

**REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER  
ON SALARIES, ALLOWANCES AND  
RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS  
OF THE MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**June 28, 2024**

**Michael D. Werier, K.C.  
Commissioner**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1.	<u>Introduction</u>	6
2.	<u>Relevant Recent Legislation</u>	7
3.	<u>History of Review Process in Manitoba</u>	7
4.	<u>The Review Process for this Report</u>	13
5.	<u>Principles Used to Determine Compensation and Allowances</u>	16
6.	<u>Judicial Compensation Report</u> (November 21, 2023, made public in April, 2024)	21
7.	<u>Economic Considerations</u>	25
8.	<u>Recent Wage Settlements</u>	29
9.	<u>Salary, Benefits and Allowance Reviews in Other Jurisdictions</u>	31
10.	<u>Members' Salary</u>	35
	Decision on Member's Salary	41
11.	<u>Premier's Salary</u>	42
	Decision on Premier's Salary	43
12.	<u>Salaries for Ministers, Speaker and Leader of the Opposition</u>	44
	Decision on Salaries for Ministers, Speaker and Leader of the Opposition	45
13.	<u>Salaries for House Leader (Government and Opposition), Chief Whip (Government and Opposition), Caucus Chair (Government and Opposition)</u>	46
	(1) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Government)	49
	(2) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Opposition)	49
	(3) Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Government)	50
	(4) Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Government)	50
	(5) Decision on Salary for Caucus Chair (Government and Opposition)	51

14.	<u>Pension Plan</u>	51
	Decision on Pension Plan	
(1)	Decision on Cost-of-Living Adjustment	56
(2)	Decision on Commuted Value Calculation	57
(3)	Decision on Times for Forms Submissions	58
(4)	Decision on Pre-Retirement Death	59
(5)	Decision on Death After Commencement of Pension – Change in Name of Act	59
15.	<u>Members' Allowances</u>	59
(a)	Clause 2 – Definitions	61
	- Decision on “non-arm’s length expense”	62
	- Decision on “kilometric rate”	62
(b)	Clause 3 – Northern, southern and Winnipeg regions	62
	- Decision on Northern, southern and Winnipeg regions	63
(c)	Clauses 4(1) and 5(1) – Payment of Expenses	63
	- Decision on Payment of Expenses	64
(d)	Clause 5(3) – What constitutes proof of payment	65
	- Decision on What constitutes proof of payment	65
(e)	Digital Signature – Original Documents	65
	- Decision on Digital Signature – Original Documents	65
(f)	Clause 5(5) – Claims for meal expenses	66
	- Decision on Claims for meal expenses	67
	- Decision on Clause 5(5) Rule 4	68
(g)	Clause 5(6) – Claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle	68
	- Decision on Claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle	69
(h)	Clause 8(2) – Certain allowances continue after ceasing to be a Member	69
	- Decision on Certain allowances continue after ceasing to be a Member	69
(i)	Clause 11(1) – Constituency Office Space	70
	- Decision on Constituency Office Space	70
(j)	Clause 12(1) – Constituency service and office operation	71
	- Decision on Constituency service and office operation	71

(k)	Clause 12(1)(u) – Costs of Framing	72
	- Decision on Costs of Framing	72
(l)	Clause 12(1.1) and 12(1.2) – Limit on communication devices and services, and Equipment and service plans for mobile communication	72
	- Decision on Limit on communication devices and services and Equipment and service plans for mobile communication	73
(m)	Clause 12(1)(i) (i) and (ii) – Advertising	73
	- Decision on advertising	74
(n)	Clause 12(1.3) – Incidental mailings	74
	- Decision on incidental mailings	75
(o)	Clause 14 – Representation Expenses	75
	- Decision on Representation Expenses	77
(p)	Clause 16.4(1) – Constituency Office rent allowance	79
	- Decision on Constituency Office rent allowance	79
(q)	Clause 20(1) – Travel Allowance	80
	- Decision on Travel Allowance	80
(r)	Clause 25(1)(b)(iii) and Clause 25.1(4)(b)(vii) – Cablevision Costs	80
	- Decision on Cablevision Costs	81
(s)	Clause 25(1)(c) and (d) – Authorized temporary residence expenses – rent for furniture	81
	- Decision on Authorized temporary residence expenses – rent for furniture	81
(t)	Clause 25.1(1) – Permanent residence treated as temporary residence	82
	- Decision on Permanent residence treated as temporary residence	82
(u)	Clause 31(1) – Miscellaneous – Appeal	83
	- Decision on Miscellaneous – Appeal	83
(v)	Other Benefits	83
(w)	Effective Date	84

Summary of Decisions 85

Appendix "A" 100

Members' Indemnities – 1974 to Current Fiscal Year

Appendix "B" 107

Jurisdictional Salaries – April 1, 2024

## 1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the fourth Report by a Commissioner since amendments to *The Legislative Assembly Act* mandated the Legislative Assembly Management Commission to appoint a Commissioner to decide on the appropriate salary, allowances and retirement benefits for Members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. The decisions are binding, and the Commissioner is to implement the decisions in the Report by the enactment of Regulations.

The Legislative Assembly Management Commission is chaired by the Speaker of the Assembly and consists of Members from all three Parties who have had Members elected in the last election. The Legislative Assembly Management Commission appointed Michael D. Werier, K.C. to be the Commissioner.

The Commissioner is to be appointed within six months after a general election and to provide the Report to the Speaker, who in turn tables the Report in the Assembly.

The previous three Reports under the current legislation were issued by this Commissioner in December, 2007, September, 2012, and July, 2017.

*The Legislative Assembly Act* requires that a Commissioner be appointed if 48 months have passed since the last general election. The previous government to the present one chose not to appoint a Commissioner and was not bound to do so, because the time period between elections was less than 48 months.

As a result, this Report is issued almost seven years after the last Report. During this time, we have seen many changes in the world and Manitobans, like others, have lived through a world-wide pandemic, volatile economic conditions resulting in high inflation, and dramatic developments in technology and how we communicate as a society.

These developments will be referenced in this Report as they have impact on the issues to be determined. The passage of time necessitates a careful examination of both the nature and quantum of the allowances.

Included in this Report will be a scan of Legislative Assembly compensation reports from other Canadian provinces that have been issued since 2017, an update on current compensations for all relevant positions, and a review of any significant developments, including statutory changes.

## **2. RELEVANT RECENT LEGISLATION**

*The Fiscal Responsibility and Taxpayer Act* (“FR&TP Act”) was enacted since the last report and requires that the Government not incur a deficit larger than the baseline amount. Ministers’ salaries are reduced if the requirement is not met.

The FR&TP Act mandated the Government to withhold 20% of the Ministers’ salaries which would increase to 40% if the Government deficit exceeds the baseline amount for two consecutive years. The amounts withheld are repaid if there is no deficit or it is below the baseline. All salary withheld has been repaid.

## **3. HISTORY OF REVIEW PROCESS IN MANITOBA**

In the 2007 report on Salaries, Allowances and Retirement Benefits, this Commissioner reviewed the history of the review process in Manitoba and it is included in this Report as it was in 2012 and 2017, with updates since that time. It is relevant to gaining an understanding of the significant developments over time.

Attached to this Report is Appendix “A” which lists Members’ Indemnities from 1974 to the present.

In 1970, an independent committee was appointed to review Members' indemnities and remuneration. This committee reported in February of 1971. Among its recommendations was that "a periodic review of Members' indemnities and allowances be carried out at regular intervals by an independent body".

In February 1980, Mr. Justice Gordon C. Hall issued a Report and Recommendations on salaries, indemnities, allowances and pensions. He suggested that a committee of the House address the issue of a permanent solution for the review of remuneration. In between 1970, 1979 and 1993, either a committee of the legislature or the full Assembly was responsible for recommendations and changes to Members' compensation.

In March 1994, the Indemnity and Allowances Commission issued its report. Under the provisions of *The Legislative Assembly Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act*, it was empowered to review and determine all aspects of compensation for Members and Commission decisions were also to be binding. The Commission was also empowered to make recommendations on a process for review in the future. This was the first Commission in Manitoba history to have the power to decide compensation rather than merely make recommendations.

This Commission's report was issued in March, 1994, and its decision came into force following the April 25, 1995 general election pursuant to the provisions of the legislation.

The changes made in 1995 are noteworthy for a number of reasons. The tax-free allowance portion of the Member's indemnity was abolished along with the car allowance. The Member's salary was established at \$56,500.00 representing a 1.5% increase over April, 1994. Future salary adjustments were to be tied to the percentage change (up or down) in the average yearly wage in Manitoba.

Of most significance were changes made to the pension arrangements for Members. The amendments to *The Legislative Assembly Act* which created the Commission set out that the existing Defined Benefit Pension Plan with an accrual rate of 3% be eliminated after



the next election. The Commission decided that this retirement plan was to be replaced with a Registered Retirement Savings Plan with matching contributions of up to 7% by the Members and the Province.

While the Commission commented that the Manitoba pension plan was among the least generous for elected officials in Canada, it determined that the pension arrangements were excessively generous and exceeded community standards. While thought to be fair at the time, this decision proved to be unfair and ultimately resulted in further changes years later. This will be the subject of comment later on in this Report.

From 1995 until 2005, Members received cost-of-living increases ranging from 0.0% to 3.3%.

In 2002, the Commission for Members' pay was established by *The Legislative Assembly Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act*. The Speaker, as Chair of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, engaged Earl Backman as sole Commissioner. His report outlining his recommendations was dated May 14, 2004. Under the terms of *The Legislative Assembly Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act*, the Legislature had to vote on the report as a whole.

The report contained a wide range of recommendations, including increases to Members' salaries, increases to salaries for Cabinet Ministers and the Premier, and changes to the pension plan. The report was summarily rejected by the Legislature which passed a resolution asserting that salary increases were not appropriate given economic conditions in the Province and asking that the Commissioner review the section on salary increases with a view to deferring them.

A supplementary report was issued by Backman on June 8, 2004 which recommended that the 1.4% salary and additional indemnity increases already paid for 2004-2005 be rolled back effective April 1, 2004. These recommendations were implemented. The Commissioner further recommended that the Legislature give some consideration to

removing the necessity for Members to vote directly on their compensation levels and possibly delegate the duty to a truly independent body or Commissioner. Backman stated that this type of process “would be less self-serving and more acceptable to the public trough”, and that to continue the present process “will forever be an exercise in masochism that serves neither the MLA nor the public very well”.

The Legislature acted on the above recommendation by setting up an Interim Commissioner who would have the authority to decide on compensation levels. The Legislative Assembly Management Commission appointed Dr. Jerry L. Gray with a request that he consider only the cost-of-living increase, an increase to the basic annual salary of Members, and salary increases only in specific roles.

The report was issued May 5, 2005. The report decided that a 2.5% cost-of-living increase to Members and Executive Council be effective April 1, 2005 and were to be computed on the 2003-2004 salaries. The annual basic Member’s salary was to be \$67,173.00 and the April 1, 2006 salary, \$72,000.00. Other adjustments were made to the salary for the Speaker, Caucus Chairs, and to the COLA system.

The report also made a number of recommendations, none of which were binding, including that the past service buyback program of the Legislative Assembly Pension Plan be reviewed because of the inability of Members to buy back service to the extent recommended in the May 14, 2004 Backman report.

The first report under the new provisions of *The Legislative Assembly Act* was issued December 19, 2007. The decisions were binding on the Legislature and the Regulation was amended to reflect the decisions in the report.

It was determined that Manitoba ranked 8 out of 10 of all the provinces for Members’ salaries. The salary was increased from \$74,982.00 to \$82,000.00. Cost-of-living increases were given for 2008 and 2009 until the freeze was imposed late in 2009.

At the time, the Premier's salary was the lowest of all the provinces at \$124,509.00. The additional salary was increased to \$67,018.00 from \$49,527.00 effective May 22, 2007, resulting in a total compensation of \$149,018.00.

The additional salary for Ministers and that of the Speaker and Leader of the Opposition was increased from \$30,957.00 to \$44,018.00.

There were no changes made to the pension plan or severance pay. Numerous changes were made to the allowances scheme, including the establishment of a separate constituency allowance expense and enhanced travel allowances.

On September 1, 2010, this Commissioner was appointed as Allowances Commissioner to review the Auditor General's 2009 Annual Report as it relates to Members' allowances and to decide what regulations or amendments to regulations should be made in order to implement the recommendations contained in the Auditor General's Report.

The Auditor General's Report contained numerous recommendations, including that there be increased transparency and accountability and that information about expenses be available to the public.

The Auditor General's Report also recommended that each category of representation expenses be reviewed and amended to reflect contemporary best practice. The areas of expenses allowed under the representation category included donations (cash and product), event tickets, scholarships and bursaries, hospitality, meals, flowers, and other promotional items.

The Report of the Allowances Commissioner outlined a number of decisions, including the elimination of donations and gifts as authorized expenses and changes to the publication of information about Members' spending, providing for greater access to information by the public.

The Members' annual report is now published on the Government website, together with monthly reports of the amounts spent under the Constituency Allowance, Constituency Assistants Allowance, travel, printing, and committee allowance, along with posting of the claims for each allowance.

Members of the public can examine copies of receipts and claims submitted.

In the 2012 Report, extensive changes were made to the Regulation dealing with authorized expenses.

The salary for Members was set at \$89,500.00 as of April 1, 2014, and the additional salary for the Premier was set at \$75,000.00 effective April 1, 2014.

The additional salary levels for Ministers, the Speaker, and the Leader of the Official Opposition were increased to \$49,000.00 effective April 1, 2014.

Cost-of-living increases were to be applied on April 1, 2015 and April 1st of each year thereafter until a new decision was made.

No changes were made to the pension plan in 2012.

The main feature of the 2017 Report was that the annual salary for April 1, 2017 was \$94,513.00 and salaries were frozen for the periods commencing April 1, 2018 and 2019.

The Report further stated that a cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2020 and April 1<sup>st</sup> in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase was to be calculated on the basis of the previous five-year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index.

As the next provincial election was held less than 48 months after the previous election, the government was not required to appoint a Commissioner. As a result, pay increases were determined by the formula set out above.

The cost-of-living increases based on the formula were as follows:

2020/21 – 1.8%

2021/22 – 1.6%

2022/23 – 2.0%

2023/24 – 3.3%

2024/25 – 3.5%

The compensation for additional salaries (i.e. Premier, Cabinet positions, Party Whips) remained at the 2016 level for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The cost-of-living increases were applied for the subsequent years.

The other significant change was the increase in Members' contributions to the LAPP from 7% of salary to 9% in a staggered manner.

Lastly, there were various amendments to certain allowances.

#### **4. THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR THIS REPORT**

Pursuant to *The Legislative Assembly Act*, the Commissioner asked Manitobans to submit their views on Members' compensation in writing.

There were advertisements requesting input in three (3) Manitoba daily newspapers between the dates of March 2, 2024 and March 3, 2024. The advertisements were also published in six (6) weekly newspapers throughout the province between March 1, 2024 and March 13, 2024 (including one Indigenous newspaper). Lastly, the advertisements

were run in twenty-seven (27) rural community newspapers during the week of March 4, 2024.

Twenty-two (22) written submissions were received from members of the public.

The Commissioner specifically sought input on the issues from the following groups and organizations:

- Manitoba Chambers of Commerce
- Canadian Taxpayers Federation
- Association of Manitoba Municipalities
- Manitoba Federation of Labour
- Manitoba School Boards Association
- The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce
- Manitoba Government and General Employees' Union (MGEU)
- MLA Representation
- Association of Former Manitoba MLAs
- Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE)
- Manitoba Teachers' Society (MTS)
- Business Council of Manitoba
- Canadian Federation of Independent Business
- Manitoba Employers Council
- Manitoba Nurses Union (MNU)

A written brief was received from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. Submissions were received from Manitoba Employers Council and the Business Council of Manitoba.

The Commissioner had telephone discussions with the Executive Director of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, the President & CEO of The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, and the President of the Association of Former Manitoba MLAs.

The Commissioner interviewed many Members of the Assembly and conducted virtual meetings with representatives of both the NDP and PC Caucuses.

In addition, the Commissioner reviewed reports issued since the last Report in 2017, including Nova Scotia MLA Remuneration Review (July, 2022), Report of the Independent Committee Established to Review and Make Recommendations on the Salaries and Benefits of Members of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick (September 29, 2022), Prince Edward Island Indemnities & Allowances Commission Report (2023), and Members' Compensation Review Committee Report – Newfoundland and Labrador (April, 2024).

The Commissioner also had available for review the Regulations or manuals from various provinces relating to their system of allowances.

All of the above reports were of great assistance in arriving at the decisions contained in this Report. Some are specifically referenced in this Report.

The Commissioner reviewed compensation and pension plans in place for Members across Canada, together with salary information for Members of Parliament, the Mayor and City Council of Winnipeg, and the CEOs of Crown Corporations.

A review was conducted of economic information relating to the state of the Manitoba and Canadian economy. This included statistics from Statistics Canada, the Government of Manitoba, and forecasts and analysis from Canada's chartered banks.

The Commissioner also reviewed statistics relating to cost-of-living increases and settlements made by the Province of Manitoba and its Crown Corporations with its unionized employees.

## 5. **PRINCIPLES USED TO DETERMINE SALARIES, BENEFITS and ALLOWANCES**

The *Legislative Assembly Act* does not set out the criteria and factors to be taken into account when determining the appropriate salary levels, and the amount and type of benefits and allowances.

In earlier Reports in 2007, 2012 and 2017, this Commissioner reviewed the principles that should guide this task. Through the years other provinces have appointed a single Commissioner or a panel to review and report to the Legislature. In some provinces, the report is binding. In others, it is a recommendation.

In some provinces, the Legislatures have frozen salaries such as in Ontario since 2009. In Alberta, following Mr. Justice Major's review in 2012, the annual salary was set at \$134,000.00 and was to be adjusted annually based on Alberta's Consumer Price Index. Since then its salaries have been either frozen or reduced. The current salary of \$120,936.00 has been in place since December, 2019.

Manitoba as well has had freezes on salary and reduction of Ministers' salaries due to Government legislation.

In all the reviews across Canada, including the most recent ones since the last Report dealing with salaries, benefits, and allowances of Members of legislative assemblies, the Reports have stressed that concepts of fairness, reasonableness and equity to both elected officials and the public should govern.

I have reviewed the prior Reports prepared in this Province. I have decided that it is useful to reproduce the observations and comments made in earlier Reports by this Commissioner and others. This is particularly so because of the time that has passed since the Report in 2017.

For ease of reference, I include extracts from the 2012 Report.



“In 2007, this Commissioner stated that in the preparation of the report I have been guided by the principles of fairness.

I went on to say the following:

‘While there undoubtedly exists different points of view as to what actually is fair, the approach taken in most interest arbitrations which are used to determine compensation levels, both in the private and public sector, is to use certain objective criteria and comparators. This avoids decision making based on emotion or anecdotal evidence.’

The concepts of fairness, reasonableness and equity are standards that have been adopted by previous Commissioners in Manitoba when reviewing compensation of Members. For example, The Indemnities and Allowances Commission in 1994 stated:

‘Any system of pay or salary must be fair, reasonable, and equitable to both the member and the public. A member is entitled to a reasonable level of pay or salary commensurate with the responsibilities of the position. The level of salary should reflect the economic realities of the province. Comparisons should be made to salary indices within Manitoba such as the average weekly wage and welfare rates and to other benchmarks such as pay levels for other public service positions within Manitoba. Inter-provincial rankings of MLAs’ salaries should compare reasonably to the Province’s relative economic position. A compensation system designed in this way will allow the general public to understand what is provided to an MLA and will allow the MLA to be clearly responsible and accountable.’

In his report to the Legislative Assembly dated May 5, 2005, Commissioner Dr. Jerry Gray stated:

‘The only valid and practical method in these situations is to (a) approach the problem through a system of multiple measurements - also known as benchmarks, and (b) make an informed and independent judgment based upon all of the benchmarks observed. Although no specific weight was assigned to any factor, it should be noted that the decisions contained in this report are, in the final analysis, my judgment with regard to the primary criteria of *fairness*. There are many other factors that were considered in making the decisions

(see Section 2.2), but the overriding objective was to achieve a situation that, in my view, moved toward fairness in pay for our elected legislators. Although all Manitobans would not likely agree to the specific definition of what is “fair”, few - if any - would argue that our MLAs should not be compensated in a fair and equitable manner. Given the complexity of the issue, the appointment of a single, independent person to make an informed judgment regarding “fairness” is the most reasonable approach.’

These concepts of fairness, reasonableness and equitable compensation are found in numerous reports across the country, including the Green Report in Newfoundland and Labrador and the Major Report in Alberta. I endorse these concepts today as I did in 2007.

What factors are taken into account in arriving at fair, reasonable and equitable compensation?

In Manitoba, Commissioners reviewing compensation have utilized certain benchmarks. In 2004, Commissioner Backman wrote:

‘Faced with the foregoing realities, it is apparent that comparisons with other jurisdictions in Canada and comparisons of the economic activity and success of Manitoba relative to other provinces should be primary factors in determining how we taxpayers compensate our elected representatives.’

In 2005, Commissioner Gray set out the following factors:

‘Some of the factors used in making the decisions are (in no particular order):

- Salary comparisons with the elected roles in other federal, provincial and municipal governments
- The need to have compensation levels that make the MLA role attractive to highly qualified candidates
- Unfairness in salaries often must be corrected over time
- The need to have compensation levels that reflect the importance of the MLA role

- The public sensitivity to how much the roles of elected officials should be paid
- The unique requirements of the MLA role, including the lack of job security and the accountability processes
- The increased cost-of-living since the last MLA pay increase
- Comparable workloads of the various roles in the Legislative Assembly
- General compensation principles, policies and practices in the private sector'

As I indicated in 2007, all of these factors are relevant. At times, greater weight will be placed on certain factors.

As a rule, weight will be placed on salary comparisons with other provinces, the importance of the role played by Members of the Legislature, the need to attract qualified candidates to run for public office, and the general state of the Manitoba economy and its standing compared to other jurisdictions across the country.

These criteria remain relevant and have been applied in reaching the decisions set out in this Report.

The duties of a Member are very relevant. It is almost an impossible task to compare the job of a Member to other occupations. It is instructive to review salaries paid to civil servants, including Deputy Ministers and employees of Crown Corporations. These salaries are not direct comparators, but are relevant.

The Members have a unique and important role in our society. There is widespread acceptance amongst independent commissioners or committees who have conducted reviews. They have all concluded that Members must be compensated fairly for the role they play and the duties they perform.

Some members of the public believe that Members are paid too much and are in it just for the money. I received representations this year that salaries be reduced by 5%. I believe this is a minority view and the majority of Manitobans value the role played by Members.

I repeat my comments of the Report of 2007:

'The role played by Members, and those sitting in Cabinet, is an important one. The decisions made by the Legislature, whether it be in the area of criminal justice, social welfare, economic development, education, taxation, or health, can have a major impact on the quality of life in Manitoba. It is necessary to pay Members at a level which will continue to attract suitable highly qualified candidates to serve the public good. This need of course needs to be balanced with the other considerations outlined earlier.

While a Member in the 1970's and 1980's may have maintained another job, they have been required for many years to put in long hours in the constituency and at the Legislature. Many rural members, in particular, spend a great deal of time travelling over large distances to community events. Changes in technology have created an expectation on the public of an immediate response to any query or demand. Constituency Assistants working out of a constituency office are standard throughout Canada.

The amount of compensation that should be paid to various occupational groups can be a controversial issue. Members of the public very often have strong views one way or the other. Some members of the public will focus on politicians whose conduct has been illegal or questionable. However, every occupational group has members who do not adhere to the professional, legal and ethical standards expected or required of them. Manitoba has experienced a high standard of conduct from its Members over the years.

The vast majority of Members choose to run for office because they wish to act in the public interest. The role of a Member is an extremely important one in a democracy. It is essential that people of high standards continue to seek public office. The remuneration must take this into account and be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.' "

The salaries paid in other jurisdictions to Members are obviously relevant and weight must be placed on them. But care must be taken in doing this because economic conditions

in the provinces are not stable and traditional “have” provinces are not as strong economically as they have been in the past.

In the final analysis, all of the above considerations must be taken into account in arriving at a decision. I have been guided by these principles in making decisions on compensation, benefits and allowances.

**6. JUDICIAL COMPENSATION REPORT**  
**(November 21, 2023, made public in April, 2024)**

The Report was referred to in the Introduction of this Report. While the jurisdiction of the Judicial Compensation Committee (“JCC”) is different than that of this Commissioner, and judges are treated in a unique fashion due to certain constitutional principles, it is instructive to reference the economic evidence and findings which were used by the Committee in arriving at their decision on compensation.

The JCC received written and oral evidence from Professor Trevor Tombe, Economics Professor from the University of Calgary.

Certain portions of his Report are reproduced below because they provide an overview of Manitoba’s economy and how it stands in relation to other provinces, and in particular Saskatchewan and the Maritime provinces.

“Economically, Manitoba is among the most diversified of Canada’s provinces and therefore one of its most stable. It has a significant presence in agriculture, mining, energy (primarily hydroelectricity) manufacturing, and a variety of service sectors, such that periods of difficulty in one area of its economy are typically offset by growth in another. In terms of the province’s overall level of economic activity, Manitoba is above average in terms of its underlying strength in some areas and below average in others. The analysis in this report reveals that Saskatchewan and the Maritime provinces are the most comparable regions for Manitoba’s economy across indicators such as labour market trends, wages, income, affordability and

public sector employment size. However, when considering broader measures like nominal and real GDP per capita, the Maritime provinces prove to be the best comparators, while Saskatchewan and Newfoundland and Labrador have higher economic activity due to their substantial resource sectors. This high GDP does not directly translate into higher levels of average labour compensation, however, since the two economies are highly capital intensive and therefore a substantial share of income goes to returns earned by owners of that capital. On a pre-tax basis, average income levels in Manitoba are significantly higher than in the Maritimes, and nearly equal to those in Saskatchewan.

Economically, I find Saskatchewan and the Maritime provinces are the most suitable comparators for Manitoba, largely due to similarities in labour market trends, wages, incomes, prices, public sector employment, and overall GDP per capita. Financially, the fundamentals of Manitoba's provincial finances are more comparable to those of the Maritimes, but over time may improve. Canada's system of equalization payments also provides more than sufficient compensation to Manitoba, especially given its lower overall price level for goods and services relative to other jurisdictions.

Looking ahead to 2026, Manitoba's economic and fiscal output is also positive. The average annual rates of normal GDP growth are forecast to be 3.8 percent between 2023 and 2026, with Real GDP growth averages between 1.4 and 1.8 percent per year, depending on the projection. Average wage and salary growth is also anticipated to materially exceed inflation in the coming years.... . In terms of finances, following several years of expenditure restraint between 2016 and 2020, Manitoba's budget outlook anticipates program expenditures will grow with population and inflation until 2026 while total revenues will grow at an average annual rate of nearly one percentage point higher. My own projections suggest an even stronger fiscal outlook, in part due to a notable increase in the growth rate of federal health transfers.

Overall, I conclude from this analysis that a combination of the Maritimes and Saskatchewan, with somewhat greater emphasis on the latter, provides a broadly appropriate economic and fiscal comparator for Manitoba. And over the coming years, this comparison will hold, with gradually increasing weight given to Saskatchewan. Manitoba's diverse and stable economy and its positive fiscal outlook means the province is well-positioned to navigate through potential challenges ahead."

On the basis of Tombe's entire evidence, the JCC stated that they were mindful of the following factors when making recommendations:

“1. There are some important similarities and some important differences between the economies of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and some important similarities and some important differences between the economies of Manitoba and those of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

2. The labour markets of Manitoba and Saskatchewan have some striking similarities. The unemployment rates, the employment rates and the labour market participation rates in the two provinces are much the same.

3. Although average employment earnings in Saskatchewan (approximately \$1,180 per week) are somewhat higher than in Manitoba (approximately \$1,100 per week), annual household incomes (accounting for income from sources in addition to employment income) are very similar in Manitoba (approximately \$75,000 per year) and in Saskatchewan (approximately \$76,000 per year). All of these figures are higher than the comparable figures in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

4. The percentage of people employed in the public sector is very similar in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

5. The population profiles and other demographics of Manitoba and Saskatchewan are also very similar.

6. Both the Real Gross Domestic Product (“GDP”) and the Nominal GDP of Manitoba are comparable to the Real and Nominal GDPs of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Saskatchewan’s Real GDP and Nominal GDP are significantly higher than those of Manitoba, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

7. The net public debt and the net debt to GDP ratios are very similar in Manitoba, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, and are much higher than in Saskatchewan. Debt servicing costs are therefore higher in Manitoba (and in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) than in Saskatchewan.

8. The tax base in Saskatchewan (consisting of personal income tax, corporate and business taxes, consumption taxes and property taxes) is broader than the tax base in Manitoba, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. As a result, personal income taxes are generally higher in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan, because Manitoba is required to rely more heavily than Saskatchewan on personal income tax to generate revenue.

9. Saskatchewan’s fiscal capacity (the ability to raise revenue through taxation) is higher than that of Manitoba, New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia.

10. Program expenditures on a per capita basis are much higher in Saskatchewan than in Manitoba and New Brunswick.”

The JCC went on to say:

“As noted above, Professor Tombe concludes that the Maritime provinces and Saskatchewan are the best economic comparators for Manitoba, but with a “somewhat greater emphasis” on Saskatchewan.

A clear difference between the economy of Saskatchewan and the economies of Manitoba, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia is that Saskatchewan has a much more substantial resource sector (consisting most notably of significant oil and potash resources) than the other three provinces. This has resulted in greater capital investment in Saskatchewan compared to the other three provinces.

Notwithstanding that difference, Professor Tombe assesses Saskatchewan as being a somewhat closer comparator to Manitoba than New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, for various reasons outlined in his report and which he elaborated upon during his oral presentation. He emphasized the following:

1. Income levels between Manitoba and Saskatchewan are very similar (partially explained by the proposition that, in an economy with less capital investment, a greater share of income goes to labour rather than to the owners of capital);
2. As a result of Manitoba having a very balanced and diversified economy it has a low risk profile. Notwithstanding a relatively high level of public debt, Professor Tombe referred to Manitoba’s credit rating being the same as those of Alberta and Saskatchewan, in spite of the lower public debt in those provinces, as evidence of Manitoba’s economic stability and sustainability;
3. Manitoba’s receipt of substantial equalization payments from the federal government provide it with a fiscal capacity comparable to that of Saskatchewan.”

The JCC noted that the Province’s economic material emphasized the following:

“1. The unprecedented negative economic impact of the pandemic, the high rates of inflation associated with the recovery and the continuing inflationary pressures existing within Canada, including Manitoba, present significant challenges which are likely to persist for some time.

2. The increase in spending associated with pandemic relief programs and recovery efforts have produced large deficits in Manitoba in 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 and a record high net debt to GDP ratio.

3. Although the Manitoba economy has recovered well and projections are for growth in revenue, such growth is projected to be modest over the next



few years, limiting Manitoba's fiscal capacity and its ability to significantly reduce the level of public debt. A recession or economic downturn is a realistic prospect.

4. Continuing uncertainty relating to inflation, high interest rates, climate related events, the war in Ukraine, and disruptions in international trade, require prudence in the management of public resources.”

The Committee recommended an increase of 8.5% for fiscal year 2023, and the percentage change in average weekly earnings for Manitoba on April 1, 2024 and on April 1, 2025. In reaching its conclusion the JCC took into account a number of factors including, but not restricted to, increasing salaries across Canada, inflation, and that Manitoba Judicial compensation should be near the midpoint of Canada, and higher than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and lower than Saskatchewan.

## **7. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS**

The state of the Manitoba economy is a material factor in assessing fair and reasonable compensation. The comparator salaries are those paid in other Canadian provinces. Therefore, it is important to assess and compare Manitoba's economic performance and status to other provinces, particularly with similar populations and size.

Further it is relevant to take into account any specific factors which justify either a cautionary approach (e.g. large deficits or droughts) or a more optimistic approach (e.g. new industrial growth with increased employment opportunities).

Generally speaking over the last number of decades Manitoba's economy has been considered to be at or near the midrange of economies across the country. Accordingly, the Judicial Compensation Committee which makes recommendations and decisions respecting salaries of Provincial Judges, has consistently confirmed that as a general principle, Provincial Judges' salaries should be at or near the midrange of salaries across the country. As noted, this was again reiterated in the JCC 2023 Report.

It is important to highlight that *The Provincial Judges Act* mandates that the Committee set out the three-province average of salaries in Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and that the Province is bound to adopt any recommendation that is below or at the level of the three-province average.

While the provision in *The Provincial Judges Act* has been in place for years, and the respective economies of the three provinces have fluctuated over time and are not of equal strength, they are considered to be good comparables.

As pointed out in the review of the 2023 JCC Report, the economic evidence and the finding of the Committee was that Manitoba Judges' compensation should be closer to Saskatchewan (but lower) and higher than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Further, it is clear that the state of the provincial economies has impacted freezes or increases in compensation, both in Manitoba and elsewhere. Briefly put, various jurisdictions have put freezes and/or rollbacks on compensation levels for MLAs. These involve political decisions and/or independent reviews which have taken into account economic challenges / deficit consideration across the country.

What is the state of the Canadian economy and how does Manitoba's economy compare to other provinces? What is the future outlook?

While opinions and projections vary there are certain common themes that one can see in the Reports from the major banks and economists.

The Canadian economy, like others around the world, was impacted greatly by the pandemic and the ensuing inflation and business closures. Events around the globe have created instability and uncertainty.

There is some optimism presently that things are improving due to the possible continuing reduction of interest rates and a drop in inflation. There are improved growth projections

across the country, but by no means are the projections “rosy” and most provinces are expecting sub-trend performance.

The economic picture both nationally and in the province is mixed with both positive and negative aspects.

Eight of ten provinces will post deficits this year with only Alberta and New Brunswick projecting a budget surplus. There are positive signs nationally as commodity prices are expected to be high.

The strength of Manitoba’s economy lies in its diversity. It is not a boom or bust economy as in some other provinces which are heavily dependent on certain commodity prices. Unemployment rates are amongst the lowest in Canada. The recent heavy rainfall will be helpful to Manitoba Hydro and to the agricultural economy. High commodity prices should be a positive factor. Inflation rates recently are amongst the lowest in Canada.

There are signs in the economy that certain industries have rebounded from the pandemic and are growing. A recent article in the Winnipeg Free Press highlighted Loewen Window and its resurgence. There are other examples of Manitoba industries that are growing and hiring new workers.

Juxtaposed against these positive indicators is the fact that Manitoba is projecting a deficit of \$796 million, down from \$2 billion in 2023/24. High interest rates affected Manitobans as they did other Canadians. In February 2024, Deloitte’s Chief Economist stated Manitoba consumers are saddled with the country’s fourth highest debt to income ratio. Manitoba’s economy has continued to grow by 1.1% which is below the national average.

Manitoba’s financial picture is assisted as it has been in the past, by large transfer payments, but analysts question how long these payments will last.

In the final analysis, one must take into account all of the above factors including that Manitoba continues to be at or near the midrange of provincial economies. The deficit remains a concern in Manitoba as it does in most provinces across Canada, and must weigh into any assessment of fair and reasonable compensation.

There are different views amongst economists as to the impact of deficits on the overall economy. While it is acknowledged that interest payments on indebtedness have an obvious effect on the economy, some economists argue a certain level of debt is tolerable in order to maintain public spending in priority areas. The level of acceptable debt and spending becomes in part a political decision for each province and for the federal government.

For example, certain provinces will elect to limit public sector wage increases and others will be more willing to negotiate higher increases for a variety of reasons. In Manitoba, recent public sector wage settlements have been much higher than preceding years of wage freezes or small increases. These increases have been put in place to address the freezes of earlier years and to compensate for recent high inflation.

The table at Appendix “A” to this Report shows that since 2008, there have been eight (8) years of 0% increases for Members’ salaries.

The recent public sector settlements are reviewed in a separate section of this Report. What is apparent is that while reducing the deficit is a goal of government, it will not preclude public sector wage increases. To that extent the prevailing economic priority differs from 2017, when the last review was conducted, when bringing down the deficit and controlling government spending was the prevailing economic policy priority.

## 8. RECENT WAGE SETTLEMENTS

I have indicated in past Reports that salary increases paid to other public sector employees are useful in setting fair and reasonable compensation for Members of the Assembly.

Having said that, there is not an entrenched principle that increases for Members of the Assembly should mirror public sector wage increases. One of the reasons is that there are other factors that are at play in the negotiation of collective agreements which may affect wage increases. These include such matters as no layoff clauses or work from home articles.

Manitoba civil service workers represented by MGEU accepted a new four-year collective agreement in January, 2024. The agreement impacts approximately 11,500 members.

The agreement was retroactive to March, 2023. The increases are as follows:

- (a) 2023 – 2.5%;
- (b) 2024 – 2.75%;
- (c) 2025 – 3.0%;
- (d) 2026 – 3.0%.

It is important to note that the civil service agreement included some additional benefits, including a one-time signing bonus of \$1,800.00 for full-time employees, and additional wage increases for recruitment and retention.

The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and MGEU reached an agreement last fall after a strike which began on August 25, 2023. The four-year agreement was from September 27, 2022 to September 26, 2026.

The increases are as follows:

- (a) 2022 – 3.0%;
- (b) 2023 – 3.0%;
- (c) 2024 – 3.4% (2.9% General Wage Increase + 0.5% Retention Adjustment Increase);
- (d) 2025 – 3.6% (2.8% General Wage Increase + 0.8% Retention Adjustment Increase).

It is also important to note that 63% of members were to receive an additional 3.5% wage increase over the life of the agreement as a result of a new maximum increment step for each pay grade. There was also an \$1,800.00 signing bonus and a no-layoff memorandum.

Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries has seven bargaining units. The MGEU liquor workers agreed on a four-year agreement in effect from March 25, 2022 to March 24, 2026 with increases of 2% per year together with special pay scale adjustments resulting in wage increases of 12% over the next four years.

The Manitoba Nurses Union and various health authorities (excepting Shared Health – HSC) ratified a new four-year agreement. The contract was not ratified by the 3,400 nurses working at Shared Health.

The contract is as follows:

- (a) April 1, 2024 – 2.5%
- (b) April 1, 2025 – 2.75%;
- (c) April 1, 2026 – 3.0%;
- (d) April 1, 2027 – 3.0%.

In addition, there were additional payments including a 1% market adjustment, long service pay increases, Northern premiums, emergency and intensive care premiums, reassignment premiums and increases in health spending accounts.

These additional amounts are related in part to recruitment and retention issues in staffing.

Private sector settlements for 2024 are projected to be in the range of 2.9% to 3.6%. Estimates at the upper end of the range made in the fall of 2023 have proven to be overly optimistic, but settlements are still in the 3% range.

## **9. SALARY, BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCE REVIEWS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS**

There are a variety of procedures in place across Canada for reviewing salaries, benefits and allowances for Members of the provincial legislative assembly.

Certain provinces, like Manitoba, appoint an independent committee to receive input from the public, Members and experts, as the case may be, and to issue a Report. In most instances, the Committees have the power to make recommendations, but not to unilaterally make changes.

In the 2017 Report, I highlighted certain past reports including the comprehensive Green Report from Newfoundland, and the Major Report from Alberta.

I have included my review of these reports which was originally in the 2012 Report and repeated in the 2017 Report as follows.

The Report of the Review Committee on Constituency Allowances and Related Matters in Newfoundland was issued in May, 2007. The Commission was chaired by The Honourable J. Derek Green, Chief Justice of Newfoundland, and the report has come to be known as the “Green Report”.

The report contains a thorough analysis of the system of compensation and allowances in that province and also contains an examination of the principles that should be applied

in determining fair and reasonable compensation and what allowances are no longer deemed to be appropriate (e.g. donations).

Green's report is useful for its review of the role played by elected officials and the demands placed on them.

The Green Report stated it this way:

“Service as an elected member in a representative assembly is, and should be, one of the highest callings to which a person can aspire in a democratic society. It is a vocation that is unlike virtually any other. It provides great opportunities for public service and for the possibility of having a direct influence on important issues at the centre of public affairs. Yet it also calls for considerable personal sacrifice and, in some cases, financial sacrifice as well. In short, it requires a special sort of person. Those who offer themselves for public office and who meet the high standards expected of them deserve commendation, not condemnation.”

The Province of Alberta MLA Compensation Review was released in May, 2012. It was chaired by The Honourable J.C. Major, retired Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Of note are the five general principles that guided that Commission in the preparation of the Report.

The five principles are:

“Firstly, clarity and accessibility have been two essential principles in this undertaking. The Commission's aim was to make the Report clear, accessible and comprehensible to the general public, and to avoid the technical terminology that exists on the subject of compensation.

Second, transparency is necessary. This principle must apply to both the process of preparing the Report and its recommendations. The evidence gathered by the Commission on MLA compensation and the conclusions drawn based on that evidence should be open and transparent to the public.



A third goal, which relates to the second principle, is to gain confidence in MLA compensation and in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. It is understandable that Albertans, as interested taxpayers, dislike – and distrust – a complex compensation system with elements that are regarded as hidden or unfair. The aim is for the recommendations contained in this Report to allow Albertans to understand the process by which their representatives are remunerated, although they may disagree with the result. To that end, an attempt has been made to use objective criteria available in the analysis of the position of MLA and in the assessment of MLA compensation.

Fourthly, the recruitment and retention of qualified competent candidates must be an objective of this Report. Albertans expect – and should attract – the most qualified representatives prepared to undertake public service.

Finally, it is recognized that the principal objective is to recommend compensation that is fair and reasonable to the Members who work in the Legislative Assembly and understandable to the taxpayers to whom they are accountable. Members should be remunerated in total in a manner that is commensurate with the duties, responsibilities and importance of their role.”

There is a consensus view articulated across the country regarding the principles that should be applied in these reviews. The reviews emphasize the importance of the role played by Members and the need to pay fair and reasonable compensation in order to attract people to run for elected office.

The reviews acknowledge the unique role played by Members and as a result, comparison with other provinces’ remuneration is given a high priority, after taking into account the differences between the provinces’ economies, population and size.

There have been four provincial reports since 2017: Nova Scotia (July, 2022), New Brunswick (September, 2022), Prince Edward Island Report (2023), and Newfoundland and Labrador (April, 2024).

In other provinces, government has not been required by statute to convene an independent review. In certain provinces such as Saskatchewan, government has taken

action to limit increases, while in others such as Ontario, a freeze on MLA salary increases has been in place for years.

Certain features of each provincial report since 2017 will be highlighted.

The Nova Scotia Report on MLA Indemnity and Salaries was the first review since 2014. The recommendations of the panel are binding. A main feature of the Report was the increase of MLA pay from \$89,234.90 to \$100,480.91, bringing it much closer to Manitoba and Saskatchewan. This does not take effect until the next general election in 2025. The extra salary payable to the Premier was to stay the same as with additional salaries for the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Party Leader, and Minister without Portfolio.

Of note was a panel suggestion that a review be undertaken to address the family-related challenges faced by MLAs, especially women and gender-diverse MLAs with young children. Adequate daycare was identified as a barrier to these groups deciding to seek office.

The New Brunswick Independent Committee last reported in 2007. In the fourteen years since then, salaries were frozen. The recommendations are not binding.

The Committee acknowledged the importance of the role of an MLA and the demands of the position. It recommended an increase from \$85,000.00 to \$93,126.00 as of April 1, 2023, and it is currently that amount. Of note, the Committee stated that the best comparables for New Brunswick were Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland and Labrador. The Committee recommended the Premier's additional salary rise to \$93,126.00 from \$79,000.00.

The Prince Edward Island Indemnities and Allowances Commission 2023 Report established binding salaries. It increased salaries by 2% effective September 1, 2023, and 2.5% effective April 1, 2024. That brought the salary to 80% of the Canadian average and 91% of the then Atlantic Canadian average. This resulted in a salary of \$82,116.00.

Premiers, Ministers, Speaker and Deputy Speaker, and Government House Leader positions did not receive an increase and all opposition House Leaders were to receive the same salary as the Government House Leader.

The Members' Compensation Review Committee of Newfoundland/Labrador recently issued its comprehensive Report encompassing 213 pages. It dealt with an extensive review of salaries, benefits and allowances similar to this Report. The Report's recommendations are not binding, and Government has not acted on the Report's recommendations at this time.

The Committee recommended an annual salary of \$120,000.00, the first increase since 2009. The annual salary and additional salary positions should be adjusted annually based on the percentage change to the Consumer Price Index and the executive pay plan. Pension benefits were to be reinstated for current and defeated Members to what they were in November, 2015.

The Committee recommended upward adjustments to mileage and meal provisions, which were outdated, and to allowances for office operation and other constituency expenses.

The Committee strongly endorsed the principle of fair and reasonable compensation for Members as stated in prior compensation reviews across the country.

It also asserted that fair and reasonable compensation of Members would expand opportunities for people from diverse backgrounds to run for public office.

## **10. MEMBERS' SALARY**

I turn to the decision regarding the basic salary of a Manitoba MLA, separate and apart from any additional compensation earned from serving in other roles. Before reviewing

and analyzing the benchmarks used to determine fair and reasonable compensation, it is important to review the history of salary increases and in particular since the last report in 2017.

The increases since 1974 to date are set out in the chart at Appendix “A” to this Report.

The increases since the 2017 Report are as follows:

YEAR	INDEMNITY	INCREASE	EFFECTIVE DATE
2017/18	\$94,513.00	0.0%	April 1, 2017 ***
2018/19	\$94,513.00	0.0%	April 1, 2018 ***
2019/20	\$94,513.00	0.0%	April 1, 2019 ***
2020/21	\$96,214.00	1.8%	April 1, 2020
2021/22	\$97,753.00	1.6%	April 1, 2021
2022/23	\$99,708.00	2.0%	April 1, 2022
2023/24	\$102,998.00	3.3%	April 1, 2023
2024/25	\$106,603.00	3.5%	April 1, 2024

\*\*\* There was a COLA increase of 1.6% effective April 1, 2017. Gov. MLAs donated the COLA back to government, and other parties donated the COLA to charities of their choice.

Members chose to voluntarily freeze their salary for the duration of their term effective April 1, 2017, and chose to donate the cost-of-living increases to the Province or to charities of their choice.

The next election was held on September 10, 2019, less than 48 months since the prior election. As a result, the Government was not bound to appoint a Commissioner to issue a Report and chose not to do so and therefore, cost of living increases (based on the formula in the 2017 Report) were made.

As evidenced in the above chart, this resulted in certain increases for 2023/24 and 2024/25 which were larger than any cost-of-living increases since 2001.

The extraordinary rise in the cost-of-living due to the world-wide pandemic impacted significantly the five-year average COLA increase.

Inflation has gradually gone down but is still having a major impact.

The increases of 3.3% and 3.5% for 2023/24 and 2024/25 are factors to take into account when considering future increases.

It also gives rise to the question of capping COLA increases to a certain percentage, if a COLA formula is to be utilized for future years as opposed to a set figure.

I turn to the determination of the appropriate increase in salary, if any, that should be payable past 2024/25.

There is a consensus across the country that MLAs should be paid a fair and reasonable salary. It should be at a level to attract qualified individuals to run for office, but not at a level where it is considered to be an inducement to seek the position.

There is no precise formula that can be applied to determine the right salary level. There are not a lot of jobs that are comparable.

The job is unique and it is challenging to find comparable occupations. That is why independent reviewers have consistently opined that the best comparables are salaries paid to MLAs and other elected officials in other provinces and federally. This, of course, must take into account the economic conditions in each jurisdiction, including the cost of living in each area.

The other accepted benchmarks include the current state of the provincial economy and economic forecasts and how it compares to other provinces, salary increases in both the public and private sector, general cost of living increases, and salaries paid to City of Winnipeg Councillors and the Mayor.

I have attached as Appendix “B” to this Report an up-to-date scan of Members’ pay across Canada, including the House of Commons. The chart includes salaries for Premiers,

Cabinet Ministers, Speaker and other positions such as Leader of the Opposition, House Leader and Caucus Chair.

The following chart sets out Members' salaries across the jurisdictions as of April 1, 2024:

**Members' Salary Comparisons – April 1, 2024**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Salary</b>
House of Commons	\$203,100.00
Quebec	\$131,766.00
Alberta	\$120,936.00
British Columbia	\$119,533.00
Northwest Territories	\$117,668.00
Ontario	\$116,550.00
Nunavut	\$112,942.00
Saskatchewan	\$109,575.00
Manitoba	\$106,603.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$95,357.00
New Brunswick	\$93,126.00
Yukon	\$93,067.00
Nova Scotia	\$89,235.00
Prince Edward Island	\$82,116.00

The following observations can be made on reviewing the April 1, 2024 figures: Manitoba remains sixth out of ten provinces, as it did in 2017. As I noted in 2017, this puts Manitoba closer to a midpoint position, which is a departure from where Manitoba stood in 2007 when the Manitoba Premier's salary was the lowest in Canada, and Members' salaries were at the low end of the range. Being at or near the mid position is consistent with certain other factors, including Manitoba's economic performance.

Some provinces have either held the line (Ontario), or rolled back salaries for Members (Alberta). Others have had certain cost-of-living increases. Since 2010 Manitoba Members have had a 0% increase eight (8) times.

Manitoba remains below Saskatchewan but close in annual salary (\$3,000.00). Both Saskatchewan and Manitoba remain above the Maritime provinces and Newfoundland/Labrador, which is consistent with the 2023 JCC findings referred to earlier.

It is relevant to note that the Newfoundland Review Committee's Report from this year recommended an increase to \$120,000.00 for their Members. The Report's recommendation is not binding on the government, and as of the date of this Report, the salary has not been changed.

Nova Scotia's Report on Indemnity and Allowances fixed the base salary at \$100,480.91 (up from \$89,234.90). It takes effect after the next general election in 2025.

New Brunswick's Independent Committee in 2022 recommended an increase to the present level of \$93,126.00 based on what it would have been had the GDP numbers been applied to increases since 2008. The Committee noted that New Brunswick compares better to Newfoundland/Labrador, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Manitoba has the largest population and is the second largest in land mass (3,800 square kilometers less than Saskatchewan).

In sum, as it relates to other provinces, Manitoba generally remains at or near the midpoint of other jurisdictions, which is reasonable in light of all relevant factors.

Salaries paid to the City of Winnipeg Mayor and City Councillors are worthy of review as a benchmark, although caution must be exercised. One would expect that salaries at the provincial level would be higher or at the very least equivalent to the municipal level, but this is not always the case. It is beyond the scope of this Report to address the reason, but these salaries are not all set by independent reviews and may be automatically tied to cost-of-living increases.

For example, at present, Winnipeg's Mayor earns \$213,328.00 annually, which is higher than the Manitoba Premier salary of \$195,936.00. City Councillors earn \$114,609.00, which is higher than a Member of the Assembly (who earns \$106,603.00).

While I cannot find justification for the difference in salary, I am mindful that economic conditions do not support the kind of wage increase that would be necessary to bridge or

eliminate the gap, but it is relevant to take into account these differences when assessing fair and reasonable compensation for Members.

I have also noted that the CEOs of the Manitoba Crown Corporations earn well in excess of the Premier's salary, many in the \$300,000.00 plus range.

Salary increases paid to public sector employees in Manitoba are a relevant benchmark. In considering these increases, one must take into account that these increases do not necessarily reflect all the benefits that have been gained in collective bargaining, such as signing bonuses, additional steps in a classification, and various premiums. Also, while Members of the Assembly can and do make representations to this Commissioner, they are not involved in a bargaining process with a "give and take" on certain issues.

There is no principle that automatically ties Member increases to civil service increases. However, it is important to factor in these increases.

I note that negotiated salary increases for 2023 and 2024 for the civil service were 2.5% and 2.75%, as opposed to the cost-of-living increases of 3.3% and 3.5% for Members. I also note that the civil service has bargained for increases in 2025 and 2026 of 2.75% and 3%.

Earlier in this Report I pointed out that private sector settlements have increased in 2024 and have been in the range of 3% (+ or -), but forecasts for the future vary and private sector settlements do not carry the same weight as those paid by the public purse.

The strength of the Manitoba economy and the cost of living are important factors in assessing the salary levels and appropriate increases for Members of the Assembly. These factors have been a major reason for the size of salary increases in many of the past years.



The Manitoba economy was reviewed earlier in this Report. There are obvious concerns about the size of the deficit, the cost of living, and the prospects of future economic growth. As pointed out, Manitoba's economy is diversified and there is hope of future growth and continued high employment. Recent public sector increases indicate that government is prepared to negotiate higher wage increases.

In the final analysis I have attempted to factor in all of the above to reach a decision on fair and reasonable compensation for Members. As indicated below, I have placed a cap of 3% on any cost-of-living increase based on the five-year formula.

This cap follows the approach taken in Saskatchewan, which also uses a COLA formula.

While it is difficult to forecast salary increases for Members in other provinces, the salary increases will continue to place Manitoba in an appropriate position as compared to Members across Canada.

### **Decision on Members' Salary**

***I have taken into account all of the above benchmarks and my decision on Members' salary increases is as follows:***

***The basic annual salary as of April 1, 2024 is \$106,603.00.***

- (1) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***
- (2) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***
- (3) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1<sup>st</sup> in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The***

*cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

## 11. PREMIER'S SALARY

The Premier is paid an additional salary over and above the salary for being a Member. This is the same structure that is in place across the country.

The Premier earns the highest salary of elected Members. The role of the Premier is analogous to a Chief Executive Officer and Board Chair. It is a demanding job and has many high pressure responsibilities. None of this is disputed.

The first issue is whether the additional compensation places Manitoba's Premier reasonably amongst the other Premiers based on the differences between the jurisdictions or whether a one-time bump is warranted.

The other issue is whether the additional salary should be increased by the same percentage as for the basic Member salary.

The additional salary paid to the Premier effective April 1, 2024 is \$89,333.00. The total salary is therefore \$195,936.00.

The total compensation for Premiers across Canada is set out in the Chart below:

<b>Premiers' Total Pay – 2024</b>		
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>	<b>Annual Amount</b>
Quebec	\$138,354.00	\$270,120.00
British Columbia	\$107,579.00	\$227,112.00
Nunavut	\$104,061.00	\$217,003.00
Northwest Territories	\$96,991.00	\$214,659.00
Ontario	\$92,424.00	\$208,974.00
Manitoba	\$89,333.00	\$195,936.00
Nova Scotia	\$101,545.00	\$190,780.00
Saskatchewan	\$79,696.00	\$189,271.00
New Brunswick	\$93,126.00	\$186,252.00

Alberta	\$65,244.00	\$186,180.00
Yukon	\$75,109.00	\$168,176.00
Prince Edward Island	\$85,302.00	\$167,418.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$65,168.00	\$160,525.00

The additional compensation for Manitoba's Premier ranks sixth out of ten provinces, and the annual total compensation ranks Manitoba fourth out of the ten provinces.

While the total compensation is less than that paid to the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, it places the Premier in the midrange of the country and it continues to be fair and reasonable and should not be readjusted based on the relevant benchmarks.

The additional compensation for being Premier will be subject to the percentage increases for the years 2025/26 and 2026/27, and the cost-of-living increase beginning April 1, 2027.

### **Decision on Premier's Salary**

***The Premier's additional compensation is \$89,333.00 for 2024/25.***

- (1) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***
- (2) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***
- (3) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.***

## 12. SALARIES FOR MINISTERS, SPEAKER AND LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

All of the above positions receive the same level of additional salary, being \$58,364.00 as of April 1, 2024. This is generally the practice across the country. The level of additional compensation is fair and reasonable based on the workload, level of responsibilities and is in the range paid in other similar provinces, as evidenced by the charts reproduced below:

### Minister's Total Pay - 2024

Jurisdiction	Additional Compensation	Annual Amount
Quebec	\$98,825.00	\$230,591.00
Nunavut	\$87,594.00	\$200,536.00
Northwest Territories	\$69,516.00	\$187,184.00
Alberta	\$60,468.00	\$181,404.00
British Columbia	\$59,766.00	\$179,299.00
Saskatchewan	\$61,899.00	\$171,474.00
Ontario	\$49,301.00	\$165,851.00
Manitoba	\$58,364.00	\$164,967.00
New Brunswick	\$62,022.00	\$155,148.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$48,665.00	\$144,022.00
Yukon	\$50,114.00	\$143,181.00
Nova Scotia	\$49,047.00	\$138,282.00
Prince Edward Island	\$54,885.00	\$137,001.00

### Speaker's Total Pay - 2024

Jurisdiction	Additional Compensation	Annual Amount
Quebec	\$98,825.00	\$230,591.00
Nunavut	\$87,594.00	\$200,536.00
Alberta	\$60,468.00	\$181,404.00
British Columbia	\$59,766.00	\$179,299.00
Northwest Territories	\$57,328.00	\$174,996.00
Saskatchewan	\$55,788.00	\$165,363.00
Manitoba	\$58,364.00	\$164,967.00
New Brunswick	\$62,022.00	\$155,148.00
Ontario	\$36,364.00	\$152,914.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$48,665.00	\$144,022.00
Yukon	\$46,546.00	\$139,613.00
Nova Scotia	\$49,047.00	\$138,282.00
Prince Edward Island	\$54,885.00	\$137,001.00

### Leader of the Opposition's Total Pay - 2024

Jurisdiction	Additional Compensation	Annual Amount
Quebec	\$98,825.00	\$230,591.00
Alberta	\$60,468.00	\$181,404.00
Ontario	\$64,336.00	\$180,886.00
British Columbia	\$59,766.00	\$179,299.00
Saskatchewan	\$55,788.00	\$165,363.00
Manitoba	\$58,364.00	\$164,967.00
New Brunswick	\$65,188.00	\$158,314.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$48,665.00	\$144,022.00
Yukon	\$50,114.00	\$143,181.00
Nova Scotia	\$49,047.00	\$138,282.00
Prince Edward Island	\$54,885.00	\$137,001.00
Nunavut	n/a	
Northwest Territories	n/a	

While there is some variation, Manitoba is slightly below Saskatchewan and slightly ahead of New Brunswick.

### Decision on Salaries for Ministers, Speaker and Leader of the Opposition

*The additional compensation as of April 1, 2024 is \$58,364.00.*

- (1) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (2) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (3) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

13. **Salaries for House Leader (Government and Opposition), Chief Whip (Government and Opposition), Caucus Chair (Government and Opposition)**

The additional salaries for the above positions are as follows across Canada:

**House Leader (Government)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>
New Brunswick	\$31,011.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Prince Edward Island	\$14,780.00
Manitoba	\$12,043.00
Nova Scotia	\$10,506.00
Ontario	n/a
Alberta	n/a
British Columbia	n/a
Newfoundland & Labrador	n/a
Quebec	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Northwest Territories	n/a
Nunavut	n/a

**House Leader (Opposition)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>
Quebec	\$46,118.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	\$24,330.00
British Columbia	\$23,907.00
New Brunswick	\$23,258.00
Ontario	\$21,329.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Alberta	\$15,120.00
Prince Edward Island	\$14,780.00
Nova Scotia	\$10,506.00
Manitoba	\$8,601.00
Nunavut	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Northwest Territories	n/a

**Chief Whip (Government)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>
Quebec	\$46,118.00
New Brunswick	\$31,011.00
British Columbia	\$23,907.00
Ontario	\$21,329.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Prince Edward Island	\$14,041.00
Alberta	\$12,096.00
Manitoba	\$8,601.00
Nova Scotia	\$5,253.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Northwest Territories	n/a
Nunavut	n/a

**Chief Whip (Opposition)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>
Quebec	\$39,530.00
British Columbia	\$23,907.00
New Brunswick	\$23,258.00
Ontario	\$16,317.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Prince Edward Island	\$14,041.00
Alberta	\$9,072.00
Manitoba	\$6,883.00
Nova Scotia	\$5,253.00
Newfoundland & Labrador	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Northwest Territories	n/a
Nunavut	n/a

**Caucus Chair (Government)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Additional Compensation</b>
Quebec	\$32,942.00
New Brunswick	\$31,011.00
British Columbia	\$23,907.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Ontario	\$14,569.00
Nova Scotia	\$10,506.00

Manitoba	\$7,415.00
Northwest Territories	\$3,805.00
Alberta	n/a
Prince Edward Island	n/a
Newfoundland & Labrador	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Nunavut	n/a

### Caucus Chair (Opposition)

Jurisdiction	Additional Compensation
Quebec	\$29,647.00
British Columbia	\$23,907.00
New Brunswick	\$23,258.00
Saskatchewan	\$16,303.00
Ontario	\$14,569.00
Nova Scotia	\$10,506.00
Manitoba	\$7,415.00
Alberta	n/a
Prince Edward Island	n/a
Newfoundland & Labrador	n/a
Yukon	n/a
Northwest Territories	n/a
Nunavut	n/a

It is important to note that not all provinces provide additional compensation because of differences between the provinces in their manner of operation and allocation of duties and responsibilities.

The House Leader plays a big part in managing the affairs of the Assembly and meets with Opposition House Leaders to coordinate the business of the House.

The Whip of each party ensures its members are present for votes, keeps Members informed about House business and arranges for speakers at debates and in committee. The Government Caucus Chair is in charge of meetings of a party Caucus where government activity and policy are discussed, and it is a sounding board for Cabinet and the Government. The Opposition Caucus Chair is responsible for its party's Caucus meeting in which it develops strategies to hold Government to account for and to develop alternative policies.



These positions have received certain cost of living increases since 2020, but have not been adjusted for some time based on inter-provincial comparisons.

A review of the compensation as reflected in the chart above indicates Manitoba is lagging behind comparable provinces and warrants an upward adjustment accordingly.

### **(1) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Government)**

- (1) The present additional salary is \$12,043.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$15,400.00 annually.***
- (2) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***
- (3) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***
- (4) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.***

### **(2) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Opposition)**

- (1) The present additional salary is \$8,601.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$11,600.00 annually.***
- (2) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***
- (3) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***

- (4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**(3) Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Government)**

- (1) *The present additional salary for Chief Whip (Government) is \$8,601.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$11,600.00 annually.*
- (2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five-year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**(4) Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Opposition)**

- (1) *The present additional salary for Chief Whip (Opposition) is \$6,883.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$9,600.00 annually.*
- (2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*

- (4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five-year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**(5) Decision on Salary for Caucus Chair (Government and Opposition)**

- (1) *The present additional salary is \$7,415.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$10,400.00 annually.*
- (2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five-year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**14. PENSION PLAN**

Pursuant to *The Legislative Assembly Act*, the Commissioner has jurisdiction to review the pension plan, including the amount of contribution to be made by Members, the pension benefits, indexing benefits, eligibility to retire, death benefits (both pre- and post-retirement), and withdrawal refunds. If change is warranted, amendments can be made to the Members' Retirement Benefits Regulation of *The Legislative Assembly Act*.

In carrying out my review, I received input from the Plan Actuary (Ellement Consulting Group), and the Plan Administrator and Trustee (The Civil Service Superannuation Board).

I reviewed the Annual Report and Annual Valuation Report. I also received submissions from the general public. As a result, I have determined that certain amendments should be made to the Pension Plan Regulation. Prior to outlining these changes and the rationale for maintaining in place certain of the provisions, it is useful to review the plan structure and briefly review its history.

The latest iteration of the pension plan was set up in 2005. There had been in place a defined benefit plan with an accrual rate of 3%, but its operation was suspended in 1993 by the Assembly after a debate in the House. The Plan was replaced by a Registered Retirement Savings Plan (RRSP) with Members and the Province contributing 7% of salary.

The move to reinstate a defined benefit plan was prompted by unfavourable financial results. The plan was reinstated with a 2% accrual rate, down from the earlier 3% rate. The new Plan also included an alternative option involving contributions to an RRSP or a tax paid trust. Most Members participate in the pension plan.

The LAPP has a consulting actuary, is administered by the Civil Service Superannuation Board, and is audited annually by the Office of the Manitoba Auditor General.

The basic features of the Plan are summarized in the LAPP Annual Report as follows:

**(a) Funding**

The Act requires members to contribute 9% of pensionable earnings and the Province to fund the balance of costs associated with the pension plan. In addition, as members of the Plan, employees can elect to purchase pensionable service for all or any part of the period they were an MLA between April 25, 1995 and the beginning of the pay period for which the member began making contributions by

source deduction to the Fund. The Province of Manitoba is required to contribute sufficient funds to pay all pensions and other liabilities as they come due.

**(b) Basic Pension Benefit**

The lifetime monthly pension calculation equals:

- (i) 2.0% of the average of the five best annual salaries received during which pensionable service was accrued or, if the member has less than five years of pensionable service, the average of the annual salaries for their pensionable service,
- (ii) multiplied by the lesser of thirty-five years and the member's years of pensionable service,
- (iii) divided by twelve months.

**(c) Indexing Benefit**

Whenever an indexing benefit is provided for pensions being paid out of the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, a similar benefit is to be provided for both deferred members and pensioners of this Plan. In the Civil Service Superannuation Plan, the cost-of-living benefit payments are limited to the extent that the amount in the separate Indexing Benefit Account is actuarially able to finance approximately one-half of that payment. Legislation limits the maximum annual adjustment to two-thirds of the increase in the Consumer Price Index (Canada) until the Indexing Benefits Account can pre-fund anticipated adjustments for the next twenty years.

**(d) Retirement**

A member with at least one year of service as an MLA is eligible to retire at age 55 once they have ceased to be an MLA.

**(e) Death Benefits Pre-retirement**

Upon the death of an active member, a survivor's benefit is payable to a spouse or partner or the member's estate when there is no survivor.

**(f) Death Benefits Post-retirement**

A death refund is payable to the estate of a pensioner or survivor where such pensions have not been paid to the full extent of the member's contributions plus interest.

**(g) Withdrawal Refunds**

Participants who cease to be an MLA may apply (subject to lock-in provisions) to withdraw funds from the Plan. Members may choose to leave their contributions in the Plan as a vested member.

Under LAPP, a Member would have to have served for 35 years to earn a pension of 70% of his or her salary as calculated under the Regulation.

Prior to the last election in 2023, the average length of service was 8.94 years. The average length of service of the current Member is 4.94 years. This compares to the April 2016 election in which the average length of service prior to the election was 11.8 years, and 5.3 years after the election.

Pension plans vary from province to province, including the amount of the accrual rate. The accrual rate for Members of Parliament is 3%, and 4% in Quebec, 3.5% in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, and 2.5% in Newfoundland/Labrador.

In the 2017 Report, I determined that there should be one change to the plan in that LAPP active Member contributions should be increased from 7% to 9% of salary in a staggered manner. This put the contribution rates on the same level as Manitoba Civil Servants.

As I indicated earlier, I have determined that certain changes in the pension plan are warranted. However these do not involve a move away from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan or an RRSP type plan.

Representations have been made that the defined benefit plan should be eliminated. In the past I have rejected this submission and I find no reason to depart from this position.

Government Civil Servants continue to have a defined benefit plan and I do not think it would be reasonable to have a lesser plan in place for elected Members of the Assembly.

While a defined benefit plan may in certain circumstances place a greater burden on an

employer, the defined benefit plan provides a predictable pension income (unlike the defined contribution plan). As I stated in the 2017 Report, “A defined benefit plan as presently constituted provides a level of comfort to those members of the public choosing to run for public office that they will have a certain pension level as part of their compensation.”

Further, it is in the public interest to attract people to run for office and to have citizens from different walks of life get involved. The total compensation must be fair and reasonable for people to give up a career or job to run for office.

A defined benefit plan with a 2% accrual rate for the reasons set out above should continue.

In the course of discussions with the Pension Plan Administrators and Consulting Actuaries, certain other issues concerning the Plan have been raised and I have determined that amendments to the Regulation are warranted in the circumstances.

The issues and the decisions respecting them are as follows:

(1) Cost of Living Adjustment

Under the Members’ Retirement Benefits Regulation which establishes the LAPP, s. 33 sets out:

**Cost-of-living adjustment**

**33** Whenever a cost-of-living adjustment is made to pensions being paid under the public service pension plan, a similar adjustment is to be made to

(a) the pension entitlement under section 31 of a deferred member;  
and

(b) the pensions being paid under this Part.

In short, the cost-of-living adjustment paid under the public service plan is adjusted similarly for the LAPP Plan. A specific account under the public service plan is maintained to fund COLA. Based on current experience, I am advised that the COLA account will not be able to meet the target of two-thirds of the increase in the Consumer Price Index.

From 1988 – 2021, the percentage of CPI granted was 66.7%. In 2022 it was 41.3%, and in 2023, 24.9%.

The question that arises is whether the LAPP plan cost-of-living increase should continue to be tied to the Public Service Plan. The LAPP is a separate plan established under a separate regulation. Further, the cost-of-living increase for the LAPP has a separate assumption in the valuation and thus the cost-of-living increase is prefunded forever.

Provincial Judges in Manitoba receive a cost-of-living increase tied to two-thirds of the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index.

I see no reason for MLAs to have a lesser benefit than Judges. Both are unable to bargain their compensation. The guarantee of an increase tied to two-thirds of the percentage changes in CPI will not cost any more to the Employer.

### **Decision on Cost-of-Living Adjustment**

***I have determined that in the circumstances, outlined above, that it is fair and reasonable that s. 33 of the Members' Retirement Benefits Regulation be made that it would state, "In no case shall the adjustment be less than two-thirds of the increase in the Consumer Price Index."***

#### (2) Commutated Value Calculation

The Retirement Regulation does not have any section dealing with how to calculate commuted value. In the past, the Plan Administrator has applied the Civil Service



Superannuation Plan commuted value method. Prior to October 2020, the calculation was based on bond rates. It became a going concern method in October 2020. Pursuant to s. 1(8) of the *Civil Service Superannuation Act*:

**Determination of commuted value**

1(8) Despite *The Pension Benefits Act*, any commuted value must be determined by the board's actuary using the going concern valuation method set out in subsection 3570 of the *Practice-Specific Standards for Pension Plans*, as amended from time to time, published by the Actuarial Standards Board of the Canadian Institute of Actuaries.

The change resulted in smaller commuted values.

At the time of the change for the public service, there was no change method to the calculation method for LAPP.

Should the LAPP's method of calculating commuted value be tied to the public service fund?

LAPP is created under a separate statute and is not subject to the *Pension Benefits Act*. A valuation is not required to be filed under the *Pension Benefits Act*. I am advised that the bond method of calculation is an appropriate method. The Provincial Judges have maintained this method of calculation and there is no reason why Members of the Assembly can't remain independent.

**Decision on Commuted Value Calculation**

***In the circumstances, I have determined that it is fair and reasonable to maintain the bond method of calculation and to have this enshrined in the Regulation.***

***Accordingly I have decided that s. 13(b)(ii) of the Retirement Regulation be amended to state:***

***Notwithstanding the above, the commuted value should be calculated using the bond valuation method set out in subsection 3540 of the Canadian Institute of Actuaries Specific Standards for Pension Plans, or such section as amended from time to time.***

(3) Times for Forms Submission

The Retirement Regulation contains sections referencing time limits of 90 days for Members to apply for benefits. The time limits in the Public Service Plan are 120 days.

**Decision on Times for Forms Submission**

***I am advised that it would be appropriate for Sections 30 and 32 to be amended to extend the limits from 90 to 120 days. Accordingly the Retirement Regulation should be so amended where applicable.***

(4) Pre-Retirement Death

Section 34(2) of the Regulation states:

- 34(2)** The death benefit under subsection (1) is payable as follows:
- (a) in accordance with *The Pension Benefits Act*, to
    - (i) the member's surviving spouse, unless he or she has obtained, or is entitled to obtain, a division of the member's pension benefits under section 40, or
    - (ii) the member's surviving common-law partner who was cohabiting with the member immediately before the member's death; or
  - (b) if there is no such surviving spouse or common-law partner, as a lump sum to the member's estate.

### **Decision on Pre-Retirement Death**

***This section precludes a Member from designating a beneficiary for their pre-retirement death benefit. I have determined that this is not a reasonable restriction and the Regulation should be amended to allow for the designation of a beneficiary under s. 34(2).***

#### **(5) Death After Commencement of Pension – Change in Name of Act**

Section 36(1) of the Regulation states:

**36(1)** *The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act* applies to the designation of beneficiaries under the plan and the revocation of such designations.

### **Decision on Death After Commencement of Pension – Change in Name of Act**

***Clause 36(1) of the Regulation refers to The Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act. This Act is now called The Beneficiary Designation Act and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect the change.***

## **15. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES**

The Members' Allowances Regulation pursuant to *The Legislative Assembly Act* sets out a comprehensive scheme for allowances to be paid to or for the benefit of Members for authorized expenses. The allowances categories are constituency expenses including expenses for access and service to constituents, business meal expenses, capital expenses for initial office set up, a constituency assistant's allowance, a constituency rent allowance, travel allowance, commuter allowance, living allowance, moving allowance, and intersessional committee allowance.

The purpose of the Regulation is to provide a fair and reasonable amount to reimburse

Members' expenses in carrying out their constituency duties. The service to constituents is to be non-partisan in nature and the system is to be transparent. The public is able to scrutinize these expenses as they are posted online.

In doing a review of the allowances and keeping in mind the passage of time since the last formal review, I have addressed the following questions:

- (1) Are the amounts allotted for expenses still fair and reasonable in light of the passage of time, changing economic factors and other relevant factors?
- (2) Are there certain categories of allowances involving expenses for communication and computer devices which require updating due to technological change?
- (3) Are changes warranted due to issues arising over the interpretation of any sections and/or the application and administration of any sections? As Commissioner, I am bound to consider the compliance review of the operations of the Members' Allowances office pertaining to the approval of MLA expense claims.
- (4) Are any amendments required to the miscellaneous sections of the Regulation, particularly dealing with appeals of decisions or determination under the Regulation?

I have taken into account my experience as Appeals Commissioner dealing with Member appeals of decisions or determinations under the Regulation. I have reviewed the Compliance Report of the Members' Allowances Office and interviewed various individuals employed by the Assembly who are involved with administration of the Regulation.

In addition, I received input from various Members of the Assembly who offered input and suggestions. I received representation from the two major caucuses.

I reviewed provisions dealing with allowances in other jurisdictions to determine if any of

these provisions would be relevant to the Manitoba context.

Some provinces have a comprehensive code dealing with allowances similar to Manitoba. Other provinces have more generic descriptions of allowable expenses and are not as detailed.

In the final analysis, the expenses allowed under the Regulation should be relevant to the work of Members in serving their constituents. Amounts for expenses should be fair and reasonable. Members should be able to understand what expenses are eligible for reimbursement and should have a timely and responsive appeal procedure.

A review of certain clauses in the Regulation follows. If an existing clause in the Regulation is not specifically amended, it can be taken that the existing clauses are to remain as is in the amended Regulation.

Any changes to the amounts are to be retroactive to April 1, 2024.

**(a) Clause 2 – Definitions**

(i) “**non-arm’s length expense**” – means an expense incurred by or on behalf of a member under a contract or other arrangement, if

(a) any of the following persons has a direct financial interest in the contract or other arrangement:

(i) the member or his or her spouse or common-law partner, or a corporation in which any of them has a direct financial interest,

(ii) a relative of the member, or a corporation in which a relative of the member has a direct financial interest,

(iii) another member or his or her child, spouse or common-law partner, a child of another member’s spouse or common-law partner, or a corporation in which any of them has a direct financial interest; and

(b) in any case referred to in subclause (a)(ii) or (iii), the member who

incurred the expense, or on whose behalf it was incurred, knew or ought reasonably to have known that the interest existed.

**Decision on non-arm's length expense**

***This should be amended to delete the reference to his or her spouse and replace it with "their spouse".***

(ii) "**kilometric rate**", in relation to transportation by private vehicle on or after September 5, 2012, means \$0.44/km plus such of the following amounts per kilometre as are applicable:

(a) the amount per kilometre, if any, by which the amount specified in paragraph 7306(a) of the Income Tax Regulations (Canada) at the beginning of the allowance period exceeds \$0.47;

(b) in the case of travel by a northern member, \$0.044/km;

(c) if the member has, within the same allowance period, authorized expenses for travel by private vehicle for more than 25,000 kilometres, \$0.05/km for each additional kilometre travelled by private vehicle in that period.

**Decision on kilometric rate**

***Before September 5, 2012 – This definition is no longer needed and shall be deleted.***

**(b) Clause 3 – Northern, southern and Winnipeg regions**

**Northern, southern and Winnipeg regions**

**3** In this regulation, members and their constituencies are categorized by region and electoral division.

### **Decision on Northern, southern and Winnipeg regions**

***The Regulation categorizes Members and their constituencies by region and electoral division. The Regulation shall be amended to reflect the new constituency names which have been adopted since the last review of the Regulation.***

#### **(c) Clauses 4(1) and 5(1) – Payment of Expenses**

The Regulation provides for direct payments to third parties in limited circumstances and sets out a process for claims for reimbursement (sections 4(1) and 5(1)).

##### **Direct payment to third parties**

**4(1)** The following expenses, to the extent they are authorized expenses, are to be paid by the Legislative Assembly directly to the person to whom they are due rather than to the member who incurs them:

- (a) rent for constituency office space;
- (b) remuneration for constituency staff.

##### **Direct payments of invoiced amounts**

**4(2)** At the request of a member, the Speaker may pay an authorized expense directly to a third party if the request is made in a form approved by the Speaker and includes or is accompanied by

- (a) a statement of the intended purpose of the expense; and
- (b) an invoice, contract or other document evidencing the obligation.

The Speaker has absolute discretion to refuse a request for the direct payment of an amount under \$100.

##### **Claim for reimbursement**

**5(1)** A claim for reimbursement of an authorized expense

- (a) must be made in a form approved by the Speaker;
- (b) subject to subsection (2), must be accompanied by proof of payment;
- (c) must include or be accompanied by a statement of the intended purpose of the expense;
- (d) in the case of an expense for travel by an aircraft, must be accompanied by the boarding pass or other proof that the travel occurred;
- (e) subject to subsection (11), must be submitted, with the necessary supporting documentation, to the Members' Allowances Office within the allowance period to which it relates or within three months after the end of that period.

#### **Decision on Payment of Expenses**

***(a) I have been advised that it is a hardship for certain Members who have difficulty making purchases by credit card, particularly at the beginning of the term. In the circumstances, I believe it would be reasonable to implement an advance system whereby a Member could apply for an advance of up to \$2,500.00 to fund authorized expenses.***

***(b) Under section 4(2) the Member can request the Speaker make a direct payment for an authorized expense. The Speaker has absolute discretion to refuse a request for an amount under \$100.00.***

***I am advised that there have been increased requests for such payments and administratively it would be easier for the amount to be increased to \$250.00. The clause shall be amended accordingly.***



**(d) Clause 5(3) - What constitutes proof of payment?**

Clause 5(3) states:

**What constitutes proof of payment**

**5(3)** For the purpose of clause (1)(b), proof of payment is to consist of the original receipt for the payment of the expense or, if no receipt can be provided,

(e) in the case of a fee for metered parking, a statutory declaration setting out the parking location, the amount of the fee, and the date it was paid;

**Decision on What constitutes proof of payment**

***Clause 5(3) sets out various methods of establishing proof of payment. Subsection (e) refers to providing a statutory declaration to verify payment at metered parking. Street parking now provides receipts. This subsection shall be deleted as it is no longer needed.***

**(e) Digital Signature – Original Documents**

At present, Members submit original documents accompanied by their “wet” signature. These documents are maintained pursuant to the Regulation.

I have reviewed the potential use of digital signatures and portable documents (PDF) as an option for Members when submitting documents.

**Decision on Digital Signature – Original Documents**

***I have determined that it would be beneficial for Members to have this option. The Regulation shall be amended to allow Members to submit documents in PDF format***

***with a secure digital signature. This will be considered to be equivalent to an original document under the Regulation.***

**(f) Clause 5(5) - Claims for meal expenses**

The Regulation contains a comprehensive clause outlining that meal expenses may be claimed under a variety of allowances.

Clause 5(5) states in part:

**Claims for meal expenses**

**5(5)** Meal expenses may be claimed under the following allowances:

- (a) the constituency allowance (representation expense under clause 14(b), business meeting meal expenses under section 14.2 and meal expenses at civil service rates under clause 12(2)(d));
- (b) the travel allowance (meal expenses at civil service rates under clause 21(1)(d));
- (c) the commuter allowance (meal expenses at civil service rates under subclause 23(2)(b)(ii));
- (d) the living allowance for a non-Winnipeg member with a temporary residence (meal expenses under clause 25(2)(a.1));
- (e) the alternative living allowance for a non-Winnipeg member without a temporary residence in Winnipeg (meals at civil service rates under clause 28(2)(a));
- (f) the intersessional committee allowance (under subsection 29(2)), if approved by the Speaker.

The Civil Service meal rates are as follows:

	<b>Breakfast</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	<b>Dinner</b>	<b>Max. Per Diem</b>
<i>Southern</i>	\$8.64	\$10.84	\$18.37	\$37.85
<i>Northern</i>	\$9.19	\$11.39	\$19.69	\$40.27

Reimbursement rates for meals are determined by the area in which **the meal was consumed**.

Meals consumed in the Northern constituencies of Thompson, The Pas, Flin Flon and Kewatinook including the communities of Bissett, CraneRiver, Dauphin River (Anama Bay), Easterville, Grand Rapids, Manigotagan, Matheson Island and Waterhen are claimed at the ***northern*** rate.

Meals consumed in all other areas are claimed at the ***southern*** rate.

Clause 5(5) Rule 4 states:

The following rules apply to claims for these meal expenses:

...

4. A claim for a meal expense under clause 14(b) (representation expense) or section 14.2 (business meeting meal expense) must state the purpose of the meeting and must include, or be accompanied by, a statement setting out the name of each person to whom the meal was provided at the member's expense.

**(a) Decision on claims for meal expenses**

***The rates have been at these levels with small increases dating back many years. They have not kept pace with price increases in the marketplace. They are not reasonable as a result and do not provide fair reimbursement to members.***

***Members should not be required to personally pay for a shortfall. The Civil Service rate shall be replaced.***

***The National Joint Council of the Public Service of Canada is a body of employers and trade unions which among other things, agrees on standard levels of meal rates. They are used by the Members' Allowances Office in Manitoba for out of province travel. They are appropriate to use for the areas referenced in Clause 5(5) and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect the following rates:***

<b>Breakfast</b>	<b>\$24.90</b>
<b>Lunch</b>	<b>\$25.20</b>
<b>Dinner</b>	<b>\$61.85</b>

***The above amounts are to be inclusive of tips paid by the Member on account of the meal.***

**(b) Decision on Clause 5(5) Rule 4**

***Clause 5(5) Rule 4 states that a claim for a meal expense (either a representation expense under clause 14(b) or a business meeting expense under clause 14.2 must list the name of each person who was provided the meal.***

***In practise, the requirement to provide last names, has proven to be challenging and a burden for Members, especially when dealing with groups of minors.***

***In view of these circumstances, the Regulation shall be amended to allow for not being required to provide names of minors who attend a group event and receive a meal.***

**(g) Clause 5(6) – Claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle**

**Claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle**

**5(6)** An expense for transportation by private vehicle (claims based on the kilometric rate and the distance travelled) may be claimed under

- (a) the travel allowance (clause 21(1)(a));
- (b) the constituency allowance (clause 12(2)(a)) after the travel allowance claims have been maximized; or
- (c) if approved by the Speaker, the intersessional committee allowance (subsection 29(3));

and, for each trip, the claim form (or a log book excerpt submitted with the claim form) must set out

(d) the date on which the travel took place and the allowance under which the travel expense is claimed;

(e) the locations of the starting point and the destination, described as

(i) the name of the city, town or village and, in the case of Brandon or Winnipeg, the name of the street or any other description acceptable to the Members' Allowances Office, or

(ii) if the location is not in a city, town or village, the name of the nearest city, town or village or any other description acceptable to the Members' Allowances Office; and

(f) the total distance travelled.

#### **Decision on claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle**

***Clause 5(6) provides for claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle under various allowances. The clause shall be amended to include that the purpose of the travel must be for legislative or constituency business.***

#### **(h) Clause 8(2) - Certain allowances continue after ceasing to be a Member**

This clause provides for certain allowances to continue after ceasing to be a Member.

#### **Decision on Certain allowances continue after ceasing to be a Member**

***There is a gap in the current clause. It does not cover the situation of a Member who runs for re-election, but is defeated. In this instance a Member should be able to recover expenses paid for residential cleaning and the Regulation shall be so amended.***

(i) **Clause 11(1) – Constituency Office Space**

**Constituency office space**

**11(1)** The following types of expenses are authorized expenses for office space to the extent that they are expenses of the member for the purpose of access and service to his or her constituents:

(a) the rent for constituency office space, to the extent that it exceeds the amount covered by the constituency office rent allowance, but only if it is paid directly by the Legislative Assembly to the person to whom it is due;

(b) the expense of parking, janitorial services, snow removal, maintenance of grounds, utilities including cable television and security systems, and other services and facilities associated with the use, occupation or enjoyment of the constituency office space, if they are not included in the rent;

(c) the expense of renovation, repair and redecorating of the constituency office space;

(d) the expense of signs for the member's constituency office, including the expense of installing, moving, maintaining and removing them.

**Decision on Constituency office space**

***Clause 11(1)(b) refers to certain expenses being covered if not included in rent (e.g. janitorial services, snow removal). This clause is not necessary and should be deleted as it is covered under office operation.***

***Clause 11(1)(b) also covers the cost of cable television at the constituency office. This shall be removed from the clause as it properly falls under office operation, Clause 12(1).***

**(j) Clause 12(1) – Constituency service and office operation**

**Constituency service and office operation**

**12(1)** The following types of expenses are authorized expenses for constituency service and office operation to the extent that they are incurred by the member for the purpose of access and service to his or her constituents:

...

(b) office furnishings and equipment that are included in the standard suite of constituency office furnishings and equipment determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission;

...

(d) subject to subsections (1.1) and (1.2), telephone services, including

- (i) installing a telephone,
- (ii) renting a telephone,
- (iii) extra directory listings,
- (iv) telephone answering service,
- (v) [repealed] M.R. November 27/17,
- (vi) long distance calls,
- (vii) mobile communication services, including all charges for voice, text, data and email services and related access fees,
- (viii) automated calling services, and
- (ix) internet phone services;

**Decision on Constituency Service and office operation**

***This clause sets out that office furnishings and equipment that are included in the standard suite of office furnishings and equipment determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission are authorized expenses.***

***I am advised that the Commission does not make such a determination and the words “determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission” shall be deleted from the Regulation as it is no longer applicable. Members’ Allowances will determine what constitutes a standard suite.***

***Also, Clause 12(1)(d)(ii) shall be deleted as renting a telephone is not necessary due to changes in technology.***

**(k) Clause 12(1)(u) – Costs of Framing**

**Constituency service and office operation**

**12(1)** The following types of expenses are authorized expenses for constituency service and office operation to the extent that they are incurred by the member for the purpose of access and service to his or her constituents:

. . .

(u) the cost to frame the member's Oath of Office, a constituency map, a photo of the Queen, a composite portrait of all Members and a group photograph of all Members in the Chamber.

**Decision on Costs of framing**

***Clause 12(1)(u) refers to costs of framing a photo of the Queen as being an authorized expense. It shall be amended to state “a photo of the Monarch”.***

**(l) Clause 12(1.1) and 12(1.2) – Limit on communication devices and services, and Equipment and service plans for mobile communication devices**

**Limit on communication devices and services**

**12(1.1)** Authorized expenses under subsection (1) in relation to communication devices and services (other than a virtual town hall meeting) are limited to the following:

(a) for the member himself or herself,

- (i) one cell phone,
- (ii) one smart phone,
- (iii) one installed car phone,



(iv) a laptop, tablet or other mobile communication device (other than a device, such as a cell phone or smart phone, that can be used as a telephone) that uses a wireless Internet data service to access the Internet, and the related wireless service plan for that device,

(v) a land line at his or her constituency office,

(vi) fax and Internet services at the constituency office and, if needed, a home land line and home fax and Internet services;

### **Equipment and service plans for mobile communication devices**

**12(1.2)** An expense claimed under clause (1)(d) or (d.1) in respect of a cell phone or smart phone is not an authorized expense unless it is incurred

(a) under the mobile communication services plan (commonly referred to as the government plan) approved by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission for use by members; or

### **Decision on Limit on communication devices and services, and Equipment and service plans for mobile communication devices**

*This clause sets out a list of authorized expenses for Members' communication devices. Due to changes in technology, the following shall be amended:*

- **12(1.1)(a)(ii) Delete “one smart phone” and replace with “one mobile or wireless device”;**
- **12(1.1)(a)(vi) Delete “if needed, a home land line and home fax and Internet services”;**
- **12(1.2) Delete “smart phone” and replace with mobile or wireless device”.**

### **(m) Clause 12(1)(i) (i) and (ii) – Advertising**

#### **Constituency service and office operation**

**12(1)** The following types of expenses are authorized expenses for constituency service and office operation to the extent that they are incurred by the member for the purpose of access and service to his or her constituents:

...

(i) advertising, whether by signage or by a message broadcast, posted or published in any media, if

(i) the sign or message includes the member's name, constituency and contact information, and

(ii) in the case of a sign, it is located within the member's constituency;

### **Decision on Advertising**

***This clause sets out that advertising by way of a sign must be in a Member's constituency.***

***It is common for Members to have signage in local community clubs in their own constituencies. In certain constituencies many residents access community clubs in neighbouring constituencies due to a lack of facility in their constituency.***

***It is reasonable that in such circumstances, the Member shall be allowed to advertise in a neighbouring constituency and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect this.***

### **(n) Clause 12(1.3) – Incidental Mailings**

#### **Incidental mailings**

**12(1.3)** Section 52.22 of the Act provides financial support for up to three mass mailings per fiscal year by a member to his or her constituents and for the related printing costs. Clauses (1)(e), (q) and (s) of this section are intended to provide additional support for incidental mailings to individuals and groups within the member's constituency, and are therefore limited to mailings addressed or delivered to not more than 20% of the addresses within the constituency. For this purpose, a series of mailings of printed materials that are substantially similar is to be treated as a single mailing.

**Decision on incidental mailings**

***Clause 12(1.3) confirms that section 52.22 of The Legislative Assembly Act provides financial support for up to three mass mailings per fiscal year.***

***Issues have arisen from time to time respecting the content of these incidental mailings.***

***The Regulation shall be amended to include a line which states that the content of such mailing shall be non-partisan.***

**(o) Clause 14 – Representation Expenses**

**Authorized expenses for representation**

**14** The following types of expenses are authorized expenses for representation to the extent that they are incurred by the member for the purpose of access and service to his or her constituents:

- (a) the expense of providing a card, certificate, plaque, flag, fruit basket, plant, wreath or flowers to a constituent or organization to mark a special occasion, if the cost of the item, including all applicable taxes, is not more than \$150;
- (b) the expense of purchasing a meal for two or more persons at a meeting on constituency business if the purchase is made to provide hospitality in conjunction with that business;
- (c) the expense of food and non-alcoholic beverages — and related products for serving the food and beverages — for consumption at a community event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business;
- (d) the expense of providing a bursary or scholarship, if it is paid directly to a school or school division and a receipt for it is delivered when the expense is claimed;
- (e) the cost of a book donated to a school or to a non-profit or

charitable organization;

(f) the expense of lapel pins with symbols connected to Manitoba, pens, magnets in the form of business cards, and other similar types of souvenir items, for distribution to constituents, up to a limit of \$30 per item including all applicable taxes;

(g) the member's cost of up to two tickets to attend a non-profit or charitable community event (which, for greater certainty, includes an event hosted by a Chamber of Commerce or similar community organization, but does not include a sporting event, a golf or other sporting tournament, a social, or a service club meeting),

(i) one of which is purchased for use by the member and is not used by any other person or, if it is the only ticket purchased, is not used by any person other than the member or his or her constituency assistant, executive assistant, researcher or intern, and

(ii) one of which is purchased for use by the member's constituency assistant, executive assistant, researcher or intern and is not used by any person other than the member or his or her constituency assistant, executive assistant, researcher or intern;

(h) [repealed] M.R. November 8/12;

(i) expenses incurred in connection with participation in a parade, other than expenses incurred in connection with the rental of a vehicle;

(j) the expense of any item used or given away at a community event in accordance with cultural practices;

(k) the expense of renting a table or booth at a community event held in the member's constituency (other than an event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business).

Clause 14 contains a list of authorized expenses for representation. These expenses are incurred for the purpose of access and service to constituents.

The list of authorized expenses has been developed over time. The list takes into account certain historical traditions in Manitoba, such as Members recognizing constituents'

special occasions, hosting constituency community events, providing bursaries and scholarships to schools, and participating in parades.

Manitoba differs from other provinces who do not either authorize such expenses or do not itemize them with the same detail.

It is important to note that the purpose of many of these representation expenses is to allow Members to meet and communicate with constituents whether it be at a charitable community event, parades, or constituency barbecues.

It is difficult to itemize every type of expense that might be associated with a parade, a barbecue or souvenirs. It is expected that the expenses will be reasonable, and if Members are not sure about an expense they should check with the Members' Allowances Office.

### **Decision on Representation Expenses**

***I have reviewed the wording of the authorized expenses in Clause 14.***

***Based on issues that have arisen, some of which are highlighted in the Compliance Report of the Members' Allowances Office, the following amendments shall be made to Clause 14 in order to provide further clarification and certainty:***

***(1) Products for serving food and beverages at a community event:***

***14(c) the expense of food and non-alcoholic beverages — and related products for serving the food and beverages — for consumption at a community event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business;***

***The following shall be added to clause 14(c): "Purchase of certain equipment such as barbecues, propane tanks and portable coolers are not authorized expenses under this clause."***

**(2) Meals at Members' community events:**

**14(c) the expense of food and non-alcoholic beverages — and related products for serving the food and beverages — for consumption at a community event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business;**

**The following shall be added to clause 14(c): “For greater certainty, a community event hosted by a Member is one held to benefit constituents or communicate with constituents. The event must be in connection with the Member’s normal role as the constituency MLA.**

**(3) Souvenirs:**

**14(f) the expense of lapel pins with symbols connected to Manitoba, pens, magnets in the form of business cards, and other similar types of souvenir items, for distribution to constituents, up to a limit of \$30 per item including all applicable taxes;**

**The following shall be added to clause 14(f): “For greater certainty, items such as shirts, sweatshirts and golf balls shall not be considered to be authorized souvenir expenses.”**

**(4) Parades:**

**14(i) expenses incurred in connection with participation in a parade, other than expenses incurred in connection with the rental of a vehicle;**

**Issues have arisen as to whether a parade must be in a Member’s constituency to be considered an authorized expense under the Regulation.**

**Some parades, particularly in the rural areas, may involve attendance from constituents in neighbouring areas.**

***To clarify the intent of the clause, the following shall be added to clause 14(i): “The parade must be either in the Member’s constituency or a neighbouring constituency.”***

**(p) Clause 16.4(1) – Constituency Office Rent Allowance**

As of April 1, 2024, the current monthly maximum entitlement is \$1,679.00 for constituency office rent (Clause 16.4(1) as updated).

Numerous Members expressed concerns about the adequacy of the allowance and that they were unable to find suitable space in their constituency at that rate. Others have rented space at higher levels and used their constituency allowance to pay for the balance.

The rental allowance was \$1,250.00 per month in 2012 and has been adjusted by cost-of-living increases. The current level is inadequate. A constituency office is vital to the work of Members and facilitates their service to constituents.

In certain areas of the City of Winnipeg, Members are paying in excess of \$2,500.00 per month and in a few instances over \$3,000.00 per month.

**Decision on Constituency Office Rent Allowance**

***The Regulation shall be amended to increase the monthly constituency office rent allowance to \$2,750.00 per month to pay authorized rental expenses. This increase shall be retroactive to April 1, 2024.***

**(q) Clause 20(1) – Travel Allowance**

The Regulation provides for a base amount for Southern Members plus the calculation of 65 return trips by private vehicle at the kilometric mileage rate between the Legislative Building and Member's residence or place of nomination in the constituency.

The base amounts were calculated many years ago, apparently based on mileage usage by the Members. Constituency boundaries have changed.

**Decision on Travel Allowance**

***It is time to reassess the individual base amounts for Southern Members to determine whether change is warranted.***

***Subsequent to the issuance of this Report, a review will be undertaken, including representations from Southern Members, to determine whether an amendment to the Regulation is warranted.***

**(r) Cablevision Costs**

**Clause 25(1)(b)(iii) – Authorized temporary residence expenses**

**Clause 25.1(4)(b)(vii) – Permanent residence treated as temporary residence**

The Regulation provides for cablevision in the same category as utilities under the authorized temporary residence expenses and permanent residence treated as a temporary residence.



**Decision on Cablevision Costs**

***The Regulation shall be amended to set out that cablevision can be claimed under living expenses to the extent it is not claimed as a residence expense.***

(s) **Clause 25(1)(c) and (d) – Authorized temporary residence expenses – rent for furniture**

**Authorized temporary residence expenses**

**25(1)** The following expenses of the member are authorized temporary residence expenses:

...

(c) the rent for furniture used in the rental accommodation;

(d) expenses related to the rental of the furniture or its use or enjoyment in the rental accommodation, such as insurance and cleaning expenses, to the extent that they are not claimed as authorized living expenses;

Clause 25(1)(c) and (d) provide for rent for furniture used in the rental accommodation, and expenses related to the rental of furniture such as insurance and cleaning expenses to the extent they are not claimed as authorized living expenses.

**Decision on Authorized Temporary residence expenses (rent for furniture)**

***I am advised that these provisions have not been used since the last review of the Regulation. As such, clauses (c) and (d) shall be deleted.***

(t) **Clause 25.1(1) – Permanent residence treated as temporary residence**

Clause 25.1(1) states:

**Permanent residence treated as temporary residence**

**25.1(1)** A non-Winnipeg member who owns and occupies a residence in Winnipeg as well as a residence outside the designated area may designate, in a form approved by the Speaker, one of those residences as a temporary residence for the purposes of this Part.

Under this clause Members can purchase a condominium or a house and have it designated as a temporary residence if certain conditions are met.

I believe it is appropriate to review whether these provisions are appropriate.

**Decision on Permanent Residence treated as temporary residence**

***The Member is entitled to receive reimbursement of property taxes, mortgage interest, common element fees, insurance, and certain repairs.***

***Under the system, a Member can sell the property when they cease to be a Member or choose to sell during the term, and benefit from an increase in value.***

***I do not believe that this system, albeit used by a small number of Members, is in the public interest. It should be discontinued and deleted from the Regulation.***

***Current Members receiving this allowance will be able to access this allowance for the balance of the term of this Assembly.***

**(u) Clause 31(1) – Appeal****Appeal**

**31(1)** A member may appeal any decision or determination under this regulation to a person appointed by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, who may be referred to as the appeals commissioner.

**Decision on Appeal**

*Members can appeal any decision or determination under this Regulation. The Regulation provides for the appointment of an Appeals Commissioner to decide the appeals.*

*In order to expedite and improve the appeal process, the Regulation shall be amended to state that all decisions by the Appeals Commissioner shall be made within 30 days.*

*In addition, before referral to the Appeals Commissioner, the Speaker or their delegate shall have the jurisdiction to allow an appeal if it is considered to be fair and reasonable to do so in the circumstances. The Regulation shall be amended to provide for this.*

**(v) Other Benefits**

All existing salaries, benefits and allowances entitlements are to continue unless specifically changed by one of the decisions in this Report.

**(w) Effective Date**

Unless otherwise indicated in a decision, the effective date of the decision is the date of this Report.

Respectfully submitted this 28<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2024.



---

MICHAEL D. WERIER, K.C.  
Commissioner

## **SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**

### **DECISION ON MEMBERS' SALARY**

*The basic annual salary as of April 1, 2024 is \$106,603.00.*

- (1) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (2) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (3) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

### **DECISION ON PREMIER'S SALARY**

*The Premier's additional compensation is \$89,333.00 for 2024/25.*

- (1) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (2) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (3) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**DECISION ON SALARIES FOR MINISTERS, SPEAKER AND LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION**

*The additional compensation as of April 1, 2024 is \$58,364.00.*

- (1) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (2) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (3) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**DECISION ON SALARIES FOR HOUSE LEADER (GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION, CHIEF WHIP (GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION), AND CAUCUS CHAIR (GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION)**

**(1) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Government)**

- (1) The present additional salary is \$12,043.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$15,400.00 annually.*
- (2) For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*
- (3) For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*
- (4) A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The*

*cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

**(2) Decision on Salary for House Leader (Opposition)**

**(1) *The present additional salary is \$8,601.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$11,600.00 annually.***

**(2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***

**(3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***

**(4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.***

**(3) Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Government)**

**(1) *The present additional salary for Chief Whip (Government) is \$8,601.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$11,600.00 annually.***

**(2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;***

**(3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;***

(4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

(4) **Decision on Salary for Chief Whip (Opposition)**

(1) *The present additional salary for Chief Whip (Opposition) is \$6,883.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$9,600.00 annually.*

(2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*

(3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*

(4) *A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.*

(5) **Decision on Salary for Caucus Chair (Government and Opposition)**

(1) *The present additional salary is \$7,415.00. An adjustment shall be made to increase it to \$10,400.00 annually.*

(2) *For 2025/26 there will be an increase of 2.5% effective April 1, 2025;*

(3) *For 2026/27 there will be an increase of 2.75% effective April 1, 2026;*



- (4) ***A cost-of-living increase will be applied on April 1, 2027 and April 1st in each of the following years until such time as a further decision is made. The cost-of-living increase will be calculated on the basis of the previous five year moving average increase in the Manitoba Consumer Price Index. The cost-of-living increase will be capped at 3% irrespective of any higher increase.***

## **DECISION ON PENSION PLAN**

### **(1) Decision on Cost-of-Living Adjustment**

***I have determined that in the circumstances, outlined above, that it is fair and reasonable that s. 33 of the Members' Retirement Benefits Regulation be made that it would state, "In no case shall the adjustment be less than two-thirds of the increase in the Consumer Price Index."***

### **(2) Decision on Commuted Value Calculation**

***In the circumstances, I have determined that it is fair and reasonable to maintain the bond method of calculation and to have this enshrined in the Regulation.***

***Accordingly I have decided that s. 13(b)(ii) of the Retirement Regulation be amended to state:***

***Notwithstanding the above, the commuted value should be calculated using the bond valuation method set out in subsection 3540 of the Canadian Institute of Actuaries Specific Standards for Pension Plans, or such section as amended from time to time.***

### **(3) Decision on Times for Forms Submission**

***I am advised that it would be appropriate for Sections 30 and 32 to be amended to***

*extend the limits from 90 to 120 days. Accordingly the Retirement Regulation should be so amended where applicable.*

**(4) Decision on Pre-Retirement Death**

*This section precludes a Member from designating a beneficiary for their pre-retirement death benefit. I have determined that this is not a reasonable restriction and the Regulation should be amended to allow for the designation of a beneficiary under s. 34(2).*

**(5) Decision on Death after Commencement of Pension – Change in Name of Act**

*Clause 36(1) of the Regulation refers to the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act. This Act is now called The Beneficiary Designation Act and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect the change.*

**DECISION ON DEFINITIONS**

**(i) Decision on “non-arm’s length expense”**

*This should be amended to delete the reference to his or her spouse and replace it with “their spouse”.*

**(ii) Decision on “kilometric rate”**

*Before September 5, 2012 – This definition is no longer needed and shall be deleted.*

**DECISION ON NORTHERN, SOUTHERN AND WINNIPEG REGIONS**

*The Regulation categorizes Members and their constituencies by region and electoral division. The Regulation shall be amended to reflect the new constituency names which have been adopted since the last review of the Regulation.*

**DECISION ON PAYMENT OF EXPENSES**

*(a) I have been advised that it is a hardship for certain Members who have difficulty making purchases by credit card, particularly at the beginning of the term. In the circumstances, I believe it would be reasonable to implement an advance system whereby a Member could apply for an advance of up to \$2,500.00 to fund authorized expenses.*

*(b) Under section 4(2) the Member can request the Speaker make a direct payment for an authorized expense. The Speaker has absolute discretion to refuse a request for an amount under \$100.00.*

*I am advised that there have been increased requests for such payments and administratively it would be easier for the amount to be increased to \$250.00. The clause shall be amended accordingly.*

**DECISION ON WHAT CONSTITUTES PROOF OF PAYMENT**

*Clause 5(3) sets out various methods of establishing proof of payment. Subsection (e) refers to providing a statutory declaration to verify payment at metered parking. Street parking now provides receipts. This subsection shall be deleted as it is no longer needed.*

**DECISION ON DIGITAL SIGNATURE – ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS**

*I have determined that it would be beneficial for Members to have this option. The Regulation shall be amended to allow Members to submit documents in PDF format with a secure digital signature. This will be considered to be equivalent to an original document under the Regulation.*

**(a) DECISION ON CLAIMS FOR MEAL EXPENSES**

*The rates have been at these levels with small increases dating back many years. They have not kept pace with price increases in the marketplace. They are not reasonable as a result and do not provide fair reimbursement to members.*

*Members should not be required to personally pay for a shortfall. The Civil Service rate shall be replaced.*

*The National Joint Council of the Public Service of Canada is a body of employers and trade unions which among other things, agrees on standard levels of meal rates. They are used by the Members' Allowances Office in Manitoba for out of province travel. They are appropriate to use for the areas referenced in Clause 5(5) and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect the following rates:*

<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>\$24.90</i>
<i>Lunch</i>	<i>\$25.20</i>
<i>Dinner</i>	<i>\$61.85</i>

*The above amounts are to be inclusive of tips paid by the Member on account of the meal.*

**(b) DECISION ON CLAUSE 5(5) RULE 4**

*Clause 5(5) Rule 4 states that a claim for a meal expense (either a representation*

*expense under clause 14(b) or a business meeting expense under clause 14.2 must list the name of each person who was provided the meal.*

*In practise, the requirement to provide last names, has proven to be challenging and a burden for Members, especially when dealing with groups of minors.*

*In view of these circumstances, the Regulation shall be amended to allow for not being required to provide names of minors who attend a group event and receive a meal.*

#### **DECISION ON CLAIMS FOR EXPENSES OF TRAVEL BY PRIVATE VEHICLE**

*Clause 5(6) provides for claims for expenses of travel by private vehicle under various allowances. The clause shall be amended to include that the purpose of the travel must be for legislative or constituency business.*

#### **DECISION ON CERTAIN ALLOWANCES CONTINUE AFTER CEASING TO BE A MEMBER**

*There is a gap in the current clause. It does not cover the situation of a Member who runs for re-election, but is defeated. In this instance a Member should be able to recover expenses paid for residential cleaning and the Regulation shall be so amended.*

#### **DECISION ON CONSTITUENCY OFFICE SPACE**

*Clause 11(1)(b) refers to certain expenses being covered if not included in rent (e.g. janitorial services, snow removal). This clause is not necessary and should be deleted as it is covered under office operation.*

*Clause 11(1)(b) also covers the cost of cable television at the constituency office.*

*This shall be removed from the clause as it properly falls under office operation, Clause 12(1).*

#### **DECISION ON CONSTITUENCY SERVICE AND OFFICE OPERATION**

*This clause sets out that office furnishings and equipment that are included in the standard suite of office furnishings and equipment determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission are authorized expenses.*

*I am advised that the Commission does not make such a determination and the words “determined by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission” shall be deleted from the Regulation as it is no longer applicable. Members’ Allowances will determine what constitutes a standard suite.*

*Also, Clause 12(1)(d)(ii) shall be deleted as renting a telephone is not necessary due to changes in technology.*

#### **DECISION ON COSTS OF FRAMING**

*Clause 12(1)(u) refers to costs of framing a photo of the Queen as being an authorized expense. It shall be amended to state “a photo of the Monarch”.*

#### **DECISION ON LIMIT ON COMMUNICATION DEVICES AND SERVICES and EQUIPMENT AND SERVICE PLANS FOR MOBILE COMMUNICATION DEVICES**

*This clause sets out a list of authorized expenses for Members’ communication devices. Due to changes in technology, the following shall be amended:*

- *12(1.1)(a)(ii) Delete “one smart phone” and replace with “one mobile or wireless device”;*
- *12(1.1)(a)(vi) Delete “if needed, a home land line and home fax and Internet*

services;

- *12(1.2) Delete “smart phone” and replace with mobile or wireless device”.*

### **DECISION ON ADVERTISING**

*This clause sets out that advertising by way of a sign must be in a Member’s constituency.*

*It is common for Members to have signage in local community clubs in their own constituencies. In certain constituencies many residents access community clubs in neighbouring constituencies due to a lack of facility in their constituency.*

*It is reasonable that in such circumstances, the Member shall be allowed to advertise in a neighbouring constituency and the Regulation shall be amended to reflect this.*

### **DECISION ON INCIDENTAL MAILINGS**

*Clause 12(1.3) confirms that section 52.22 of The Legislative Assembly Act provides financial support for up to three mass mailings per fiscal year.*

*Issues have arisen from time to time respecting the content of these incidental mailings.*

*The Regulation shall be amended to include a line which states that the content of such mailing shall be non-partisan.*

## **DECISION ON REPRESENTATION EXPENSES**

*I have reviewed the wording of the authorized expenses in Clause 14.*

*Based on issues that have arisen, some of which are highlighted in the Compliance Report of the Members' Allowances Office, the following amendments shall be made to Clause 14 in order to provide further clarification and certainty:*

***(1) Products for serving food and beverages at a community event:***

***14(c) the expense of food and non-alcoholic beverages — and related products for serving the food and beverages — for consumption at a community event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business;***

*The following shall be added to clause 14(c): “Purchase of certain equipment such as barbecues, propane tanks and portable coolers are not authorized expenses under this clause.”*

***(2) Meals at Members' community events:***

***14(c) the expense of food and non-alcoholic beverages — and related products for serving the food and beverages — for consumption at a community event organized by the member in conjunction with constituency business;***

*The following shall be added to clause 14(c): “For greater certainty, a community event hosted by a Member is one held to benefit constituents or communicate with constituents. The event must be in connection with the Member's normal role as the constituency MLA.”*

***(3) Souvenirs:***

***14(f) the expense of lapel pins with symbols connected to Manitoba, pens, magnets in the form of business cards, and other similar types of souvenir items, for distribution to constituents, up to a limit of \$30 per item including all applicable taxes;***



*The following shall be added to clause 14(f): “For greater certainty, items such as shirts, sweatshirts and golf balls shall not be considered to be authorized souvenir expenses.”*

**(4) Parades:**

**14(i) expenses incurred in connection with participation in a parade, other than expenses incurred in connection with the rental of a vehicle;**

*Issues have arisen as to whether a parade must be in a Member’s constituency to be considered an authorized expense under the Regulation.*

*Some parades, particularly in the rural areas, may involve attendance from constituents in neighbouring areas.*

*To clarify the intent of the clause, the following shall be added to clause 14(i): “The parade must be either in the Member’s constituency or a neighbouring constituency.”*

#### **DECISION ON CONSTITUENCY OFFICE RENT ALLOWANCE**

*The Regulation shall be amended to increase the monthly constituency office rent allowance to \$2,750.00 per month to pay authorized rental expenses. This increase shall be retroactive to April 1, 2024.*

#### **DECISION ON TRAVEL ALLOWANCE**

*It is time to reassess the individual base amounts for Southern Members to determine whether change is warranted.*

*Subsequent to the issuance of this Report, a review will be undertaken, including representations from Southern Members, to determine whether an amendment to the Regulation is warranted.*

**DECISION ON AUTHORIZED TEMPORARY RESIDENCE EXPENSES (CABLEVISION COSTS)**

*The Regulation shall be amended to set out that cablevision can be claimed under living expenses to the extent it is not claimed as a residence expense.*

**DECISION ON AUTHORIZED TEMPORARY RESIDENCE EXPENSES (RENT FOR FURNITURE)**

*I am advised that these provisions have not been used since the last review of the Regulation. As such, clauses (c) and (d) shall be deleted.*

**DECISION ON PERMANENT RESIDENCE TREATED AS TEMPORARY RESIDENCE**

*The Member is entitled to receive reimbursement of property taxes, mortgage interest, common element fees, insurance, and certain repairs.*

*Under the system, a Member can sell the property when they cease to be a Member or choose to sell during the term, and benefit from an increase in value.*

*I do not believe that this system, albeit used by a small number of Members, is in the public interest. It should be discontinued and deleted from the Regulation.*

*Current Members receiving this allowance will be able to access this allowance for the balance of the term of this Assembly.*

**DECISION ON APPEAL**

*Members can appeal any decision or determination under this Regulation. The Regulation provides for the appointment of an Appeals Commissioner to decide the appeals.*

***In order to expedite and improve the appeal process, the Regulation shall be amended to state that all decisions by the Appeals Commissioner shall be made within 30 days.***

***In addition, before referral to the Appeals Commissioner, the Speaker or their delegate shall have the jurisdiction to allow an appeal if it is considered to be fair and reasonable to do so in the circumstances. The Regulation shall be amended to provide for this.***

## APPENDIX "A"

**MEMBERS' INDEMNITIES - 1974 to Current Fiscal Year**

YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
1974		\$9,600.00	\$4,800.00	\$14,400.00	--
1975	Basic	\$9,600.00	\$4,800.00	\$14,400.00	
	COLA	1,049.41	524.71	1,574.12	10.9%
		\$10,649.41	\$5,324.71	\$15,974.12	
1976	Basic	\$10,649.41	\$5,324.71	\$15,974.12	
	COLA	918.49	459.47	1,378.41	8.6%
		\$11,568.35	\$5,784.18	\$17,352.53	
1977	Basic	\$11,568.35	\$5,784.18	\$17,352.53	
	COLA	631.16	315.58	946.74	5.5%
		\$12,199.51	\$6,099.76	\$18,229.27	
1978	Basic	\$12,199.51	\$6,099.76	\$18,229.27	
	Stat. Adjust	.49	.24	.73	
	COLA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0%
		\$12,200.00	\$6,100.00	\$18,300.00	
1979	Basic	\$12,200.00	\$6,100.00	\$18,300.00	
	COLA	1,047.49	523.74	1,571.23	8.6%
		\$13,247.49	\$6,623.74	\$19,871.23	
1980	Basic	\$13,247.49	\$6,623.74	\$19,871.23	
	COLA	1,319.76	659.88	1,979.64	10.0%
	Stat. Adjust	7,752.51	876.26	2,628.77	
		\$16,319.76	\$8,159.88	\$24,479.64	
1981	Basic	\$16,319.76	\$8,159.88	\$24,479.64	
	(COLA)	1,646.50	823.25	2,469.75	10.0%
		\$17,966.26	\$8,983.13	\$26,949.39	
1982	Basic	\$17,966.26	\$8,983.13	\$26,949.39	
	COLA	1,977.83	988.91	2,966.74	11.0%
		\$19,944.09	\$9,972.04	\$29,916.13	

YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
1983	Basic	\$19,944.09	\$9,972.04	\$29,916.13	
	COLA eff. June 18/83	1,272.02	636.01	1,908.03	6.3%
		\$21,216.11	\$10,608.05	\$31,824.16	
1984	Basic	\$21,216.11	\$10,608.05	\$31,824.16	
	Defrd COLA	403.32	201.66	604.98	
	Basic	\$21,619.43	\$10,809.71	\$32,429.14	
	COLA	880.24	440.12	1,320.36	4.0%
		\$22,499.67	\$11,249.83	\$33,749.50	
1985	Basic	\$22,499.67	\$11,249.83	\$33,749.50	
	COLA	748.49	374.25	1,122.74	3.3%
		\$23,248.16	\$11,624.08	\$34,872.24	
1986	Basic	\$23,248.16	\$11,624.08	\$34,872.24	
	COLA	887.52	443.76	1,331.28	3.8%
		\$24,135.68	\$12,067.84	\$36,203.52	
1987	Basic	\$24,135.68	\$12,067.84	\$36,203.52	
	COLA	878.00	439.00	1,317.00	3.6%
		\$25,013.68	\$12,506.84	\$37,520.52	
1988	Basic	\$25,013.68	\$12,506.84	\$37,520.52	
	COLA	890.67	445.33	1,336.00	3.6%
		\$25,904.35	\$12,952.17	\$38,856.52	
1989	Basic	\$25,904.35	\$12,952.17	\$38,856.52	
	COLA	878.00	439.00	1,317.00	3.4%
		\$26,782.35	\$13,391.17	\$40,173.52	
1990	Basic	\$26,782.35	\$13,391.17	\$40,173.52	
	COLA	1,181.00	591.00	1,772.00	4.4%
		\$27,963.35	\$13,982.17	\$41,945.52	
1991	Basic	\$27,963.35	\$13,982.17	\$41,945.52	
	COLA	Statutory increase declined.			0.0%
		\$27,963.35	\$13,982.17	\$41,945.52	

YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
1992	Basic	\$27,963.35	\$13,982.17	\$41,945.52	
	COLA	954.00	477.00	1,431.00	3.4%
		\$28,917.35	\$14,459.17	\$43,376.52	
1993	Basic	\$28,917.35	\$14,459.17	\$43,376.52	
	COLA	534.00	267.00	801.00	1.8%
	Basic	\$29,451.35	\$14,726.17	\$44,177.52	
	Reduction	1,119.17	559.58	1,678.74	(3.8%)
		\$28,332.18	\$14,166.59	\$42,498.77	
1994	Basic	\$28,332.18	\$14,166.59	\$42,498.77	
	COLA	436.00	218.00	654.00	1.48%
	Basic	\$29,887.35	\$14,944.17	\$44,831.52	
	Reduction	1,106.94	553.49	1,660.43	(3.70370%)
		\$28,780.41	\$14,390.68	\$43,171.09	
1995	Basic	\$29,887.35	\$14,944.17	\$44,831.52	
A. <sup>1</sup>	COLA	52.00	26.00	78.00	0.174%
		\$29,939.35	\$14,970.17	\$44,909.52	
1995	Basic			\$56,500.00	
B. <sup>2</sup>					
1996	Basic			\$56,500.00	
	COLA			565.00	1.0%
				\$57,065.00	
1997	Basic			\$57,065.00	
	COLA			1,199.00	2.1%
				\$58,264.00	
1998	Basic			\$58,264.00	
	COLA			991.00	1.7%
				\$59,255.00	

<sup>1</sup> Prior to April 25, 1995 General Election

<sup>2</sup> Subsequent to April 25, 1995 General Election

YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
1999	Basic			\$59,255.00	
	COLA			1,897.00	3.2%
				\$61,152.00	
2000	Basic			\$61,152.00	
	COLA			367.00	0.6%
				\$61,519.00	
2001	Basic			\$61,519.00	
	COLA			2,031.00	3.3%
				\$63,550.00	
2002	Basic			\$63,550.00	
	COLA			700.00	1.1%
				\$64,250.00	
2003	Basic			\$64,250.00	
	COLA			1,285.00	2.0%
				\$65,535.00	
2004	Basic			\$65,535.00	
	COLA				0.0%*
				\$65,535.00	
*Note: Commissioner recommended that 1.4% COLA be given up. Legislature accepted that recommendation and appointed a Pay Commissioner to make pay decisions.					
2005	Basic			\$65,535.00	
As at April 1	COLA			1,638.00	2.5%
				\$67,173.00	
2006	Basic			\$67,173.00	
2006	Adjustment to base per Commissioner			4,827.00	7.2%
2006	Adjusted Basic			\$72,000.00	
	COLA			1,512.00	2.1%
				\$73,512.00	
2007	Basic			\$73,512.00	
As at April 1	COLA			1,470.00	2.0%
				\$74,982.00	
Note: COLA for fiscal year 2006/07 is applied using a five year average for CPI for Manitoba.					

YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
2008	Basic			\$82,000.00	
	COLA			1,722.00	2.1%
				\$83,722.00	
2009	Basic			\$83,722.00	
	COLA			1,842.00	2.2%
				\$85,564.00	
2009	Basic			\$85,564.00	
	COLA*				0.0%
				\$85,564.00	
2010	Basic			\$85,564.00	
	COLA				0.0%
				\$85,564.00	
2011	Basic			\$85,564.00	
	COLA				0.0%
				\$85,564.00	
2012	Basic			\$85,564.00	
	COLA**				0.0%
				\$85,564.00	
2013	Basic	\$85,564.00		\$85,564.00	0.0%
	No COLA				
				\$85,564.00	
2014	Basic	\$89,500.00		\$89,500.00	
	No COLA				0.0%***
				\$89,500.00	
2015	Basic	\$91,201.00		\$89,500.00	
	COLA			1,700.15	1.9% COLA
				\$91,201.00	
2016	Basic	\$93,025.00		\$91,201.00	
	COLA			\$1,824.02	2.0% COLA
				\$93,025.00	



YEAR		INDEMNITY	ALLOWANCE (TAX-FREE)	TOTAL	INCREASE/ DECREASE
2017	Basic	\$94,513.00		\$93,025.00	
	COLA			1,488.40	1.6% COLA****
				\$94,513.00	
2018	Basic	\$94,513.00		\$94,513.00	
	No COLA				0.0%
				\$94,513.00	
2019	Basic	\$94,513.00		\$94,513.00	
	No COLA				0.0%
				\$94,513.00	
2020	Basic	\$96,214.00		\$94,513.00	
	COLA			1,701.00	1.8%
				\$96,214.00	
2021	Basic	\$97,753.00		\$96,214.00	
	COLA			1,539.00	1.6%
				\$97,753.00	
2022	Basic	\$99,708.00		\$97,753.00	
	COLA			1,955.00	2.0%
				\$99,708.00	
2023	Basic	\$102,998.00		\$99,708.00	
	COLA			3,290.00	3.3%
				\$102,998.00	
2024	Basic	\$106,603.00		\$102,998.00	
	COLA			3,605.00	3.5%
				\$106,603.00	

**Note: COLA for fiscal year 2009/10 and onward is applied using a five year average for CPI for Manitoba.**

**\*No Cola applied for fiscal year 2009/10 as per amendment to Legislative Assembly Act, Member's Salary Regulation, Sec. 1.1(4).**

**\*\* On April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012, the government announced in the budget speech that a 20 % reduction in Ministerial will continue and no cola will be applied to MLA pay for the 2012/13 and 2013/14 fiscal years. The 2012/13 Estimates of Expenditure and Revenue was not adjusted to show the reduction.**

**\*\*\*No COLA is to be applied to the basic pay for 2014/15. As per the Commissioner's Report on Members' Salaries, Allowances and Retirement Benefits, Members basic pay will increase to \$89,500 effective April 1, 2014.**

**\*\*\*\*Gov. MLA's donated COLA back to government. Statement in the House by Premier. Other parties followed however donated COLA to charity of their choice.**

APPENDIX “B”

Jurisdictional Salaries – April 1, 2024

	House of Commons	British Columbia	Alberta	Saskatchewan	Manitoba	Ontario	Quebec	New Brunswick	Nova Scotia	Prince Edward Island	Newfoundland and Labrador	Yukon	Northwest Territories	Nunavut
Basic Indemnity	\$203,100.00	\$119,533.00	\$120,936.00	\$109,575.00	\$106,603.00	\$116,550.00	\$131,766.00	\$93,126.00	\$89,235.00	\$82,116.00	\$95,357.00	\$93,067.00	\$117,668.00	\$112,942.00
Taxable Allowance							\$20,256.00					\$23,261.00	\$8,786.00	\$30,607.00
Taxable Allowance MLAs outside commuting distance of capital													\$8,786.00	
<b>Presiding Officers:</b>														
Speaker	\$96,800.00	\$59,766.00	\$60,468.00	\$55,788.00	\$58,364.00	\$36,364.00	\$98,825.00	\$62,022.00	\$49,047.00	\$54,885.00	\$48,665.00	\$46,546.00	\$57,328.00	\$87,594.00
Deputy Speaker	\$50,100.00	\$41,836.00	\$30,240.00	\$16,303.00	\$12,043.00	\$17,249.00	\$46,118.00	\$31,011.00	\$24,523.00	\$27,442.00	\$12,166.00	\$18,589.00	\$8,587.00	\$22,589.00
Assistant Deputy Speaker	19,600.00	\$41,836.00											N/A	
Deputy Chair of Committee	\$19,600.00	\$23,907.00	\$15,120.00	\$8,153.00	\$8,601.00	\$12,704.00							\$5,154.00	\$5,925.00
									If only one Deputy Speaker salary is \$24,523. If more than one, \$12,500 each					
<b>Government:</b>														
Premier	\$203,100.00	\$107,579.00	\$65,244.00	\$79,696.00	89,333.00	\$92,424.00	\$138,354.00	\$93,126.00	\$101,545.00	\$85,302.00	\$65,168.00	\$75,109.00	\$96,991.00	\$104,061.00
Deputy Premier				\$61,899.00									N/A	\$95,827.00
Minister	\$96,800.00	\$59,766.00	\$60,468.00	\$61,899.00	\$58,364.00	\$49,301.00	\$98,825.00	\$62,022.00	\$49,047.00	\$54,885.00	\$48,665.00	\$50,114.00	\$69,516.00	\$87,594.00
Minister w/o portfolio / Minister of State	\$96,800.00	\$41,836.00	\$27,216.00		\$49,193.00	\$22,378.00	\$98,825.00	\$46,563.00	\$49,047.00				N/A	
Parliamentary / Legislative Secretary / Assistant	\$19,600.00	\$17,930.00		\$3,000.00	\$5,164.00	\$16,667.00	\$26,353.00						N/A	
Secretaries of State (HoC)	\$72,400.00												N/A	
House Leader (if not a Minister)	\$96,800.00			\$16,303.00	\$12,043.00			\$31,011.00	\$10,506.00	\$14,780.00			N/A	
Deputy House Leader (if not a Minister)	\$19,600.00		\$12,096.00	\$8,153.00			\$32,942.00		\$5,253.00				N/A	
(Chief) Whip	\$36,000.00	\$23,907.00	\$12,096.00	\$16,303.00	\$8,601.00	\$21,329.00	\$46,118.00	\$31,011.00	\$5,253.00	\$14,041.00			N/A	
Deputy Whip	\$13,800.00	\$17,930.00	\$9,072.00	\$8,153.00		\$14,569.00	\$26,353.00						N/A	
Other Whips						\$10,490.00							N/A	
Caucus Chair	\$13,800.00	\$23,907.00		\$16,303.00	\$7,415.00	\$14,569.00	\$32,942.00	\$31,011.00	\$10,506.00				\$3,805.00	
Deputy Caucus Chair				\$8,153.00									N/A	
<b>Official Opposition:</b>														
Leader of the Official Opposition	\$96,800.00	\$59,766.00	\$60,468.00	\$55,788.00	\$58,364.00	\$64,336.00	\$98,825.00	\$65,188.00	\$49,047.00	\$54,885.00	\$48,665.00	\$50,114.00	N/A	
Deputy Leader				\$16,303.00									N/A	
House Leader	\$50,100.00	\$23,907.00	\$15,120.00	\$16,303.00	\$8,601.00	\$21,329.00	\$46,118.00	\$23,258.00	\$10,506.00	\$14,780.00	\$24,330.00		N/A	
Deputy House Leader	\$19,600.00			\$8,153.00		\$10,490.00	\$26,353.00		\$5,253.00				N/A	
(Chief) Whip	\$36,000.00	\$23,907.00	\$9,072.00	\$16,303.00	\$6,883.00	\$16,317.00	\$39,530.00	\$23,258.00	\$5,253.00	\$14,041.00			N/A	
Deputy Whip	\$13,800.00	\$17,930.00	\$7,260.00	\$8,153.00		\$10,490.00	\$26,353.00						N/A	
Caucus Chair	\$13,800.00	\$23,907.00		\$16,303.00	\$7,415.00	\$14,569.00	\$29,647.00	\$23,258.00	\$10,506.00				N/A	
Deputy Caucus Chair				\$8,153.00									N/A	
<b>(Recognized) Third Party:</b>														
Leader	\$68,600.00	\$29,883.00	\$27,216.00	\$27,081.00	\$49,193.00	\$41,608.00	\$46,118.00	\$46,563.00	\$24,523.00	\$27,442.00	\$24,330.00	\$24,893.00	N/A	
House Leader	\$19,600.00	\$11,953.00	\$12,096.00	\$8,153.00	\$6,883.00	\$18,182.00	\$32,942.00	\$15,505.00	\$10,506.00	\$14,780.00	\$12,166.00		N/A	
Deputy House Leader	\$6,800.00					\$9,557.00							N/A	
Whip	\$13,800.00	\$11,953.00	\$7,260.00	\$8,153.00	\$5,164.00	\$14,685.00	\$26,353.00		\$5,253.00	\$14,041.00			N/A	

	House of Commons	British Columbia	Alberta	Saskatchewan	Manitoba	Ontario	Quebec	New Brunswick	Nova Scotia	Prince Edward Island	Newfoundland and Labrador	Yukon	Northwest Territories	Nunavut	
Deputy Whip	\$6,800.00					\$9,557.00							N/A		
Caucus Chair	\$6,800.00	\$11,953.00		\$8,153.00		\$13,170.00			\$5,253.00				N/A		
Chair of Full Caucus													\$3,682.00	\$3,457.00	
Chair of Regular Members' caucus														\$3,457.00	
<b>Committees</b>				see note 2	see note 1					see note	see note				
Chair	\$13,800.00	\$17,930.00	\$200/meeting	\$16,303.00	\$223/meeting	\$16,317.00	\$32,943.00	\$200/meeting	\$2,101.00	\$161/meeting			\$7,608.00	\$5,104.00	
Chair Standing Ctee (if different from other ctees)													\$7,608.00		
Chair Select Ctee (if different from other ctees)													\$7,608.00		
Chair – PAC (if different from other ctees)									\$3,152.00		\$12,166.00		\$11,210.00		
Deputy Chair		\$11,953.00		\$8,153.00	\$223/meeting	\$9,324.00	\$26,353.00		\$525.00		\$9,300.00		\$5,154.00		
Members				\$130/meeting				\$125/meeting		\$109/meeting			\$4,259.00		
Presiding Officer of Committee							\$19,765.00								
Member of the Bureau of the National Assembly							\$19,765.00								
Vice-chairs of Standing, Special, Standing Joint and Special Joint Committees	\$6,800.00														
Chair of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians	\$50,100.00														
Member of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians	\$13,800.00														
	Note 1: \$2,000.00 car allowance for Prime Minister, Cabinet Minister, House Leader of the government and Leader of the Official Opposition Note 2: \$1,000.00 car allowance for Speaker			Note 1: Annual salary adjustment is CPI capped at 3%. Note 2: Eligible Committees are Public Accounts, Human Services, Economy, Crown & Central Agencies, IGA & Justice.	Note 1: to a maximum of \$5164 for Chair and \$4305 for vice chair					Max of \$4500 annually	only PAC compensated  2024 update – there has been a review of the Members' of the House of Assembly Salaries, Severances, Pensions and Allowances Members' Compensation Review Committee / March 2024. The House is currently sitting, the report has been tabled and the next steps will be for the House of Assembly Management Commission (HOAMC) to review the recommendations. HOAMC may choose to accept, reject, or change the recommendation. The Committee has the authority to do that but cannot change the recommendation so that it gives them a better benefit than the recommendation.				