker, could I make one more comment while you're looking for something?

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Carr.

Hon. Lori Carr: —I just want to reiterate in the letter that actually came directly from the Acting Law Clerk, the office that we're talking about right now:

> Mr. Weedmark approached the Speaker with this request in good faith and on advice of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, who would be the arbiter in any eventual appeal to this decision.

So she's asking for an appeal to the decision. Right here, according to this office, says that the Conflict of Interest Commissioner would be the arbiter of any eventual decision. So that in and of itself actually says that this is out of order.

Nicole Sarauer: — Mr. Chair?

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — Just in response, first of all we've already canvassed this point. But second of all, nothing in that content says anything about whether or not this motion is in order or out of order. That's the only question that's before you right now.

Chair Goudy: — Thank you for your patience. Our Legislative Assembly Act, 2007:

> **Review of use of allowances, etc.**
>
> **56**(1) At the request of any member or on the Speaker's own initiative, the Speaker may conduct, in the Speaker's capacity as chair of the board, any review the Speaker considers necessary to determine whether a member's use of any allowance, disbursement, payment, good, premises or service provided pursuant to this Act complies with:
>
> (a) the purposes for which the allowance, disbursement, payment, good, premises or service was provided; or
>
> (b) the purposes of this Act or the board's directives.
>
> (2) The Speaker shall inform a member of any review concerning the member as soon as is reasonably . . . [responsible].
>
> (3) If, after a review, the Speaker determines that a member's use of any allowance, disbursement, payment, good, premises or service provided pursuant to this Act

> does or does not comply with the purposes for which it was provided or with the purposes of this Act or the board's directives, the Speaker shall:
>
> (a) inform the member in writing of the determination; and
>
> (b) provide a copy of that determination to the board.

Which didn't get tabled, and again that was . . . Apologies for that.

[09:15]

To say now this is a Legislative Assembly Act . . . It's not part of this board's responsibility to change the Act. And my responsibility that I carried out to, you know, to the best of my ability, I gave a rationale for that decision. I would find this motion out of order because we'd have to . . . like we're voting to change the Legislative Assembly process, is what I'm saying. And so I therefore . . .

But I don't want to seem like I don't want to hear your concerns and your arguments. And you know, we could put things to a vote for my own benefit. But to say that the Speaker rescind all exemptions, that takes away the responsibility that the Speaker has through *The Legislative Assembly Act, 2007*. So I would find it . . . Yeah, I don't think there's good grounds for this motion. I am sorry.

But I would like to, you know, to know, to hear your perspective is that you would obviously like this direction to be taken by the Speaker. And the three government members, I think I know your perspective as well. So I appreciate your input into the decision-making process. Thank you.

Any other business? Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just arising out of the previous conversation we had with Ms. Lang about the fraudulent payment, I would like to table a motion to:

> Direct the Legislative Assembly Service to return to the Board of Internal Economy with a legal opinion on the pursuit, by civil proceedings, for the collection of any outstanding balance owed arising from the fraudulent invoice submitted to the LAS by the NDP caucus.

I would so move.

Hon. Lori Carr: — I'll second that.

Chair Goudy: — Seconded by Ms. Carr.

Nicole Sarauer: — Can I see the motion . . . [inaudible].

Hon. Tim McLeod: — I'll have to write it out. But I could read it again.

Nicole Sarauer: — Whichever you prefer.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — The motion is to:

> Direct the Legislative Assembly Service to return to the Board of Internal Economy with a legal opinion on the pursuit, by civil proceedings, for the collection of any outstanding balance owed arising from the payment of the fraudulent invoice submitted to the LAS by the NDP caucus.

A Member: — Just to see what the next steps could be towards getting the money.

Nicole Sarauer: — Yeah, I'm fine with that. It's just the process, like it's just the content, the accuracy of what happened. I'm fine with the legal opinion getting granted. Like it implies that . . .

Chair Goudy: — Ms. Sarauer.

Nicole Sarauer: — I have no issue with seeking a legal opinion about this process. I do want to make sure that the language that we're using about what occurred is accurate. To be clear: the invoice that was provided was not fraudulent; it was the banking information that was fraudulent. So there were valid invoices by a third-party vendor.

I believe the first few invoices were properly paid to the correct banking information. Then a fraudulent actor provided a change in banking information. Subsequently, those invoices were paid to that fraudulent banking information. It's just really important when we're talking about criminal activity that we're very, very accurate in what occurred.

So I would suggest government consider an amendment to this so that it's more accurate as to what happened. And then we'll be supportive.

Chair Goudy: — Mr. McLeod.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Thank you. I would propose to amend the language in the motion. As the member has accurately pointed out, the invoice wasn't fraudulent; the payment was.

Nicole Sarauer: — The banking information.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — The motion would be amended . . .

Hon. Lori Carr: — The banking information submitted.

Hon. Tim McLeod: — The motion would be amended to read . . . I move to:

> Direct the Legislative Assembly Service to return to the Board of Internal Economy with a legal opinion on the pursuit, by civil proceedings, for the collection of any outstanding balance owed arising from the fraudulent payment of the invoice submitted to the LAS by the NDP caucus.

I so move.

Nicole Sarauer: — The payment to fraudulent banking information . . . [inaudible].

Hon. Tim McLeod: — Makes a fraudulent payment.

Hon. Lori Carr: — He does get to the payment is what it is.

Nicole Sarauer: — Okay. Yeah, I think it's okay.

Chair Goudy: — And a seconder. Okay. It has been moved by Tim McLeod and seconded by Lori Carr that we, the BOIE:

> Direct the Legislative Assembly Service to return to the Board of Internal Economy with a legal opinion on the pursuit, by civil proceedings, for the collection of any outstanding balance owed arising from the fraudulent payment of the invoice submitted to the LAS by the NDP caucus.

All in favour? Carried.

Any other business? Anybody move to adjourn the meeting?

Hon. Tim McLeod: — I so move.

Chair Goudy: — Mr. McLeod. All in favour?

Thank you. So 9:25. The board stands adjourned to the call of the Chair at 9:25 a.m. Thank you all.

[The board adjourned at 09:25.]