



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FORTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

---

Volume XLVIII

THIRD SESSION

Number 35

---

HANSARD

*Speaker: Honourable Perry Trimper, MHA*

Thursday

November 1, 2018

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER (Trimper):** Order, please!

Admit strangers

I would like to welcome all the Members back to the House of Assembly

In the public gallery today, I would like to welcome Shara King and David Mullett of Midnight Tailors. They will be mentioned in a Member's statement this afternoon.

Welcome to you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** And I would like to extend a very special welcome to Ms. Cheryl Davis; she is the wife of the MHA for Topsail - Paradise who is here on a very special occasion today.

Welcome to you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Members

**MR. SPEAKER:** For Members' statements today we will hear from the Members for the Districts of Mount Pearl North, Placentia West - Bellevue, Virginia Waters - Pleasantville, Ferryland, Windsor Lake, and then I'll be over to the Member for Gander at that time.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

**MR. LESTER:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hon. House today to congratulate Coffee Matters on their return to their original Mount Pearl location.

In early April of this year, the Mount Pearl business was forced from its home in a strip mall on Commonwealth Avenue following a fire at Elite Tattoo Studio next door. The business lost thousands of dollars' worth of food due to smoke damage, and the structure itself was completely cleared out.

After the fire, co-owner Scott Hillyer said he was overwhelmed with the flood of support they received from the community when preparing

their temporary space for business. Customers, suppliers, contractors, other businesses and community members were there to help.

Hillyer attributes the show of support from the community to the good brand that Coffee Matters has built, which puts people and goodwill first, and profits second.

He said: "We have a philosophy that whoever calls looking for donation, whether it's a five-dollar gift card or whether it's something larger, we always try our best to donate back to the community."

I would ask all Members present to join me in thanking Coffee Matters for all they do in the community and congratulate them on their return to their original home in Mount Pearl.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Placentia West - Bellevue.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Brushett was 21 when he joined the Royal Artillery 59th Newfoundland Heavy Regiment and served during the successful Battle of Normandy, in addition to service in Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany.

His unit fired its last rounds of the war in Hamburg, Germany, two days before the city's German forces surrendered. Upon returning home, he raised a family and became a dedicated member of the Free Masons. He passed away this January at the age of 98.

Mr. Cyril Butler joined the war effort at the age of 18, serving in the Royal Air Force while stationed at Scotland, Wales and England on D-Day. Upon returning home, he served in the Naval Reserves and as a councillor and town manager in Marystown. He was instrumental in the erection of a war monument in Marystown and the creation of the Sea Cadet Corps. A consummate gentleman, Mr. Butler passed away in July at the age of 96.

A third veteran, Mr. Don Holloway, served with the Canadian Army, Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps from '42 to '47 in ammunitions, naval mine and U-boat detections supply system. He

became a passionate advocate for recreation, serving as Marystown's first arena manager and recreation director before becoming president of both provincial and National Pensioners and Senior Citizens Federation. He passed away in September at the age of 96.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. Members to salute all veterans, but most certainly, these three heroes hailing from Marystown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Virginia Waters - Pleasantville.

**MR. B. DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in this hon. House to recognize local entrepreneurship Shara King and David Mullett of Midnight Tailors in my district. Midnight Tailors are tie makers from St. John's who create handmade-to-order custom ties for everyone, and for every occasion or non-occasion, including weddings, corporate situations, or if you just want to look sharp.

Sci-Fi on the Rock, St. John's largest pop culture convention afforded them the opportunity to realize the potential that convention settings offer to market their unique #geekchic casual accessories. Midnight Tailors then decided to hit the Canadian convention circuit each year, peddling their wares at established giants such as Montreal Comiccon and Hal-Con, among many others.

Midnight Tailors also supply several retail outlets with their products, proving that there is a huge niche market for custom accessories in our community. Since initially starting with classics and bow ties, they have expanded to cufflinks, earrings, scrunchies, handkerchiefs and headscarves, ensuring that there is something for everyone in their shop.

Midnight Tailors have shown that with a little imagination and a lot of drive, anything can happen. They are a creative cornerstone of our

community. I look forward to seeing what creations they come up with next.

I ask all hon. Members to join me in wishing Shara, David and Midnight Tailors the best of luck, and remember to support local.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to recognize the graduating class of 2018 of Stella Maris Academy in Trepassey. The class included three high school graduates: Adrianna Nichol, Riley Pennell and Dion Perry.

Last Saturday, I was honoured to share in the graduation ceremony for these three students held in Portugal Cove South. While Stella Maris student enrolment has declined significantly in the last decade, their academic and athletic results have always been extremely high. The innovation and commitment of the staff and students have ensured students are ready to take on any challenge.

The size of their school and class has not affected their academic success. Their success is tied to the tremendous supports from the school staff, the communities and parents. These supports have played a big role in maximizing their education experience, opportunities and have provided the needed guidance to the students over the years at Stella Maris.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to join me in honouring the graduates from Stella Maris Academy in Trepassey, and wish them every success in their future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. Member for the District of Windsor Lake.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated, lifelong public servant who recently announced his retirement from this Chamber. The Member for Topsail - Paradise entered the House in 2010, but his contributions to the well-being of the province span decades.

Prior to entering provincial politics, he spent 25 years as an officer in the RNC, served as councillor and deputy mayor in his hometown of Conception Bay South, and has been a lifelong volunteer and community leader. The Member served eight years as a Cabinet minister, Leader of the Opposition, and the 12th premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, while devoting himself to the people of his constituency.

Whether the Member for Topsail - Paradise stays retired from the public eye or not, his future activities will be performed with the dignity, compassion and dedication that he has always shown.

The PC caucus thanks the Member for his service, and wishes him and his family Godspeed as they write the next chapter of their lives.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** For further Member statements, I would ask the Member for Gander to please address the House of Assembly to confirm leave, and then proceed with his statement.

Thank you.

**MR. HAGGIE:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I thank my colleagues for leave to present this statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise in this hon. House to mark the passing of my friend and former colleague, Dr. Doug Torraville.

Coming to Gander from a practice in Grand Falls-Windsor in 2004, Doug rapidly established himself as a pillar, not just in the obstetrics

service but in the community itself. His tireless efforts carried his beloved discipline through many challenging times, and it was only his unreliable physical health that finally ground him to a halt.

It's a remarkable testimony to the man, his character and skills, and the love and respect in which he was held by staff, that the entire obstetric nursing complement from the hospital formed an honour guard to escort him on his last journey through the church in which he worshiped regularly. In turn, their nursing colleagues had volunteered to fill their places on duty to allow all of them to pay their respects. It was the entire hospital coming together.

He will be remembered as a tireless advocate for midwifery, in Gander in particular. The profession, his discipline and his community will be the poorer for his passing, but his memory will continue in the hearts of we who knew him.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Statements by Ministers.

#### Statements by Ministers

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Land Resources.

**MR. BYRNE:** Thank you very, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps the only thing tougher than a Newfoundlander and Labradorian is a Newfoundland Pony. Our ancestors worked alongside this iconic animal to make their living from the land and from the sea. The pony was often an essential way of their life and was used for many, many jobs including plowing fields, hauling fish nets, hauling wood and as a means of transportation from isolated communities.

To help others to ensure the continued perseverance of this significant, iconic and special breed, our government is providing land for their protection, pasturing and breeding.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to inform this House that in September we issued a 50-year lease for approximately 10 hectares of Crown lands near Hopeall, Trinity Bay, to the Newfoundland Pony Society to create a Newfoundland Pony Heritage Park.

While these 10 hectares will assist the Newfoundland Pony Society in its efforts to provide sanctuary to these beloved animals, we must also recognize the tremendous efforts and dedication of those who, for decades, have committed their time and their resources to save the pony from extinction.

Mr. Speaker, while my department is working hard to protect and preserve the Newfoundland Pony, so too are we working hard to improve the circumstances of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

As part of our Way Forward commitments we increased access to Crown lands, we identified 62 areas of interest totalling approximately 64,000 hectares for agricultural use. I'm very proud to state to this House, Mr. Speaker, that 49 of these areas – a total of approximately 50,500 hectares – have now been reserved for agricultural developments.

Mr. Speaker, today we have over 27,000 hectares of agricultural land and agricultural leases which have been issued to existing and new entrants.

Watch as we grow. Truly, we are on the way forward.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

**MR. LESTER:** Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland pony still remains the one and only official heritage animal of our province. Considering its reputation as a hardy, strong, yet gentle creature, I can think of no better representative in the barnyard to represent our province's history.

I am very familiar with the Newfoundland pony. For my tenth birthday my grandparents gave me

one. With that pony I was taught to work the fields and haul out wood every winter. We on this side of the House applaud the efforts of the Newfoundland Pony Society and encourage all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to visit the Heritage Park upon its opening.

In reference to the secondary part of the Ministerial Statement, I'm glad the minister has finally put forward numbers regarding this report, as I've requested them time and time again both in and outside the House. While these numbers are substantial, they remain vague and are not a reflection of what I'm hearing from industry. Huge delays in application process and lease production, largely attributed to the Crown Lands move from its original location to Corner Brook. Further to that, I refer to the old saying: Never change horses in mid-stream.

In speaking with the industry, both producer and representative organizations have expressed frustration with the lack of consultation and collaboration which was promised in *The Way Forward* document on agriculture. Now that the minister has confirmed these numbers, I look forward to a detailed request, which was posed six months ago. Once again, I would like to remind him that the political announcements do not feed people, farmers do.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

The Member's time has expired.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

**MS. MICHAEL:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Thanks to the minister for the advance copy of his statement. The Heritage Park should help the Newfoundland Pony Society immensely in its work to preserve the breed. The park will have land for raising horses, growing hay, providing a refuge, and eventually attracting visitors.

But there's also a concern, I say to the minister, that more land will be needed around the

province to increase the numbers and ensure the Newfoundland pony survival. It needs more than the Heritage Park. However, congratulations to the society for all its work, its amazing volunteer work.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further statements by ministers?

The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in this hon. House to promote a wonderful initiative supported by the Department of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

The Research Inspired Student Enrichment Awards, or RISE, gives recipients an opportunity to attend research-related enrichment programs at prestigious schools, such as the Research Science Institute based at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the Da Vinci Engineering Enrichment Program at the University of Toronto; and the Boston Leadership Institute in Wellesley, Massachusetts.

High school students in the province who demonstrate academic excellence in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, and who will be completing level II by June 2019, are eligible to apply. Awards range in the value of \$7,900 to \$15,100, and will be granted to a maximum of 15 students. Eligible students must have a minimum average of 90 per cent across all level I courses, and have a minimum number of courses in science and mathematics.

Mr. Speaker, the deadline for this year's RISE Awards is November 8.

As part of *The Way Forward's* Technology Work Plan, we want to give students the opportunity to further their educational horizons

in ways that promote experiences with technology and innovation, while also building on their potential here at home. The RISE Awards is a wonderful program that empowers our youth to aim higher and achieve more academically. In supporting this initiative, our government is showing its commitment to increasing innovation, fostering creativity and developing an entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. Speaker, 110 RISE Awards have been presented to students who thrive academically in our schools. I encourage all students to apply and reach their full potential, becoming tomorrow's innovators, educators, researchers and leaders.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement. On behalf of the Official Opposition, we join with the minister in encouraging students to apply for the RISE Awards. Students in this province have continually demonstrated that they can compete on a world stage. From Enactus Memorial to the success of the Paradigm Hyperloop, our students are demonstrating their intelligence, critical thinking skills and abilities in every discipline imaginable.

The Research Inspired Student Enrichment Awards are another opportunity for students in this province to expand their horizons. They will give students the ability to attend enrichment programs which will teach additional skills and inspire students to pursue post-secondary studies in various areas.

Mr. Speaker, the potential of our youth is endless. I encourage all students to seek out opportunities and strive for success.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, thank the minister. Congratulations to all the previous RISE Awards recipients on their achievements and best of luck to this year's applicants. What a great opportunity for our young folks. Young people are essential to the future of our province and they deserve every opportunity to pursue the best education possible, especially in innovation.

These awards play a valuable role in supporting our students but so too do our post-secondary institutions here at home who are also centres of excellence. They cannot take any more cuts.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

### Oral Questions

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CROSBIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the minister responsible for The Rooms. The Rooms request for proposals for an agency of record this year incorporated certain conflict of interest guidelines. Did The Rooms get their conflict of interest guidelines from the minister and, if not, from where did The Rooms get the guidelines?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I answered the question around the RFP that was issued for an agency of record yesterday. That is within the CEO's responsibility and of The Rooms Corporation to be able to enter into an RFP to secure an agency of record.

They did so following guidelines and they did issue an apology for a poor use of an example that was put forward, but there was no knowledge of government, there was no direction put forward by me and that is not the direction of this government to do so with the example that was put forward by that RFP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** A further question for the minister: Conflict of interest guidelines in effect when The Idea Factory was hired by The Rooms as agency of record stated that it is a conflict of interest – and I'll quote this – to represent or advise any person or organization engaged in advocacy activities against the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, including any provincial Crown corporation or other agency of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador – end quote.

Would the minister advise the House whether this guideline continues to limit The Idea Factory and the clients they represent, and does this continue as government policy?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter of public record. The Rooms CEO has apologized for the poor use of example, but it had no impact on the actual awarding of the RFP. It was not part of the RFP process and this was not something that was sanctioned by government, approved by government. This was something taken by The Rooms CEO in the responsibilities that they have to issue an RFP.

They had used the appropriate process of having three people to review four proposals and the matter of the example that was used on a questionnaire for conflict of interest was not a factor in awarding the decision. It is not the viewpoint of government, nor is that how our government would operate.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** I thank the minister but just to ensure we're on the same page, the language that was so regrettable was from the RFP but the RFP incorporated certain conflict of interest guidelines.

The question is: Are those conflict of interest guidelines that The Rooms used earlier this year still in effect?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, this was an example that was used on the website when they went out to procure a record, a Q & A. It was not part of the assessment process. There was an independent process put forward where there were three people who reviewed four best proposals, they had a matrix, they did verifications – there were four proposals. The best person was submitted.

The CEO has highlighted that this was not part of government, not part of government's decision. This was something that The Rooms had done and they had done in error by using a poor example.

There was a public apology issued through The Rooms Corporation and issued through the listserv of government. I'm sure the Member opposite would review that apology and that matter that was made by the CEO of The Rooms.

This is not how government is operating.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the minister and I are still not on the same page.

The question and the wording that I read out is from the conflict of interest guidelines incorporated by the RFP. We both regret the wording, the explanatory wording in the RFP, but I'm now asking about the conflict guidelines.

Are they still in effect?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, we'll never be on the same page I think when it comes to the Member of the Opposition, his policies and directions.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** He has not been clear with the people of this province when he talks about we need to ensure that every year there has to be a debt break, a balanced budget, \$900 million in cuts that he would make in spending. We take a balanced approach here on this side of the House. We have a plan to get back on surplus when it comes to creating jobs and building for the economy.

When they talk about cannabis and the industry that we're developing right here, they would prefer to have importation so there would be no jobs here and no economic development and no spinoff. That is the direction of what they are talking about here on this side of the House.

I've answered his question repeatedly. This is not the direction of government nor The Rooms.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, it seems that when the question is particularly embarrassing, the red herring treatment is dragged out.

For the minister: Would the guidelines that I have quoted in previous questions forbid The



Idea Factory from representing or advising, for example, the Employers' Council or a public sector union?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, the answer is simply no. It is simply no, because this was an example that was used in a Q & A on a website. It was not part of the request for proposals to have an agency of record. This was a poor use of an example; it was highlighted by the CEO.

This was something that The Rooms Corporation undertook on their own. It is not government's policy to be restrictive in that viewpoint, and it is something that The Rooms Corporation had apologized for. I cannot be more clear than that in all of the answers that I've put forward.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Again, Mr. Speaker, the language used in the RFP that has been regretted and withdrawn is not the same as the guideline. If the guideline is not aimed at clients like the Employers' Council or NAPE, can the minister say what persons or organizations engaged in advocacy it is aimed at?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the Member opposite certainly understands contracts, understands requests for proposals in his previous career. What I have pointed out is that The Rooms has the responsibility to enter into a request for proposals on their own to procure an agency of record. They had done that. They had followed the procedures of filing for a request for proposals. That was done by three people. It was independently awarded. There were four proposals.

When it comes to these guidelines that are put forward, there was an example in one of the questions that had reflected a very poor example that is not representative of government nor The Rooms, nor did it have an impact on who was awarded the contract.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Would the minister inform the House whether it would ever be proper for government or a Crown corporation or other agency to refuse the contract with a consultant based on whether they represent or advise a person who is engaged in advocacy activities against government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, there are times when there are certainly a conflict of interest that would exist why somebody would not be able to do work for government, and the Member opposite would certainly know that and could cite examples of that.

But in this instance, this was irrelevant. It was an error in judgment by The Rooms in placing this forward in an example. It reflected poorly. The Rooms CEO has apologized for it. But it had no bearing on the issue of the RFP and who was awarded – a very credible firm that is doing great work on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, the Human Rights Act forbids discrimination on the basis of political opinion.

Can the minister advise the House whether the conflict of interest guideline in use by The Rooms is consistent with the Human Rights Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, I happen to recall months ago that the Member opposite, while he was seeking to be the leader of the party that he's now responsible for, had stated that he would file a human rights complaint into this matter, and maybe he can inform the House if he has, and what the outcome of that would be.

But the fact is that The Rooms followed a process to issue an RFP. They have the right and responsibility to do so. It has nothing to do with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. To have The Rooms – they did this independently, they put forward a poor example, it is something that they had apologized for, but it had no impact on the awarding of the actual contract.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** I thank the minister for pointing out the issue of the complaint.

As a matter of information, I did make a complaint, it was rejected by the commission because I was not a person with standing to do so; I was not affected by the incident. I commend it to the minister's attention to look into whether this is, in fact, in breach of the Human Rights Act.

A question, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, for the Premier: According to news reports, Nalcor has paid monies owed by Astaldi to workers since October 14, which we fully supported and are pleased to hear. Would the Premier be able to inform the House the approximate amount of the payout by Nalcor, and what fund the amount will come from?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, this has been a difficult time for the workers of Astaldi. It is unfortunate, and it has been something that we've been monitoring and working with Nalcor on over the last number of weeks, as the public is well aware.

The people who work for Astaldi, if they have not already been paid, in the next few days they will receive their payment. Nalcor has made that arrangement. Nalcor is working with the surety on that very issue, because it is so important to the people of the province.

So, I guess the answer to the question that I've been asked is how will Nalcor get reimbursed for the monies that they have paid to the workers of Astaldi, it will be through the surety, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** I'm not sure that I heard the last words, it will be through ...?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** The surety.

**MR. CROSBIE:** The surety, I see, yes. Thank you.

Can the minister state the approximate amount Astaldi owes to workers in health and pension benefits? Whether Nalcor will cover any shortage or whether someone else, some third party would be involved in that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Astaldi was required to have both sureties, bonds, letters of credit up to I think it was about \$400 million; it was required as part of their contract. As the Member opposite is aware, he is a lawyer, the lien that was placed by RDTC, the Trades Newfoundland and Labrador for payment of pensions and benefits plans was done in July and August.

The surety made payment in September; we're waiting to see what happens in October, Mr. Speaker. It would be through the required surety and bonds that are underway, and they are working through that process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** For either the minister or the Premier: Is it the position of government that the Astaldi default has not undermined the completion schedule for Muskrat?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Premier.

**PREMIER BALL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I think the CEO at Nalcor has made it quite clear that Astaldi right now is not one of the primary constructors at the Muskrat Falls site. Nearly 95 per cent of the work that has been completed by Astaldi right now – work is ongoing. CEO Marshall has told us that this will not interfere with the schedule on all of this.

There are some 500 workers that worked with Astaldi. It was the primary goal for us to make sure that they got paid for the work that they did on the site up there. As I said so many times, the impact of Muskrat Falls on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador is not as a responsibility of the people that worked there, it's as a result of a bad deal that was put in place by the previous administration.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

**MR. BRAZIL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We've been advised by an ambulance operator that the Department of Health and Community Services have placed all payments to ambulance operators on hold until further notice.

Can the minister confirm if this is correct and, if so, what is the reason or reasons for withholding the payments?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

No, there has been no hold placed on payments to ambulance operators. What has happened with one individual operator in Central Health is that any back billing for overtime, over and above their regular block funding, has been asked to be forwarded to the department for verification. Since that instruction was put in place in June, no invoices have been submitted by the operator to Central Health, so nothing has been forwarded.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

**MR. BRAZIL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That's not our understanding that there was a memo sent – that there would be a hold on payments to the ambulance operators as such. So you're now clarifying that that has not happened at all, and there are no operators now that are waiting on their full payments to come forward.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** The only one I am aware of where there has been any issue around holds has been the one I have just referred to. And yes, there have been no invoices submitted by that company to Central Health since the instruction on those invoices only was placed with them in June.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

**MR. BRAZIL:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just out of courtesy, I will note, you may not be aware of this. This is, from our understanding, actually happening. I do ask that the minister look into this to see if, indeed, this can be confirmed; and, if so, if he would rectify it because there may be ambulance service out there who cannot provide a service because they're not being paid for that service, and we need to ensure that those service are there.

So I do ask the minister if he would look in to see if this is, indeed, a situation that is happening right now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** I would be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker. I would just draw to the attention of the Member opposite that since the Grant Thornton audit earlier on this year, each of the private operators has now agreed to have Grant Thornton staff in their office to provide auditing and verification services on a go-forward basis. So, hopefully, these kinds of issues will not arise in the future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I asked the Minister of Finance how the shortfall in revenues from cannabis will be made up. He did not answer the question then. I'm wondering today if he could answer that question for us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

**MR. OSBORNE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is a supply issue at the moment across the country. Every province, every jurisdiction of the country faces this supply issue. We're hoping that, by the end of the year, we have assurances that the supply should be in regular order to the retailers in this province. That's certainly our hope.

Based on demand, Mr. Speaker, we're hoping that we'll make up the shortfall that has been faced as a result of both the deadline for legalization being October 17, as opposed to July 1, as well as the shortfall on supply.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The minister indicated yesterday, and he mentioned it again here that time, the demand is obviously greater than the product that is not available, and that precedes what was expected.

So I ask the minister: How did you come up with your original demand projections?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

**MR. OSBORNE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The original projections were provided by the federal government to all jurisdictions in the country. And based on the estimates by the federal government, the provincial jurisdictions and territorial jurisdictions put supply and sales expectations in place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Canopy Growth is constructing their facility on a piece of land recently purchased from a developer by a numbered Newfoundland and Labrador company. The company acquired the land immediately prior to leasing it to Canopy.

I ask the minister: Is he aware who owns this numbered company?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

**MR. OSBORNE:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of who owns the numbered company, but I would like to add some context to Canopy Growth and the deal that the province has reached. We've heard criticism from the Members opposite regarding the deal, the tax remittances to Canopy Growth over a period of approximately 14 years.

The thing is the municipal property tax to the City of St. John's is about a million dollars a year for that facility. The sales tax, personal

income tax, the payroll taxes to the province are in excess of \$2 million a year. Without that facility, we wouldn't be collecting those amounts. Those amounts add up to approximately what the payout is over the 14 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for answering the question with regard to his knowledge of who would own the land being leased, but in short, there's no conflict that exists. This is a publicly traded company of about \$11 billion.

Would the minister look in and see who exactly owns that property of the company and who's leasing that property to Canopy?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

**MR. OSBORNE:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not involved in the ownership of the company, nor am I a shareholder in the publicly traded company. I don't know who owns the numbered company, I don't know, other than the individuals who've been in the public media regarding the ownership of Canopy. But certainly we'll endeavour to find out, if that's what the Member wishes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister: Why does a privately traded, approximately today \$11 billion company, have to lease a piece of land upon which to construct a \$50 million facility, and we're putting in \$40 million in actual tax credits? Why would they not finance and be part of that deal? Why is it necessary for the province to be involved?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, the publicly traded company is certainly building the facility. When we had entered into the deal with them in December of 2017 there was an urgency of the – we had the understanding that July 2018 cannabis would come into production and for sale here in this province, across the country, so we needed to enter into a supply agreement.

That had been moved to October, but the company, the publicly traded company, they had identified that they would build a facility in the northeast Avalon and it would be up to them to determine which site and which area, whether they buy land, lease land, buy a building. They could have looked at other properties, whether it be the Costco that was being closed down or other properties that are out there.

There are people looking at buildings all over this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The minister referenced yesterday that he's absolutely considering these types of deals for other companies relating to the \$40 million tax credit.

So, I'll ask the minister today can he identify who those companies are and if the deal has been done.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** I would say to the Member opposite that deals certainly would be imminent and stay tuned for that particular matter. Once we're in a position to release anything for the public, we certainly will and make those details available.

It's very important to highlight that we are building an industry here in Newfoundland and Labrador, and that when you deal with publicly

traded companies, there is a procedure and protocol that you would have to undertake, and that in these particular deals the companies determine their location. They determine where they want to set up. They acquire their land. They put their building, their capital. They're publicly traded businesses. They determine their business plan. What is of interest to us as a government is securing supply, the jobs and the economic benefits to Newfoundland and Labrador.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Terra Nova FPSO began service in 2002 and was said to have a life span of approximately 20 years, and is speculated to be in need of repairs and maintenance.

I ask the minister: Has Suncor been advised of when they intend to take the vessel out for these repairs and what will be the effect on production?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Suncor has been a good operator in our offshore Newfoundland and Labrador. They certainly have made a tremendous amount of investments in our offshore and we're very, very pleased to have the Terra Nova project, of course. It's been a big component of our offshore.

They will be doing repairs, Mr. Speaker. I have a meeting arranged with Suncor, with the operators of Terra Nova, and I may have more information after I have that conversation with them.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the minister: In terms of those repairs, will they be taking place at the Bull Arm facility, Marystown, the dockyard in St. John's? Where will they take place to?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Mr. Speaker, it depends on the extent of the repairs and what is required. Sometimes they may have to go outside of this province if they cannot fit within the requirements of what we have in the province, but we have not discussed at this point where those repairs will be taking place because it depends on the extent.

As I've advised the Member opposite, I will be having a meeting in the very near future with Suncor to discuss that. Obviously, this government would always want to have the work done in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the minister. Why has no decision been made on the requests for proposals on the operation of the Bull Arm site?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That's a very good question. We have been working. As the Member opposite knows we did go out for an expression of interest and then further to a request for proposals. Four proponents came forward and two of which have come down through the request for proposal.

We have been having many, many discussions with them and it's very public as to who – one is for a supply basis and one is for a fabrication facility. We've been having multiple discussions to try and make it the best possible solution for long-term opportunity in Bull Arm and working

with, obviously, the Member of the House of Assembly for that very area and with the communities to make sure the long-term success of that facility is there.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The provincial ambulance system is in trouble: no central dispatch; financial anomalies; inefficiencies; paramedics, unions, employers, owners, the public, every player is in an uproar; and the minister simply throws up his hands and says government is just buying a service and doesn't have the power to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a government contract with a courier company. Ambulances are an essential part of our health care.

I ask the minister. When is he going to take responsibility and do what is necessary to ensure a safe, well-functioning, effective ambulance service for the people of the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** Thank you very much for the question.

Mr. Speaker, I think some of the preamble is something I would take issue with. I wouldn't like this fear mongering to spread beyond the Chamber. If you need an ambulance and dial 911, you will get one. It will turn up in a timely way, with skilled people there.

We are having some challenges and we inherited a situation where we had had Fitch one, Fitch two, Fitch three, POMAX reports all neglected and we are working on that.

We have plans afoot for central medical dispatch. We have done the audit with Grant Thornton, and we have put in place financial measures to deal with the irregularities that we

identified. We are working on it, Mr. Speaker; it's not nothing is happening.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Speaker, only yesterday in this House the minister said that he simply gives the money; that he has no control over how that is spent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister: If he is not in charge of the provincial ambulance service, then who is in charge?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** Mr. Speaker, we inherited a system with the ambulance service that we are working to rectify. It is currently based on the concept of a contracted service. We are meeting with the ambulance operators, be they private or community, and RHA to work together to solve this problem. It is not my problem, it is not their problem, it is a collective one and, between that determination, we will come up with the answers we need.

We have rolled over the ambulance agreement, we are working towards a potential RFP and trying to design with them, collectively, what this system will look like so it will best serve the needs of the population in the future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Speaker, the inheritance that the minister speaks about was three years ago. So this year the Grant Thornton audit found serious financial anomalies in the ambulance sector, yet government has done nothing to address these issues, and now says there won't be any changes for at least another year. That brings us to four years, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the minister: Why is he putting off fixing problems his own government has perpetuated

by its failure to provide financial oversight in this essential part of health care?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** With respect once again, Mr. Speaker, that preamble is flawed, and the Member misspeaks. We have not done nothing. We have done the Grant Thornton audit, we've actually listened to the results of the Fitch inquiries, all three of them, and we are putting in place central medical dispatch and we're putting in place contract management.

We are dealing with contracts that are outdated and we have inherited. We are now bound by a new *Public Procurement Act*, and we're working within that to deal with those situations. We have put in place, at our expense, Grant Thornton to monitor and provide real-time fiscal data, at no expense to the ambulance operators, so we can monitor the things she says we're doing nothing about.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

**MS. MICHAEL:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Fitch ambulance report in 2013 recommended government immediately set up a central dispatch facility to ensure ambulances get to people in a timely fashion. Six years later, there is still no central dispatch and people remain at risk.

So I ask the minister: After three years of being in government, why have you not created a central dispatch facility, which the Fitch report recommended be done immediately?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** To coin a phrase of one of my colleagues: Stay tuned; it's coming.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for St. John's East – Quidi Vidi for a quick question, please.

**MS. MICHAEL:** I ask the minister then: He's saying keep watching, it's coming. So will we also find coming the turning over all the ambulance services in this province to the Medavie Blue Cross corporation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

**MR. HAGGIE:** Mr. Speaker, we are still in discussions with essentially a blank sheet of paper as to how our ambulance operators would like to proceed. I'm not going to pre-judge that. If that's what the Member opposite wants, I hear her opinion, thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has ended.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Notices of Motion.

#### Notices of Motion

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will ask to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Assessment Act, 2006, Bill 34.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further notices of motion?

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

#### Petitions

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.



**MR. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At a time when the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are dealing with high levels of taxation, increased unemployment rates, increased food bank usage, increased bankruptcies and many are being forced to choose between food, heat and medications, Newfoundland Power and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro are continuing to seek numerous power rate increases through the Public Utilities Board.

Once the Muskrat Falls Project comes online, these rates are predicted to further increase significantly to unmanageable levels for the average citizen of our province. While government has indicated they are working with Nalcor to mitigate rates, they have provided no detailed plan as to how they intend to do so.

Therefore, we petition the House of Assembly as follows: To urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to publicly provide all of the potential options for rate mitigation, develop a comprehensive, detailed plan –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

Thank you, please proceed.

**MR. LANE:** – to deal with current and impending power rate increases. This plan is to be provided to the public as soon as possible to allow for scrutiny, feedback and potential suggestions for improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I have about 100-120 names here today. They're coming from areas like King's Point, Grand Falls, Port Anson, Springdale, Harry's Harbour, Nicky's Nose Cove – never heard of that place before. That's a new one on me, Nicky's Nose Cove. Rattling Brook and so on. So, Mr. Speaker – Harry's Harbour and so on.

Mr. Speaker, there are people from all throughout the province who are concerned. We all have concerns certainly about where power rates are going. We're all, I'm sure, listening keenly to what's happening with the Muskrat Falls Inquiry and, hopefully, we will get some

answers there. Some of the answers coming, so far, have not been good. They've been very disturbing, to say the least. But at the end of the day, regardless of how we got to this point, we're here.

Now, the government has indicated that they're going to mitigate rates, and I'm glad they've said that. I certainly hope they do. But just simply saying that is not good enough for many people. People want to know, specifically, what the plans are going to be to mitigate rates. That's what people want to know, that's why they signed this petition and that's why I'm presenting it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources for a response, please.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree with the Member opposite that people in the province are quite concerned about the Muskrat Falls Project and its impacts, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate the Member opposite wasn't concerned enough when he made the decision to do ahead with that very project.

At the time of sanctioning, I believe the Member opposite would've made a decision to have Muskrat Falls costs given 100 per cent to the ratepayers of this province. This government has said, quite clearly, that will not be the case, Mr. Speaker. That will not be the case.

We are working diligently and thoroughly, not just to ensure that the Muskrat Falls Project is finished in a better place than where I started, we are working very diligently and methodically to finish the project and not have any more extensive costs added or burdens added to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we are also equally working methodically and diligently to have a plan to address the concerns around Muskrat Falls costs, and we can reassure the people of this province, it won't be borne by the ratepayers or the taxpayers.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further petitions?

The hon. the Member for St. John's Centre.

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the hon. House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador has one of the lowest minimum wages in Canada, and minimum wage workers earn poverty incomes; and

WHEREAS proposals to index the minimum wage to inflation will not address poverty if the wage is too low to start with; and

WHEREAS women and youth, and service sector employees, are particularly hurt by the low minimum wage; and

WHEREAS the minimum wage only rose 5 per cent between 2010 and 2016, while many food items rose more than 20 per cent; and

WHEREAS other Canadian jurisdictions are implementing or considering a \$15-an-hour minimum wage as a step towards a living wage;

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to urge government to legislate a gradual increase in the minimum wage to \$15 by 2021, with an annual adjustment thereafter to reflect provincial inflation.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, the minister has gotten up each time I've presented this petition lately to say, well, you know what, we're at \$11.15 now, and they've increased minimum wage, but at the snail's pace rate that they're doing, and if they're only increasing the minimum wage according to the increases in the cost of living, we will never – most of us will be gone by the

time we reach \$15 an hour. Everybody else in the province will have surpassed that. And as noted, most provinces are looking at \$15 an hour as a target that will eventually get them to a living wage.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador deserve better than this, and they need better than this, we know that. And again, it negatively impacts predominantly women and young people, a lot of people who don't have a formalized education, and this is not the way to do it. This is holding the province back. We need government to take bold actions that modernize our province, that modernize our legislative standards. We need that, we deserve it, and it's in the best interest of the people, it's in the best interest of the province, and it's in the best interest of our economy.

All the research has shown that appropriate, targeted minimum wage levels of at least \$15 an hour, by the year 2020 or 2021, in fact is providing a boost in the economies where it is already undergoing.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour for a response, please.

**MR. HAWKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, again, rise on making a response to that petition because, again, I just need to correct some of the information that the hon. Member opposite. I learned a long time ago, when we get up to speak we shouldn't use terms such as "all." She just said that all research – all research has indicated that \$15 an hour is what it should be? That is incorrect. There's research out there that's telling otherwise as well. So that is just one point, Mr. Speaker.

The other point I wanted to make, she talks about most of the provinces in Canada are looking at \$15 per hour. That's not necessarily accurate either, Mr. Speaker. There are some provinces that are. There are other – she's using "most." There are 10 provinces in Canada and most would be anything like six or seven, that would be most, and that's incorrect. If you look

at Newfoundland and Labrador, we are at \$11.15 with a 65 cent increase in one year.

As minister, it is my responsibility to strike a balance between the employer and those that are working. So, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes becomes difficult to try and do that. I will also mention, for clarity, that in Newfoundland and Labrador right now it's \$11.15, Nova Scotia it's \$11, Ontario it's \$12 – I'm sorry, Quebec is \$12, Ontario is \$14, Saskatchewan is \$10.96. And so when you say most provinces, that is incorrect.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further petitions?

The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

**MR. P. DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise on a point of personal privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Sir, it is my honour to grant you this point of personal privilege.

Please proceed.

**MR. P. DAVIS:** Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all hon. Members for the opportunity to rise this afternoon, and I can tell you at this point in time, the quietness and silence here is deafening. You have learned now how to quiet the House, Mr. Speaker. This is apparently how it's done.

I thank all hon. Members for the opportunity to say a few words this afternoon. I referenced the hon. Speaker and hon. Members in this hon. House and I do so in reflection of us as a group of elected officials. I've always been told, Mr. Speaker, we should never forget who elected us; we should never forget why they elected us. And furthermore, we should never forget who we were when they went into the ballot box and chose who they were going to elect to represent them here in this House.

I'm not going to belabour this point today; it's not my intention to belabour this today. But I do point out, and I know first-hand from own

experience, that sometimes it can be easy, sometimes it can sneak up on you when you get caught in a moment, or caught up in a moment that's happening, to fall away from our own values or to slip away from the principles that really make us the people we are that cause people to vote for us in the first place.

I've done that on occasion here in the House myself, where I've said something to somebody either while standing on the record or off the record and had quickly regretted it afterwards; or, in some cases, upon reflection over some time had regretted it as well.

It's very easy for all of us to get caught up in the politics of what goes on here. We know in politics there's also a to-and-fro and a maneuvering and an effort because every politician knows that the next day after the night before when you realize you've been elected, on everybody's mind is the fact that you have to get re-elected. That's not lost on any of us. That's part of what we have to do. If you don't conduct yourself and create policies and opportunities and you don't do the things that people expect you to do, then you are essentially setting your own fate and future.

So, it's hard sometimes for all of us to stay focused on doing what we came here to do, to do good for the province, and do good for the people of the province and to keep that first and foremost.

I also encourage all Members that when you see your colleague or you hear your colleague going down a road that maybe is not the right way to go, instead of applauding and encouraging and supporting and always seeing – there is lots of humour happens here but seeing the humour when you say oh, maybe that person shouldn't have said that or done that, I think it's incumbent on all of us to tap that hon. Member on the shoulder and say I'm not sure we should go down that road, or maybe we should think about it differently.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, and the truth of it is that when one person in this House goes astray or does something or says something that reflects negatively upon that Member, it reflects negatively on every single one of us. Because people of the public quite often see us as one,

and many people in the province they don't care what party we represent in many ways. They don't care which side of the House we're on. If we do something or act in a way that doesn't make them feel good about us, it quite often reflects on all of us.

So we should all strive at all times to be the example, no matter where we are, who we're with or what we're doing at the time, because Newfoundlanders and Labradorians expect us to be the example that they want their loved ones and family, their children, to strive to be. People expect better from all of us and we're all responsible for that – me included, Mr. Speaker. All of us in this entire House are responsible for that.

I think about the future as well, especially with me stepping down, finishing tomorrow. There are so many great wonderful people in our province that are so capable and smart and educated, diligent, well respected, well regarded and well intended who do great work in their communities. That do great work in their own neighborhoods and do great work in our province. They've also done, in many cases, great work in our country.

We need those people, Mr. Speaker, to step up and offer themselves to become a Member of this House. We want them, and I want them, to want my job. If they want to come, run for us, work for us, be a Member of this House, and there are people that are latching at your coattails and say I want to do what she does or he does, or I want to be in that House like he has been or like she has been, then I think we've done a better job because we want those good people to step up to become Members of this House, to offer themselves, to strive for better for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago – here comes the story part – I was a very young man and I was trying to find my way as a teenager and through school. I can tell you, I wasn't the most focused student in high school. I see a former high school teacher of mine, he's at Tim Hortons in Manuels every single morning; the man is in his eighties. My colleague behind me here certainly knows him well. He's there every single morning and every now and then I say to him: Sorry about that. I'll say: Sorry the way I was in

high school. Because I can tell you he knew me. I knew him but he certainly knew me, and I was a pretty young guy at that point in time.

I always knew that whatever work I did I always said I can't see myself being in an office, working at a desk, processing paper and doing those kinds of things. I was going to need to be more challenged than that; I was going to have to have excitement in my life and so on. I always thought well, what really fits for me would be policing. That'd work for me. Imagine you were into the thick of it day in, day out, day in, day out. Sometimes it sounds like politics.

So, I applied for the RCMP and the RCMP, they are the mothership of policing in the country. They are what all police agencies should strive to be. As a young Newfoundlander and Labradorian, as a young Canadian I said there's nothing better I could be. If I wanted to be a police officer, I was going to head to the best, the top, and so on.

I applied for the RCMP. I went through the rigorous process of application, testing, fitness testing and all the rest of it, doing exams and so on. I was fortunate that they had accepted me and they said yes, we're going to take you. They said the bad news is that they were going through at the period of time – and good that they were – where they were diversifying the RCMP. I almost said force then. I like service, by the way. People talk about police forces. I like police service because I think police do more than just apply force and apply the law. I think they provide a service as well.

They were diversifying the RCMP service by hiring visible minorities and more women, diversity of language and so on and I was a white, English-speaking, young man from Newfoundland and Labrador. So I said: Well, I'm going to apply for the RNC; if I can get in the RCMP, I can get in the RNC, no problem. You know, if the RCMP will take me, any other police service should be able to take me. So I applied for the RNC, and much to my surprise they turned me down. They wouldn't take me. And I said: This is messed up. How does this happen?

So I went back to them, and there was no follow-up interviews back in those days, post-

process interviews where you can go back and say what did I do wrong, or what should I do different; but I called them up, and I went and saw Gary Browne, actually, who increased through the ranks to deputy chief in his career, and I went back and he was in the selection committee – he tells everyone today our history – and I went back to him and I said: Why are you turning me down?

And first thing they told me was – my wife's in the gallery, so I got to be careful, because she tells me this every day – they said: We don't like the way you drive – because I got a couple of tickets during my time as a young person – you're going to have to fix that. But they said also: We see what you've done. I was going to university for a little while; I've worked probably since I was 14, 15 years old. They said: We don't see what you're doing in the community; we don't see how you're contributing to the lives of others. And I went: Oh yeah, that's that volunteer work stuff.

My father spent a lifetime giving to his community. In my younger years my father and I never always got along; we certainly did later in years, but he was someone who – we had supper, he had to rush out the door because he had a meeting to go to. Dad always had a meeting to go to. I said: I'm not going to be that; that's not going to be me. So here I was trying to find a meeting to go to, because I had to go do something to prove to them I could do something outside the box for others.

I said: I got to find something that's going to be meaningful to me, and enjoyable, and will help me be a better candidate, because I'm going to reapply to the RNC again next year. I got to be a better candidate; what can I find? And at the time, and some of you may remember back in those – and the Member for Windsor Lake and his legal background, and anyone else with a legal background, will remember the early '80s when the young offenders act first came into being, and it was pre-that, before that, and there was a program called the juvenile diversion program.

I said: Well, what's that about? The juvenile diversion program was a pilot project, and I found my way down to their offices on Harvey Road here in St. John's, and I went in and met

with the executive director, and said: What's this about, and I need some volunteer time, and can I help you out?

Margie Harris-Stapleton is who it was. Many of you, I think, would know her through the work that she continues to do in the community. And I was this young kid; I tell you, I was pretty green at the time. I was very much an introvert. I had lots of issues and confidence – I would never stand in a venue like this and speak. And I said, what can you do? How can I help you, and so on? They were looking for volunteers. We had a conversation and they said, yes, we're going to do this. We're going to take you and we'll take you as a volunteer. I really had no experience, Mr. Speaker, in volunteering at the time.

The Juvenile Diversion Program was about – historically, what had happened was a young person or an adult who had conflict with the law, got caught drinking under age, shoplifted an item of very small value, broke their neighbour's fence or threw a rock and broke a neighbour's window, these types of things traditionally were held by charging the person and the young person would go to court. This program was about finding a different way to divert the behaviour of those young people.

So they trained me as a mediator. I didn't know what a mediator was back in those days, but they trained me as a mediator to mediate the differences between, for example, a neighbour and the young person, or a victim of a theft and a young person, or if the young person had been drinking under age, then we would mediate between the young person and their family.

They trained me to be a mediator. I thoroughly enjoyed it. I learned a lot from it. It was also then, before too long they appointed me to the board, asked me would I go on the board. I said sure, what's that? What's a board, and I became a board member. It was my first ever board position. I don't know how many I've had since then, but it was my first ever board position.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I learned so many lessons through that experience. The program was about giving kids a break. It was about giving them a second chance. The program taught me, don't be too quick to judge people. Hear them out first and find out really

what's the issue, the root of the issue here and what's happening, and why did this behaviour occur and how did this conflict with a neighbour, friend or with the law occur? Don't be too quick to condemn people.

Sometimes people do need a break, and sometimes those small things you can do for someone will make a big difference in their lives or in their future. I took that back to – well, took that with me my entire life, because the year after that I went back to the RNC and I applied again. They said: oh, yeah, you. What have you done the last year? I volunteered. What did you do? I volunteered at Juvenile Diversion. Oh, what did you do down there? Well, I became a mediator. Oh, really. Yeah, and I coordinated mediation sessions.

By that time, I was training other mediators and I was a board member. They were giving me lots of opportunity and helping me develop and grow and be a better person. I brought all that back and the RNC accepted me.

I should point out, about two weeks before I went to the Police Academy at Holland College in Prince Edward Island, the RCMP phoned. They said, we hear you're going to Holland College. I said, yeah, that's right. Okay, well come down and see us, we'll take you now. I had a choice to make but I certainly, absolutely, have no regret. I absolutely made the right decision by following the career that I did.

Those lessons, especially with young people, I spent a lot of my career working with young people and with families who have had difficulties with young people and so on. I took a lot of those lessons with me throughout my entire life. I was blessed with the people I work with in the RNC; some fine, fine women and men who look after all of us in so many ways.

We're actually blessed with so many first responders in our province, not only police but firefighters, the medical attendants, the search and rescue people; the people who are at the emergency rooms at the hospitals who face chaotic and difficult, challenging circumstances every day; people who work in the acute care wards; social workers who are working with children and families who are struggling to get through and to look for a better day ahead. There

are so many people in those front lines of public service and government service that there are too many to mention.

I remember as a councillor in Conception Bay South – and Conception Bay South has a composite fire department of career and volunteer firefighters. I remember one time I was speaking at one of their events. I know my friend behind me here will appreciate this one as well, and many of you. I made a significant error when speaking at an event because I referred to the career firefighters as professionals and the rest as volunteers.

I very quickly recognized my error, and I heard it loud and clear. Because no matter if that emergency medical response team is a volunteer or if they are paid employees, or if they're firefighters or volunteers, or if they're paid employees, or – in some cases we have people who volunteer to support and assist with police. Mr. Speaker, they're all professionals in Newfoundland and Labrador and we owe them a great debt of gratitude for what they do.

I'm not going to go down the road of too much policy today, but there's one that's current for me. I've spoken to the minister and I appreciate the discussion we've had on this this week, and I would be remiss if I didn't mention it. We have first responders who are suffering today, and I am thankful that last year the government decided – and the minister took the initiative to change the policy for workers. Because in the policy, what was required by a worker was to identify the event that caused their mental health challenges and issues. If it be an occupational stress injury or actually full-blown diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder.

I know now, and I didn't know then, but I certainly know now that post-traumatic stress disorder doesn't have to be caused by an event, especially for first responders. If you've got someone who for five or 10 or 15 or 20 years, whatever the case may be, who's been responding to these chaotic, difficult and challenging circumstances, I'm telling you here today, and I tell all Members of this House, they are impacted. They are. The people who respond every day are impacted. It took me a long time to figure it out. It wasn't until after I left government and came in the Opposition when I

had more time to process it that I came to realize that.

We have people, first responders, today who've retired or resigned from their jobs because they can't do it anymore. The policy that existed when this happened for them doesn't apply to them. So if a person today – I left policing in 2010, eight years ago. It seems like a long time. I've learned a lot about myself in that eight years. I've learned a lot about myself and the impacts over the last couple of years. And I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, there are so many first responders out there who are not able to even get support to see a psychologist who specializes in occupational stress injuries, because they don't meet the criteria.

So I ask the government, and I ask this House, it's the only policy item I'm talking about today, but I encourage you, I urge you, I beg you to have a very serious look – and if it means, and I know it's a complex piece of work. I know that there's a campaign in the province right now to include a presumptive clause for all workers, and that's going to be a ton of work. It could take months or years to get through all that work.

If the government was to say, well, right now we're going to provide presumptive coverage for first responders, and if you wanted to determine who they were and follow a narrow scope that occurs in the country – because most every province has it today – and if you had that presumptive clause for first responders with a commitment that you're going to review other classifications of employees and broaden that as time goes on, at least start to help the ones that are in that core that you can help. Because there are first responders who have given so much to our province are suffering, and they need that help.

Being an MHA, Mr. Speaker, is not easy either. Every one of us know here sometimes the things that our constituents sometimes will ask us for that we can't do, that we'd like to do. We'd love to be able to fix all their problems and we know we can't. It doesn't matter what side of the House you're on or where you sit in this Legislature, you can't do it. I know for you, as well, Mr. Speaker, it can be frustrating, not

being able to achieve sometimes what you'd like to do.

It's not easy being a minister. I've experienced that as well. And I know that sometimes you'll sit at the Cabinet table and you'll go: I don't know about this. I always knew that the rule in Cabinet is: If you can't live with the decision, then you have a choice to make. Because you can stay in Cabinet, and if I can use the term "live for another day" to help influence other decisions in the future, or you can pack up your bags and go home.

If you stay there, you can help in the future, and sometimes that's really challenging. There's something you philosophically or principally don't really believe in or it's a real challenge for you, but you know there are other things coming that you want to support and you feel can help go in the way that you want it to go, and you can only do that if you're sitting at the Cabinet table.

And being a Cabinet minister can be even harder, because your constituent sometimes will come to you and say: Well, you're a minister; you can make this happen. And you go: No, really I can't. Sure you can; you can make this happen. So it's tough.

I know it's tough being a premier because I had that one. It was toughest time of my life; no ways about it. No argument from the Premier. I sent him over a note earlier, because I was thinking about the things that the Premier and I actually have in common, Mr. Speaker. I sent him a note earlier, when the House sat earlier today, and I said: Am I right in thinking that you're a Toronto Maple Leafs fan? Because I'm a Toronto Maple Leafs fan. Is that okay with everybody?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. P. DAVIS:** So, Mr. Speaker, I do have support on the other side of the House. But it turns out the Premier's not a Toronto Maple Leafs fan. I thought we had that in common. But I noticed today he's wearing a nice gold or yellow-coloured tie; so am I. He's got a black suit on. He's wearing his poppy, a white shirt. We have all that in common. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that's about it. That's about all we got in common.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Grey hair.

**MR. P. DAVIS:** But – my hair's not grey. It's really hard to get someone to dye a little bit of grey in so I look like I'm experienced, right?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** (Inaudible.)

**MR. P. DAVIS:** But, Mr. Speaker – oh, is grey a good colour?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Grey it not a colour.

**MR. P. DAVIS:** Grey is not a colour.

Mr. Speaker, it is tough business when you're faced with the decisions, and it's never, never easy. I'll tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, it's not easy over here either. I got to be honest with you when I sat in government, in some ways, I used to look at the Opposition, and some of you sat in the Opposition over here, and I go: Man, they got it so easy. They have no idea how tough and how hard it is, and your difficulties and challenges are certainly different from ours.

But it's not easy for us over here either, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of work to do in a short period of time every day. We have a caucus who's a small, but very hard-working team that I'm very proud of. And someone said to me recently: How's it been anyway? Your job is to pick holes in the government, you got to find their shortcomings, you point them out, when you catch them making a mistake you go: Aha, I caught you. I said: Yeah, but do you know what? That's not that easy to do. You can do that for a day or you can do that for Question Period but I can tell as time goes on, that wears on all of us.

I go back to my earlier comment. Sometimes it doesn't reflect on all of us very well, so we've got to find our places. This team over here, Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud of. They've done a great job as an Opposition and they've done a great job supporting me along the way.

Mr. – oh, I almost said your name and I'm not allowed to say his name. The Member for Windsor Lake, I thank him for his comments at the beginning of the House session this afternoon. You took three pages out of my speech, so I'm sure everybody appreciates that. You've got an important job to do as well. I got

to say I've been impressed with how you've handled yourself over the last couple of weeks. I have to say that.

With all due respect, the comments I hear from people is that there is a significant contrast that's been established now in this House, a very different way from doing business on one side and doing the other. As that proceeds and experience grows and so on, then we'll all see where the chips fall because I'll be home with my bag of chips and I'll be watching on TV as well to see how all that goes. But I do wish you, Sir, and the entire caucus all the best in the future.

I've been thinking about, lately, some of my former colleagues and I've been so lucky in the past as well. I've got some of them who are still friends today. I had one very recently say to me: Paul, if you're lucky – okay to say my own name is it, Mr. Speaker? Oh, thanks; I wouldn't want to be expelled from the House today.

He said: Paul, if you're lucky as a politician, you get to make two decisions in politics that will impact you significantly on a personal level. You can decide when you join politics, and if you're really lucky, you can decide when you leave because sometimes other people will decide that for you. Well, I'm very lucky. I'm very, very lucky.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, in my experiences that I've had over my lifetime and all the way back to when I became a volunteer with juvenile diversion program, which was a catalyst in so many ways for volunteerism, I can't remember a time, any significant period of time since then that I didn't do something in my community. Because the truth of it is it's tremendously rewarding. It's also tremendously beneficial because when you get to work with other people and learn from them, they are sometimes the best lessons of all.

I've never differentiated myself, the difference or separated my work life from my volunteer life. They always mesh together. They all become one and you are what you are when you are at work, when you're volunteering, when you're trying to help a group or an organization, you are what you are. But both of them are very rewarding and fulfilling. Both work and



volunteerism, when you think about it, is really – and the work we do as a police officer, as a politician, it's about people. We are in the people business in such a big way. You're in the policy business and operating, doing the business of running the province and so on, but it's really all about people. I give full credit to the people who I've been blessed to have had the opportunity to work with through all of those experiences.

I've always shied away and tried to shy away – it's not about me; it's not what I've done. It's always about team, not me as a person. I've always credited the people around me, and I do that today.

Volunteering is about community groups. Groups are groups of people. Running an election or deciding to run for an election is about team or about people and teams who come together to achieve a goal. It's always perplexed me, Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest with you. I always get so perplexed by how people give up so much of their time to help a politician get elected. It's fascinating, it's amazing and we would never be able to do it – none of us would ever be able to do it if we never had a crowd of people around to help us go through that process. Those who get the best teams quite often run the best elections, but we always do it.

From the time I first ran in council in 2001 to the nomination processes and by-elections and elections – the leadership election, the leadership process I went through in 2014 was probably the longest, hardest run personal campaign of my life. People during that campaign from all over the province stepped up and reached out to help me be successful in that campaign; it's amazing. It continues to amaze me when I think about it and reflect upon it, and we should never forget how valuable they are.

Friends and neighbours and people who I've never met, family – how much patience do your families have for the jobs that we've taken on, the roles that we've taken on? All work together to win an election, Mr. Speaker, as I said it's really pretty amazing. I thank all of them, all of those countless people from the very beginning when I first ran in 2001 – I've been on the ballot more times than I can count with two hands since 2001. If you include nominations and

running for deputy mayor and council and by-elections and elections and so on, it's more than two hands the number of times. I've never done it alone, I've always done it with the help of people and I'm truly thankful for them.

Back in my days in the RNC, Mr. Speaker, which was my first real time in public service, I learned about our public service. Policing is removed somewhat from the regular public service, but public servants are the backbone that keeps the police agency operating.

When I came here into the House, I saw a new level of experience. I had a new level of experience with our public service and public servants throughout our province. When I became a Cabinet minister, I got hands on, and deep, and learned so much about how much we rely on our public service. I saw it first-hand.

We've got great, talented, hard-working people in our public service throughout our province and we should – every one of us in this House should be so proud and pleased to have all of those people, because they do a fabulous job for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

In my time in Cabinet, and in the Premier's office, Mr. Speaker, there were many, many days that I drove on to the parking lot, dark in the mornings, and thought, will I be the first one there today? Nope. And there were many, many days I left here late at night, and I thought, am I the last one here tonight? Nope.

I don't remember a time, and there were many, many days I was here early in the morning and left late at night, I can't remember a time when I was the first one here or the last one to leave. That's because public servants were here doing what we asked them to do, and working for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

I mentioned caucus, and I can't overstate how important it is to have a team. I know when you go through really difficult, tough times, Mr. Speaker, and you're getting a rough ride or you're getting a hard go, then it's so important that the people around you are the right people that are continuing to support you, and I've certainly enjoyed that. It's a constant battle to try and balance your working life and your House

of Assembly responsibilities, but I've got admiration for all of them.

Mr. Speaker, I've had more than what I ever wanted as far as experience with health care. Everyone knows I was diagnosed in 2011, and I went through a summer of chemotherapy treatments, and then in the fall I became a Cabinet minister. What a lot of people don't realize is that I continued treatment for two years while I was a Cabinet minister. I did maintenance treatments for two years.

I had fabulous, fabulous care. We've got some of the finest doctors – I'm sure the Minister of Health knows it first-hand, he's worked in our system for so many years. But we got some of the finest health care professionals in this province that you're going to find anywhere in the country or in the world, right here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. P. DAVIS:** We talk about employees all the time, but people quite often in the public, especially lately, but a lot of people don't understand quite often the difference in political staff and public service. Because political staff are our chosen people who work on our political goals, which is separate from the public service. And what a team I've had around me since day one.

When I first got elected and I came in, I was brand new and knew nothing. I came in on a by-election. So I came in on my own. You look over here, how many Members here came in on by-elections? He did, you did, you did, he did, he did – he's not here today but I'm thinking about him. They all came in on by-elections. And I knew nothing. There was a group of people here that very quickly rallied around me, taught me the ropes, what I needed to know and helped me along the way when I first came in here.

I've never believed that the leader or the premier, or the Cabinet Minister has to be the best of everything in the room, or the brightest and most educated. You don't have to be. But what I've been able to do, Mr. Speaker, is bring some of the brightest and most talented people around me, then engage with them and get the

best out of them. Then that helps us get the best results. I take my hat off to all of them and thank them so much for the work they've done, all the political staff that have supported me. I have so much to be thankful for, Mr. Speaker.

When I won the leadership in 2014, that evening – and Tom Marshall, who was premier at the time, said I'd like to speak to you tomorrow. I told this story a couple of weeks ago. He said, can I meet with you tomorrow? Can you come see me? I said sure thing. He said just come up for an hour. I said, I'll be there tomorrow morning. So I got there around 10 o'clock. I think I went home 10 o'clock that night. Because if you know Mr. Marshall, he likes to have a yarn. But he's very wise in many ways, very, very wise.

One of the most important pieces of advice he gave me, he said tell your friends not to stop calling. I said, what are you talking about, tell them not to stop calling? He said they're going to stop calling. The premier knows what I'm talking about.

He said your friends will stop calling because they're going to call you and say come to dinner tomorrow night. I can't, I have an event to go to. How about, let's go to the cabin on the weekend? I can't, I got three events on the weekend to attend. Okay. Well, how about Monday night next week? No, I can't. I got something else going.

He said so tell your friends please don't stop calling, because while you put everything into politics and into your work, just remember, that the day you walk out, your friends and your family are the ones that will be there for you.

The time is right, Mr. Speaker. The time is right for me to move aside and to allow the evolution and change that happens in our House. Change is not a bad thing. It's time for me, almost nine years – it was January 2010 when the seat became vacant. Then I was off to the nomination race, and the by-election race after that. The time is right for me to move on. I do so with some pleasure and pride having served here, but it's the right thing for me to do.

I wish everybody all the very best. I thank everyone for all their support over the years. I

wish every Member of this House the very best and may good judgment always guide your deliberations.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Premier.

**PREMIER BALL:** Mr. Speaker, if I could take leave just to have a few comments.

As always, you sit through this House, and as the Member opposite just mentioned – and we're certainly all sad to see him leave today. I've listened to a few of those farewell speeches over the years in my nearly seven, eight years now in this House, and I will say that today gave us some insight of the Member opposite in his time in politics. I remember back in 2010 and the circumstances surrounding the by-election which led to the Member opposite coming into this House.

Also today, I think is a time for all of us to reflect on who we are as individuals, as he talked really about the people that elected us and the times and occasions that we get to actually reset who we are as individuals. I get that, Mr. Speaker, being Leader of the Opposition, sitting as an MHA, and, of course, now as Premier. Getting that time to reset is important for all of us to reflect because it does take us back to our roots and gives us the foundation of who we are as individuals.

Also, he made some very good points about informing our colleagues of who we are. Indeed, from time to time we are not perfect people here in this House, and from time to time we will make mistakes. But encouraging others and allowing others to enter into that space in our life, I take those words of wisdom.

I do want to share, though, one moment back – as Leader of the Opposition, back in 2011 coming into this House, and being just here for a few weeks I found myself as leader of the Opposition, and therefore you'd be leading Question Period.

So I think it's always – my mind went back to this today, and the Member opposite was at that

point, I think, the minister of Service NL. And I remember standing in Question Period, and we see it today, and usually the leader of the Opposition would lead off with a riveting question to the premier of the province or whatever, or to someone like in Finance, like we see.

Very rarely would you see the leader of the Opposition lead off Question Period to a new minister that's sitting in a second row. So I saw the minister as he came in and took his chair, was about right there, and I had a question – I remember the question; it was about an issue down on the Burin Peninsula at the time. His colleague was sitting next to him, and I was trying to get his attention, because what I didn't want to do was to catch the minister off guard; I really wanted to make sure that he was fully aware that the question was coming to him, and give him the chance to actually get up and do what he had to do on his first question in the House of Assembly from me as leader of the Opposition.

So his colleague was there, and he was the guy, remember you said the great big calculator, I know we won't use words, but I think every Member of this House around in those days will remember who I'm talking about. So I was trying to get the Member's attention, but he was of course getting ready for Question Period. I was tapping him, tapping him, so I made a wave to his colleague, and I remember the back and forth, and it was like third baseman or first base coaches, was like ... and we were making those gestures. I just wanted to let the minister know that I was going to come to him for a question. He got up and he did his job, did a great job in answering the question on behalf of the people that he'd already met with, so for me it was making sure that those issues.

So, there is a lot of that that happens in this House of Assembly. We see the to and fro that occurs in Question Period and the debates, but I will say there's always a level of respect for each other that occurs in this House of Assembly. I say as Premier of the province, and I speak to the Member, knowing very well that he sat in this very chair, and both he and I have had many exchanges back and forth. I will say I've always had a lot of respect in the integrity

that you carried yourself as an MHA, as a premier of this province.

Regardless of the meetings that I attended on a national basis, I've always made sure that those colleagues of yours that have been there now, that we actually had the chance to transition from your chair to mine, always made sure that I let them know how you were doing and what you're doing in your life today, just want to make sure that you know that.

You raise some very good points, and there's nothing wrong with any Member leaving this House and addressing a policy position. I think everyone that leaves this House, there will always be bits of unfinished work that will happen; that is what we do. And you raised the issue of PTSD today, which is an important issue on many people in our province. So I thank you for addressing that, even a policy question as you give your farewell speech to the people of the province and to us as Members of this House of Assembly.

I did notice, however, that when we talk about things we have in common, not just a shirt and tie and why I didn't get a memo – your wife didn't send me a memo or you didn't send me a memo, this just happened, but I appreciate the fact that we do have things in common. The fact that you might be a Leaf fan and I'm a Canadians fan, that's one thing. But the fact is this; this is what we have in common.

We have in common – I heard this quite eloquently explained today in the comments that you made, what we do have in common today is that we share a view that the people of this province, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador is why we sit in the Chamber that we sit in. I share that view with you; this is something that we have in common.

You also made mention of some of the challenges. I really compliment you, the way you handled those over the years. I remember being at an event a few years ago and you were there, at dragon boat races. I remember those days and you did your role, you did the thing that you were doing on that day and you were actually contributing to a cause that was very important to you and your family. So, I remember all those things. Also, Mr. Speaker,

the fact that you shared a view that public servants play a key role and, those around us, to support us each and every day in the work that we do.

I'll make a few final comments, as you leave today. It's important that you leave with obviously going back to your family and whatever your future holds, what I will say for all Members of this House of Assembly, all Members of government today to you, Sir, is this, that we wish you and your family all the best.

If at any point, you want to send some advice this way or share some of your experience – I've had that opportunity to share that advice with premiers of all political parties in the past; that offer still stands. I think all of us as statesmen, as leaders in this province can learn from one another.

So for you and your family today, I'm not bidding you a farewell because I'm sure our paths will cross again at some point, but I'm saying thank you on behalf of every single Newfoundlander and Labradorian for the role that you played in making this place a better place to live. We wish you, whatever the journey is, wherever your journey takes you, all the best to you in your future, good health and thank you for all you've done.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

How lucky are we? How lucky are all of us to be here today to be able to serve the people of Newfoundland and Labrador? How lucky have you been, Paul Davis, to be able to serve the people in such an honourable way?

I guess today is about your legacy as well and what kind of legacy you leave. You leave a legacy of hard, hard work. You leave a legacy of commitment, of passion and compassion. You leave a legacy of absolute determination to make this place, our place, a better place for everyone.

I want to thank you for that and on behalf of my colleague, Lorraine Michael, we want to thank you for the leadership that you have shown both as the 12th premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, as the leader of the Opposition. We want to thank you for the ways that you have influenced this House. Every time all of us come to gather in this House we listen to each other; we learn from each other. Sometimes we agree; sometimes we vehemently disagree.

I can remember the first time I so vehemently disagreed with you over something when you were a Cabinet minister, and how hard I pushed, and how hard you pushed. I still think I was right in that one, by the way.

One of the things that people should know as well that when you were first elected to the House of Assembly, that you were elected with 82 per cent of the vote. It was so interesting to hear you speak so eloquently today about how important team work is and how important it is to open up, to allow people to come, to work together and to value that.

I was so moved today as well when you talked about you thought maybe you'd be the first one in in the morning and maybe you'd be the last one out at night. But there were others in the team that you were able to pull together. That's a sign of true leadership, to be able to inspire others to do the best that they can too and to all work together.

Cheryl, thank you. You're going to get him back. Thank you for all the ways that you have supported him as well in the great work that he has done here for the people of the province.

I just want to go back again to the issue of legacy and what the eight years that you have served here as an MHA, as a leader, and as a premier, is the story of that part of your life and I'm sure there'll be so many more stories to tell. We will hear them unfold. I know that this is not the end of your story.

I remember one of the first times I actually met you face to face, and I said: I believe we have something in common. And you said: Oh, what is that? I said: We both have been through chemo, yet we are dancing in this political arena. Because we know that one of the most creative

things to do in the face of cancer is to push back, and to live as fully as we possibly can, and to share that determination to live as fully as we possibly can.

So I just want to go back before I finish, that 82 per cent of that vote –

**MR. P. DAVIS:** Stuck in your craw, isn't it?

**MS. ROGERS:** Well, yeah, it sticks in my craw. But let me tell you why it sticks in my craw, Paul Davis, because Victor Hugo wrote that the supreme happiness in life is a conviction that we are loved. Paul Davis, you are loved.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** If I may, and the Speaker does have an opportunity to say, I would also like to offer my congratulations, Sir, on your decision today. I thought your words were very prophetic. As the Premier alluded to – I have not had an opportunity to watch a lot of farewell speeches, but I will always remember your words.

I also would suggest that you and the Premier have another thing in common. You each had one of my elbows when I came through those doors as the Speaker, and there wasn't a hope of resisting, and I will never forget that force and that excitement of coming into this role.

I've enjoyed our many conversations. It's been good to get to know you, Sir. I wish you all the best. As the Leader of the Opposition said, I say, Godspeed to you and your family in this next chapter of your life. As a final confession on transparency, your wife and I are Facebook friends. That's as far as it goes.

I do wish you all the best, Sir. Take care.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes, I call Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day.

**Orders of the Day**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I move from the Order Paper, Motion 2.

Further to the motion adopted by the House on Wednesday, October 23, 2018, that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on a date to be announced in the House by the Government House Leader following consultation with the House Leaders for the Official Opposition and the Third Party, in order to receive the Commissioner for Legislative Standards, for the purpose of answering questions and providing clarity on the process of the recently tabled reports inquiring into Members' Code of Conduct.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commissioner for Legislative Standards be provided up to 15 minutes to offer opening remarks and that the Commissioner for Legislative Standards be permitted to have up to two support staff accompany him, if he so chooses, but support staff will not speak; and.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a maximum of 400 minutes be allocated for this debate.

I would like to move that motion, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader, control of the debate.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I'll just wait, Mr. Speaker, until the time goes up on the clock, but I can guarantee I will not need that full 60 minutes.

Basically what I'd like to do in moving this motion today is to hopefully try my best to provide some clarity and some background on what it is we are doing, because this is an usual motion that we're moving today, one that I guess is quite rare is what we would say.

Just to go back, and I'm not going to get into the why we are here today, but I want to go back as far as last Wednesday. So last Wednesday was

the movement of a private Member's resolution that I would note was supported unanimously in the House, and even included a friendly amendment for an opportunity for Members to question the Commissioner for Legislative Standards on the floor of the House of Assembly so that Members could have an opportunity to question, to inquire, to get information about reports prior to the debate of resolutions that would come from that report and recommendations made by the Commissioner for Legislative Standards.

That motion was made last Wednesday and was supported unanimously by the Members of the – actually, I don't think it was supported unanimously, but it was supported by a number of Members of the House of Assembly and certainly it was passed.

What that lead to then was an opportunity for House Leaders, as well as House staff, to figure out how do we enable that process to happen, to basically have a stranger enter the House, come onto the floor of the House and how does that debate look, how does that debate take place.

Again, I want to thank the House staff for the work that they've done in going across the country. This is not something that you see a lot of. I think it's happened twice in this province, once back in the Come By Chance days and I think once back in the '60s the Auditor appeared on the floor of the House.

I believe that we have had prime ministers appear on the floor of the House to speak but not to answer questions. This process will be an opportunity for Members to both speak and to listen to the Commissioner for Legislative Standards who was the drafter of reports which have been tabled in this House by the Speaker as chairperson of the Management Commission.

The other thing I want to point out to people that many times there's – as Government House Leader it's my duty to move motions like this, certain motions that are government policy, but this is a motion that would have come from the Management Commission. It has been discussed by Members, by the House Leaders in this House. I think we've worked very well together to determine what we think is a good process to

put in place and, again, enabled by staff of the House.

So what we've done here in moving this motion – and again, notice was given yesterday, we are debating this today, and hopefully passing this today. Because the goal amongst House Leaders was to hopefully allow for the Commissioner for Legislative Standards to present himself to this House this coming Monday, which requires the passage, obviously, of this resolution today if we want that to happen.

We've laid out a scenario here where the Commissioner will present, the Commissioner will have support staff, and we've put on 400 minutes, which works out to roughly 6½ hours here. The 400 minutes was basically created by the taking the number of Members that sit in this House, 40, and putting 10 minutes on. Again, this is not something we've done. Anybody that watches the House of Assembly and watches debate on legislation understands the different stages, first reading, second reading, but this is not going to be the same, obviously, as a debate over a piece of legislation.

It will be done during a Committee of the Whole which, to people watching, the Speaker removes himself from the Chair, the Deputy Chair will sit at the table and will moderate this debate and will allow for the questioning to go on. But in this case it's not Opposition asking government; it's all Members of the House of Assembly, as Members of the House of Assembly, being able to ask the Commissioner for Legislative Standards any questions that they may have on the reports that he filed here in the House of Assembly.

So we've established the timeline on this, which is 400 minutes. What we have not established – and again, I would point out to people listening that even though we are governed by Standing Orders, with the consent of House Leaders, Members can come to arrangements that work for this House as it relates to debate. So hopefully what we're going to do before Monday – the only thing that has not been decided is how the 400 minute allocation will work.

I will point out that it's my opinion, my point of view – and I think it may be shared other

Members – is that this is not a process that any of us in this House have been privy to. All we want to do is to have a process that makes everybody, every Member of this House, and we are all equal, feel treated equally and an opportunity that we think is fair to ask questions of the Commissioner for Legislative Standards – who I would point out is a Statutory Officer of the House, and actually would be in this position by virtue of a vote of all Members of this House.

So every Member should be treated the same. I would just like to see a process that when it's done, hopefully all Members can say, I feel like I've had a full and fair opportunity to ask the questions that I've wanted to ask and to have clarity and confirmation of any information. Because again, the reports that the Commissioner has filed are public, they are tabled, and everybody – hopefully all Members have had an opportunity to read them. Again, I would encourage, obviously, everybody to read these reports if they're a Member of the House of Assembly.

So this is our opportunity to ask questions. That's my goal, is that I would like all Members to walk away from this after that day saying, I feel like I've had an opportunity to ask those questions. So that's why we need to figure out the time. I don't believe that all Members of the House of Assembly will use the time or ask questions. Some Members may have no questions; some Members may require extra time. So we want to come up with an approach that works for everybody, based on the timeline that we've laid out here.

I can advise the House that I have – and you can see on the Order Paper. I've made a motion under Standing Order 11, so that the House do not adjourn on this coming Monday at 5:30. The reason for this, I think it's in everybody's best interest that when we start – and especially for the Commissioner as well. That when we start we allow the process to unfold, and to stop it at 5:30, if we're continuing on past that time, to stop it and come back the next day I think is a disservice to everybody and to the Commissioner.

I think what I will be doing, if necessary, is I would move that motion that day, so that when we start we will go as long as we need to go,

knowing that we have the maximum of 400 minutes. So that's my intention as well, to do here in the House that day.

Again, I'll continue, as I've done over the last number of days and weeks, is I'll work with my colleagues in the House to figure out how Monday will operate in terms of questioning, how it will work in terms of time limits and time allocations. Hopefully, that's something that everybody can come to agreement on, and it allows everybody to feel like they've had that opportunity.

What I want to do before I take my seat, and I will have an opportunity to speak at the close of this if necessary. What I will be doing, hopefully after this, so people understand the process moving after that. This is something that the Members of the House have supported. It's an opportunity to question the Commissioner for Legislative Standards. I then, as House Leader, have to move five notices of resolution for the five reports that have been tabled. They cannot be combined into one. They have to be one for each of the recommendations – or each of the reports that have been put here in the House of Assembly.

My goal is that after everybody's had an opportunity to ask those questions, is that I would hopefully be able to put on the Order Paper, this coming Tuesday, those Notices of Motion. Again, what I can say is I really want to thank the Table staff, particularly the legal Clerk.

This is very difficult, because the legislation governing this is very prescriptive. So it's not like we have a huge amount of flexibility in the wordsmithing of resolutions. It's very broad, and we're trying our best to put in resolutions that – you try to be flexible sometimes, but we may have to go with what the legislation sets out. Thankfully, we have the guidance of Table staff who help guide us on a day-to-day basis, but especially in times like this where this is not something we've dealt with very regularly.

So, hopefully, we'll put those notices of resolution in. Then, obviously, those will be dealt with in the House as per regular course. Those motions will be called, then they will be voted on and then we shall proceed from there.

I put that out there because there has been some confusion, especially amongst people outside. I did a significant scrum yesterday with the media where they were asking: how does this all work, the mechanics of it. I'm trying to explain, I think this is how it works because this is something different. So that's the process we're following now.

The debate today is on this resolution that sets up what, hopefully, will happen this Monday, which is we'll have the Commissioner for Legislative Standards in. It is not today to debate resolutions coming. It is not to debate anything like that.

Again, I'm certainly not telling anybody what to say or what not to say. That's not what I'm getting into. Today's purpose – for those watching – is we're trying to set up a process that has not really ever been done in this House when it was here. I think the last time it was done – I don't think we even sat here. I think it was up on the 10th floor. So we're trying to set up a process. We'll see how that goes. Again, I'll listen to my colleagues in the debate.

I'll take my seat, and hopefully have an opportunity to speak again today.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

As this is a government motion, I look to the Opposition now to respond.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Government House Leader for his explanation.

Before I respond to the points that arise, it might be appropriate if I mentioned that in at least one of the precedents that he referenced, and that had to do with the Come By Chance Oil Refinery. My father was a very active member of the House and a participant in the questioning, but I believe it was Mr. John Shaheen who was examined by the House on that occasion. For all I know, he may have had something to do with



the other precedent as well, being active in politics at the time in this House.

The hon. the House Leader for the government has explained how the 400 minutes will work. He's referenced equal treatment and fairness, all of which are excellent sentiments. He also said that every Member will be treated the same, or should be treated the same. The point that arises from that, Mr. Speaker, is that not all Members are equally situated in this process or have the same interest in it, because there are – and using the language of these five reports, there are plaintiff Members and there are defendant Members, two defendant Members on this occasion.

I recognize that the hon. Leader of the House for the government has referenced the exact details of the process and procedure for questioning and the allocation of time might be worked out by consensus or consent among the House Leaders. I just want to put on the record at this point that there's a case to make – and I do this because as a lawyer, and I'm sure my friend across the aisle will recognize the point I'm making, due process is very important. Due process is critically important that justice be done and due process is critically important that justice be seen to be done.

When I say that, I mean that it may well be thought by the Members who are described as defendants in these reports should be allocated more than the arithmetical 10 minutes here. Again, I note that my friend across the aisle has referenced that we may work that out by consensus between House Leaders.

There's another reason why I say that. I just draw attention at this point to the fact that the act, known as the *Public Inquires Act*, is referenced by the – and I'll call it, for shorthand form, the Accountability Act. I think we'll all know what I mean when I say Accountability Act. It does reference and incorporate the *Public Inquires Act* but as I've learned over the last week or so, section 30 of the *Public Inquires Act* says that: "Where another Act confers upon a person or body the powers of a commission under this Act, the powers conferred on the person or body are those powers given under sections 9 and 10...."

So it's not the entire act that applies, the entire *Public Inquires Act*, but only nine and 10. Nine and 10 have to do with the "Power to inspect" and the "Power to compel evidence." So the rest of it doesn't apply in the circumstances we're confronted with. Why that might be important is that there's a section, section 5, which deals with participation at an inquiry. Just so we're all clear here, the Public Inquiries Act is the act that governs, for example, the Muskrat Falls Inquiry that we're all familiar with, and probably are following along in the daily news as I speak.

That act, the Public Inquiries Act, says, in (4) of section 5: "A commission shall not make a report against a person until the commission has given reasonable notice to the person of the charge of misconduct alleged against him or her and the person has been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel."

So, the reason I read that out is if I understand the process followed by the Commissioner of this House, the Commissioner for Legislative Standards, that particular due process privilege or right may not have been extended by the Commissioner to the two respondents in the course of the investigations which led up to the reports that have been tabled in the House.

The reason I bring the attention of the House to that is again to come back to the fact that these two Members, the Member respondents, may well feel justified in seeking to ask questions of the Commissioner that take longer than 10 minutes.

I just wanted to put those due process concerns on the table for the benefit of Members.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands.

**MR. JOYCE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm just going to stand and speak a few minutes as a respondent. I just want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for bringing up the point about due process. I will be bringing up some incidents where I felt that due process was not carried out

properly. I'll just be throwing things out now, Mr. Speaker, so that the Government House Leader can – questions that I'll be asking like: Was due process followed? Was the legislation followed? Did he dig into certain areas whereby if there were any possibilities of collusion with any of this – was there any collusion among people to bring up certain parts of this? So, that's going to be some of the issues that I'm going to be bringing up, Mr. Speaker.

Also, I'm going to bring up why some witnesses weren't called that you put forth that will clarify a lot of stuff. It's very important. There are certain witnesses that would show that the facts that's presented, that some people say was put in, that someone else says it wasn't put in, but there's a third person that can confirm it. Those are the kind of things that I need to know, Mr. Speaker.

I know when I was speaking with the Commissioner last Wednesday he made some statements to me that I'm hoping that he's going to be able to back up. Because it did affect my life for the last six months and there are going to be a lot of questions. So I'll be asking the Government House Leader what range of questions we can ask, because there's a lot of information in there that I felt was never brought out. There's a lot of information.

I'm not getting into the reports, but there is a lot of information that was presented as evidence by witnesses that was never put in the report. There are a lot of people that could have been interviewed that were never interviewed. Why wasn't that done if you want the due process?

So those are the questions that I'll be asking. I'll be fair and I'll be upfront to Bruce Chaulk and to all the people. I'll be asking: How can Rubin Thomlinson write a report, you confirmed a report, cut-and-paste which he said here last week, 100 per cent, then all of sudden just turn around and add to it? Those are the kind of questions I'm going to be asking, because at the beginning when all this started – and it started the day before actually, when Bruce Chaulk made the statement when he was asked about the Premier, he said: I don't have the expertise, but I do have people who do have the expertise.

So once you make that statement, you are putting yourself up that whatever this person says is going to be whatever this report says. But when you get this report from the expert, and then the report from the expert says here are the results, and then all of a sudden you say no, no, no, I'm going to add to the results. I don't have the expertise, though, but I'm going to add to it. So that's the kind of questions that I am going to be asking is: What gave him the authority to do that?

I have one quote there – I won't get in the report, but there's one quote there that I have. I'm also going to be asking why certain witnesses if there's – and he had information, Mr. Speaker, and so do I about who was talking to who, and I had that information and he does also, and it's very important to me. And I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that, for bringing up the due process because I personally feel that if the due process was carried out, we wouldn't be here today. This would've been settled.

Again, it's my right in this House of Assembly to ask these questions. Again, it's my right in this House of Assembly to defend myself. I make no apologies to anybody for the questions that I'm going to ask Mr. Chaulk. I don't make any apologies for anybody, for the information that I'm going to present. I make no apologies to anybody, Mr. Speaker, of why I'm going to do that.

At the end of it, at the end of all this, I just hope that the Legislature will come up with a policy where this won't happen again. If there's a way to resolve this somehow, one way of putting people, myself and the Member, putting us through this for six months.

There's something I got to put out also, Mr. Speaker, is we're always hearing about confidentiality. That's the big thing about they brought up, and I know Members brought up confidentiality. I got to ask one question to all the people from the Legislature: If confidentiality is such a big issue, how did our names get put out in the first place? Did anybody ever think about that?

This process is supposed to be done in a certain way, and that's the kind of questions I'm going

to be asking the Commissioner. If everything, all this is supposed to be confidential, how did our names get out there? So the whole process itself, Mr. Speaker, once this is said and done, we need to come up with something because this may happen again, it may not, please God it won't; but if it comes up again, we need a procedure in place where you don't have two people put out there, shoved out, now you got to prove you're innocent – not that you prove you are guilty; you got to prove that you're innocent.

That's the kind of thing that we need to look at as a Legislature, because everybody knows once your name is out there you have to prove you're innocent. And until that's done – and then just on the proof that you are guilty, you're relieved of Cabinet duties, and you make it so you don't want to put your colleagues through any more hardship, you ask yourself to be relieved of caucus because of that. But confidentiality, everybody says well the report shouldn't even have been out there. How did our names get out there? That's a big question, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to be bringing up, and I'll be showing how our names got out there.

So I will be asking a lot of questions, and I will be asking the Speaker, I'll be asking also in the report – I hope I'll get leeway from the government leader and the people involved to ask the type of questions: How much credibility did you put on the witnesses and the complainant and the respondent and all the witnesses? How much credibility did you put when statements were made, and you got facts put there? That's the kind of thing that I'm going to be asking.

I'll inform the Government House Leader, I'm going to ask, like when you put in – and Mr. Chaulk also said that he'll take the information and then he'll review it. What are the timelines? We all understood in this House – I did, and I got it from a good source – that it's 90 days. But according to Mr. Chaulk, what he said the other day is that when I get the report I'll review it. I'll send it to the respondent. When he comes back I'll review it and then I decide when the time starts. I don't think that's in the legislation.

This should have been settled three months ago. That's what we were all told, Mr. Speaker. My first complaint was in May. The second

complaint, when all this started – this is the kind of question I'm going to be asking. The second complaint wasn't put in until June 27, two months later. But this is supposed to be finished in 90 days. Ninety days is in the legislation.

Once a request for an opinion is made he got 90 days, no later than 90 days. There wasn't even a second one put in for two months. Yet, my name is out there: put out of Cabinet, asked to leave caucus. And no second complaint in that started all this. So that's the kind of questions I'm going to be asking.

Also, the question I'm going to be asking – because Mr. Chaulk said that once he gets the information, if there's no credibility to it. I'm going to be asking Mr. Chaulk, with the report that was put out there – and one of the reports that me, personally, that my financial affairs aren't in order, what proof do you have? Why should that be put out there?

So that's the kind of questions, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to be bringing up to him. Because if there's no proof, why would you even put it out there? If someone makes a statement in a report with absolutely no proof, why should that be in the report? Sure, that would be taken out so you don't have to go through the embarrassment of people thinking your finances aren't in order. That's the kind of questions I'm going to be asking. They're relevant. There's just no need of it; there's no need of it. Those are very important questions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll be sitting down now but I just wanted to give the Government House Leader an opportunity to say what type of questions I'll be asking. I ask all Members in the Legislature to remember one thing, remember one thing, how did my name and the Member's name get put out in public if it wasn't for the reprisals? That's the only question I ask everybody. If it's confidential, how did our names get out there? That's a big question, and I'll answer that next week, please God.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

**MR. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't intend to speak long, but the first thing I want to do is I want to concur with the Leader of the Opposition. It's actually something that had occurred to me when I was thinking about it as well, he raised it first, but I think he makes a very valid point. When we go through this process it's very likely that a lot of Members – I know I intend on listening more so than asking questions.

I probably won't have any questions, there's a good chance I won't, but in fairness to those who have been accused of things and those who have made the complaints, I think it's very important to the process that they be allotted a significant period of time to be able to ask questions. As the Member here has alluded, and as well as Members who have made the complaints, that they have the ability to ask questions as well. They are more deserving and need the time more than I would. So I would certainly concur with that point.

The other point I just want to make in terms of this process thus far, the Government House Leader has referenced the fact that he has been working with Members of the House on developing a process, a fair process that would involve all Members. While that's great to hear, and he's saying he has been working with the Opposition House Leader, with the House Leader of the Third Party, I would remind the Member and this House that not everybody are part of those three parties.

I sit as an independent. We have two other independent Members. I don't know if they were consulted or not on what the process is going to be, but if we're going to be developing a process and timelines and coming to a consensus, then there are three Members that are not represented by either three caucuses at this point in time. It's important that we be included in whatever that process is, at least given a heads-up as opposed to showing up here Monday and told here's what we decided for you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Any further speakers to the motion?

If the hon. the Government House Leader speaks now he will close debate.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't plan on speaking long. I'd like to thank Members for speaking to this. I'm presuming we will have, hopefully, unanimous support for this motion.

As I've said to the House, I'll continue working with everybody to ensure that come this Monday, we have a process that is agreeable to Members in moving this process forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is the House ready for the question?

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against, 'nay.'

The motion is carried.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would call from the Order Paper, Order 2, third reading of Bill 28.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 28, An Act To Amend The Arts Council Act, be now read a third time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the said bill be now read a third time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against, 'nay.'

The motion is carried.

**CLERK (Barnes):** A bill, An Act To Amend The Arts Council Act. (Bill 28)

**MR. SPEAKER:** This bill is now read a third time and it is ordered that the bill do pass and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Arts Council Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 28)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I call Order 3, third reading of Bill 29.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 29, An Act To Amend The Forestry Act, be now read a third time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the said bill be now read a third time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against, 'nay.'

The motion is carried.

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act To Amend The Forestry Act. (Bill 29)

**MR. SPEAKER:** This bill is now read a third time and it is ordered that the bill do pass and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forestry Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 29)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I call Order 4, third reading of Bill 31.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 31, An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Accountability, Integrity And Administration Act, be now read a third time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the said bill be now read a third time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against, 'nay.'

This motion is carried.

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Accountability, Integrity And Administration Act. (Bill 31)

**MR. SPEAKER:** This bill is now read a third time and it is ordered that the bill do pass and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Accountability, Integrity And Administration Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 31)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I call from the Order Paper, Order 7, second reading of Bill 30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Virginia Waters - Pleasantville, that Bill 30, An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act, be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act." (Bill 30)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** I am pleased to stand today to speak to the amendments to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak to the amendment specifically, I would like to highlight the importance of bringing issues like this to the forefront. It provides an opportunity for many of us to become aware of the challenges newcomers to our province may encounter, and the need for full acceptance of all persons in our society.

If we are to move forward as a society, it is important that we all recognize that tolerance alone is not enough. Everyone in our society deserves acceptance, regardless of sexual orientation, gender diversity, race, colour or religion. No one should ever have to worry about being judged or harassed because they were born in a different part of the world into a culture different from ours.

Mr. Speaker, our government believes in equality for everyone, and we respect the diversity of all individuals. It is important that we remain progressive and accepting, continuing to empower people who have chosen to make Newfoundland and Labrador their home.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater empowerment for individuals than to find gainful employment when they make a home in a new country. Today we are addressing a matter that will help a number of immigrants who have chosen

Newfoundland and Labrador as their home to find that employment.

When substantial amendments were made to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* in 2007 they included a requirement that anyone employed as an agent, which may be a security guard, a private investigator, an armoured vehicle guard, security consultant, or burglar alarm agent must be a Canadian citizen. Prior to 2007, it only had been required that the individual be a landed immigrant.

Currently, there are 47 security agencies licensed in the province. These include businesses that offer security guard services, armoured courier services, burglar alarm service, private investigation services or security consulting services. The individuals are hired by the licensed agency, who is responsible to ensure those hired meet the requirements of the act, which include, a minimum of 19 years of age – that's section 11 – and criminal records check verifying the person has not been found guilty or convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code, which is section 12.

Standard terms and conditions of a security guard agency licence require a security guard to have completed a training program based on criteria established by the administrator of private investigation and security services – a role of the director of Consumer Affairs Division. The other option is that they plan to be enrolled in a training program within four months of employment and complete the training program within 12 months of employment.

Aside from this province, it is important to note that no other jurisdiction requires Canadian citizenship. Only British Columbia requires a person to be a permanent resident – the term which replaces landed immigrant in many federal and provincial documents and legislation.

While the amendment would eliminate the requirement for agents and security guards to be Canadian citizens, all agents and security guards must be employed by an agency or registered as one. All agents must be licensed through Service NL. This means there is always oversight from a Canadian citizen or permanent resident or a

person is not eligible to hold a licence to carry on the business of agency unless the person is a Canadian citizen or permanent resident under federal immigration legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have stood many times in this House of Assembly regarding legislative amendments and, each time, I have said that it is incumbent upon us as a government to ensure legislation is effective for the people it serves. As a government servicing the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, it is important that we listen to our residents and modernize legislation to reflect the current environment of our province.

I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the Human Rights Commission and security guard agencies in bringing this issue forward to my department. Discrimination in employment on the basis of nationality is certainly not a principle of our government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard to collaborate and engage with all our stakeholders to ensure our actions and initiatives are inclusive and reflective of the diversity that exists in our province.

I have personally stood in this hon. House to introduce amendments to recognize gender identity and expression. We have also amended the regulations to help our built environment become more accessible and inclusive. Wherever and whenever possible our government has worked to foster an environment that celebrates the diversity of our province and its people. As I said earlier, it is very important that we remain progressive as a government and continue to recognize the strength that comes from bringing our differences together.

My colleague, the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, certainly has helped facilitate the recognition of this diversity. Through the immigration strategy he has focused on ensuring Newfoundland and Labrador becomes an even more attractive destination of choice for newcomers to live, work and raise their families.

Immigration supports efforts to encourage private sector job creation and economic growth as identified in *The Way Forward on*

*Immigration in Newfoundland and Labrador*. We know Newfoundland and Labrador is facing significant demographic challenges. With Canada's most rapidly aging population and lowest birth rate, it is projected that by 2025 the province will experience a 10 per cent decline in its working age population, resulting in 35,000 fewer people in the provincial labour market. We also know that immigration is an important tool to help address these trends. And, as my colleagues have said many times, a strong plan for immigration is an important step in securing a sustainable future for the province.

Mr. Speaker, when this amendment to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* is made a number of newcomers to our province will be able to secure the employment they deserve in this field. It will also help a number of companies address recruitment pressures they have experienced because of a section of the act that has been proven to be discriminatory in nature. Bringing this amendment forward is a part of our government's continuing efforts to embrace and celebrate the diversity of all people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I have said many times in this hon. House that it is important that we constantly review and amend our legislation, and ensure it is meeting the needs of the people of our province. It is equally as important that we embrace the differences that exist among us, and help continue to make Newfoundland and Labrador a place that celebrates such diversity.

I am pleased that we are here today to debate this amendment to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act*. It truly is another step along our path towards true inclusion. It also represents one more way for us demonstrate our acceptance of those who choose to make this wonderful province their home.

As *The Way Forward on Immigration* states: "Together we will succeed in building a more economically, socially and culturally vibrant province that attracts and retains skilled immigrants."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for the District of Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, it's a privilege and an honour to rise in this hon. House to speak to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act. Mr. Speaker, as the minister just eloquently described, Bill 30 would amend the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* to remove the requirement that agents and security guards must be Canadian citizens.

By way of background, Mr. Speaker, the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* comes under the purview of the Department of Service Newfoundland and Labrador, and it dates back to 1981. Service Newfoundland and Labrador licenses and regulates activities relating to private investigations and security guards through the Consumer Affairs Division of the department.

Mr. Speaker, under paragraphs 11(1)(a) and 11(2)(a) of the current *Private Investigation and Security Services Act*, a person must be a Canadian citizen to be eligible to either: (1) hold a licence as an agent; or (2) to be employed as a security guard by a licensed security guard agency.

In the act, Mr. Speaker, an agent is defined as "a private investigator, an armoured vehicle guard, a security consultant or a burglar alarm agent." A security guard "means a person who, for hire or reward, guards or patrols for the purpose of protecting persons or property ...." A security guard agency is defined as a "business of providing the services of security guards, guard dogs or armoured vehicle guards."

Mr. Speaker, according to Service Newfoundland and Labrador officials, there are 47 such licences for security guard agencies operating in the province, and a number of these agencies approached the department requesting that the Canadian citizenship requirement for agents and security guards be removed. Department officials, during our briefing, stated that the agencies have said they are receiving complaints about the Canadian citizenship

requirement from people who are seeking employment with their companies.

Service NL officials stated the department consulted with the Human Rights Commission and the Department of Justice and Public Safety, and it was their opinion that the requirement for Canadian citizenship could, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, or the *Human Rights Act, 2010*, potentially be found to be discriminatory against immigrants, refugees and others who are legally entitled to work in Canada, but who are not Canadian citizens. Officials stated that despite the fact there is no current Charter challenge, but as Service NL has been advised the potential exists, government is repealing the Canadian citizenship requirements for agents and security guards.

Mr. Speaker, during our briefing, Service NL officials were asked whether a requirement that a security guard or agent be either a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident would be an alternative. The email we received in response to that question was that adding such a requirement would still exclude certain people, such as international students or foreign workers, and would therefore still expose the measure to a rights challenge. So that is why the officials are recommending this as the type of change as proceeded with.

The officials also added there is a residency requirement for an agency, that is set out under section 10(1)(a) of the act, and the licence holder must be a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident. A business manager must be ordinarily resident in Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's basically a summary of the briefing we received. In terms of the proposed amendments to the act, currently paragraph 11 of the act outlines the requirements as: "A person is not eligible to hold a licence as an agent unless that person (a) is a Canadian citizen; and (b) is 19 years of age or over."

Or "(2) A person may not be employed as a security guard by a licensed security guard agency unless that person (a) is a Canadian citizen; and (b) is 19 years of age or over."

Bill 30 will repeal paragraphs 11(1)(a) and 11(2)(a) and thereby remove the Canadian



citizenship requirement for agents and security guards.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is our understanding of the bill as presented, and we will certainly look forward to asking the minister some additional questions in Committee of the Whole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further speakers to the motion?

The hon. the Member for Virginia Waters - Pleasantville.

**MR. B. DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Sorry about that; the Member for Conception Bay - Cape La Hune caught me off guard there for a second, she sat down so quickly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That would be Fortune Bay. The Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MR. B. DAVIS:** Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune, sorry.

Excellent. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very glad and pleased to stand here today to speak to Bill 30, the amendments to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act*. I believe we all have a role to play in making our province a destination of choice for immigrants and their families.

As the MHA for Virginia Waters - Pleasantville, I've had the pleasure and the opportunity to experience first-hand what it means for immigrants to create a new life here in Newfoundland and Labrador. It's one of the things that I take a lot of pride in, that I have one of the most ethnic-diverse districts in our province.

I attended an event in my district recently in which a newcomer to our province said to me, if you're brave enough to say goodbye, then you'll be rewarded with a new hello. And that stuck with me ever since I've heard that. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this perfectly summarizes the reasons why we must work to ensure more newcomers choose to settle here and build a future for themselves, our communities and our province.

Immigration has been a part of Newfoundland and Labrador's development for centuries. Newcomers settled in communities throughout our province and helped shape our province's identity. It has been defining our province's economy, social, cultural and demographic growth. Newcomers fill high-demand labour market vacancies, as well as they create jobs, Mr. Speaker. Many newcomers own businesses in Newfoundland and Labrador, providing meaningful employment for local residents, and provide quality goods and services to industries such as information technology, food and accommodation, health care and education.

During the last session of the House of Assembly, I was pleased to stand with the Minister of Service NL to amend the *Corporations Act*, which added two new categories to the Newfoundland and Labrador Provincial Nominee Program, namely the international graduate entrepreneur program and the international entrepreneur.

These changes make it easier for international graduates and entrepreneurs to establish themselves and create businesses and jobs in our province. It helps our government's efforts to grow the provincial workforce and the economy. And now we stand here today, Mr. Speaker, to amend another piece of legislation that will remove barriers for immigrants to our province who wish to be employed in the security services industry.

These amendments support the ongoing efforts to attract and retain newcomers. It encourages the hiring of immigrants and permanent residents and broadens the pool of eligible candidates for security companies and agencies. It also, Mr. Speaker, is the right thing to do.

The Minister of Service NL referred to earlier the current practices of requiring immigrants to be a Canadian citizen in order to find employment in the security services industry as discriminatory, and I couldn't agree more. Undoubtedly, our government works hard to end discriminations of any kind, including that which potentially is experienced by newcomers to our province. We want to send a strong message that Newfoundland and Labrador is a wonderful place to live, work and raise a family.

In fact, in *The Way Forward: A vision for sustainability and growth in Newfoundland and Labrador*, we committed to developing a five-year plan to increase immigration by 50 per cent. We'll welcome approximately 1,700 immigrants annually by 2022, and I know the minister is working very diligently to try to accomplish those goals.

This plan acknowledges that immigration is necessary to address both the demographic and the economic needs within our province, and assists in attracting young people from other parts of the world, bringing diverse perspectives, talents and skills to our labour market. This includes a focus on hiring skilled immigrants to fill hard to fill positions and initiatives to promote diversity and multiculturalism within the public service.

Throughout the plan, led by the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, my colleague, our government has been aggressively implementing the actions in partnership with the stakeholders, including employers with 25 of the 39 actions implemented or under ongoing proposals. The amendment to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* introduced in the House today is certainly in keeping with this direction. It will allow those legally entitled to work within Canada to gain employment as security guards or agents, helping grow our provincial workforce while making Newfoundland and Labrador their home.

Mr. Speaker, I often think of how difficult it must be to make a decision to leave one's country. I read an article recently by a local engineer, Prajwala Dixit, in which she talked about immigration may not always be about a better life, but rather a different life.

Regardless of the motivation, there must be a high level of anxiety surrounding the unknown that awaits you. Leaving friends and family is a significant choice to make. There are often considerable cultural differences and language barriers that often newcomers may not even know a single person in the place they're going. That is why it is incumbent on all of us here in this House of Assembly, but all of us around this province, to make that transition as easy as possible, recognizing that we're all human

beings, and we all have the same basic requirements of acceptance.

Removing the employment barrier based on being a Canadian citizen is certainly a step towards acceptance. This amendment is also very positive for the companies who reached out to our government to make us aware of impediments to hiring that they're facing, giving their recruitment issues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate once again how immigration to our province presents a great opportunity to contribute to our social and cultural identity. We welcome, support, respect and value people of all backgrounds, and we all have a role to play in increasing immigration in Newfoundland and Labrador.

As a government, we also have a role to ensuring that legislation and policies governing our province are supportive to our immigration goals. The amendment to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* is one more action towards helping us achieve those goals. I'm very proud to stand with this government and support this initiative.

Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act. My colleague just referenced the immigration component to this and accessibility, and access to those coming in to our province related to the duties as defined in the current legislation and any regulatory framework.

Currently right now, under paragraphs 11(1)(a) and 11(2)(a) of the current *Private Investigation and Security Services Act*, a person must be a Canadian citizen to be eligible to, number one, to hold a licence as an agent and, two, to be employed as a security guard agency.

The act defines what that would be. A security guard “means a person who, for hire or reward, guards or patrols for the purpose of protecting persons or property ....” It references a security guard agency “means the business of providing the services of security guards, guard dogs or armoured vehicle guards.” So it outlines, as well, the definition of what has been defined.

I know in a briefing that was given by the department indicated there were some complaints or inquiries about the Canadian citizenship requirement from people seeking employment with their companies. Now, I think if we go back in terms of the legislation – I may be corrected – there was a double component. There was a landed immigrant status or a Canadian citizenship originally that was a requirement, and then it was reduced down to Canadian citizenship, if I remember correctly.

As well, in the briefing, there was a discussion about the department consulting with the Human Rights Commission and the Department of Justice and Public Safety, and an opinion rendered in regard to Canadian citizenship could – and that word is “could” – under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms or *The Human Rights Act, 2010*, potentially to be found to be discriminatory against immigrants, refugees and others who are legally entitled to work in Canada, but who are not Canadian citizens.

I think there was some discussion, as well, about: Is there a Charter challenge underway now? Has that been set in motion? My understanding, and the minister can clarify it as well, there’s no current Charter challenge based on this particular circumstances, I understand. But apparently, there’s – and that’s why we’re debating this today. The intent of the bill is that, apparently, there’s been some discussion about the potential exists for a possible Charter right based on the requirement for Canadian citizenship. For that reason, government is repealing the Canadian citizenship requirement that’s being proposed here for agents and security guards.

There was also discussion about the citizenship and a permanent resident would be an alternative, and that would still excludes certain people possibly, which is the argument such as international students or foreign workers, and

may, again, reportedly expose the measure to a Charter of Rights challenge.

So those are some of the things that have been discussed. Obviously, the issue of temporary foreign workers, that’s something that many employers in the province are able to avail of. There was an opinion rendered by Service NL. The potential for an employer to avail of the Temporary Foreign Worker Program is not likely to be sufficient grounds for limiting these employment opportunities to exclude certain people otherwise legally entitled to work in Canada.

So those are some of the parameters of the actual bill and what we’re discussing here today, and the genesis seems to be, for it, is that we had some representation from some companies here that are involved in this industry. I assume they were in touch with people in the province who were looking at seeking employment and weren’t able to seek employment based on some of the requirements that were outlined in this piece of legislation.

When we get to Committee, I certainly would want to have a discussion about the overall intent of the piece of legislation originally and what was trying to be the intent of it at that particular time and why we are transitioning into what we have here today and what’s hoped to be achieved by this today. There’ll certainly be some questions to be raised as we go through.

That’s related to security, the parameters of that industry, and how it currently operates and what these changes will mean. As I said, there’s nothing right now pending in regard to a Charter challenge, but there is some concern that could become an issue. Well, discussions about the positions, not related to immigrants or immigration but what roles are these positions in in the industry. Is it federal and provincial?

If you look at the various industries and you look at labour standards, some industries are under the Canada Labour Code. You look at things like airports, certain transportation on sea or on land, there are variations in terms of what legislation and what’s applicable, based on an industry which is in the constitution of our country and who regulates that. Whether it’s regulated at a federal level in regard to

employment, the Canada Labour Code, or whether it would fall under employment and provincial labour codes and other regulatory frameworks. Those are some of the discussions we have. I think they're important discussions when we get through Committee and have some discussions of those parts of it as well.

I think there was some mention of the particular groups that advocated for the change; who else had discussions about this; what were the other groups in regard to proposing the change; were there stakeholder consultation; privacy issues in terms of talking about immigrants coming to our province or here already on various status to be here accessing employment, those sorts of things.

So these are all legitimate questions that we need to have answers to as we go through and have a fulsome discussion on the topic. As well, what are we seeing in other jurisdictions; are we mirroring what other jurisdictions are doing to make sure we get it right, and the reasons for doing that.

Those are some comments, Mr. Speaker, on Bill 30, and I look forward to people participating in debate this afternoon, and then when we are at Committee we will have far-reaching questions and get into debate in Committee as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I'm very happy to speak to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act, and it will remove the requirements for agents and security guards to be Canadian citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this makes total sense. Why wouldn't we – absolutely, why wouldn't we? We can and we will, it's the right thing to do, and it's a smart thing to do. It's a smart thing to do for our province right now, particularly when we look at the demographics of our province, and how important it is that we have an open

door in making it even more possible for newcomers, for people who have immigrated to Newfoundland and Labrador to find employment. Because that's one of the things when people come, they are looking for employment, and it's one of the key issues in retention, as well. Good weather helps, but this is really important as well.

So, the government's policy objective with this bill is to eliminate a requirement in the act which could be found to be discriminatory under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of the *Human Rights Act, 2010*. So a lot of folks maybe didn't even realize that, that in fact this legislation, as it stands before being amended, could contravene our Human Rights Act. We don't want that, so we need to clean that up. We need to clean it up for that reason. We also need to clean it up for all the reasons that I've said in terms of the need to make it as easy as possible, and as efficient and as effective as possible for people who are newcomers to find employment, gainful employment, meaningful employment.

The existing requirement that a security guard or an agent; an agent includes private investigators – I don't know how many private investigators there are here in the province, Mr. Speaker, and how many people have thought that they would like to grow up to be a private investigator. I don't know if anybody in this – I assume government knows, or somebody, somebody in Service NL probably knows how many private investigators there are here.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Forty-four.

**MS. ROGERS:** My colleague from Ferryland says that there are 44 private investigators. I don't know, I guess there's a private investigator school that you go to, or perhaps it's former police officers, people who've worked in our police services because of the training that they have. So maybe they're part of that community of private investigation.

So there are armoured vehicle guards, who drive around with valuable things, money and who knows what else; security consultants or burglar alarm agents, and they must be Canadian citizens. That could be found to be in discrimination based on nationality or citizenship. So, absent a good faith reason to

require it. So there is no good reason to require it – none at all. So that's why it has to be changed, because there is no good faith reason to require someone to be an actual Canadian citizen to do that work.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, we see many people from different parts of the world who are coming to Newfoundland and Labrador. Some for school; some because they have family members here; some because they've heard about Newfoundland and Labrador and they want to be here; and we see folks from all over who are part of the security community. That's great to see that diversity. It only enriches all of us.

So we have folks who are immigrants, who are refugees and others who are legally entitled to work in Canada, but who are not Canadian citizens. They could have grounds for a successful challenge to this legislation, before amendment, for a human rights violation.

I am supporting this, Mr. Speaker. The other thing is that I think it's interesting to see why this is important – what is our immigration policy? It's an excellent example of providing more opportunities for people who are not, or at least not yet, Canadian citizens to find employment. This allows them better integrations into the community, a chance at being self-sufficient and can lead to establishing roots in the community, which could lead them to staying in the province instead of moving elsewhere in Canada.

We sure want that, Mr. Speaker. We haven't had much success in retention of folks.

**MR. HAWKINS:** That's not true.

**MS. ROGERS:** Some of it because not as much retention – the minister here is saying that that's not true, what I'm saying. We haven't had as much success. Not blaming this on the government. There are a number of reasons, as in other places in Canada. So this is a great thing to do to improve the success of our retention rate here in the province.

So establishing roots, for people to be able to establish roots, to be able to have – Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and

Labour, he's talking over there and trying to correct me. It'll be good to hear him speak about this. But he really mustn't take affront –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**MS. ROGERS:** He really mustn't take affront to what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, because it's not a criticism. It's not a criticism of him. It's not a criticism of his department. It's just stating that it has been harder. It has been harder and some of our retention rates over the years here in Newfoundland and Labrador have been problematic. This only increases it. They really should listen when I'm saying – I'm praising the government for this. This is absolutely –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MS. ROGERS:** Yeah, there we go, Mr. Speaker. That's the spirit that we should have in response to what I'm saying here right now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MS. ROGERS:** Great. So I know that the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, he'll be able to go home this evening and know that he knows that there's been full support for this.

We know how important, how important the whole issue of immigration is right now in our province. So anything we can do to help people stay – not only is it important for people to be able to cling to Newfoundland and Labrador, it's very important for Newfoundland and Labrador to be able to cling to people and do whatever we can to help them establish roots in our community, and in a respectful way as well.

Mr. Speaker, a little bit of an aside – how important it is, because some of these jobs are minimum wage jobs, how important it is to be able to raise our minimum wage to make sure that people stay even longer, to make sure that they want to do these jobs, that –

**MR. SPEAKER:** Don't forget relevance now.

**MS. ROGERS:** Yes, my relevance, Mr. Speaker, is about being able to retain immigrants

and refugees so that our population grows, and the incredible benefit that happens when we have people from all parts of the world and that diversity, what it means to our communities here in Newfoundland and Labrador. We see the great benefit, whether it be people opening up restaurants, whether it be people opening businesses or sharing their cultural activities. How lucky are we when this happens, when we remove unnecessary blocks and barriers from people being able to find meaningful and full employment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are areas where we need people for those jobs. So we have to make sure that those jobs allow people to be able to live in dignity.

Just recently, we saw the creation of two new programs for newcomers who want to start a business in this province. One for international students graduating from post-secondary institution, and the other for the general population of newcomers. It also removes the stipulation that in order to be an agency, you have to be a Canadian citizen. So this also opens up the opportunity for starting, creating new businesses, by people who aren't Canadian citizens. And hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it increases the number of people who will set down, settle in and set down roots in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The latest amendments add to providing economic opportunities for newcomers. It's a good thing. It's a great way to end our time in the House of Assembly this week, something so positive and something that really speaks to increasing economic opportunities for newcomers. Bravo, Mr. Speaker, absolutely, bravo for this one. Not only do we increase economic opportunities for newcomers, it also impacts our general economy as well. There's another bravo. What more would we want?

We have an aging population. That proportion of our population, that ratio is moving. It's not moving in the right direction in terms of the workforce that we need and the services that we need. We also see a number of potential industries on the horizon that will require more security workers, whether it be some of the megaprojects, whether it be something in the oil industry. So it's important that we are able to fill

the jobs that will be necessary, that help grow our economic diversity here in the province.

It is projected that by 2025 – not so far away, Mr. Speaker. Who would've thought 2018? Here we are, 2018. Yeah, here we are. Look, how many years is that? That is seven years. Seven years, Mr. Speaker, the province will experience a 10 per cent decline in its working-age population. That's 35,000 fewer people in the provincial labour market – 35,000. What that means, not only in terms of fewer bodies to do the work, but also what does it mean in our overall economy? That's scary. That's scary.

So we have to do everything we possibly can to counteract that movement. We can't make anybody stay at the age that they're at – we can't, and that's probably a good thing. We can't prevent people from aging, and that's no slight to seniors in our province because seniors in our province have brought us to where we are today, but we will need younger people and more people of working age who want to work here in the province.

The other downfall of that is that "This limits growth by reducing the number of workers contributing to the economy ...." And I'm sure the Minister of AESL – Advanced Education, Skills and Labour – wouldn't be very happy seeing a reduction of tax revenues because of a reduction in the number of people who are working. Boy, we are going to need more and more money; everything is costing more and more, and we're going to need more and more money to be able to provide the services to the people in our communities. So without these kinds of actions, again, which is a positive action, "these trends will significantly impact the province's future social and economic growth and prosperity."

So attraction and retention of newcomers to this province has become – a lot of people don't realize that, because our birth rate has plummeted for a number of reasons. A lot of young folks feel that they can't afford to have children or they can only afford to have one child. That's all wrapped up in the cost of living, the cost of housing, the minimum wage, the cost of child care – that's a big one, Mr. Speaker. The cost of child care is a big one for people not having children.

Even more so, we have to find ways to attract and retain newcomers to this province, and that has become one of the most prominent methods of government addressing the province's demographic problems or challenges – huge challenges, not insurmountable. And many of our Members here in this House have done their part for the population growth and have had children, but there's only so much individuals can do, so we have to look at other ways.

The province's, also, long-term economic and social sustainability relies on its ability to attract and retain newcomers and encourage new arrivals to establish careers, homes and families in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in the last by-election in Windsor Lake, it was great going knocking on doors and meeting so many people who were immigrants to the province and who were refugees. How many of them have said to me, I'm having a hard time finding work because I'm not a Canadian citizen, when knocking on doors; or saying they couldn't find work because they weren't a Canadian citizen and who were ready and wanting? Mr. Speaker, desperately wanting to work and to also be really actively involved in the community at large.

So this ensures that that will be more possible. There may be other areas where we can see improvements to make it more possible for newcomers to be able to find gainful and meaningful employment and to participate fully in the economy, which is what folks really, really want to be able to do.

Just this week, the minister responsible made a Ministerial Statement in the House stating that 547 newcomers were nominated under the NL Provincial Nominee Program, and 285 under the Atlantic Immigration Pilot Program. So that's a total of 832 people. That's a good news story, too.

That's good news, but our province has had a long-standing problem with retention and ability to keep people here. So this is a positive step in the right direction, and hopefully it will help establish a higher retention rate. It would help in that area and make it more possible for a diverse community of people to be involved in these particular areas of employment.

So thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I will be really happy at the end of this week to say how wonderful for all of us to be able to support a piece of legislation like this.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you very much.

The hon. the Member for the District of Mount Pearl - Southlands.

**MR. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm glad to have an opportunity to speak to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what my colleague just said, and I want to say up front –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**MR. LANE:** – that I think we all realize that we have an aging population. We all realize we have a shrinking population. We all realize that efforts have been made to date to increase our population. We can recall at one point in time the former administration, or perhaps the one before that, actually had a program that was encouraging families to have more children. There was a thousand-dollar bonus or whatever it was, I believe at the time baby bonus or something, to encourage us to have more children.

I think that's met with limited success, if any success arguably, so I think we all recognize that, unfortunately, we're at a point where our population is to, it needs to grow significantly. Obviously, there would an economy of scale. The more people we have the lower the cost of services, because there would be more people to share in the burden.

We have an aging demographic, of course. So it's even worse because even though – because a lot of our population, of course, is aging and leaving the workforce, and there won't be people there, necessarily, to fill those jobs. So

that brings us to the whole aspect of immigration as a strategy to help grow our population.

I think it's fair to say that every Member of this House has supported the concept of immigration. The Member alluded to a bill that was passed in the House of Assembly. It was passed unanimously during the last sitting that allowed, for example, university students who were foreign students, give them the opportunity to actually start businesses and to encourage business growth. We all supported that. I support that and I think it's a great initiative.

I support the immigration program. Certainly, we're all immigrants, except for, theoretically – technically speaking, unless you're a member of our Indigenous population, we're all immigrants. Our ancestors immigrated here from England, from Ireland, from France and so on, for the most part. So we're all immigrants.

The concerns that I'm going to raise has nothing to do with not supporting immigration, because I believe that we need to. We really have no choice than to support immigration and to support people coming here from all throughout the world, regardless where that's from.

Many people immigrate to Canada and immigrate here to Newfoundland and Labrador. A lot of them bring unique skillsets and so on, that they can bring to our province to help diversify our economy, to start a business and to create jobs and to start families and have children. Something we haven't been doing a great job at, having children. Coming here, having families, growing that population. And that's important. I support it, and I know every Member in this House of Assembly has already, by virtue of all the bills that have been passed here, supported that concept of immigration to grow our economy. Because it makes sense and it's something that we have to do.

Not to mention the fact that it brings diversity to our community and different traditions and celebrations and so on. It makes it a more diverse place to live and raise a family and so on, and it brings with it a lot of good things and opportunities.

That said, because I'm sure you could tell, Mr. Speaker, there was sort of a "but" coming, and

where the "but" is to for me is that under the original *Securities Act*, as I understand it through the briefing, the act used to say that to be a security guard or so on you had to be a Canadian citizen or a landed immigrant. At some point in time, back about 10 years ago or whenever it was, they removed the landed immigrant. I don't know why; nobody could tell us at the briefing why that actually happened. Perhaps the minister will when we get to Committee, but for some reason it got removed. I don't know why it did –

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please!

**MR. LANE:** – but it did, and it just said Canadian citizen. By virtue of saying Canadian citizen, then that would mean if somebody came here as an immigrant to Newfoundland and Labrador, or if we have a student at the university and so on, they would not be able to get a job, as I understand it, not in that industry. They could get a job in other places, but they can't get a job in the security industry.

I believe that is wrong – I truly believe that is wrong. If we want people to come here and to live here and to raise a family, to have children so we can increase our population, then one of the things we need to do is ensure that they can avail of employment as people that are living here, raising families here, hopefully getting mortgages here, buying cars here, paying taxes here, contributing to our economy – all good, all good.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we could achieve that by amending this act, not to remove Canadian citizen, but to add back into it what was once removed: the concept of a landed immigrant. If we needed to put something else in there specifically to deal with university student or somehow – because we did make an amendment to other legislation that we could allow university students to open a business here.

So if we could do that, I'm sure we could do something here to allow university students while they're going to university, just like anybody else, to be able to work part time or whatever in a security job, no different than they can work part time over to one of the fast-food restaurants and so on. No issue with any of that.



And it could be achieved by adding to the bill, as opposed to taking away Canadian citizenship.

Now, what's the difference? What is the difference? I'll tell you what the difference is, as I see it at least. The difference as I see it, by not adding landed immigrant, and instead taking away Canadian citizenship, is that we are opening the door, we are opening the door once again for a few people who have businesses set up, whose business is to bring in temporary foreign workers, and to fill all these jobs with temporary foreign workers. That's my fear; that's my concern.

Now, you can say that there is temporary foreign worker – there are rules that govern how you can get a temporary foreign worker. Originally, the way it was set up was supposed to be, basically, if you couldn't get anyone to do the job, if you had a business and you had tried everything to get someone to fill jobs and you couldn't do it, you're saying, I'm going to go out of business, I can't get anybody local to do it. Well, then there was a system that you could apply to get temporary foreign workers.

Now, anecdotally – anecdotally only, because I don't know the stats or exactly how it works. Anecdotally, people will say, and I've certainly heard, that that system is being manipulated. That system is being manipulated in a way to fill the business up with all temporary foreign workers. Why? Why would someone want to do that? I don't know. There are a lot of reasons that have been thrown out there to me, why someone might want to do that.

Perhaps it's because you can get people that you can get to come in and do split shifts and night shifts and everything else that nobody else around here would ever put up with, and to abuse that, because you're talking people who are desperate to come in and looking for work. You're getting that. Or, to say bring people in and then put them up in houses and stuff, that they're going to pay rent to you and pay houses off. We've heard all those things. I'm sure other people have heard this, too.

So that is the concern I have, is that this will open the door for somebody now to say all the jobs are all going to be temporary workers. We'll all say we can't find anybody, because

who actually checks? What checks and balances are there to ensure that if I have a company that I'm actually making best efforts to advertise and to try to fill the jobs and so on with local people? And when I say local people, I'm talking local people who are immigrants now, too, local people who are immigrants. That's why I'm saying add landed immigrant.

I'm talking about university students who are from other countries, as well. So to be quite clear, this is not about someone because they're from different country. They want to come here, live here, contribute, and so on; that's what we want.

We all want that, but we don't want to see this idea that all of a sudden everybody is just going to be getting all temporary foreign workers who are sort of coming here and gone again, come here, gone again, and they're not setting roots, necessarily. They're not having families, they're not getting mortgages, they're not investing in our economy and growing our population, they're coming here to simply get work and go back again or send the money home or whatever the circumstance might be.

That's my fear. I think a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have that concern as well when it comes to the temporary foreign workers. Not immigration, not people who choose to come here and live here and raise their family – they're all welcome, as far as I'm concerned. They're all welcome, and we support this. I support them, absolutely.

After coming here, of course they want jobs, and sure they should get jobs so that they can earn a living to support their families just like everybody else. That's not the issue. The concern is the temporary foreign workers and opening up the door. My fear is that's what this does, and I think it could have been built within a different way, achieving the same thing, achieving the exact same thing by simply saying landed immigrants, making a provision for university students, adding that instead of taking away Canadian citizenship. That would be my concern, Mr. Speaker.

With that said, I'll take my seat.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Any further speakers to the bill?

If the hon. the Minister of Service NL speaks now, she will close debate on the bill.

The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** I'm pleased to stand today to speak one last time to the amendments to Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Private Investigation and Security Services Act. As I said in my earlier remarks, I want to highlight again how important it is to bring matters like this to the forefront. It is only when we understand the challenges that newcomers to our province are encountering that we can address these important issues.

As the Member for Virginia Waters - Pleasantville said when he stood today, we must work to ensure more newcomers choose to settle here and build a great future for themselves in our communities and in our province.

My colleague, the minister responsible for the immigration strategy, has made great progress on increasing the number of newcomers to the province. In fact, 2017 represents the highest ever number of individuals supported with a 20 per cent increase over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, we all know how important finding employment is for many individuals. I'm sure we can all remember that wonderful feeling of securing employment for the first time or finding employment in a field of interest. Anyone coming to Newfoundland and Labrador as a newcomer to establish a new life, or an international student for that matter, should have the ability to secure employment. It is important that we continue to empower people who have chosen to make Newfoundland and Labrador their home.

The amendments we have made to the *Private Investigation and Security Services Act* will assist a number of newcomers to our province in securing that employment. These amendments also represent our government's focus on helping end discrimination of any form.

I want to thank once again the Human Rights Commission and security guard agencies in bringing the issue forward to government. It is important that we constantly review our legislation to ensure it is adequately serving the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Bringing this amendment forward is part of our government's ongoing efforts to celebrate the diversity of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I want to thank my hon. colleagues for their support of the amendments we brought forward today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 30 be now read a second time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against.

The motion is carried.

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act. (Bill 30)

**MR. SPEAKER:** This bill has now been read a second time.

When shall this bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a

Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 30)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Government House Leader.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said bill.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against.

The motion is carried.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### **Committee of the Whole**

**CHAIR (Warr):** Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 30, An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act.

A bill, “An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act.” (Bill 30)

**CLERK:** Clause 1.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 1 carry?

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We don’t have a lot of questions, but we do have some questions that we were wondering if we could get some clarity on.

In the current act, what is the intended purpose of Canadian citizenship being a requirement to work in a security role?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Mr. Speaker.

Canadian citizenship was put in on the previous amendment, and I guess, over time – we went through *Hansard* and we couldn’t find the information to why that amendment was made. I guess, at that time, when the government brought it forward, they anticipated that there was a need for it. But we really couldn’t find, in *Hansard*, why.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Okay. Thank you, Minister.

Will this act apply to, and include, security guards at airports and port authorities?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Yes, all security guards that I listed earlier are included, and those are included also.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Minister.

Can you elaborate for us as to why these changes are being made now?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Well, they’re necessary, as I elaborated when I introduced this amendment, was the fact that we have a declining population. There is a request – I mean, in numerous –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Segments.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** – segments of the population, numerous jobs: retail service, personal care homes and security. We have owners and operators coming to us and saying we're having difficulty finding employees. You must reach out to Newfoundlanders first and foremost, and try to ensure that you can't get any –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Labradorians.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Newfoundlanders and Labradorians first and foremost, and ensure that there's no one available to work the position.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Minister.

Can you inform us, as well, what consultations were done prior to proposing these amendments for the bill?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** I can. I have a list of 12 agencies here that we've consulted with, plus the Human Rights Commission. I can table this or I can read it out. Do you want me to read it out?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Read that.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Okay, we have ADT Security Services Canada Inc., Brink's Canada Limited, Garda Canada Security Corporation, GardaWorld Cash Services Canada Corp., Independent Armoured Transport Atlantic Inc, Paladin Security Group Limited, Rogers Communications Canada Inc., Securitas Canada Limited, Shannahan's Investigation & Security Limited, Bell Telephone Company of Canada, Vivint Canada Inc., West Reid Inc., and, of course, the Human Rights Commission.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Thank you, Minister.

That was one of my next questions, actually: was the Human Rights Commission contacted.

We were wondering as well, if the – did I hear you say the Department of Justice and Public Safety there?

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** (Inaudible.)

**MS. PERRY:** They were included. Okay.

So we were wondering if they were included. What feedback was provided by all of these entities, and was there a jurisdictional scan carried out with respect to what's happening in other provinces on this issue?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Yes, JPS did do an analysis on this request. These companies came to us simply because they felt that this was discriminatory, not being able to employ people because of this. We are, in actual fact, the only province in Canada left with this in our act.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

**MS. PERRY:** Okay, thank you, Minister.

This is my final question. Is there any type of plan or strategy under way or in the works to inform stakeholders and the public about the changes contained in this bill?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Yes, definitely. As soon as this change comes, yes, here in the House of Assembly, we will definitely inform all the agencies. I believe there are 47 licensed agencies in the province.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

**MR. LANE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister, I'm just wondering – as I spoke to in second reading. I'm just wondering, why did the department, given the fact – if this is about trying to grow our population, immigration, bringing people here, having people stay here, invest in our community and so on and grow our population, why wouldn't you just simply add landed immigrant and make a provision for

university students as opposed to eliminating Canadian citizens, thus opening up the door for companies to fill all these jobs with temporary foreign workers?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Okay. First, permanent residents are citizens of other countries. The landed immigrant language has changed with the federal and provincial documents over time. So immigrants, refugees and others who are legally entitled to work in Canada but are not Canadian citizens can have grounds for a successful challenge to this requirement. That's evident. So we were informed by the Human Rights Commission that the probability of a challenge, because of this – and we are the only province in Canada left with it in our act, could in fact invite a challenge.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

**MR. LANE:** So, Minister, just to be clear, because I just want to make sure I'm clear on this. You're telling me that if somebody from another country, for example, who would theoretically be a temporary foreign worker, doesn't have refugee status, is not an immigrant into Canada and all that kind of stuff, somebody randomly in some country says I feel like I want to work in Canada, even though I'm not an immigrant per se, and there could be a Charter right to say I want to come here and get a job.

Is that what you're saying?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Service NL.

**MS. GAMBIN-WALSH:** Yes, if you're legally entitled to work in Canada, you can challenge.

**CHAIR:** Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

**CLERK:** Be it enacted by the Lieutenant-Governor and House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows.

**CHAIR:** Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

**CLERK:** An Act To Amend The Private Investigation And Security Services Act.

**CHAIR:** Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

**CHAIR:** Shall I report the bill without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

**MS. COADY:** I move, Mr. Chair, that the Committee rise and report Bill 30.

**CHAIR:** The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 30.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

**MR. WARR:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 30 without amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill 30 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

**MS. COADY:** Now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now.

When shall the said bill be read a third time?

**MS. COADY:** Tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Tomorrow.

Thank you.

On motion, report received and adopted. Bill 30 ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Noting the hour, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, that we do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**MR. SPEAKER:** All those against, 'nay.'

This motion is carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 1:30 o'clock.

Thank you.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 1:30 p.m.