



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FORTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

---

Volume XLVIII

THIRD SESSION

Number 41

---

HANSARD

*Speaker: Honourable Perry Trimper, MHA*

Wednesday

November 14, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Admit strangers.

**Orders of the Day**

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

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

I will call from the Order Paper, Order 5, resumption of the second reading of a bill, An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I recognize the hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

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

It's certainly a pleasure to rise in this hon. House one again and speak to Bill 32, an amendment to the *Labour Standards Act*. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, bills come before this hon. House that you often see full agreement from all sides of the House. There are a lot of merits to this bill, and things in the bill that we do like, Mr. Speaker. I will just talk a little bit about some of the background of the bill.

Family violence leave is intended to provide job protected leave for workers subjected to family violence. It is currently in place in five Canadian jurisdictions, with others considering similar legislation. In 2016, Mr. Speaker – and these statistics are rather alarming – Statistics Canada reported that there were 336,487 police-reported violent crimes, and 86,405 of those accused were actually family members. In Newfoundland and Labrador, there were 1,251 incidents of police-reported family violence. An interesting statistic in there, Mr. Speaker, one that a lot of people are talking about recently, is that 746 were female, but 505 were male. And that, too, is quite alarming.

I would concur that men are equally as deserving of our attention and supports, as are women. You know, it has become more prevalent in today's society, more people are talking about violence, whereas in the past it was swept under the rug. I think it's crucial that we

continue the conversation, we continue the awareness, and we do strive to make efforts to assist both men and women, recognizing that all genders, all persons are impacted by this travesty of society.

What's even more alarming is that the research also suggests that only 10 per cent of incidents are actually reported. So, if you consider that 90 per cent of abuse is out there, still continuing to this day, to be pushed under the rug or hidden away or not talked about, it is very, very concerning, Mr. Speaker.

As an MHA of a region that was seriously impacted – I mean, we'll never forget in the Coast of Bays region, we had two very serious incidents of family violence, seven months apart, all in the same year. It was the grace of God that we didn't lose more people but, in both cases, we lost both partners, the husband and the wife through domestic violence. It's a time of tragedy and hardship that will never, never, never be forgotten, and we owe it to these people and their families to do what we can to ensure situations like this never happen again.

So, this bill is going to provide family violence leave; three days of paid leave and five days of unpaid leave for persons who are experiencing family violence, to try and avail of some of the supports needed, and the interventions needed to circumvent or try and prevent any further violence, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** I ask for just a little bit of order, please. It is very difficult to hear the speaker.

Thank you very much.

**MS. PERRY:** The only thing, I guess, that I would like to see in terms of the unpaid leave – there will be five days of unpaid leave. That will still cause some financial duress. If, at some point in time, we can revisit this and have the entire 10-day period as paid leave that would be an improvement that we would certainly like to see.

The cost of family violence to Canadian society is approximately \$7.4 billion annually and the

cost to employers is approximately \$77.8 million annually. Losses through absenteeism, lengthy periods of leave, reduced productivity, higher turnover and issues related to workplace safety are all components of that cost, Mr. Speaker.

In this bill, as we're bringing forward, like I just said there will be 10 days of leave annually, three days paid and seven days unpaid. The purpose of these leave days, they must be used to seek and receive medical attention, counselling or other services from a health professional; seek and receive services provided by a transition house, a policing agency, government or any organization that assists those affected by family violence; move a place of residence and/or seek and receive legal services or assistance. These are the types of activities which would warrant this leave from an employer under the new law that will be passed.

Terms of eligibility – an employee has to have been employed for a continuous 30-day period with the same employer. The employee, their child or a person for whom an employee is a caregiver has been subjected to family violence by either a family member, an intimate partner, a parent of a child with the employee, or a person who is a caregiver to the employee.

The employee must advise the employer as early as possible in writing or via otherwise of intention to use the leave, the anticipated start date and the duration. The employee may be required to provide the employer with reasonable verification of the necessity of the leave.

There will be responsibilities under this new law, Mr. Speaker, for the employers as well. The employer must ensure the confidentiality of all information related to any leaves under the *Labour Standards Act*, not just family violence leave. Mr. Speaker, that is crucially important.

I speak with some experience in terms of concerns around confidentiality. If we are going to raise that number from 10 per cent to 100 per cent and close that gap of 90 per cent of people who are not coming forward, it is crucial that confidentiality be maintained. That is a very key component of this act, Mr. Speaker.

As well, the employer may disclose information where the employee consents to the disclosure, or the disclosure is required by law, or the disclosure is required for the administration of the *Labour Standards Act*. These would be the only exceptions, Mr. Speaker.

This bill has received a fair bit of consultation before being brought forward to the House. Some of the groups consulted include: the Newfoundland and Labrador Employers' Council, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, the Provincial Advisory Council for the Status of Women, the St. John's Status of Women Council, the Newfoundland and Labrador Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre, and the Violence Prevention Committee of Avalon East.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate here that we cannot forget that men are as much victims of family violence as are women in today's society. We do need to ensure that we increase our efforts for men supports as well.

Legislation in other jurisdictions was also reviewed before bringing this bill before the House. Just to take a look at what's happening across the country: in Alberta the government offers 10 days of unpaid leave; Saskatchewan has 10 days of unpaid leave; Manitoba has five days of paid leave and five days of unpaid leave. They can take up to an additional 17 weeks of unpaid leave if the issue persists.

In Ontario, there are five days paid leave and five days unpaid. They can take an additional 15 weeks of unpaid leave if the issue persists. In New Brunswick, five days paid, five days unpaid. They can take up to an additional 16 weeks of unpaid leave if the issue persists. For PEI and Nova Scotia, legislation is currently under consideration but none has been passed yet. And for Canada as a whole, there's a proposal, which is not yet enforced, for five days of paid leave and five days of unpaid leave.

So that's where this issue sits across the country, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly is a piece of legislation that is much needed. We do have a serious issue in this province and in this country with family violence, and every effort we can take to curb family violence and provide

supports for people is certainly something that we should be doing. I'm very pleased this bill has been brought before the House today.

With the many stressors that people in these situations face, the uncertainty around your job could certainly be another factor in holding you back from coming forward. So hopefully this measure will do something to help increase the numbers of people who are coming forward and help them at least have some confidence that their job is safe, there will be job stability for them and they can take the remediation efforts necessary to try and rectify the situation they're dealing with in their lives.

So I'm certainly pleased that this bill is before the House here today, and we will be supporting this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

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

I'm happy to stand this morning and speak to the subject of Bill 32, which is an amendment to the *Labour Standards Act*. Certainly, initially in the presentation of the bill and in subsequent speakers – the Member for St. John's Centre, for example, and just now, the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune.

We have heard the details of what the bill is about with regard to recognizing the need to understand the impact of domestic family violence as it relates to the workplace, and we cannot, in workplaces, go around ignoring what is going on in the lives of workers and not recognizing their needs. It's absolutely essential that we do that. Today, we're dealing with something that's recognizing the need in relationship to family violence.

I can remember back in the 1960s, 1970s, major companies here in this province, for example, recognizing the need of workers who had problems with alcohol addiction. I actually had a relative where the workplace was very

understanding of the need for the person to have the time to get over that addiction, to give time –

**MR. KING:** (Inaudible.)

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

I remind the Member for Bonavista, if he has something to say he can get on his feet and walk around to the other Member.

Please continue.

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

The point I'm making is that we have had a history with some issues and people's work as personal lives that have been recognized in the workplace and need for accommodation. Back in the 1960s and '70s we probably didn't use that term, but there was accommodation for people. We didn't have it in legislation and it was the concern of the employers that made it happen, but it did happen.

So to see us now recognizing the need to have legislation that covers domestic violence is really a step forward, but we are behind in terms of what's happening across the country. The majority of the provinces have been dealing with this. We have two others in Atlantic Canada who haven't, but the majority of the provinces have dealt with the issue of domestic violence needing to be recognized as having a real impact on workers lives, and the need to have something in legislation to help workers as they deal with domestic violence.

So it's essential that we have this legislation. What's disturbing, and especially because here in Newfoundland and Labrador we have the highest incidence of family violence in the country. What's disturbing is that instead of looking at the fact, okay, we're jumping in for the first time; well, let's not jump up on the first rung of the ladder. Let's jump a little bit higher, because there are other rungs there. Why go for the bottom one when there are higher rungs to jump to? What I see with what we're doing is just jumping for that lowest rung, the very minimum, and I would like to suggest that we need to be better than the very minimum.

The three days paid leave and seven days unpaid leave is definitely insufficient. I'm just thinking, take if a woman on a Monday night gets beaten up in her home, and does get out that night or the next morning with her children to a shelter, even just the time that's needed to make that adjustment to getting the kids into the shelter, the kids into the schools, now that they're in a shelter, et cetera, that in itself could eat up the first three days of unpaid.

So it's certainly insufficient and it certainly needs to be reconsidered in terms of the number of days. I think the Member for St. John's Centre will have more to say about that during Committee, because we have to make sure that we're not just giving people a little bit of hope; that we're giving them more than a little bit of hope. That somebody who's in a situation right now knows that if she – and I'm saying she because the majority who suffer domestic violence are women; I know there are men – but if she were to come forward now, she has a bit of hope that she can get some assistance.

For somebody who is on low income in a job that's minimum wage, et cetera, they are not going to be able to afford unpaid leave. So that's why we need to look at the number of days for paid leave, because workers who are low-income workers will not be able to afford unpaid leave. So we really have to look at that.

When we had the briefing, the officials noted that there was consideration given to having extra weeks for unpaid leave available to add to that number, and it was noted in the briefing that it was considered for the legislation, but – quote unquote – a major proponent, who was consulted, objected to it.

Well, I know the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour didn't object to that, and I would consider the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour a major component. So I would suggest that the eye of the government right now, with regard to this legislation, should be looking at the workers. They are the major proponent; not an individual, but as a body. They are a major proponent. And for them, this really is very, very small in let's make our first step, the largest step that we can make to be up with the other provinces who have made that larger step.

There have been individual workers who have come out publicly, especially in social media. I saw one moving video of a worker talking about how it has to be more than the minimum, and I'm sure others in the House have probably watched that video as well. It was a very, very compelling video by this woman, not begging, but imploring that we make the legislation stronger; that we increase the number of paid days, in particular. If the 10 days even were all paid, that would be a larger step and a good step.

One of the things that we hear is critics who say that this leave will be misused, but there is a study in the United Kingdom which showed there that only 6 of 12,000 prosecutions were found to be false. That's 0.005 per cent. It's not going to be an issue. Nobody is going to be coming forward for this unless they need it. Legislation will cover that. People will have to give proof that they need the time, that there is domestic violence.

I think the study in the United Kingdom has shown that the average worker is not out there wanting to use the excuse of domestic violence as a way to get time off work. So let's disabuse ourselves of those kinds of things that may go out there. In actual fact, people who are being abused – women and men who are being abused usually downplay abuse. They don't want to even recognize there's domestic abuse going on. That's a major step forward. So I don't think we have to worry about it being abused.

I put that out right now in second reading and I think we will have more to say about this in Committee.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

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

It's certainly my pleasure to stand and speak again this morning, this time to Bill 32, An Act to Amend the Labour Standards Act.

I'm not going to take too long with this one. There have been a lot of people who have

spoken about it. I think it's pretty clear what the bill entails. Basically, again without getting into all the details that have already been said, it's providing both paid and unpaid leave for people who find themselves challenged with family violence in their home.

I think it's a good bill. It's certainly something that I support. It is being done in most other provinces, as has been indicated. I realize, my colleague who spoke before me indicated that in some provinces perhaps they've gone further. They've been doing it for – the bill has been in place for – not this bill, but legislation has been in place in other provinces for a while. Most provinces have it. Some of the legislation arguably in other places is stronger. Perhaps some is on par and some may be not as strong. There's a variation, and there are a couple of provinces who don't have it at all.

At the end of the day, this is a start. I think it's a good start. I think every Member in this House of Assembly is obviously going to support the bill, whether we think it could be improved or go further is obviously a matter for debate, but what we have before us right now is a good bill. I'm sure we all support it. I certainly do support it. It's unfortunate that we require this kind of legislation but it's one of the realities of life, unfortunately. We've seen tragedies here in this province as it relates to family violence and domestic violence, and sadly it's there.

Really, all that's being done here is providing an opportunity for someone who finds themselves in a violent relationship to have the ability to get time off work. In the case of the specifics of this bill, three days paid leave and seven days unpaid leave, perhaps those numbers will change and increase over time. We have to give time for this to evolve and determine whether or not the amount of time that's given under this legislation is sufficient or if it isn't.

I will agree with my colleague who just spoke, I really don't believe this is something that's going to be abused. I really don't think someone is going to come forward to their employer with issues like this just to get a day off. I really don't believe that's going to happen. I really believe that anyone who uses it is someone who is, unfortunately, going to need it.

As the Minister of – well, he's Minister of Education now, but he was Advanced Education. I'm not sure what he is, but he's Education now. He was Advanced Education, Skills and Labour last week. And to my memory, when he spoke he talked about the fact – which I do agree with him on – that there has to be a balance in all these things.

Yes, we have to be cognizant of the needs that are out there and provide legislation such as this for people who have these issues in their lives; but, by the same token, there also has to be a realization for the people who – for the employers who have to provide this time off, the paid leave, and even the unpaid leave, because there are issues about replacing people and so on. It's great to say it should be all about the person having the issue, and I'm sure that's where we're all focused right now, but there is also a reality that we all have to be cognizant of when it comes to the actual employers that have to provide this leave.

So it's like everything, like all kinds of legislation, whether we're talking about this, whether we're talking about minimum wage or whatever we're talking about, quite often when we're talking about workplace benefits and changes to labour standards, there always has to be a fair balance between the needs of the employees and the real needs – and they are real, legitimate needs – of employers as well. Because they have to operate a business, they have to be viable. If they're not viable, people don't work. If people don't work, they don't pay taxes and we don't have any programs. So that is a reality as well.

I think this reaches a fair balance, and I'm sure that as this unfolds over time and it gets tested, I'm confident that if there is an overwhelming need brought before the government of the day – whoever that government might be – to say that we need to make some changes and amendments to this to strengthen the legislation one way or the other, I'm certain that based on the seriousness of what this bill is all about, which crosses all party lines – it's not a rural versus an urban thing, it's not a political thing, it's a people thing – that could affect anybody, including the families of anyone in this House – anybody – if there are amendments that are required down the road to strengthen it in any

way, I'm sure that whoever is sitting in this House of Assembly, I would think, would be more than willing to do just that.

For now, as I said, it's a good start. It's a good thing to do. It's the right thing to do. I certainly commend the minister and the government for bringing this forward. I will be supporting this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

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

It's indeed an honour again to stand in this House and address my colleagues and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, but particularly around a very important bill. Ideally, it would be better if I didn't have to speak to this because there wasn't a need for it, but the reality is there's a need here, that we do have a serious issue in our society that needs to be addressed. I know it's across the board. It's not segregated to one department or one agency, it's across the board and we all have a responsibility to find the mechanisms to do three things as I see it.

One – and the primary one – eliminate domestic violence. We need to do that through education. We need to do that through better awareness. We need to do that through supports. But also while we're addressing that and trying to make strides forward, we need to ensure that those who are adversely affected by domestic violence, the individuals involved, the families involved, the communities that are involved, are also supportive in a mechanism that works for everybody. We need to ensure, thirdly, that our society has a better understanding and takes responsibility for addressing this issue, with the ultimate goal of eliminating it.

It was a pleasure to hear that this was being presented and that there had been dialogue and discussion around how do you implement something that addresses and supports the need of the individual who's facing domestic violence

and their family while, at the same time, being cognizant of the fact that you don't want to put a hardship on another part of what that individual is involved in, the business they work for or the entity that they're engaged with as part of that. How do you find that balance? In life, unfortunately, you never get the perfect balance, because there's always the pendulum, there are circumstances that change on a day-to-day basis that dictate things don't flow as fluently as we'd like, and the supports one day don't cover what you needed for the next day.

I will say, at the beginning, as I will end in a few minutes, I support where we're going with this. I support the intent, I support the process and I support the engagement. Does it go far enough? I don't think most of our legislation goes far enough, because it's into it after that we discover, you know what, hindsight, we probably should've did this and should've did that; but that's part of having an open dialogue, which I would think would give us an opportunity to identify, are there holes in what we're presenting, are there other ways that we could provide the service and the supports that are necessary, particularly when you're dealing with something as dramatic and life-altering as domestic violence, and the impact that it has on the individuals involved here, and our own society.

So, while I'm supporting this, I'm very cognizant, and my colleagues earlier had said we need to be open to making sure that once this starts moving forward, if we identify that it falls short to where we want to be, we need to be able to quickly react to ensure we provide or fill those gaps and move things forward.

Coming from where we were in the past, and it's alarming that it took us this long to get to where we are, knowing this is not something that just happened in the last few years or the last decade, domestic violence has been around forever and a day. Unfortunately, it was taboo to speak of it, it was hidden, people unfortunately put up with things that they should never have to put up with when it comes to violence and being controlled and ridiculed, and this was never the intent of our society. We've come a long way in the openness; we now also got to come a long way in the supports that we put in play.

So I do like that the legislation is addressing some of the financial struggles that people would have, and that becomes one of the big ones. I mean, the key thing is about safety, and being able to get control of your own life and your family's life when dealing with domestic violence. But to do that, sometimes the restrictions dictate that you can't become independent; you can't make that first step forward in getting control of your life again because of the financial restrictions.

People still have to pay their bills; people still have to deal with their family needs. They don't want to make a step backward while they're trying to deal with something negative in their life and change so that it's a positive. So, the financial support upfront is very valuable. The three days' financial support at least gives a bit of a buffer that an individual or family can look at where they are financially and what their living arrangements are going to be, what expenditures are they going to have, how are they going to be able to deal with that.

The 10 days – and I understand there has to be a period there, because this just doesn't solve itself overnight. The first day or two, as people will tell you in domestic violence, is collecting your thoughts and realizing you're not at fault. There's somebody else who is doing this. You need to get to that point where you now get your thought process in line so now you can start addressing how you deal with this.

The three days financially at the beginning, while not a lot, at least gives somebody some breathing space to be able to collectively think at least I'm dealing with all kinds of hardships in my life because of what's happening, at no fault of my own, but financially it's not going to be a burden on me for that period of time. The 10 days gives me time, with family supports and community supports, to be able to address how I'm going to move forward as part of that.

Again, we're all weary, but we're all cognizant of how you do this from a financial point of view. I think a priority has to be – and we've all agreed to that here. The first priority is supporting the individual who is facing this situation, and that we have to scold and send a message quickly, domestic violence is not acceptable and that we all support it. If it means,

financially, it's going to be a cost to our society in some way, shape or form, to address, deal and support this, we've got to accept that. But we need to find a balance so it doesn't, in another avenue, do harm to what we're trying to provide here that after somebody gets control of their life and starts to move forward, that they still have gainful employment available, that it hasn't hurt them financially or put them too far behind.

When we look at this legislation, I think we've all agreed to the point we're moving in the right direction. I think this would be the stepping stone to some other things we may do around how we deal with it from a criminal point of view, the counselling that may be engaged here, the communities' role in supporting individuals, the counselling services that may be available to those individuals, how even our educational institutions – because in a lot of cases we're dealing with people who either have children who are in school or themselves may be people who are in educational institutions, and how we use that mechanism. Because we have a good, safe mechanism where people who are there for a multitude of hours during the day, how do we better partner to be able to provide particular services, be it counselling or supports within those mechanisms.

I do have some concerns, and it's been echoed by my colleagues in the Third Party around the length of time that it can be done as part of that process. I've struggled. I've struggled with is three enough, is five enough, is 10 enough, the 10 days and these type of things. I'm like anybody else, my first priority would be supporting people and it would mean if it takes six months of payment, we'd do that; but, unfortunately, we still have to have the balance. We have to make sure what we do in the front end doesn't hurt the same individual in the back end. How do we find that balance?

So, I don't know if this is the exact balance. Maybe there's a discussion and an alternative that comes, but I do like that we're getting somewhere. But I do hope – and this my part, if I add nothing else to it – that it would be on record that this is not where it stops. Whatever is approved here today is not where it stops. This is the starting point, and I compliment government for that. This is the starting point of moving the next level of supports around domestic violence



and, particularly, dealing with their employability or their sustainability in their employment and their financial supports while we're doing that.

So, I do support all of those. There will be some questions that we have in Committee for clarifications. And then we'll figure out from there how we help move this piece of legislation forward, and what will meet the needs, particularly of those who are struggling with domestic violence.

I just want to end by saying it's a great dialogue here, it's a great opportunity for us to do the right thing, and getting the right balance. But in the balance, ensuring that this is, again – I want to reiterate; this is the starting point of us really putting our foot to the pedal of ensuring that we find ways to start eliminating domestic violence, but supporting those who are going through it at this point, to ensure that they can move on with their lives, and be what they always have been: productive citizens in our society.

So, I thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

If the hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour speaks now, he will close debate.

The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

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

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

It's my pleasure to stand today and close debate on Bill 32, An Act to Amend the Labour Standards Act. I'd also be remiss if I didn't say a big thank you to the previous minister for all the heavy lifting on this bill. I get the opportunity to stand up here and give closing remarks, but he did all the work on the front end of this, so I want to thank him for that.

Also, I'd like to thank the numerous speakers that spoke to the bill, many of which spoke in

direct favour of this, which is fantastic: the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development; the Member for CBS; the Minister of Natural Resources; the Member for St. John's Centre; the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune; the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi; the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands; as well as the Member for the beautiful District of Conception Bay East - Bell Island, as we likes to refer to it.

So, I'm thankful that they all got up and added their comments to this great piece of legislation that we're bringing in here today. I would also like to acknowledge the input from the efforts from the Federation of Labour and the employers throughout our province.

This is an important amendment, one in which will provide a new form of leave from work to help employees and their families better deal with the consequences of family violence. I know we all agree that family violence is a very, very serious issue. We've all discussed it here today. In our province, Mr. Speaker, the total number of victims of police-reported family violence – and it's very important to highlight the police-reported aspect of this – is approximately 1,200 people; however, we know, through all the research, that it suggests that around 10 per cent of those incidents are actually reported, so it is a fairly big problem in our community.

According to the federal Department of Justice study, the cost of the family violence to the Canadian society is approximately \$7.4 billion annually. This includes an annual economic cost to employers as well, Mr. Speaker, of \$77.8 million annually. This is due in large part to absenteeism, lengthy periods of leave, reduced productivity and issues related to workplace safety. Unfortunately, family violence is far too common an occurrence and effects of this violence can be devastating to the survivors and their loved ones. As noted, studies have shown that there is a huge cost to family violence. That people who are experiencing family violence report that it is negatively affecting their performance.

With all this in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we all take steps to address family violence. One incident of family violence is too

many. The introduction of this leave, specifically for victims of family violence, is a step to the front.

Family violence leave will help individuals and their families, while acknowledging and balancing the ability of employers to meet this obligation. It applies to an employee, their child or person for whom the employee is a caregiver who have been subject to family violence.

It will come into effect on January 1, 2019 and can be used for the following purposes: seek and/or receive medical attention, counselling and/or services from health care providers; seek and receive services provided by transition houses, policing agencies, governments or organizations that provide services to people subjected to family violence; to move a place of residence; to seek legal services or assistance.

The amendment will also ensure job protection for employees who avail of this leave. The introduction of paid leave is new for labour standards legislation in this province and across the country. Previously, the only form of paid leave in *Labour Standards Act* which established the minimum terms – and I like to repeat that, the minimum terms – and conditions of employment in this province was one day for bereavement leave. Any time we amend the labour standards legislation, we have to keep in mind the importance of balancing the needs of both the workers and their employers.

I'd like to address a concern that was brought forward by the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi. We understand that we've done jurisdictional scans. Our officials in our department met with the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the St. John's Status of Women Council, NL Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre, Violence Prevention Avalon East, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, Newfoundland and Labrador Employers' Council, Canadian Federation of Independent Business, St. John's Board of Trade and Chamber of Commerce were extended invitations as well.

So, we've consulted with a wide variety of people and stakeholders across our province. In addition to that, we did jurisdictional scans. While jurisdictions – as mentioned by some of

my hon. colleagues across the way, and in our side of the House – have five days of paid and five days of unpaid, Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick; a number of jurisdictions, Saskatchewan and Alberta, have none. They just have all unpaid leave. And PEI has a similar model to us that we're proposing here today: three paid and seven unpaid days.

One thing I'd like to highlight is the fact that this is a first step. Any good legislation that's brought to this hon. House is always evaluated and looked at for the betterment of the people that are utilizing it. We're always looking at improvements on the legislation side.

In the introduction of three-day paid leave and seven days unpaid leave, we believe we've achieved this balance that will help the victims who are experiencing family violence, while also recognizing the impact of employers, and it is a very good first step.

Mr. Speaker, this government is ensuring that our labour standards legislation remains relevant and responsive to the ever-changing challenges we are facing in the workplace each and every day. When family violence occurs, this amendment ensures that the employees will have the leave available to do what needs to be done when they need to do it. Providing three days paid leave and seven days unpaid leave strikes this balance.

We believe these amendments to the *Labour Standards Act* is a step in the right direction to help those who are subject to family violence. Let me be clear, we hope we never have to utilize this, but we understand with the numbers that we've seen come forward from Statistics Canada and others, that this is a need in our province.

We will monitor the roll out of this new leave and determine the levels of uptake and whether it's meeting the intended objectives. Our government is sensitive to the needs of the victims of family violence. We remain committed to improving the lives of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and our community through the introduction of relevant and responsive legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

The motion is that Bill 32 be now read a second 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 (Barnes):** A bill, An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act. (Bill 32)

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

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

**MS. COADY:** Now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 32)

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

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

I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 32.

**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, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

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 32, An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act." (Bill 32)

**CLERK:** Clause 1.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 1 carry?

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Through the debate on the bill, we've collectively – I guess we all kind of agree with this bill in its entirety. We have some questions, though, I think we'd like to have some clarity on.

When you look at groups that were consulted – I had it here somewhere – was the Board of Trade consulted in this process? I know they're not listed here, but was the St. John's – I know the Employers' Council and CFIB were, but was the Board of Trade consulted?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Yes, the Board of Trade was consulted; the St. John's Board of Trade was consulted. We also reached out to chambers of commerce and extended an invitation, but they did not respond.

So we reached out to those, and hopefully that answers your question.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, I was aware – the St. John’s Board of Trade, apparently, provided some feedback on this legislation and expressed some concerns, but they never did receive a response. Do you have any information as to why?

The question came up as to – they provided feedback but there was no communication back to them after they submitted their feedback in May of this year, and there were some concerns addressed or brought to my attention on that issue. Can you elaborate any further, Minister?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** I can’t speak directly to why they weren’t responded to at the end. I know the information that was received in the consultation process was what we developed the bill with, so I guess the consultation back to the groups that we’ve dealt with would be bringing forward this legislation as it is today.

I can get the answer for why they didn’t receive, at a future date for you.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** On the consultation with the employers’ groups, Minister, can you – I know their list is being consulted. So are all of these groups in favour of this legislation?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** I know they were consulted on the legislation and played a vital role in us developing the legislation. I can’t speak to each individual one, if they were supportive of the three days versus 10 days unpaid leave. That was a culmination of all of the consultation processes.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

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

Minister, what checks and balances can be put in place to protect employers? And some employees as well, because there are going to be a lot of employees that’s going to legitimately use this leave.

We’re going to have some situations where we know that where there’s a will, there’s a way around the system, people tend to do so. So what checks and balances are going to be put in place to protect those that are entitled and to help employers deal with those that are not entitled? Because we know, unfortunately, that’s the reality of society.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Labour Standards sets the minimum standards for what employers have to deliver. We’re leaving it so that the employers can have that discussion with their employees to see what they would need to bring forward, whether it be a doctor’s note or – it needs to provide reasonable verification. So we’re leaving that open for interpretation between the employer and the employee.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

I wonder if the minister could just reference section 43.34(1), and it lists some definition of who an employee would be. Under that heading, (e) says: “any person who is a member of a class of persons prescribed in the regulations.”

I wonder if the minister could just expand on what specifically that would be, and who would be involved in that group – that is, I guess, yet to be prescribed in regulations.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** I’ll get that information for you during the debate here today.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Minister, on another issue with this legislation. We deal all the time with confidentiality – I know we all do as elected officials. We sign consent forms if anyone comes in to get any help or assistance from our offices.

On the flipside, we're dealing with confidential information and very sensitive information that employers will hold. And we got right down to the basics of a three-person, small little business to the biggest operation. They're going to possibly have very sensitive information belonging to employees and they're not going to want this stuff divulged to – they're not going to want this to get out, for obvious reasons. So how do we protect, or what do employers have to do to protect this information? Because that can be very sensitive.

In today's world, confidentiality and personal files and issues like that, it's very sensitive information. So are there any safeguards in place, or any requirements going to be placed on employers to protect this information on behalf of their employees?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Yes, there is, and that was a very good question.

Employers are required to keep the information confidential, except when the employee consents to disclosure. The disclosure is required by law, and the disclosure is required for the administration of the *Labour Standards Act*.

We're encouraging the employers – they already have this in legislation to keep that confidential. So that's what we're doing through the legislation here.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

In that same section I referenced earlier, 43.34(1), as we go down through that, there's a subsection (3), and that references: "An

employee who wishes to take a leave of absence under this Part may be required to provide the employer with reasonable verification of the necessity of the leave in accordance with the regulations."

I wonder if minister could speak to the context of reasonable verification, and what the intent is in regard to meeting that standard.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Some of examples of that, Mr. Chair, is a doctor's note or a note from a service provider. We didn't want to be too prescriptive on this. We wanted to make sure the employer and the employee had the ability to make that arrangement themselves. We know that there are many arrangements around. In different employee-employer relationships that occurs right now in our society, there are many different relationships.

We just want to set the minimum standard, so we wanted to make sure that they had to provide reasonable verification, but that's between the employer and the employee to be determined.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

I thank the minister for that. Just further to that, and we go down to 43.35: "An employee who intends to take family violence leave under this Part shall give written notice to his or her employer as soon possible before the leave is to begin of that intention, unless there is a valid reason why that notice cannot be given."

So, I guess my question is: In all cases, is there a requirement to give reasonable verification and, if there's not, what would be acceptable in regard to where the notice cannot be given? I wonder if you could just some comment on that.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** We want the employee to make every opportunity to do it as quick as possible but, obviously, we understand situations may arise that they may not have the ability to do it

as quick as possible, because the violence may have happened on a Monday, as an example, and they may have to seek medical attention right away.

So they may not be able to provide their employer with the written notice, or anything like that, at that time; but, at the earliest convenience they could, that would be what we're requesting in the bill.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Okay, thank you, Minister.

That makes sense. It's really a timing issue what we're referring here in regard to – okay, thanks very much.

I was just wondering – it's three days paid leave, if it's approved, and then there are seven with the unpaid leave.

In regard to that – and this may be outside of the realm a little bit, but has there been any review done in regard to insurable earnings, and any effect those seven unpaid days would have related to somebody filing something like employment insurance benefits? Is there any effect in that regard?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Through the consultation process with the groups that we consulted earlier with that I listed, it was arrived at that EI is probably not the best fit for that. But what we're looking at is obviously the three days paid and seven days unpaid, which puts it in a great first step for providing that service for the people of the province.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** I think my question was a little bit different on that respectfully. I particularly think of seasonal employees and from my experience, my district, someone works in a fish plant or a construction industry and sometimes the days that are used for insurable earnings are very tight.

If someone was to avail of this leave and they had 10 days and seven of those days were unpaid, the question is: How will that affect their claim for EI? Would, therefore, there be seven days removed and need seven extra days to meet their 420 hours, we say? That's my question in regard to have you done any looking at what that unpaid leave would do to a claim for EI and especially related to the seasonal industries.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** I'll get the correct answer for the hon. Member for that for sure. For continuous employment, 30 days prior, that's all you would need to be available for that. I understand you're asking about seasonal workers and I'll get that answer for you as well.

Other than that, the main requirement is you have to have a continuous 30 days of employment with the employer in order to avail of that legislation that we are putting forward today – or that leave, sorry.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister, I'm getting to the bottom of some of my questions, but getting back to the approval or the verification of – under 43.34(b) it says: "a person who is or has been in an intimate relationship or who is living or has lived with the employee." How does this be verified? Who's the verification – whose word is taken? Because anyone unfortunately could come in and file in any one of those brackets. Who is the go-to person to verify this stuff?

You're working for an employer. Employers don't know, most times, what their employee's personal lives are. This is good legislation for people that are affected, but I go back sometimes that this opens the door sometimes to – so how do you keep this all in check? Again, it's checks and balances.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Thank you for the question.

The victim is the key here in this process. So we want to make sure that they provide reasonable verification, and that's all we're requesting, and that'll be worked out between the victim, the employee, with the employer.

So it's important that the victim gets the services that they require, and I'm sure that between the employer and the employee will be fine to determine that there.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Reasonable verification, that's fair enough, but can you give me an example what you or what's considered to be reasonable verification? Because that's where I'm kind of stuck to.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Another good question. As I mentioned earlier, an example of that would be a doctor's note or a note from a service provider that the victim is seeing. That wouldn't be provided the day they make their statement or written notice to the employer because they wouldn't have received the services at this point.

But an example would be the doctor's note or the service provider's note.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

I just had a question for the minister in regard to seasonal employment again. Someone who has a pattern with employment insurance earnings, with seasonal employment year over year, and returns to work at a particular time during the year, they may return to work and may not reach that 30-day period to avail of the particular requirement, yet we know they have a pattern of employment with that employer over a number of years.

Would there be any accommodation made for that person if they were a victim of family violence prior to that 30-day period, recognizing the fact that they have a pattern of seasonal

earnings? This specifically says you have to have 30 days of employment.

So, say they return to work, and on the 20th day they were unfortunately a victim of family violence, is there any way they could avail of this leave, as they have a pattern of being a seasonal worker and a pattern of being with that employer?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Absolutely, I think that that's important. The 30 days is for a new employer – if they start employment with a new employer, it would have to be 30 days, but if you've got a consistent track record with the employer, I can't – this legislation is all about protecting the victim here. So, we're about trying to make it as easy as possible for the victim to receive the services that they require, and making sure there's a balanced approach with the employer.

So, I think we've established that here with respect to that, but I will get the answers to the EI questions because that's a little bit of a nuance there.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** I thank the minister for that.

He indicated that the individual would be protected here if it's less than 30 days and a seasonal employee. Where in the legislation is that protection? Where specifically would that ensure that that person would be accommodated? I just need clarity on that if I could.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister, you say under reasonable verification, doctor's notes and from professionals, and it tripped me back to the consultation process. Was there consultation done with the Newfoundland and Labrador Medical Association to deal with – I guess they give doctor's notes for illness for absence from work and whatnot, but if a

doctor's note is going to be dealing with this sort of issue, which we're not dealing with illness, what a doctor would be – that's their speciality. Again, it's not of being opposed. I think there are valid questions asked, because once this comes into legislation it will be the law of the land and all employers have to abide by it, and these things just jump out.

Were they consulted? And, if so, is there any viewpoint from their perspective to basically verifying family violence? That's what is being asked by these medical doctors.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Yes. The example I used as a medical note would be for receiving medical services, or a service provider. Like a transition house or anything like that, that would be slightly different, obviously, depending on what services you require at the time. It could be anything from having to receive medical attention or it could be receiving the police report, or anything along those lines. Anything that gives you reasonable intention for that, that's what we're looking for here.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just got to be clear on this. There are issues that are going to happen that you're not going to require any of those things but you're still going to be a victim of family violence. So how do you get your evidence? How do you get reasonable verification on a process like that when you don't deal with transition houses, you don't deal with the RNC, you don't deal with a medical doctor, but you are, no doubt, still a victim of family violence? Who verifies this?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** As I said previously, we don't want to be prescriptive with the legislation here. It's got to be an arrangement between the

employee and the employer. We're just saying provide reasonable verification.

Some employers may not require anything. They may say the hon. Member for CBS is a victim of violence. He may not have to bring forward anything, because his employer has that relationship with him over a period of time that this is uncharacteristic or whatever. So it's the relationship that's built between the employer and the employee. This sets the minimum standards, that's all Labour Standards do. Employers overshoot this every day. From the perspective of providing reasonable verification, that's all we're looking for from here.

As well, the EI question from earlier, this is under the domain of the federal government. For the purposes of Labour Standards, leave does not count towards the accumulation of benefits, et cetera, considered to be time out of the office. All leave is required to be – have to be worked 30 days; require that you have to work 30 days, yes.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister, you just made reference to the minimum standards, and I understand the relationship piece. I think we all got medical practitioners or professionals that we deal with on a regular basis and they all know us quite well. But you refer to the minimum standards. What is the minimum standards? What do you classify as the minimum standard? What is the minimum standard?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** If this legislation passes here today or into the future and receives Royal Assent, it will be three days paid and seven days unpaid. That will be the minimum standard. Employers can do far more. That's the minimum that they can do. That's the floor; the ceiling can go a lot higher than that.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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



I thank the minister for information to questions I asked in regard to employment insurance.

I recognize the regulatory framework is under the federal government, but I go back to seasonal employment. People in many areas of the province, especially in rural communities, often have challenges getting 420 hours and they're very cognizant of the number of hours required and how they try to achieve those hours.

Will there be any notification in your publication of this leave or would employers – or will you reach out to those advocacy groups and have that information to let anybody who wants to avail of this particular leave, that it would negatively affect a claim for EI at some point in the future.

I understand the leave, I understand the importance, but it's also important that people understand the ability to claim another program based on the implications if they were to claim this. Not that I'm suggesting in any way that they shouldn't avail of it or anything like that, but this is obviously a significant factor.

I deal with it all the time in my district, small communities, people looking to get qualified for EI and the circumstances behind that. How specifically will you deal with that in terms of making people aware?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** We're going to communicate that through the stakeholders as well, but ensuring that the employers are understanding of what's coming forward.

But that's the reason why we're implementing this starting January 1 of 2019, because it gives us the opportunity to reach out to those employers and those employees so they understand their rights and the minimum standards they have to provide by.

So we're going to reach out through the networks through our department, and it's going to be communicated to the employees and to the employers.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Thank you, and I thank the minister for that.

He referenced this 30-day provision. Previously, I asked about that for seasonal employees, and you indicated there was a means to accommodate someone who had a pattern of seasonal employment but returned back in a particular season, but was a victim of family violence prior to the 30 days, and you indicated there were ways to accommodate that individual.

I thought you just said recently that, in fact, that doesn't exist. It would have to be a definitive 30 days of return to employment before someone could avail of the leave. Is that correct, related to seasonal employment?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** There's no reference to seasonal in the bill kit here, but what I am going to do is I'm going to have the answer – I'm going to take that question to our staff and bring it back to the House, to the hon. Member.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** Okay, thank you.

The minister gave an answer a few minutes ago related to 30 days provision, and I thought you said there was no ability there to come in under that 30 days related to seasonal employment.

So is there a means to do it or is there not, or you're not sure and you're going to get the information? I apologize, but I'm not clear.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** It doesn't appear in the bill kit there, but there is a reasonable intention of the employee to be working for that employer previously.

So I'm going to take that, as I said before to you, and bring back the answer to you for that.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

**MR. PETTEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Minister, was there any jurisdictional scan on the uptake, what the anticipated uptake will be for this leave in the province? Was there any numbers analyzed for that?

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Yes, a very good question.

We did do a jurisdictional scan to see what other provinces were doing to deal with this, the issues that have been faced in other provinces. It's very new, so we haven't seen a lot of the uptake side of it yet.

What we're going to do, as I said previously in my closing remarks, we're going to look at – like any good legislation, you're going to look at the legislation when it's implemented and see if there's need to make revisions or improve, and see if those days move up or stay the same, depending on the uptake for that.

But a very good question.

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

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

Minister, the Member for Ferryland has raised some very important points – something I never thought of. I guess it's because I don't have a lot of people working seasonally, so to speak, in my district. I'm sure there are a few, but certainly not like in a lot of districts.

So given the fact that there is nothing in the legislation specifically dealing with seasonal employment and there seems to be a gap there, is it possible that before this bill goes beyond the third reading if there is nothing there and it's not covered, that you would be willing to bring forth some sort of an amendment to deal with that issue? Because if we don't deal with that issue, then it could be this time next year or two years from now before this bill comes back here again

and we do deal with it. So I'm just wondering is an amendment possible, from your perspective.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** As I've mentioned to the hon. Member before, there's no reason to believe that if you have a history with the employer – say you're a fish plant worker and you've been working there year over year over year – that this wouldn't affect you. That's why I've gone to get the answer to make sure – I don't want to speak out of turn on that. I want to make sure I know the answer for the hon. Member that asked the question earlier.

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

**MR. LANE:** Yes, I realize that and I thank you for that, Minister. I guess the point is that when you get the answer, and if they were to say it has to be 30 days, because the fact that we're not contemplating seasonal employment, we're not contemplating year over year with a particular employer – in the bill it's not contemplated – if they come back and say, b'y, that's really not contemplated and if we pass the bill as-is, then this is going to be a gap.

I guess my point is if that's the information that comes back when staff analyze this, would there be a willingness to entertain an amendment rather than just pass this now in Committee and then second reading and then it's done and then we could be two years from now before we make the change? That's my question.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** I understand completely where you're coming from. This is intended to protect the victims. We are going to do that. Everything we could possibly do to protect the victims in any of these cases, we're going to be doing.

So we've set the parameters on there, I've gone to our staff, just asked a question on seasonal employment, because I think it's a very valid question that was asked and, hopefully, I'll have the answer back shortly before we go any further.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

I listened to the minister in regard to the issue I brought in the 30-day provision and seasonable employment. The issue is – and I don't want to repeat myself, but it's of extreme importance, I think, personally, from my years of experience dealing with people seeking originally 920 hours for the first claim of EI, which wouldn't be particular here because it wouldn't be a repeat case. It's not only the fishery, it's the construction industry, it's the tourism industry, it's a vast amount of industries that are seasonal in our province that have grown in the past number of years, especially in the tourism and, in some cases, the construction industry. So, there's a large portion of our population that avails of those hours to qualify for EI.

If it's not here – and I've brought this up before, and that's why I said about the 30-day provision that's in the proposed bill and it's very clear that you're saying 30 days you need to have an employment to avail of the leave. If something else is not written there, if there's not an option to accommodate or an option for consideration, once we accept this I don't see how those particular individuals – which will be a large number – if in that case they did apply for the leave, say 10 days, took the three paid leave, seven unpaid, how that might affect a claim or something they would do at a latter point.

I understand the minister's good intent to say that we will look to accommodate but, unfortunately, in bill and law once that gets executed it's not reviewed here in the House, it's reviewed by public servants or others and there are strict interpretations of what is written. So if that strict interpretation is here, I'm not sure how we're getting to being able to have a second look by somebody down the road, in a month or two, or twelve months when a particular case occurs.

I think it's a valid point and I think it's important that we know which side we're on at the end of the day in regard to the 30-day period mentioned in the bill.

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

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

The other point I want to raise – and again, it ties into what the Member has talked about on the 30 days. I realize that part of the issue here in terms of people qualifying for their employment insurance, what we're hearing on that part is that if you took three days paid leave and seven days unpaid – so that's 10 days – you were on an EI claim and you need so many hours of work in order to qualify for your EI, then this could preclude you from qualifying. Because if you need 420 hours, for argument's sake, and then let's say you're off for 60 hours on this leave, now you're 60 hours short and that's not going to be recognized by the federal government as I understand it. So that is going to be a problem for people if they face that circumstance.

I realize the minister can't do anything about that, in this House, in terms of this bill; but, given the fact that we've identified that as an issue, given the fact that there is similar legislation in almost every other province, I would ask the minister respectfully if he could perhaps, at some point in time, bring it up in any meeting he might have with our federal minister or perhaps his federal counterparts responsible for this legislation in an effort to bring it forward to the federal government to make a provision under the EI legislation to accommodate this particular leave that is occurring in pretty much every province.

I just throw that out there to the minister and ask him that he would bring it up to the federal counterparts to put it on their radar so they could make some amendments to the federal legislation to accommodate the issue that we're talking about here and people would not be denied their EI because of family violence.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

**CLERK:** Clause 2.

**CHAIR:** Clause 2.

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

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

It's been very interesting to hear the questions that have been posed by my colleagues, and I would like to further look at the issue of the number of paid and unpaid days. The Member for Ferryland brought up an issue that is very important as well because if we're looking at how many days are paid leave and how many are unpaid, it's very much often those who are the least economically advantaged who will have to use their paid days. When a woman leaves a violent situation with her children, if she has children, she often is in the most perilous economic situation in her life.

She often has to leave where she lives. Oftentimes, with no supplies and no clothing. So all the extra expenses, she may have to go find another apartment. If her partner is a wage earner, she doesn't have access to that, probably for a while, if at all. So it's a really, really precarious economic time for someone fleeing domestic violence. One would think that we would do the best that we can to give – because we're all talking about how much we are committed to the issue of domestic violence and we are committed to prevention, we are committed to remedies and solutions, and that's what we're talking about in this bill.

So, Mr. Chair, I'm curious as to why government – and I'm speaking to clause 43.34, where it says: "An employee, having been employed with the same employer for a continuous period of 30 days, shall be granted by his or her employer a period of family violence leave of 3 days paid and 7 days unpaid leave in a year ...."

Mr. Chair, when we look at the situation that a women might be in, if she flees during the workday because it's dangerous – we all know, as well, research has shown that, for instance, the most dangerous and vulnerable time for a

women leaving a domestic violence situation is at the time of leaving. Because we know that domestic violence is not simply about disagreements and fighting. It's about control; it's about humiliation; it's about taking away resources from the victim. So it's really complex. Oftentimes, the most dangerous time is when she leaves.

So, she may go to work on Monday morning, her partner may go to work on Monday morning, and then she comes back during the workday, when he's away, and maybe gathers her stuff and some stuff for the children; goes to a relative's house, goes to a transition house; or then, she may have to go to school to get the children, and bring them to safety as well.

We know that it's complex. It's complex in terms of the amount of time she may need. She may need to go to the hospital or to see her doctor. She may need to see a lawyer. She may need to go to the children's school and maybe transfer the children to another school. She may need to arrange for the family pet to go somewhere. And each one of these – none of this is frivolous. This is about securing safety for herself and for her children, and it's also about not only the immediate safety, but also trying to re-establish themselves, and re-establishing her life and the life of her children.

I'm going to be talking in gender terms because predominantly it is women who are the victims of domestic violence. I think that that's undeniable. I will, just for debate sake, use the gender of the victim as a female and as the offender male, just for the sake of speaking to this legislation.

We know how complex it is. We've all talked about it in this House. Again, we've all talked about our commitment, our awareness about this issue. I've been working on this issue, Mr. Chair, for over 38 years as part of the group that started the first transition house here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We know of what we speak. Several Members in this House know of what they speak, either through their professional careers or experiences within their own families or with their colleagues or their friends. We all know of what

we speak and we've all heard about it in the media, so we know of what we speak.

I'm surprised that our government and all of our Members in the House who pledge a commitment to this issue, would say let's do the minimum. Why would we do this? It's at a time in a woman's life when she needs most, when the needs are so most, not to be the bare minimum. But we're talking about giving resources, making sure that resources are there for a woman to escape and re-establish her life and re-establish the lives her children so that they can get on with their lives, so that they can go back to work, so that they can get on with it. That's what we're talking about. Let's keep that in mind.

Oftentimes, when a woman chooses to leave, she knows that financially she may be choosing poverty or extreme financial difficulty for both herself and her children. It is a very vulnerable and crucial time.

What are we saying? What are we saying in this House to the women of Newfoundland and Labrador that we're just going to give you the bare minimum? That this is a first step. Now, we know some provinces don't even give three days paid leave; we know that. We know that some provinces haven't even gotten to this point, but New Brunswick is giving five days paid leave, five days unpaid leave. Ontario is giving five days paid leave, five days unpaid leave. Manitoba is giving five days paid leave, five days unpaid leave.

I don't know why, how anyone in this House can justify, knowing that this has worked for these provinces, and that Nova Scotia is yet looking at legislation, BC is considering legislation, as is Quebec – why would we, in this House, in 2018, when we know so much, when we know the situation, how crucial this is, why would we say to the women of Newfoundland and Labrador, or any victim of domestic violence, why would we say: We know these other provinces have done better than us, but we're just going to give you three days paid leave.

Why would we do that, Mr. Chair? When we know the situation, we know the vulnerability, we know the danger, we know how crucial this

initial time is for women and children to get to safety, to re-establish their lives. And employers – I've been an employer. When you've had someone work for you for a while, the more stable their home life is, the more resources they have, the better that is for an employer as well.

The minister has talked about, well, often employers go above and beyond the law, and that's true; we've seen that. But some don't. Some really don't. Sometimes it's larger companies – often it's smaller companies because there's a relationship built with their employees. But sometimes it's larger companies, international companies, who have large numbers of employees, who will not do that.

So, Mr. Chair, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi, clause 2 of the bill is amended at the proposed subsection 43.34(1), by deleting the phrase "3 days paid leave and 7 days unpaid leave" and replacing it with "5 days paid leave and 5 days unpaid leave," and again this is seconded by the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Committee will recess so we can take a look at the proposed amendment.

### Recess

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

With regard to the amendment, the amendment is said to be in order.

The hon. the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

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

I'm pleased to stand and speak to the amendment. I was pleased to second the amendment by the Member for St. John's Centre. I think she did an eloquent job when she spoke prior to moving the amendment, talking about what does exist in our country right now in other jurisdictions with similar legislation as

we are debating here today. But she also spoke eloquently to what it means to remove oneself from a dangerous situation, what that can mean, both in terms of a situation that's gone on long term and also in cases where something may have happened immediately and requires the person to get out of a situation of danger.

It's very complicated, the situation of somebody who is experiencing domestic violence and the various situations in which the person, with others whom she loves, like her children, can find herself. It's not simple, it's very complicated, and it's very difficult to have a piece of legislation that will cover all of the complexities that are involved.

We did hear the Member for Ferryland and the Member for Conception Bay South speak earlier in the debate, in Committee of the Whole, with regard to the issue around being eligible for EI, for example. So it's very, very complex. When it comes to the need of somebody to get out of a dangerous situation, there are also various complexities as well.

So that's why we should be making sure that, at this moment, as we're passing this legislation, that we don't wait; that all of these situations, these complexities, are considered, and we make sure that the legislation that we're going to pass will be the best that we can do at this moment – not the minimum of what we can do at this moment, but the best of what we can do at this moment. And even if we had to slow down the passing of the bill for a few days while some questions get answered, I think that would be extremely important.

The amendment that's being put forward, and has been put forward by the Member for St. John's Centre – and, as I said, which I was very glad to support – is an amendment that the change can be made without any more information. I think it's a matter of political will because the minister has recognized, and it was recognized in the briefing that we had, that this issue was considered – the issue of a longer time was considered. We're talking about increasing the number of paid days.

So, I think it's just absolutely logical to move forward on this. I know that the Member for St. John's Centre wants to speak to this again, and

she will be speaking to what does exist in the country that is showing that we're not just being flippant here in putting this forward. There are logical precedents –

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

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

**MS. MICHAEL:** – here in our country.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

There are precedents in our country, which say that this is a logical amendment, an amendment that we hope the Members will support.

**CHAIR:** The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for St. John's Centre.

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

We have an incredible opportunity before us today. As legislators, we have an incredible opportunity here to send a message to the women of Newfoundland and Labrador; to send a message to the women's organizations all over the province who've been working on this issue.

We have an incredible opportunity to send a message to our community as a whole; to say that we understand the complexity and the dynamics of domestic violence. We have an incredible opportunity to say we will be, as a province, modernized and informed around the issues of domestic violence, and that we will adhere to what is becoming best practices in the country. This is the opportunity that is before us today. Why would we not take it?

Now, in the briefing, Mr. Chair, it was said that there was a major component – that it was considered for the legislation. An official noted that a major proponent who was consulted about this legislation –

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

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, I'm having difficulty hearing myself here.

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

**MS. ROGERS:** Thank you very much.

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

I remind Members if they wish to partake in a conversation, they take it outside.

Thank you.

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

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

So, it was said that an official noted a major proponent was consulted who objected to five paid days. I'm not sure why that would be. On what side is government falling on this? This is not an issue today for anybody to play politics with. I'm not playing politics with it. I'm sure, Mr. Chair, that nobody in this House would wish to play politics with this issue.

Again, what we're looking at is what is the best remedy, what is the best solution, what is the best legislation we can put forward.

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

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, I really ask for protection here.

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, for anybody to say that this is politics, it baffles me – absolutely baffles me. What we have – again, Mr. Chair, if the Members would listen – is that it's clear here. New Brunswick: five paid days, five unpaid days; Ontario: five paid days, five unpaid days; Manitoba: five paid days, five unpaid days; Nova Scotia and PEI are looking at their legislation; BC is looking at their legislation; Alberta has no paid days. Mr. Chair, isn't that unfortunate? But the best practices –

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

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest to the Members that rather than attacking me, let's attack the problem.

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

**MS. ROGERS:** Let's attack the problem in a secure way, in a comprehensive way and in a fair way around domestic violence that so many women and children all over the province experience, and we know that. We know the stories. We know the effects. We've been talking about these kinds of issues in this House for years. We've passed great legislation and this government has been part of proposing and passing great legislation. They passed changing the definition of domestic violence and modernized that.

This government also modernized our *Residential Tenancies Act* to also make it easier – not easy, because nothing is easy in this area, but making it easier, helping women and children escape domestic violence. They passed fabulous legislation around that.

They also passed fabulous legislation around harassment-free public sector workplace. They have done good work and this is the opportunity to continue that good work. We're not asking for the moon. If people are worried about misuse, once again – critics fear that this is going to be misused.

How, in God's name, is a woman going to go to her employer and say my life is in shambles, I am in danger, my children are in danger; I need help, I need some time to be able to get our life in order so I can come back and be the best worker I can be for you – that's what this legislation is about. Why would a woman go through that when we know the shame and the stigma and the turmoil and the pain that's involved in this? Why would anybody misuse it?

The research in the United Kingdom around this is showing that only six of 12,000 prosecutions were founded to be false; that's .005 per cent. Mr. Chair, we can do this in the best way possible. This is the opportunity. This is the opportunity that faces us right here today. What are Members going to do when they go back to their districts and say, you know, b'ys, no, all these other provinces that have five days paid and five days unpaid, all the women's groups all over the province have said this is the best scenario – they're not asking for the moon, but

this is the best scenario. The labour groups have said this is the best scenario.

Members who have spoken on the other side of the House talked about thanking all those who have worked so hard to help bring this legislation forth. What are you going to say when you go back to your communities and say no, no, we know that best practices and the moment is towards five days paid but you know what, we don't think that's what the women and children of Newfoundland and Labrador should get. That's what we're saying if we don't pass this amendment. Why would we do that? We have an incredible opportunity.

The Member for Ferryland, when he talked about seasonal workers, when he talked about we know important paid days are for our seasonal workers in fish plants, in construction, predominantly in some of the more rural areas, that the fewer days of paid leave will affect whether or not they will even be eligible for employment insurance. We know how important that is, and I'm so glad that the Member for Ferryland brought this up.

This is the least we can do. The least we can do is to say to the women and children of Newfoundland and Labrador, we know what best practices are, we know where legislation is heading to in most parts of the country – we know that. And again, Mr. Chair, it is in most parts of the country where Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick, and again, BC's looking at their legislation, Nova Scotia is. We know that we can do this. There is no good reason not to. That's the interesting thing. What is the good reason not to, except to say, well, somebody lobbied us and they said we really don't want to put that in legislation? Well, who lobbied them? Who opposed it, and why?

Again, this is not about giving people paid holidays. This is about ensuring that your worker will be able to get her life in order, her children's life in order so that she can come back and do the best work that she possibly can. So, Mr. Chair, I implore the Members of this House to listen to the experts, because we're not the experts in this House. The experts have presented to us what they feel is the minimum standard, what they feel is the minimum standard in order to secure someone's life and

their children. They believe that the very minimum standard is five days paid and five days unpaid. This is not going to cost government anything. We know legislation doesn't change hearts, and we know that the majority of our employers take care of their employees. They care about their employees. But what we do know is, at times, we need legislation when hearts are not there.

Mr. Chair, once again, I implore my colleagues in this House to consider doing the best that they possibly can.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR:** Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Mr. Chair, one thing I can promise you is I'm not going to politicize this issue for sure. I stand in this House with the best research that we've done, with consultations met with – let me read out the people that we've consulted: the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the St. John's Status of Women's Council, the NL Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre, Violence Prevention Avalon East, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour – who are very supportive of this, by the way – Newfoundland and Labrador Employers' Council, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and the St. John's Board of Trade.

Mr. Chair, what we've done is we've got a great first step for new legislation, which has not been brought to this House before. It's balancing the needs of the workers and the needs of the employers.

Like any good legislation – like I've mentioned before – we're going to evaluate it. If we find that it needs to be redone, we will do it. We have done this in the *Highway Traffic Act*, in my days with Service NL. We've done in other legislation in this House. That's what we'll do

The hon. Member always uses Alberta as the example for every other thing, except this. So they say that we've done the least we possibly can. The least we possibly can is what we're



currently in – nothing. Alberta has 10 unpaid days; Saskatchewan has 10 unpaid days; BC hasn't got anything; PEI and Nova Scotia are under consideration. Yes, Manitoba, Ontario, and New Brunswick – as the hon. Member has identified – have had five paid days and five unpaid.

What we've done is struck a balance through consultation, which is how it should be done, not politicizing any issue. There are issues here – the hon. Member knows this, because I was shocked when I read it myself. The number of violence against males is 41 per cent, 59 per cent for women. Yes, it's a problem that we've got to rectify and that's what we're going to do. This strikes the balance between where the employers and the employees can benefit.

As I said before, I'm not going to belabour the point. As I've said before, we will look at it if it needs to be changed. We're not afraid of making changes.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Member for St. John's Centre.

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

The minister, when he says they have consulted, and he named all the status of women's groups, and the status of women's groups and the labour groups all recommended five days paid and five days unpaid. And when he talks about balance, we're talking about people who are in danger, who are trying to get their lives back together. Like, what is the balance there? I don't quite understand that.

Now, because Alberta has zero, does that mean we should go there? What I'm talking about, Mr. Chair, is where best practices are heading. And we do have an opportunity here, this is new legislation. The minister could've erred on giving too much and then looking at the legislation and rolling it back.

But why? Why do what's really the minimum, when the best practices across the country are

moving towards five days paid and five days unpaid? Why would we not do that? What is the problem there? Maybe he can tell me. Maybe the minister can tell me who was opposed to five days paid and who was in support of five days paid, and let's take a look at what he means by balance.

The Employers' Council are not experts on domestic violence. The Board of Trade, they're not experts, and their members are not experts on domestic violence. But the women's groups, who have been working in this area for over 30 years, they are the experts, and labour organizations who have done all kinds of work in the workplace around domestic violence, they have expertise.

So if someone were to go and speak to a doctor and an employer about someone's medical condition, they would listen to the expert who is the doctor in that case. So for the minister to talk about what is striking a balance and consultation, of course there was consultation. We're not talking about doubling the amount of paid leave, we're talking about adding two days. We're not talking about increasing the number of total days, it's still 10 days. We're talking about what is best practices.

Why at this point, once again, when we have the opportunity to do the most comprehensive and the most modern and the most responsive approach to this issue, why would we not do that? What is it that the minister is going to say to all these women's groups and groups of experts around this issue? What is he going to say? How is he going to explain to them why he decided to do this first step and not make really robust – because a lot of this legislation is robust that we see in this legislation. Who is he listening to? He's not listening to the women of the province. He's not listening to the women's groups who have so clearly said we need five days paid leave.

Again, we know that the women who would most be impacted by this are marginalized women. So we're talking about women in minimum wage jobs. We're talking about Indigenous women who are often lower earners. We're talking about women in precarious work. A lot of women in rural areas, that's who we're talking about. How can he justify this? We know

that it's not going to be misused. We know that it's for the benefit of the women and children, and the benefit of an employer, so that people are well and able to go back to work once they get their lives established.

There's also something that women's groups have brought up, is that in terms of danger for women, increased danger – again, we know that women planning to leave, that's the most vulnerable time in their whole relationship and the danger there. So if they have their paycheque docked, they haven't yet left but they're seeing counsellors, they're seeing the transition house, maybe they're seeing lawyers, they're getting ready to leave and if their husband – again, it's about control. Domestic violence is about control. It's not about spats or disagreements, it's about control. We know that dynamic.

So their partner sees that their paycheque has been docked, and he's going to say why, what's going on here? What's going on here? So that's an issue as well. It's about making sure that the woman has the resources that she needs to stabilize her life, to stabilize the lives of her children to be able to be safe and to be able to get herself back to work stronger than when she was in a violent situation.

I know I'm somewhat belabouring this point, Mr. Chair, but, again, it is a mystery to me. Who is government listening to around this issue? Because we know – because I've spoken to them, I know government has spoken to them. We know the recommendation has been strongly made by labour, by women's groups, by the experts, asking government to do the right thing and to legislate five paid days and five unpaid days.

So who has government been listening to? Because they're not listening to the women of the province. They're not listening to the experts in this area, and I'm sure the former Status of Women minister knows that. I'm sure the current Status of Women minister knows that as well, what has been asked for by the experts in our communities.

This can be a day where government can proclaim victory. Victory for doing the right thing; victory for having the most robust legislation in the country, along with the other

provinces that have also deemed fit to do five days paid and five days unpaid. This is an opportunity for government to be able to say we did this because we know it's the right thing, because we are committed to the issues of domestic violence.

So, Mr. Chair, again, I would like – I don't know how the minister will respond to my questions about who he might be listening to on this. Again, this is the opportunity for an absolute sense of victory and pride in what this government can do for the women and children of this province, and for the employers of this province.

Again, they can rest on their laurels around the great work that's been done in changing the definition of domestic violence and changing the *Residential Tendencies Act*, and instituting harassment-free public sector workplace.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR:** The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

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

I hadn't intended on standing up and speaking anymore, but I feel compelled to speak. Particularly, given the fact that we're going to be going into a vote and perhaps Division will be called. I don't know if it will or if it won't. If Division is called, I will not be supporting the amendment.

Before I get framed, as everyone has been framed here, to my view – and I understand the Member is passionate about what she's saying, but I don't like the idea of having it framed that somehow if Members of the House are in agreement with bringing in legislation where we have nothing now – and let's bear that in mind. As of today, we have zero legislation. Also, bearing in mind that there are provinces that also have zero. There are provinces like Alberta which have 10 unpaid days – where there's an NDP government, by the way. I just throw that in there. But it's true; they haven't made a move.

There are other jurisdictions that are seven and three and, yes, there are three that are five and five – fair enough. To sort of cast this net, if you

will, and say that if we don't support this amendment, how are you going to go back to your district and talk to women? I really feel, Mr. Chair, that I have to challenge those remarks. I have a wife. I have lots of women in my life: sisters, a mother-in-law and so on. I have two daughters.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Girlfriends.

**MR. LANE:** No, not girlfriends – somebody said girlfriends, no.

And daughters in my life – obviously, there is nobody in here that is going to condone family violence. Nobody condones that. I certainly don't.

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

**MR. LANE:** And I have to say, as one Member who will not be supporting the amendment, because I feel that it is a fair balance, based on where we are right now, which is nowhere, I believe it is a fair balance. I would disagree, like when the Member talks about that we're not listening to all the women of Newfoundland and Labrador. She spoke to a couple of groups, I'm sure. Now she can stand up again and say who she spoke to, but we know there are two or three women's organizations, and they do great work.

We all support the work that they do, and I'm sure they do have expertise in this area. I know they have some expertise in this area. But to suggest two or three groups represent the views of all women in Newfoundland and Labrador is absolutely untrue as well. There are all kinds of people that have different views on things.

To suggest that the Federation of Labour – and granted, they do great work as well, but they were also up here in the stands, as I recall, up here in the gallery when the bill was presented, supporting what was being done. I'm sure they do have some expertise, and people that are working on these things. But I would say also employers, through the Employers' Council and so on, they also have people who have researched things and have expertise. They have lots of women in the Employers' Council and the Board of Trade in leadership positions as well, and they're women. I'm sure they have expertise and they care about this issue.

Again, as I said when I spoke earlier, there has to be some reasonable balance. There has to be a reasonable balance. We can't just simply dismiss employers. I mean if we didn't have employers – just think about it, we're talking about all the time we're in this House saying, boy, I wish we had this, I wish we had that and I wish we had something else. There's not enough money for this; there's not enough money for that. We need to diversify the economy. Well, it's employers that are doing that. Employers are doing that. They're the ones who are employing people. They're paying business taxes. They're creating spinoff. They're creating a good economic environment so that we can get money and people can work and people can afford to do the things they need to do and the government can afford to do what they need to do, so we need employers.

To simply say that all employers, they have no expertise and their voice doesn't count, we're not going to listen to them, we're going to listen to groups on the other side of the argument, that's not right either. There has to be fairness and balance in all this.

I think, as has been said, there's nothing to say we cannot revisit this at some point in time as things change or whatever and increase the number of days. If that's what the consultations show and the statistics are borne out and so on, I'm sure that Members of the House of Assembly would be willing to entertain that.

I don't want to repeat everything I've said, but I do want to say, for the record, that me not supporting the amendment to go from three and seven to five and five, for the record, I have to say that does not mean that I am in any way supporting family violence. That does not mean that I am against women of this province. It does not mean that I don't care and does not mean that I'm not listening. It does not mean that I don't appreciate the great work of the women's groups. It does not mean that I don't appreciate the great work of labour unions and so on.

What it does mean is that I'm being fair and reasonable and looking at all sides, comparing it from where we are today to where we're going to be, comparing it to other provinces across the country, and I see it as a reasonable compromise, a good bill, supported as I said,

once again, by the Federation of Labour, the president of NAPE up in the gallery that day that this bill came forward. They supported it and I'm supporting it, as is, without the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

**CHAIR:** Shall the amendment carry?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Nay.

**CHAIR:** The amendment is defeated.

On motion, amendment defeated.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 2 carry?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Carried.

On motion, clause 2 carried.

**CLERK:** Clause 3.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 3 carry?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Carried.

On motion, clause 3 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?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

**CLERK:** An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act.

**CHAIR:** Shall the title carry?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

**CHAIR:** Shall I report the bill without amendment?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Carried.

On motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

**CHAIR:** The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

**MS. COADY:** I move, Mr. Chair, that the Committee rise and report Bill 32.

**CHAIR:** The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 32.

Shall the motion carry?

All those in favour?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Those against?

Thank you.

Carried.

**Recess**

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, the Speaker returned to the Chair.

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

**MR. SPEAKER (Trimper):** The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay and Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Admit strangers.

**Statements by Members**

**MR. WARR:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 32 without amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Today we will hear statements by the hon. Members for the Districts of Windsor Lake, Exploits, Torngat Mountains, St. George's - Humber, and Terra Nova.

**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 32 without amendment.

The hon. the Member for Windsor Lake.

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the St. John's Hindu Temple for their successful Diwali celebration this past weekend, which I had the privilege to attend.

When shall the report be received?

**MS. COADY:** Now.

Diwali is the biggest and brightest of all the Hindu festivals, a five-day celebration of light, love and reflection. Temples, homes and streets are illuminated with candles and fireworks as families, friends and co-workers come together to exchange gifts.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

**MS. COADY:** Tomorrow.

As our emcee for the evening, Archana Shah, put it so well, to grow up in the Hindu community here in Newfoundland and Labrador was to have two back-to-back Christmases.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Tomorrow.

Thank you.

The event itself was a triumphant success, full of delicious food and great entertainment. I congratulate the Board of the Temple and all the volunteers. It's a tribute to the spirit of their community here in this province, that even on a cold, snowy night, Hindu Newfoundlanders and Labradorians were still able to light up the sky with a brilliant fireworks display.

On motion, report received and adopted. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

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

I look forward to attending next year's celebration and encourage this House to take up the Diwali message of always putting light before darkness.

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

Considering the hour, I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, that we adjourn until 2 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn – we'll actually go into recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

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

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

I rise today in this hon. House to pay tribute to Doreen Tremblett of Bishop's Falls who recently surpassed the 33 year mark, making her the longest serving councillor with the municipality to date, and one of the longest serving in the province. Having served as a councillor for 17 years, and deputy mayor for 16, Doreen has extended her volunteerism to other realms as well.

Some, but not all, of her extended community and regional involvement brings with it: being a long time standing member of the Bishop's Falls Heritage Society; over 22 years as coordinator for the Kids Eat Smart Club and school council at Helen Tulk Elementary; 10 years with the town's development corporation; six years with the annual Trestle Suicide Prevention Walk, and over two decades serving with the Salvation Army Advisory Committee for Central Newfoundland.

I ask all hon. Members to join with me in congratulating and thanking Doreen Tremblett for taking the time to make things better for the residents of Bishop's Falls, and our region as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

As an Indigenous member and representative in this hon. House, it is indeed an honour to recognize the accomplishments of other Indigenous people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Today, I recognize Josh Dyke, a young wrestler from Sheshatshiu, who recently returned home with a gold medal from the 2018 British Junior Wrestling Championships on November 10, 2018.

Last year, Josh won bronze at the North American Indigenous Games in Toronto and

showed himself to be a promising wrestler. With the help of Coach Peter Petipas, and mixed martial artist, Collin Baikie, Josh trained intensely for the British Juniors with an even loftier goal in mind.

When the match time came, his opponent had to drop the fight. Not wanting to win by default, Josh challenged the top competitor in a different weight class. Mr. Speaker, he won that challenge and considers it his gold medal match.

I ask my hon. colleagues to join me in saluting the sporting accomplishments of Josh Dyke. Mr. Speaker, it's not the size of your community that matters. What matters is the size of your heart and the fire within.

Well done, Josh.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of St. George's - Humber.

**MR. REID:** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to members of the Western Newfoundland Team Broken Earth. The team left yesterday for their nine-day mission to Haiti. The 21 team members come from Stephenville, Port aux Basques and Corner Brook.

In response to the devastating earthquake that shook Haiti in 2010, Dr. Andrew Furey took a team of volunteers to provide much needed medical care. Eight years later, Team Broken Earth continues to provide relief to the island nation and has also begun expanding aid into other countries such as Guatemala and Bangladesh.

Team leader, Dr. Wade Thomas, says the team will focus on education and working side by side with Haitian doctors. They raised funds to pay for their trip and they bring their own supplies so they are self-efficient when they arrive.

In closing, I ask all Members to join me in commending the members of Western Newfoundland Team Broken Earth for the work they do, for sharing the Newfoundland spirit

with the world, and for inspiring us all to do great things.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

For 60 years, Royal Canadian Legion Branch 41 has been supporting veterans and the communities throughout the Glovertown - Eastport area.

On Saturday, November 3, two of the Legion's members received the highest honour, the Life Achievement Award, during its annual honour and awards banquet.

Mr. Chesley Bull, now aged 99 years, served King and country in the Royal Navy between 1941 and 1946. Being a founding member of Branch 41, Chesley continues to attend all regular meetings and special events during Memorial Day and Remembrance Day. He was a Charter Member of the Eastport Lions Club and the Volunteer Fire Department.

In addition, Royal Air Force Veteran, Mr. Don Windsor, was recognized during the awards dinner for his lifetime commitment to his comrades, youth and the community. For 41 years, Don has been an active Legionnaire; having held several executive roles, as well as serving as a District Commander. Don is credited with establishing the local Air Cadet Squadron and he is the past Honourary Colonel of 9 Wing Gander.

I ask all hon. Members to join me in applauding Veterans Chesley Bull and Don Windsor on the achievement of their Royal Canadian Life Member Award.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Statements by Ministers.

#### Statements by Ministers

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

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

I rise in this hon. House today to update Members on the recent Atlantic Growth Strategy trade mission to China.

The mission brought together premiers, federal ministers, and representation from the business community and post-secondary institutions from across the Atlantic provinces to attract investment and trade activity.

I'm pleased to note that there was great interest from our Chinese counterparts in many of the opportunities for collaboration and engagement with Newfoundland and Labrador.

At the Canada China Business Council Forum, I was able to discuss the many trade opportunities that exist between our province and the growing China market.

This included everything from investment opportunities in our oil and gas and mining industries, to highlighting the products that we have to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding Chinese consumer market.

Having just launched our *Mining The Future 2030* and its plan to grow mining activity in our province, I was especially pleased to meet with the chairman and management team of HBIS Group, one of the largest steel manufacturers in China, which has interest in the mining industry in Labrador. In our meeting we advanced discussions to help realize our goal to establish new mining activity and new employment right here in our province.

In addition, I had a meeting with the chairman and management team of China National Offshore Oil Corporation, and the Embassy officials advised me that they are the largest Chinese investor in Canada. Our meeting was to discuss the current and future opportunities in offshore oil and gas related to *Advance 2030*.

I'm also pleased to note that during the trip, Ocean Choice International announced that they are now listing new products on Chinese e-commerce platforms.

Outside of our efforts to grow large scale natural resource development, smaller companies also

benefited from the mission. For example, companies like Empowered Homes, which is a tech firm started by two young entrepreneurs from our province, also pursued opportunities for their mobile app enabled, Wi-Fi compatible, line voltage thermostat. Our mission delegates pursued opportunities in the areas of technology, food and beverage, and education as well.

In total, Newfoundland and Labrador had more than a dozen companies, and the College of the North Atlantic participated in various parts of the program in China and built upon our province's great reputation as an ideal place for businesses to grow and invest, and for students and institutions to partner in the area of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, both our government and the federal government agreed that building a strong relationship with China is vital to the continued growth of the Canadian economy. That is why we made this mission a priority under the Atlantic Growth Strategy, in the same way that we have worked together through the strategy to improve immigration, workforce development, e-health and many other opportunities.

Working together, we will continue to grow the economy in ways that benefit current and future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** I congratulate the hon. Premier on his trade mission, and for the advance copy of the statement. Our province is rich in natural resources, work ethic and ingenuity; all of which make for the possibility of excellent trade relationships with global partners.

I'm pleased to see small- and medium-sized businesses expand their reach from our shores and hope that the businesses that participated in this trade mission forge long-lasting relationships. I'm also pleased that the delegation had productive talks with companies

and officials in China regarding both the oil and gas and mining sectors, both of which have seen the benefits of the work and investments made not just by this government, but by previous and successive Progressive Conservative governments.

The Chinese market for our seafood products has also been an important relationship that deserves further cultivation, which the hon. Premier has not mentioned in his statement today, but I look forward to hearing of any progress being made by the delegation on the exportation in particular of seal-based products to this market.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

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

I thank the Premier for an advance copy of his statement, and congratulations to the Premier for a successful China trade mission.

I was pleased that delegates also included smaller companies as well as the large resource players. This will ensure a greater possibility of economic diversity. The potential in the Chinese market is remarkable, and here's hoping this opens up great opportunities for our brilliant smaller local companies, as well as our large resource sectors.

Thank you, 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.

**MR. MITCHELMORE:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hon. House to provide an update on the cell service initiatives taking place across our province.



Mr. Speaker, as part of Budget 2018, the provincial government announced it would invest \$1 million in a new cost-shared cellular service pilot program to address gaps and deficiencies in cellular service infrastructure in unserved and underserved communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

This call for proposals outlined the provincial government's commitment to contribute up to a maximum of 25 per cent of project cost toward cellular coverage infrastructure upgrades. The remaining 75 per cent is to be provided by the service provider, municipalities, private ventures and/or regional government partnerships.

As a result of our government's initiative, Mr. Speaker, residents and travellers in areas of the Great Northern Peninsula and Port au Port Peninsula will enjoy expanded and improved cellular service coverage. These first two approved projects include a collective investment of almost \$2 million.

The call for the cellular service pilot program closed on October 1, and I am pleased to inform the House that in the coming weeks more projects regarding improved and expanded cell service coverage will be announced.

Mr. Speaker, this provincial program builds on the significant broadband investment announced earlier this year in partnership with Connect to Innovate, a federal program that aims to provide Internet service to unserved and underserved communities. Many rural and remote communities will be gaining benefits from the joint investment of \$40 million in broadband infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, improvements in cellular service infrastructure and Internet service can be an enabler for economic development, contributing to economic prosperity, social development and global competitiveness. Our government continues to strengthen the province's economic foundation by delivering on commitments in *The Way Forward* to support innovation and technology.

Thank you.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

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

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House can agree that cellular service is critical to our economy, our tourism industry and the safety of our travelling public.

The minister referenced two projects on the Northern Peninsula and the Port au Port Peninsula, but I'd like to remind him that there are many other areas in the province where cellular service is still not available. I hope that upon reviewing proposed projects that a regional perspective is used and that the enhanced service is spread throughout all areas of this province. Within my own district, and other rural Liberal districts, there are many dead zones where cell service is still not available. I'm sure all of our constituents, business owners and visitors would appreciate added cell coverage and we look forward to the remaining announcements.

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 thank the minister. Congratulations to these two areas on finally getting adequate cell service. They have been waiting for too long for what is a basic service. Cellular service is so essential now for tourism, for other rural businesses. It's essential for education, for families and friends to coordinate their lives, and even to interface and access government services. And it is essential in emergency for saving lives. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that all areas have cell coverage.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

**Oral Questions**

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Natural Resources indicated that Nalcor was working with the payroll company to complete the payroll for over 120 non-unionized workers.

Could the minister confirm that her government and Nalcor have committed to paying these non-unionized workers as they did for Trades NL workers?

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

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

I do have an update. I can say that Nalcor has been working with the surety to get the information that is required. As I said yesterday, the stop-work order was on October 18, with stopping work on October 20, and all people were paid. All the workers of Astaldi were paid up to October 20. What we're talking about is some workers did continue on after October 20.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, of course, has spoken to Nalcor on this very important issue. Nalcor is working to get the information that is required to ensure the people have the wages that they've worked for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** I thank the minister for that.

The elapsed period since October 20 is now 14 or 15 days. It's been suggested that these workers may not receive their pay cheques until after Christmas.

I ask the minister: Why is it taking so long to resolve these non-unionized workers when it

was resolved quickly for TradesNL? Is Nalcor hedging on paying these workers?

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

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

As I just indicated, the stop-work order was on October 20 and everyone was paid up until October 20. Subsequent to that time, there were workers that did stay on at the request of Astaldi. We have spoken to Nalcor about this very important issue. Nalcor is trying to get the information that they require in order to assist with this situation.

The surety is now involved. I know that Nalcor has reached out to the payroll company for Astaldi. You have to have the information, and that requires the co-operation of Astaldi in order to be able to do so.

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, hope that the necessary executive action will not be long in being taken.

Last week, Finance Minister Osborne – I'm sorry, the Minister of Finance said that the government will be providing support to communities impacted by the closure of the RONA stores.

I would ask the minister: What program will this support be provided through?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

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

**MR. DAVIS:** Thank you very much for the important question. It's devastating news that we've heard; devastating for the employees and their families that have to be impacted by this.

We've reached out to both the union and the company to coordinate efforts through sessions with Service Canada, and we're looking forward for training supports, resume writing, job search activities such as those.

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

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** Perhaps the minister might explain: Is there a specific program aimed at placing and possibly retraining these workers?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

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

There's a basket of resources that we're utilizing to put these workers back to work and give them opportunities to succeed in the future.

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

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** Bombay and Bowring have also indicated door closings in St. John's stores. I ask the minister: Will the support for workers impacted by RONA closures also be extended to others who lost their job because of retail closures?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Not just workers for RONA but any workers that are impacted in any job closures or opportunities to expand their workplace, or expand into the employment market, we're going to be doing everything we can to work with any business that's experiencing any problems.

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

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

**MR. CROSBIE:** Would that business closure include Burry's Shipyard in Clarenville?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** As I've just said, Mr. Speaker, it's every worker in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador who's experiencing employment shortages like that, our office is going to be there for them; we've got their back.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister said he was not aware of a proposed deal to sell land on Mews Place for \$1. Interestingly though, he knew that this land was going to be used for a catch basin. So, I ask the minister if he has had an opportunity to check with officials to determine if they were aware of this proposed deal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works.

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

As I quite clearly said yesterday, there was no prepared deal; there was no direction to sell this land. Mr. Speaker, in checking yesterday afternoon, in mid-November last year, there was a request came in from the company in question for a meeting. There was no meeting. There was a conversation between two engineers that lasted approximately 10 minutes, and that was that, Mr. Speaker.

Any time we sell land in this province, we do so to get the best value for the taxpayers of this province. Mr. Speaker, any single person in this province can go into the Registry of Deeds today and find what land the province owns. It is on a weekly basis we have companies inquiring about land the province owns. When somebody inquires about that, we follow up with a conversation, but this conversation ended after about 10 minutes.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

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

I want to point out to the minister, what he's saying, it may be accurate. Our issue is –

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

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

**MR. PETTEN:** I stress the word “may,” Mr. Speaker. I really use that word lightly.

But the issue is the sale for \$1 when it was supposed to be for market value. This land, there was direction given; this land was supposed to be sold for \$1. That's the issue, and that's what we're hearing. We're hearing it from good sources.

I'll the minister another question now; maybe he'll be able to answer this one.

Once that deal fell through, did the same numbered company involved with Canopy Growth attempt to buy government-owned land near Snows Lane in Torbay?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works.

**MR. CROCKER:** Mr. Speaker.

I take exception to the preamble on that question. Any time that I represented the department and we do something to sell land or do any investment, we do it for the best interest of the province. If that Member opposite, who sat in a government, who sold land deal after land deal – and I'm going to table in this House as soon as we get it consumed; there was never direction in my department to do anything from anybody when it comes to a land sale.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, if this land – and I'm not sure if it was expropriated in the construction of the Team Gushue Highway. It would not be a decision of the Department of Transportation and works; it would government decision.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

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

So my final question would be – the minister was saying it was a 10-minute meeting. Will he come clean with the House and tell them did any officials in his department sit down –

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** I remind all Members, I will not tolerate any heckling.

Please proceed.

**MR. PETTEN:** Have any members in his department met with this numbered company; that we can't seem to get an answer of who owns this numbered company. So if any officials in his department – because we're hearing they did – met with this numbered company involved with Canopy Growth.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works.

**MR. CROCKER:** The answer is absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of land in this province. My department has requests on a daily basis, and we have a division in the department that looks after the land and the properties that the province owns. We have requests on a daily basis from companies and from people wanting to purchase properties.

I don't get down at that level in the department. I don't go into the Lands Division every morning and say: Who made a request for land today, or who made a request on a building today? That's not the way.

We have a competent public service; we have competent staff. We have a very competent staff in Transportation and Work. That's their job. They're doing a job, and I'll leave it to them.

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

Minister, as this is World Diabetes Day, during the Estimates Committee meeting of April 30, the Minister of Health and Community Services said – and I quote: The diabetic registry has had some challenges with getting the geekery sorted out. We got the regulatory framework in place. I gather there have been some discussion about difficulties with entry and access.

Has the department sorted out these difficulties, since April, to get the diabetic registry functioning?

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

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

The short answer to that long preamble is yes.

I would like to take advantage of World Diabetes Day to point out some of the things this government has done in relation to diabetes. We are the first province in Canada to put in place the BETTER Program – upstream, preventative, self-management program. We have people in Corner Brook Wellness Collaborative who've taken that up. We have the program running in Corner Brook, in Ramea, in Burgeo. It will start in Sheshatshiu and in Gander shortly.

We have training in the other RHAs to fill in that gap. The diabetes registry is up and running. We have a remote patient monitoring program for diabetes with 1,345 people currently enrolled. We have specialized foot care programs for people with diabetes ....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

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

The hon. the Member for the District of Conception Bay East - Bell Island.

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

The minister forgot to mention the diabetic strips that they took away from people who need them on a daily basis.

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

**MR. BRAZIL:** The minister talked about using the registry to get an up line between what is current best practices and then an idea of how our population fits in there, to see where the gaps are and then work to fill them.

How is the department using the registry to identify the gaps and fill them?

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

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

The first part of his preamble is answered by the second part of his question. We have aligned ourselves with Canadian best practices. That is what we did with the test stripes. You get test stripes now based on your clinical need, based on the treatment that you have for the disease condition you have. It's flexible, it's adaptable and it's open to a special access program to allow increased strips.

By doing that one thing alone, we have been able to reinvest \$4 million back into diabetic care in this province by that one manoeuvre alone. So I argue, that's exactly what we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

The minister can argue, but he needs to talk to those who are fighting with diabetes who don't have enough strips to be able to do their testing on a daily basis.

The Canadian Diabetes Association in 2016 wrote: "In order to stem the tide of increasing diabetes burden, the" association "urges the Government to develop and implement a Provincial Diabetes Strategy that would address

the serious gaps in preventing and managing diabetes in the province.” A stand-alone specific diabetic strategy.

Is this stand-alone diabetic strategy still a goal?

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

**MR. HAGGIE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I started to list off some of the bits in there. We actually have a chronic disease strategy which works for the other people in this province with diseases such as COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, congestive heart failure, chronic kidney disease.

With reference to the diabetic test strips, they are accessible for those people whose clinicians feel they need more than the allocation. We have had 540 applications. We have 11 per cent of the province currently suffering from diabetes. Mr. Speaker, I would argue, that’s a pretty close fit.

So under our diabetic strategy, we have Improving Health: My Way, a chronic disease self-management program geared for diabetes. We’ve got 2,500 people on that. We have moved that into the (inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

**MR. BRAZIL:** Mr. Speaker, the Chronic Disease Action Plan set a 2018 target to begin integrated registries with the provincial electronic health records and electronic medical records to ensure appropriate information is available to health care providers.

Will the minister table an updated timeline to complete the integration and tell us what the obstacles are to getting this done?

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

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

On the issue of an integrated provincial electronic medical record, we are making significant progress in collaboration with the Newfoundland and Labrador Medical Association. We are working to integrate their program, and we have nearly 300 individual licenses there. We have gone through the RHAs to get that same program on an enterprise licence for all our salaried physicians, which represent about 40 per cent of our primary care practitioners.

We are working to integrate the two together, and that process will continue. It will never end, Mr. Speaker, because once we get it done, we’ll be back to the beginning to make it even better.

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

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

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

Is the minister concerned that with the exorbitant tax hikes his government has imposed, many people simply cannot afford to eat healthy servings of fruit and vegetables, or participate in sports and recreation and join gyms and the like, which contribute to diabetes?

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

**MR. HAGGIE:** Mr. Speaker, I’m not exactly sure where to start there, but maybe the fact that our taxation regime here is on a line with the rest of Atlantic Canada would be a realistic figure from a financial point of view.

As far as healthy eating is concerned, there is an education program that starts in schools. And, in actual fact, we’re seeing a significant change in adult behaviour, depending on the children coming home and teaching their parents about healthy eating.

I accept that the cost of food on the North Coast and in certain areas is very high, but I would refer to my colleague to my left here who has got 64,000 hectares of extra agricultural land available for this province to develop its own agriculture. We only produce 10 per cent of our food – once we did 90 per cent. When we get

back up there, Mr. Speaker, that problem will improve.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, you went to China: What discussions did you have with Chinese officials about topics of market access for our seal products?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Boy, was I ever waiting for this, Mr. Speaker, because not only did I speak with companies in China about access to seal products, I spoke with the vice-minister responsible for agriculture with special responsibilities for fisheries, the Chinese senior official, making sure that Newfoundland and Labrador's voice is understood, it's made clear in China.

Do you know something? One of the interesting things that was made very abundantly clear to me is that while many, many promises were made in the past about accessing seal products within the Chinese marketplace, it was made abundantly clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that while that voice and that expression was made on the floor of this House many years ago, that the Chinese government was not necessarily acting with that same vigour and resolve. That has to be corrected ....

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

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Minister, you said last fall you were going to encourage the federal government to move forward to opening markets on seal products in China.

Can you tell us what action has taken place so far?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** That's exactly why, Mr. Speaker, it's so, so important to participate in these international trade missions, not only to seek out the council and best advice of advisors on the ground in those foreign jurisdictions, but to talk to government officials directly, clearly, succinctly, about accessing those markets. That's why it's so important; my own discussions with the vice-minister responsible with special responsibilities for fisheries was so important. But, also, Mr. Speaker, senior federal Cabinet ministers were on the ground in China.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, we spoke about making sure that the federal government stepped up to ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador harp seal products enter foreign marketplaces, including China.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Minister, you spoke about this a year ago. What action has been taken since then? None.

What action have you taken?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Perhaps I will speak so that the Member will understand what I'm saying.

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

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Is that action has been taken by making sure that foreign jurisdictions, other countries which are receptive or potentially receptive to seal products, understand the value, the ability to supply the marketplace, the value to their marketplace, that consumers would accept this as a desirable food product. That action does take time.

I'll point out to the hon. Member, I recall many, many years ago when people from that side of

the floor of the House stood up and exalted the benefits of China as the new marketplace for seals. When I was in China, guess what? It seemed to me that we were starting from scratch all over again. The ....

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

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Mr. Speaker, what a minister.

Have you had any discussions with the federal government or Chinese officials on export certificates, and what is the status?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Mr. Speaker, when you speak with a minister of the Chinese government, you speak about many, many things; but one of the most important things, the purpose of this mission, was to enhance and improve market access by Newfoundland and Labrador fisheries and aquaculture products, companies. That's what we did.

We not only spoke directly with senior government officials, we spoke with companies. We reinforced that in China – one of the most important reasons why senior government officials, why the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador personally attended this mission, this Atlantic Growth Strategy mission, because in China, remarkably like no other jurisdiction, government-to-government interaction is essential in closing the deal.

That's why the Premier was there, that's why I was there and, quite frankly, it should've been there a long, long time ago and it wasn't.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Minister, since you became minister, do we have better access to markets in China with our seal products?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** I would argue that we do. Can we do better? Absolutely, we can. Does the marketplace in China evolve on a 24-hour clock or a seven-day cycle or even a 12-month cycle? No, it does not.

This is a 1.3-billion-person marketplace. The consumer middle class in China is growing by 15 million persons per year. This is a marketplace that needs a sustained effort, a constant effort, to break into.

Mr. Speaker, we have that sustained discipline. We will do that and we will see benefits to the Newfoundland and Labrador seal industry but, most importantly, to the Newfoundland and Labrador seafood industry, we will see those benefits in China.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

**MR. K. PARSONS:** Have you had any discussion with the Canadian Food Inspection Agency on export certificates for China?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** I have spoken with the minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the hon. Jonathan Wilkinson. I have spoken with the minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. I have spoken with senior officials. That is one of the reasons why we enter into these trade missions, not only to dialogue, to meet with and discuss directly with our Chinese counterparts, with Chinese companies, with our Newfoundland and Labrador companies.

But, Mr. Speaker, yes, we on this side, we have a very, very good relationship, a working relationship with the federal government. We don't always agree, sometimes we agree to disagree, but we have the capacity to speak with our federal counterparts, and we do so on a regular basis.

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



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

**MR. LESTER:** Mr. Speaker, I've been contacted by several agricultural producers who have expressed frustration because they have no access to limestone because the budget has run out. I raised this very issue in questions during Estimates.

Minister, can you confirm that this is the case that we have run out of limestone for our producers?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Mr. Speaker, when you run short of something, it's because demand is so high. One of the reasons why demand for limestone is so high is because we are growing agriculture and farming in Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Mr. Speaker, growth creates that sort of expectation and the greater demand. Do you know what? We don't look at problems; we look at solutions. So yes, Mr. Speaker, there was shortage in limestone and the moment we found out that that demand, because of growing interest in agriculture, growing production, we met that issue, we met that problem with a solution. We increased the amount of limestone that was available because we increased the budget that was available and that, Mr. Speaker, is growing agriculture in Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

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

**MR. LESTER:** So I guess we can say there's now no shortage of limestone nor fertilizer.

Now, Minister, I brought this up that that budget stayed the same for the past three years. Why was there a delay? Why couldn't we have acted proactively and had the budget increased in accordance with our anticipated expansion?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Mr. Speaker, when you forecast things, you do so at a modest, you do so at a reasonable – you try to put in a forecast that you might expect will meet with demand. The real issue that we're speaking of on the floor of the House of Assembly right now is that demand, that expectation, that growing of agriculture in Newfoundland and Labrador far exceeded any expectation, and the demand and expectation for limestone which is indicative – it's really the bell weather of how our initiative, our *Way Forward* initiative to grow agriculture in Newfoundland and Labrador is progressing. Yes, indeed, we need more limestone and we're providing it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to answer the Member's question directly, whatever limestone is needed, whatever fertilizer is needed, we're going to supply it because we are growing agriculture.

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

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

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

**MR. LESTER:** So can I contact these producers and tell them they can expect delivery by the weekend?

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

**MR. BYRNE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, you can contact whoever you want because we're already in contact. I've been in contact with several producers that said: Minister, we could use some more limestone. The answer came back: We'll get you more limestone. We'll make sure that there are always those contingencies in place. Mr. Speaker, contingencies are important. It's too bad – it's really, really too bad that same forethought about contingencies wasn't in place for Muskrat Falls.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North, for a very quick question, please – a very quick question.

**MR. LESTER:** I'd like to remind the minister that limestone is a continual application, it does not necessarily –

**MR. SPEAKER:** Very quick question, Sir, please.

**MR. LESTER:** Are you aware that limestone has to be applied every year to existing land? That is what creates the demand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Land Resources for a very quick response, please.

**MR. BYRNE:** Because, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why forecasting may be off is that in 2013, in the last five years, the number of farms, according to Stats Canada, in Newfoundland and Labrador shrunk by over 100 by 20 per cent.

We are now seeing a resurgence of farming in Newfoundland and Labrador as a result of *The Way Forward*. And yes, Mr. Speaker, I do fully understand that limestone must meet the pH requirements of the soil in question, and will always be there.

We will always be there –

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

**MR. BYRNE:** – to support our farmers.

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

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

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

Government amended the *Labour Standards Act* to require three days of paid leave and seven days of unpaid leave for victims of domestic violence. When women flee domestic violence, it's often the most dangerous time of their lives and they are most vulnerable. There is much they have to do to re-stabilize their lives and their children, like seek medical attention, find housing, appear in court and more.

I ask the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour: What made his government decide to do only the bare minimum by proposing only three days of paid leave, when the rest of the country is moving to five days of paid leave?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the great question.

Research and consultations, that's what drove the decision making. We consulted numerous groups, as I listed earlier today. In the process, that's where we came up with the number. It's a great first step.

As I said before, legislation is a moving target. Obviously, we're going to do things. If we need to do improvements, we're going to do those as they come forward.

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

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

**MS. ROGERS:** Mr. Speaker.

They weren't listening to the experts that were the woman's groups and the anti-violence groups at all.

Mr. Speaker, the workers at D-J Composites are thankfully now in arbitration with the employer. The length of this lockout and the use of replacement workers both pointed to the vulnerability of our workers, in the face of multi-nationals that want to lower wages and get rid of unions.

An industrial inquiry, in 2011, found that legislation was not strong enough to prevent such companies from refusing to bargain and bring in replacement workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour: Will he amend the *Labour Relations Act* to prevent the use of replacement workers and impose binding arbitration when collective bargaining has broken down?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

**MR. DAVIS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question.

As a government, we've always said that negotiated deals are the best deals, working with both parties. The D-J Composites are in process now. We got to let that process happen. Obviously, a negotiated deal is, by far, the best way to move forward on this.

**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.

Government brags about its new arrangement to raise the minimum wage a few cents each year with the cost of living, but the starting point is so low that our minimum wage will remain the third-lowest in the country forever unless something is done. Many jurisdictions have been bypassing us as they move to a \$15 minimum wage.

I ask the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour: Will he adopt a schedule to gradually increase the minimum wage to \$15 so these workers can bring home more than a poverty wage?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

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

We did extensive consultations on this. We've established a growing minimum wage that is tied to an economic indicator, which is what the industry wanted. The industry and employees deserve to know where the rates are going to be moved. We tied it to the national consumer price index. It's a balanced approach. It's not an ad-hoc approach that's been in the past. I think we need to have openness and transparency in a process, and that's what we've decided to do and that's what we've done.

**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.

The Labour Standards regulations say that overtime wages shall be calculated as the minimum wage rate multiplied by 1.5, which is unfair to non-unionized workers who earn more than the minimum wage. Some have come to us saying their employer won't pay more than one-and-a-half times the minimum wage for overtime, which is less than their regular wage.

Will the minister commit to doing what most Canadian jurisdictions have done, and set the overtime wage at one-and-a-half times the employee's regular wage? It makes sense.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour.

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

We understand that minimum wage is there. We've put it in place, a target that is tied to a national CPI, which is important to stabilize that in openness and transparency. That's an important piece. I understand the question deals with overtime, and we're working through that. And any time there are questions come forward to us, our staff in our department is looking forward to options to make it better for the employees.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will ask leave to introduce the following resolution to the House:

BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Assembly as follows:

WHEREAS section 7 of the *House of Assembly, Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act* provides that the Law Clerk of the House of Assembly is to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on nomination by the House of Assembly;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Ms. Kimberly Hawley George, QC be nominated for appointment as the Law Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to Standing Order 11(1) I hereby give notice that this House do not adjourn at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, November 19.

Thank you.

**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 Conception Bay South.

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

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

WHEREAS many students within our province depend on school busing for transportation to and from school each day; and

WHEREAS there are many parents of school-aged children throughout the province who live

inside the Eastern School Districts 1.6 kilometre zone therefore do not qualify for busing; and

WHEREAS policy cannot override the safety of our children;

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to urge government to eliminate the 1.6 kilometre policy for all elementary schools in the province and in junior and senior high schools where safety is a concern.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has gotten a lot of attention over the last several weeks. It's an issue that our caucus has been bringing to this House of Assembly for the last couple of years. It's a simple issue in the sense of explanation. It's a safety issue. Our children are walking to schools in areas where there are no sidewalks, there are high traffic volumes.

I know my district, and my colleagues got the same, we all can share the same stories. Parents are concerned. People in our communities are concerned and our districts are concerned. People on the opposite side got parents in their districts that are concerned. We all feel the same. We all feel the same about this. This is not an isolated Opposition PC issue. This is an issue that's out there in society.

You go into social media posts constantly, you read it in the media, people have grown an attention, maybe because there was a lot of acceptance or there was nothing done. It was there forever and everyone just kind of forgot about it. It would rise every September and fall. That's true, and that has happened over the years.

Even before I ever got into politics, this issue always arose and it fell off. But I don't think it's going to fall off this time, Mr. Speaker, because people are really to a point now, they've had enough. They're frustrated. They feel the safety of their children is paramount, which I totally agree. Our most vulnerable are our children and our seniors. If we can't look after them, as a

society we need to take a hard look in the mirror, Mr. Speaker. That's not where we should be.

This day and age, 2018, to be standing here day after day, along with my colleagues, arguing for a policy to be reviewed, to be changed, to be looked at and follow – listen to what the people are asking, Mr. Speaker, that's all everyone really wants. Instead, we hear rhetoric.

We got a courtesy stop put in between zero and 1.6. It doesn't matter if there are no seats on the bus, Mr. Speaker, you can have a courtesy stop in the school parking lot. It makes no difference. If there are no seats on the bus it means nothing.

I find it a little tad insulting to Members on this side, and I'm sure parents out there, when the minister gets up on his feet day and after and responds with that answer. That don't cut it. Everyone sees through that. They want answers. They want a reasonable answer to their question. We're presenting their issue and I expect the minister to give a reasonable and respectable answer.

Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development for a response, please.

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

I again stand and speak with regard to the 1.6 kilometre. I take exception, Mr. Speaker, to the Member opposite. He talked about, made reference that he's only been doing this for the last three years. He's been advocating to remove the 1.6 kilometre. I have to go back again, Mr. Speaker, I keep going back because obviously the Member was attached to the previous administration when the 1.6 kilometre was sitting in there at that time, and I don't understand why he didn't lobby then.

All of a sudden, it becomes a lobby issue within the last three years. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Member opposite something we have done that they did not do. They had some courtesy seating in place but they did not have any courtesy stops in place, Mr. Speaker, and we

have put in a courtesy stop within the 1.6 which we'll continue to do.

He gets up there and talks about safety. Safety is very important. It's very important for me as the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite should realize as well the policy, because obviously they worked through that same policy. So he's very well aware of the policy of what happens within the 1.6 responsibility of making sure the students get to school in a safe manner. That in the policy that that same government made applications and applied by is the same policy that's here today.

Mr. Speaker, we have – and it's important for us to make some changes and to look at that. My question goes back again: What does the Member want to do, eliminate 1.6 for every single student? If not, safety is not an issue for some of the students that are outside of that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Further petitions?

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

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

I stand today to present a petition on behalf of residents in my district. The Public Utilities Board has approved a licence for an ambulance owner to operate near Bay Bulls to Bauline. This area is one of the fastest growing areas of the province. There have been many concerns from residents, municipalities, councils, emergency responders regarding response times.

THEREFORE we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows:

To support the position of a service provider and ensure the residents of Bay Bulls to Bauline meet national standards for response times.

This is an issue that I brought to the House of Assembly on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, and have met with a number of residents expressing their concern on actual

individual cases and individual experiences they had in regard to response times.

This particular area is serviced right now by Eastern Health and the Health Sciences Complex as far as Mobile, and then on the other side going south from an ambulance service in Cape Broyle. And this all goes to the response time and when a call is made. We've had a number of incidents where we're gone beyond the national standard, we're into 30, 40, 50 even, over an hour response time in this particular area where we've seen tremendous growth.

We have long-term care facilities. In the summertime we have a significant cabin country, and the amount of population goes up excessively. We also have, obviously, Route 10. The tourism industry and the amount of traffic we have through the area as well is pretty significant.

Speaking to the regional fire departments, the volunteer fire department in Witless Bay which covers the area. They respond to structural fires, vehicle accidents, but medical responses as well. So even on their time, and they're volunteers, I mean there's a lot of time spent – they're often the first responder when a 911 call goes in.

So there are many sides to this, and I've spoken to the minister before. We've met with the minister. I know there was a review done and an audit of the ambulance services. There was supposed to be a service delivery aspect done this particular fall. This is an issue that should've been dealt with months ago. I call on the minister to intervene, to deal with this and to make sure standards are being met and the service is being provided for the people of this region.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

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

I rise to present this petition, and the background to the petition is as follows:

WHEREAS the Bay d'Espoir Highway and its branch roads, Routes 360, 361, 362, 363, 364 and 365 have become overgrown with very dangerous roadside alder growth; and

WHEREAS the Coast of Bays region is a very busy area with a high volume of industrial traffic for aquaculture, the fishery and hydroelectricity; and

WHEREAS the region has a transient workforce that requires workers to travel on the highway at early morning hours and late at night, often in foggy, dangerous weather conditions with no cell coverage; and

WHEREAS there have been weekly incidents of moose accidents in the region this year, some very serious and daily near misses; and

WHEREAS all residents are very concerned and worried to drive the highway due to a fear of a moose accident; and

WHEREAS every effort should and must be made to protect the safety of residents and reduce unnecessary road hazards for travellers;

THEREFORE we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows.

Mr. Speaker, we got another 50 or so names on the petition here today, and this is an issue of very grave concern. It's beyond the point now of being frustrated with the alder growth. People are literally afraid to get in their cars and drive anywhere. And we have no choice, Mr. Speaker. We have to drive from community to community to go to work. We have to drive from our small rural area to the larger centres in Grand Falls or Gander to access hospital services. We have no choice but to travel this road, and every time we do it our lives are in jeopardy.

It really is becoming a serious, stressful situation for many people who are very reluctant to get in their cars and travel the road. It's getting very, very serious. The region has been overlooked in terms of brush clearing for the last three years. There's a dire need, and we really need the government to recognize that alder clearing must be a priority. We certainly are hoping that we're going to hear the minister stand up in response

to our petitions and announce that brush clearing is coming in the very near future.

We can't go through another winter, Mr. Speaker, of this danger. It's only a matter of time before we have a fatality because of alder overgrowth, and there's no need of it when a tender can be called to get some of the worse areas done between Little River, Harbour Breton and the (inaudible) Pond area in particular. It's very, very dangerous and we need government to recognize that we need assistance.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

This being – I'm sorry. We have the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works for a response, please.

Thank you, I apologize.

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

I thank the hon. Member for the petition. Mr. Speaker, when we look at brush cutting in this province, we look at our province as a whole. We have 10,000 kilometres of road.

The Member talks about being overlooked. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was brush cutting done in the Member's area in 2017. There was actually no brush cutting done in the 2015 construction season.

So let's tie that back for a second, Mr. Speaker. In 2015, when that Member who gets up and claims that – she was on the government side. She couldn't deliver then. The reality is, we look at brush cutting. Safety is everybody's concern. Absolutely, and we'll continue to do it.

**MS. PERRY:** (Inaudible.)

**MR. CROCKER:** The Member is over there, I respected her when she was speaking, Mr. Speaker, she's not showing me the same respect.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is, when she sat in government in 2015 there was no brush cutting in her district. It's not about districts, it's about need. It's about 10,000 kilometres of road in our

province, and the reality is we work with contracts. We'll continue to do so. We'll take the safety needs of people into consideration.

The reality is here, if you look at groups like SOPAC, Mr. Speaker –

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

The hon. the Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune on a point of order.

**MS. PERRY:** That's not correct information. My understanding is the tender for 2015 got cancelled in December of 2015 after the election.

**MR. CROCKER:** Mr. Speaker, that's (inaudible) –

**MR. SPEAKER:** Folks, I'm sorry, I don't see this as a point of order. It's a disagreement between hon. Members. We are at 3 o'clock now, so I thank the minister for his response.

### Orders of the Day

#### Private Members' Day

**MR. SPEAKER:** I now call on the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay to please stand in his place and introduce the resolution, Motion 3.

The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay.

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

The text of the motion reads:

WHEREAS fourteen mineral commodities are produced or mined in the province including iron, nickel, copper, cobalt and gold; and

WHEREAS the mining industry in 2018 is expected to employ 4,800 people (excluding construction) throughout Newfoundland and Labrador with \$48 million in exploration expenditures and \$3 billion in mineral shipments are forecasted; and

WHEREAS the growth and diversification of the mining industry will provide meaningful contribution to a more diverse workforce by

doubling the current number of women employed and by providing meaningful opportunities to rural areas of our province; and

WHEREAS by 2030 the provincial government envisions five new mines, sustainable direct employment of more than 6,200 people in operations, and doubling our annual exploration expenditures to \$100 million; and

WHEREAS to be successful the government will focus on, being competitive, with clear and efficient regulatory processes; advancing targeted public geoscience, marketing and education; promoting effective Indigenous and community engagement; and pursuing innovation and emerging technologies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House supports the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in its plan for growth in the mining industry of our province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I require a mover and a seconder, Sir.

**MR. WARR:** I move it, and it's seconded by the hon. Member for Labrador West.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Okay, thank you.

The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay.

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

Before I get into my remarks, I want to say thank you to the Member for Labrador West. It was his idea on the PMR, Mr. Speaker. Our interests in mining are from our growing up in mining towns. Like I said before, I want to get into that – certainly, I want to take the opportunity on my feet today to salute my three colleagues, the new Minister of Advanced Education, Skills and Labour, the hon. Minister of –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Municipal Affairs.

**MR. WARR:** – Municipal Affairs and Environment, and the hon. the new Minister Responsible for the Status of Women. Great choices, and I congratulate them on that.

Mr. Speaker, again, growing up in a mining area, we moved from the City of St. John's in 1964 to the community of Springdale.

Obviously, at that particular point in time, I think we still had three operating mines within my district. Those mines were actually Gullbridge or Gull Pond, copper mines down in Whalesback and certainly the copper mines down in Little Bay as well.

It was a bustling town, my hometown. Obviously, none of the mines were in my community but, being the service area for that part of Green Bay, we saw all the spinoffs from the people who worked in those mines. I have a lot of friends who are miners today and it came as a result of their parents and grandparents years ago. I wanted to add one more WHEREAS in my preamble, but I thought the Member for Labrador West wouldn't appreciate it, but I'll say it anyway:

WHEREAS Tilt Cove was the first mine in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1864;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the District of Baie Verte - Green bay be considered the mining capital of Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

**MR. WARR:** I thought I would just get a little bit of a cheer and a rise from hon. colleagues here.

Mr. Speaker, our government's plan – I have to say I got into these two documents last night just in some general reading. *Mining in Newfoundland and Labrador* and *The Way Forward on Mineral Development – Mining the Future 2030: A Plan for Growth in the Newfoundland and Labrador Mining Industry*.

Just a couple of fabulous documents that sort of tells where we were, where we are and where we're going to be. *Mining the Future 2030*, an initiative of *The Way Forward*, will lead to growth of the mining industry for Newfoundland and Labrador.

By 2030 the provincial government, as part of *The Way Forward on Mineral Development*, has envisioned five new mines throughout the



province. Actually, there are several developing properties which are currently in the works: Tacora Resources Inc., Search Minerals Inc., Alderon Iron Ore Corp., Matador Mining Limited and Maritime Resources.

Some of my other colleagues who would be recognized to speak to this PMR today, Mr. Speaker, will certainly bring up some of those comments as well and probably discuss some of the mining happenings that are going on in their own districts.

It's a plan, Mr. Speaker, that was developed in collaboration with Mining Industry NL. This strategically positions Newfoundland and Labrador to avail of opportunities under developing Canadian Minerals and Metals Plan.

*The Way Forward on Mineral Development* aims to include at least 30 per cent of women in our mining workforce by 2030. It's just a little while ago I had one of my own daughters actually was just recently hired by Rambler Mines and Metals down on the Ming's Bight area, and she's certainly enjoying her first taste of the mining sector as well.

Global estimates suggest that women in mining industries comprise only 10 per cent of the workforce; 10 per cent in Australia, 13 per cent in South Africa, 9 per cent in the United States and 15 per cent in Canada. By raising that to 30 per cent, it will make us leaders in women miners. Our vision is strong, Mr. Speaker. We realize our potential. When we took our strengths and potentials, we listened to the people of this province and we developed a plan that builds towards the future. We do all of this with the people of our province and the people of our respective districts in mind. It's our plan forward.

Currently, we have 14 metal and non-metal commodities produced. We also have 11 producing mines, three of which are in my District of Baie Verte - Green Bay. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, they are Anaconda Mining, which are mining gold; Rambler Metals and Mining Canada Limited, which is copper and gold; and Maritime Resources, which are owner of the Hammerdown gold mine that's on the King's Point road.

In the document, *Mining in Newfoundland and Labrador*, in the fall of 2018, it speaks to mineral development and producing mines, and I'd like to concentrate on two of the mines I mentioned in my district. Rambler Metals and Mining Canada Limited owns and operates the underground Ming copper-gold mine, the Nugget Pond mill located on the Baie Verte Peninsula, and the year-round bulk storage and shipping facility at Goodyear's Cove, which is just west of South Brook, Mr. Speaker. This is a company that expects to generate 185 person-years of employment in 2018.

I'd also like to point out that Rambler Metals and Mining Canada is continuing with its Phase II optimization strategy to transform the Ming Mine into a sustainable, 1,250 tonnes per day operation by increasingly blending ore from the Lower Footwall Zone with high-grade, massive sulphide ore.

To continue work at a high-production level, Rambler Metals and Mining Canada upgraded their ventilation system to increase airflows which results in improved productivities in all areas of the mine. The Lower Footwall Zone has a projected 20-year mine life.

Ming Mineral last operated in 1982 and produced over 2.1 million tons of ore; grading 3.5 per cent copper, 2.5 gold and 11 grams per ton in silver over 10 years in operations. Mining ceased when workings reached a neighbouring property boundary.

Rambler purchased the Nugget Pond mill in facility in October of 2009 for \$3.5 million Canadian as a gold-processing carbon in pulp circuit. This facility is capable of processing both gold and copper bearing ore types.

Just talking about all the ore that's shipped out of Rambler, Mr. Speaker, it was only just a few years ago, I guess, I started speaking to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Works with regard to piece of roadwork between Ming's and the mill on the Snook's Arm road. I'm happy to report that the minister sought – we got, I think, 84 one-way trips with the heavy haulers, going over that La Scie road every day. So it certainly takes it wear and tear on the road. And I certainly appreciate the minister looking into

that for me and we got 8.3 kilometres of that road done this year.

Presently, there is common crushing and grinding plant feeding both mills. However, through a future expansion and addition of a new crushing and grinding circuit, the company hopes that the facility will have the ability to process both ore types simultaneously.

Goodyear's Cove, Mr. Speaker, is a fully integrated concentrate storage and shipping facility located just 140 kilometres from the Nugget Pond mill. This site is fully functional and has room for future expansion.

Anaconda Mining, Mr. Speaker, is another producing mine in my district. They operate the Point Rousse Project near Ming's Bight on the Baie Verte Peninsula and consist of the Pine Cove gold mine and mill, the Stog'er Tight deposit, the Argyle deposit, and approximately 5,800 hectares of perspective gold bearing property. I certainly welcomed and had the privilege of traveling to Anaconda with both the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation. Both of those ministers had the opportunity to travel there with me to do a mine tour. I certainly appreciated that.

And I'm sure the Minister of Natural Resources appreciated the fact that she had a \$500,000 gold nugget in her hand. I'll call it a nugget, but it was a gold brick in her hand that – I found it just as heavy as what she did when she lifted it. It's an amazing piece of metal to have in your hand, and just knowing it's done here locally and, obviously, the value of that piece of gold.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Bring some in, Brian.

**MR. WARR:** What's that?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Bring some in (inaudible).

**MR. WARR:** Yes, absolutely.

Anaconda completed mining the Pine Cove open pit in March, and it will now function as an input tailings storage facility, providing 15 years of additional tailings capacity.

The Stog'er Tight Deposit development was completed in April 2018, and ore production began in May, with 28,974 tons of ore mined in May and June. Quite good, Mr. Speaker.

April of 2018, Anaconda registered the Argyle Deposit for an environmental assessment. The planned capital expenditure for the development is \$265,000 in 2018; \$880,000 in 2019; \$50,000 in 2020, for a total of \$1.195 million.

I also need to make mention, Mr. Speaker, of Maritime Resources, which is located in Green Bay. Maritime Resources is the sole owner of the Hammerdown gold mine, which I mentioned earlier. It's located just off King's Point Road. In April 2017, Maritime conducted a pre-feasibility study on the once active Hammerdown site, and their findings have shown that there are enough reserves to reactivate the mine for five years.

So that's real good news for that area, Mr. Speaker, because I can tell you, there were 60 or 70 people that were employed in that mine during its production as well, coming from the Green Bay area. It would be great to see them back on track again. They found 7,600 tons at 7.96 grams per ton of gold still at the site. Green Bay property is approximately 12,775 acres, or 51.7 square kilometres. Their goal is to reopen as an open-pit mine, Mr. Speaker, to reduce the pre-production timeline.

Hammerdown mine life is said to be, potentially, five years; producing an approximate average of 35,000 ounces of gold per year. The Green Bay property is host to four gold deposits.

I'm going to conclude my remarks here, Mr. Speaker. I'm just about out of time. I look forward to having the opportunity at the end of the PMR to get up and speak again and I'll certainly pass it along to my colleagues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

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

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

I'm pleased to rise today to participate in discussion on the private Member's resolution put forward by the hon. Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay related to the mining industry. It's certainly a resolution that I think all Members here would have consideration in supporting.

The last words: "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House supports the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in its plan for growth in the mining industry of our province." I don't think anybody would really disagree with that. Economic development, extracting our resources, maximizing our return in the mining sector, in our fishery and our oil and gas industry are all pillars of what we all want to accomplish for our province.

The mining sector, as we know, traces back decades in regard to the activity in this province and what it has meant for our province in terms of returns on our natural resources, particularly in the mining sector, certainly Labrador. The Member himself in terms of his area, in terms of the activities taking place over there traditionally, historically and how we've seen a rebound in gold mines in that area and other activities as well. It is an exciting time for that area and we continue to support that and provide those supports to make sure they can grow and there's certain economic opportunity there.

I had an opportunity as minister of innovation, business and rural development to be involved in the mining industry in regard to the department and some of the initiatives in terms of supporting innovation.

One of the sections of the resolution talks about a "focus on, being competitive, with clear and efficient regulatory processes; advancing targeted public geoscience, marketing and education; promoting effective Indigenous and community engagement; and pursuing innovation and emerging technologies."

The previous research and development corporation, which was an entity that was created to work with the private sector to extract partnerships, funds; to look at applied research that could be used in various industries in the

province, particularly oil and gas, the mining sector so we can be innovative and find new ways and new effective and efficient ways of doing processes to extract more, to bring greater royalties back to the province, to look at regulatory frameworks and how we do it differently, and to be leaders, world-class leaders in certain industries like mining.

That also reaches out to the support industries in growing those small industries and support companies that can allow other growth to develop in terms of jobs and economic activity. Because it's not just about the mining industry, it's about the supports around it and how we develop those because that drives the economy as well and drives employment.

So the research and development corporation, which was abolished by the current administration in 2016, I think it was, we had a –

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

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** I think the minister said hear, hear, but I would disagree. I think it was a good entity.

I worked with the hon. Member in his area. I worked with some of the operators there, invested in new technology, a new way of doing business which allowed greater returns and pushed that innovative button that we need to make us leaders in industries and in new companies. So I think it's really important.

I'm not sure now what the leverage point is for those private companies that want to look at partnering with government, doing things like innovation, accessing emergency technologies, all of those areas that are so important; not only in the mining industry, but certainly in the oil and gas sector as well to improve how we're operating and, again, extracting maximum value. So that's important from that perspective.

The other one he talked about was a regulatory framework. When you look at investment – folks around the world, companies, various financiers and wanting to invest in various projects around the world, it's important they have a playing field. That while we take care of all the regulatory frameworks, whether it's environmental, in particular, that it's done in an

expeditious way that allows risk to be minimized; we have the framework in place where we protect our environment but, as well, that there's a process in place in regulatory frameworks that allow things to be done expeditiously in regard to getting investment done and getting projects up and running.

As I said, investors look at various jurisdictions and say, well, what's the environment like there? Is it open for business? Is it engaging? Recognizing there are regulatory frameworks that need to be in place. How quickly can we get through those? How can we flow that investment, and how can we start new industry and new companies to support that?

That's very important, and that's mentioned in the resolution as well: "Advancing targeted public geoscience." Which gives some good insight into what's happening in regard to particular areas of the province, various geotechnical data and what comes from that. That goes to the whole issue, too, of investment and investors seeing what actually could be available and what the potential is.

Much like we see in our offshore and a significant investment we've done in seismic work and dollars in that to promote that data so investors can see that and make informed decisions on investments and really, in many respects, encourages investment and makes sure that they know where they're investing. It makes us very receptive to investment from around the world.

Marketing and education about the industry itself and mining and what the opportunities are is extremely important as well. From a post-secondary point of view and from our youth and looking at careers and what the options are, I know many of the jobs in the mining industry are good paying jobs, certainly very technical in many cases, and really supports many of our communities and regions of the province.

So the marketing of the environment we have here, as I said, from a regulatory point of view, the framework we have from a geotechnical point of view and the information we have in geoscience, all of those adds into marketing the environment we have here, a place to do business, a place to invest.

As well, from an education point of view, I think of that from the perspective of all of our industries, as we look to future growth – and I'll speak to in a second some of the directives the current administration has taken in regard to a plan to get to 2030 to increase the production of the industry. I think when we need to promote that with our youth and recognize through our post-secondary and our colleges and the technical schools that there is a future here. If you're interested in this type of activity, there's a future here for you.

We should certainly align our labour force, or what it could be in the future, to the technical training and to the expertise that's required to meet that demand, if, in fact, some of those targets that are predicted by the current administration are met. Because any industry that's driven, you certainly need the labour force and the expertise to meet that industry. So that's something that we need to be aware of in terms of an education point of view for those in our society in terms of having that labour force available.

Promoting effective Indigenous and community engagement – any time there's a development in terms of who's in that particular area and who's involved in terms of land agreements or land rights or Indigenous groups and overall community engagement, whether it's municipalities, whether it's local leadership, whether it's the people living in those communities and the effect that a development has, it's really important that as mentioned here in the resolution that that's engaged and there's an engagement process.

And that's usually pretty standard today in reaching out and hearing from all those concerned and everybody has a right to have a say in regard to that development. Then issues that are identified in regard to changes or what might happen, we can plan for that in the long term. If there's risk, we can mitigate those risks. That's important that that engagement happens so it can be met.

It was recently announced by the current administration in regard to some projections, where their intent is to take the mining industry. Again, I don't think anybody would disagree with the last part of the resolution we're

discussing here today in plans for growth in the mining industry of our province. I think everybody would support that.

Some of the pillars or the guidance that has been given by the current administration or targets that they talked about, by 2030 the provincial government envisions five new mines; sustainable, direct employment. It talks about the number of people in operations and doubling our annual exploration expenditures to \$100 million. I guess that's fundamental in regard to encouraging development at some point and accessing a mineral that's been identified through our geotechnical work or geosciences that you can ensure that the exploration is done.

That's first and foremost where it needs to go. That the exploration is done, we get the identification of significant deposits or possibility of significant deposits and then the work is done to bring that fruition and look at activation of actual production and bringing it to market. That can often a long continuum, but it's an important continuum. We need to make sure that we have the know-how, the expertise and the regulatory framework, as I said before, to make sure that it's an inviting environment for investment because, without that, those investments aren't going to be had. We need to be a competitive market and one of many competitive markets around the world.

It's important in that sense. I wish government well in terms of hitting those targets but, again, we need to create that environment. It's fine to set the targets and a wish list, if you will, but you need to ensure that you create that environment and access for that to occur. We look forward to what happens over the next decade in regard to doing that.

Now, as I said before when I started, our history in regard to mining development in this province is long and has traditionally been throughout our province. It has created a lot of wealth in our province when you look at the past number of years, decades and decades. One of the things we're tied to – and I just mentioned the plan by the current administration in regard to meeting those targets. Geopolitical activities in the world, the commodity prices go up and down, we see a number of years ago the late 2010, 2011, around that time, markets were very high

for iron ore based on, as an example, steel production. We saw massive amounts of construction and development going on in places like China, Brazil, India, so those countries were driving the market in regard to certain commodities, and one of those being steel.

So we saw, at that time, the value go exceedingly high. Then there was a slowdown, certainly in the Chinese market in regard to that, the building that was going on, and it started to pull back in regard to that commodity market. So that was a direct result – and also we certainly saw it in Labrador, but now we see that's starting to bounce back, which is positive and we see things happening in other parts of the world that requires that commodity. So it's tied very stringently to what's happening in the market.

So again, that ties to us being very competitive. Because when the operations they get very marginal, the investors will look at, well, where's the best place to go, if it's marginal now in terms of development – when the commodity's very high and so high, it's not as important to investors to that point because they just want to get in, get the commodity, the market's very hot, but I think it's really important to have that environment when it's marginal.

And we're heading back up that way with Voisey's Bay, going underground now. I know the quality of iron ore in parts of Labrador is of top quality. I know the Chinese, now, in terms of looking at being more environmentally friendly, the use of certain commodities now, they're even looking at the quality and content of a certain commodity comparatively in jurisdiction to jurisdiction because the actual environmental waste, we'll say, or the effect on the environment, can be less based on the quality of that product.

Countries now and jurisdictions are even looking in that much detail in regard to the various similar, say, iron ore, various deposits around the world, what type of deposit is it, what's the quality of that deposit, and based on that they may indeed to investments or come to that particular region.

From our perspective, this resolution is indeed something that certainly I would support. You know, growing the industry, who wouldn't want to support it here in the industry? I'm happy to see the government has outlined somewhat of a plan in regard to what their projections are up to 2030 in the mining industry. We got huge potential. We'll have, in 2041, lots of electricity with Muskrat Falls; we'll have electricity in Labrador. One of the things from my time in government was new investment coming and where are they getting access to electricity.

So over the next number of years, we'll have that opportunity to service Labrador, new investment, and to be allowed to use that, again, to be an incentive to build that industry in Labrador, and all of those deposits, and not be tied to Quebec and what they had. Certainly there is a trough up there which both sides have in regard to mineral deposits, but we can highlight our deposits and support and have the investment to continue to grow the industry and, as the minister has mentioned before in regard to their policy for 2030, I do wish they reach those targets for the benefits of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Natural Resources.

**MS. COADY:** Thank you very much.

I'm very pleased to hear the hon. colleague's support for our plan when you consider that we've had over 100 stakeholders come together, and I'm glad to hear the Opposition talk very positively about the opportunities in the mining industry. And I want to thank the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay for bringing forward this private Member's resolution. It's an important one, I believe.

When you consider how long mining has happened in our province, what a history we have for mining and development in Newfoundland and Labrador. Think back to the Dorset Paleo-Eskimos mining soapstone – and I see the Speaker smiling and nodding – 1,600

years ago in the Baie Verte Peninsula. When you think of the work that the Innu and the Inuit had done in Labrador. When you think of the Vikings on the Great Northern Peninsula and they mined bog iron, Mr. Speaker. Then I'm going to call it more modern day, even though it wasn't modern day, but more modern day in 1864 in Tilt Cove.

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

**MS. COADY:** So here you have – I just made a whole lot of “hear, hears” in the House. I haven't touched on everybody yet; I'm trying to get to everybody in the House.

But mining does have that, what I want to call, really grand effect across all of Newfoundland and Labrador, and certainly with increased exploration, increased mining activity, doing so in an environmentally responsible way certainly will strengthen our economy, will provide jobs. A lot of them in rural communities, Mr. Speaker, and we're glad to see that.

That's what's envisioned in *The Way Forward*, a sustainable plan for growth and development in the mining industry. Our plan builds on a great 2017. In 2017 – and I'll reflect this for the House; I've said this publicly – we really had a record number of mineral exploration approvals and licences issued to prospectors and exploration companies. I believe the number is something around 20,000. It does mirror some of the geological work and the geological survey that is done by the province. It does kind of marry that work, because a lot of these approvals for prospectors are outlined in the same area where work has been done.

Most recently, we've had a conference here – one of the largest – it is the largest conference in Atlantic Canada for mining, and a lot of reports were produced that really do outline some of the opportunities. Especially, for example, on the Island portion of the province in gold and, then in Labrador, some more in different types of minerals, including iron ore, and including our rare-earth minerals, Mr. Speaker.

But building on a great year in 2017 – 2018 has brought us a whole lot of excitement in the mining industry; including Voisey's Bay Underground, the expansion of IOC, Wabush

Mines, Canada Fluorspar. It's contributing almost \$2 billion in economic activity.

I've said in this House before that the Department of Natural Resources, over the last 18 months, has moved forward on \$16.5 billion in economic activity, and \$2 billion of that comes from mining alone.

Now, I've said that we've had, over the last several months, on many, many occasions to discuss the Provincial Mineral Strategy. We've held workshops and discussion tables around the province; listening and collaborating with Mining Newfoundland and Labrador and the Prospectors Association of Newfoundland and Labrador. We really had a great steering committee that was comprised of many people from Mining Newfoundland and Labrador, and some other of their members, but who are independent of the board.

We've had discussions with stakeholders from Labour, from Education, from Indigenous governments and other industry stakeholders. We brought them all together to share some of the plans that we feel that we, as a government, and we, as an industry – the mining industry – can pull together and really grow the industry.

The future of the industry really depends on education, training, recruiting and retaining people, building technical and leadership skills, strengthening our Indigenous and community engagement, and female participation – we really want to encourage more women in the industry, as well, in technical careers. But we have to be really globally competitive in order to do so.

So, here's what we envision, Mr. Speaker. We envision, in this province, by 2030 – and we might even get there before then. These are stretched targets, but they can be accomplished. Five new mines in our province. When you look today, we have 11 producing mines. We want to increase that by five, so we'll have 16 producing mines.

Sustainable direct employment of more than 6,200 people – direct employment; that's not including the construction employment, direct employment. Currently we have 4,800, so we

really want to have thousands more working in the mining industry.

Doubling – and this is crucial – the annual exploration expenditures to \$100 million a year, or at least 5 per cent of the Canadian total. Think of it, Mr. Speaker, if we could double our exploration in the province, because exploration drives opportunity. You explore, you determine where your mines can be made and held, and therefore we really want to double that exploration activity and working with our annual geological survey to find opportunities in the province.

We want to rise to \$4 billion in annual mineral shipments, or at least 10 per cent of the Canadian total. Currently, Mr. Speaker, we're at \$3 billion. We want to go to \$4 billion. We think it's attainable.

A workforce that's more diverse, including a minimum of 30 per cent women – a minimum of 30 per cent women. That's double where we are today. So, we have a plan to go out there and encourage more female participation in a non-traditional role, but we know there are a lot of great female miners.

I reflect upon most recently hearing, during the conference, Heather Bruce-Veitch who has been 30 years with IOC. She's one of those great female miners that I'm talking about and her contributions to that industry, and how IOC is growing the number of women participants in their mine.

We want to ensure the province is consistently ranked as a top three Canadian jurisdiction in permitting times. We think this is important. By ensuring that we are moving through processes quickly, speaks to that regulatory environment that others have spoken to here today. We want to ensure the province is consistently ranked overall as one of the top three Canadian jurisdictions by industry. We think that would really drive opportunity in the mining industry in this province.

To be successful in our plan – and I think, Mr. Speaker, at the end, I will table a copy of the plan so it can be held by the House for anyone who'd like to have a copy of it. *The Way Forward on Mineral Development*, called

*Mining the Future 2030*, was recently released and the plan speaks to four different focus areas to ensure we can mine in the future: being competitive, with clear and efficient regulatory processes; advancing targeted public geoscience, marketing and education – including global marketing, by the way, Mr. Speaker, getting our message out of what a great mining jurisdiction Newfoundland and Labrador is. We do a lot of that now. We think we should be doing more to encourage that foreign investment.

The Premier spoke a little earlier today about meeting a great company in China that is already contributing to our mining growth in the province, but there are many, many more that we could target.

And promoting effective Indigenous and community engagement. We think that's very important in order to do that. And pursuing innovation and emerging technologies. These four broad categories have a lot of tactics under them for ensuring that we can prosper and grow our mining industry.

We've also begun collaboration with other federal, provincial and territorial jurisdictions on the development of a framework for a Canadian minerals and metals plan that focuses unlocking Canada's resource potential. So Newfoundland and Labrador has our plan, but we're also working with the Government of Canada and other jurisdictions across the country so that we all continue to grow Canada's opportunity.

We have the opportunity to increase exploration in geoscience, as well as exploration expenditures, mineral shipments, revenues and jobs, and our goal is to be consistently ranked, as I said, as a leading Canadian jurisdiction. *Mining the Future 2030* is about investment, it's about jobs, especially in rural areas.

Now let me kind of give you a quick update, in the time I have remaining, of what things are already happening, and how exciting a time it is. Anaconda Mining is continuing to work towards the development of its Argyle deposit. That's in Baie Verte - Green Bay, and they're undergoing an environmental assessment and planning to begin additional mining in 2019.

Rambler Metals – again, in the Baie Verte - Green Bay district. Rambler Metals is planning to expand its tailing management facility at the Nugget Pond site in 2019. And in St. George's - Humber, Red Moon Resources is starting mining its Ace gypsum deposit, and the first load of shipment was in September of 2018.

In Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans, we know that Marathon Gold Corporation is 100 per cent owner of the 240-square-kilometre Valentine Lake property in Central Newfoundland. Marathon has released its updated preliminary economic assessment on October 30 of this year to incorporate its aggressive drill results and updated resource estimates of the Valentine Lake Gold Camp. So that's very promising.

In Burin - Grand Bank, Canada Fluorspar, which is located in St. Lawrence, consists of an open pit transitioning to an underground mine. In 2018, CFI is expected to generate 141 person years of employment, and they've just recently done their first shipment. In August of this year, 4,700 tons of fluorspar mined at St. Lawrence is heading to the United States.

In Labrador West, we've got Tata Steel Minerals Canada, resumed construction of their \$700 million wet processing plant that has been put on hold since 2017 due to low commodity prices. Commissioning the plant is scheduled, hopefully, later this month.

In Cartwright - L'Anse au Clair, we have Search Minerals. That's three rare earth elements camps in Labrador, and they are progressing through their environmental assessment process. We're hoping for mines in those areas. They have filed a Foxtrot rare earth element mine for provincial and federal environmental assessment, which is positive news there.

Again, going back to Lab West; in September, Alderon announced the results of its updated feasibility study on the Rose deposit, the Kami iron ore project in Western Labrador. In June, we announced that Voisey's Bay underground mine was proceeding with construction, and that's in Torngat Mountains. Vale underground mine will extend the operating life of Voisey's Bay at least 15 years.



Placentia West - Bellevue – a new name on that district. Placentia West – Bellevue, we see the continuity of the operations in the Long Harbour processing plant. Of course, Vale officially marked the start of transition to the underground mining with first blasts of the Reid Brook portal rock face was very positive, of course, for Placentia West - Bellevue.

In September, I was back in Lab West again. I've visited all these sites, Mr. Speaker. I travelled to Labrador West as the Iron Ore Company of Canada officially opened Moss Pit, a new open pit that will extend the life of the current mine, maintain production of high-quality iron ore concentrate and pellets, and secure employment. Again, that's in Labrador West.

So a lot of activity all over the province but a lot concentrated in Labrador, as my hon. colleague just mentioned.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Beaver Brook Mine.

**MS. COADY:** And, of course, Beaver Brook Mine is also there looking to re-engage.

Mr. Speaker, the mining industry continues to evolve and really develop in the province. I love the old proverb that reads: What is coming is better than what is gone. What is coming is better than what is gone, and I truly believe that for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are blessed with an abundance of natural resources, and intertwined with this is our entrepreneurial spirit, our culture of hard work, our perseverance and our strength of character. It is the expertise, determination and creativity of the people of this province that will ensure the province's prosperity.

I'm very, very happy to table *Mining the Future 2030*, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad we have the support of many in this House today to move forward on continuing to grow the mining industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

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

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

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

It's indeed an honour to stand, as we traditionally do on Wednesday afternoons, to speak to a private Member's resolution. It's an honour to speak to this one for a number of reasons.

As I do traditionally, I will start with a statement that I'll also end with, that I wholeheartedly support the private Member's resolution being put forward because I see the value and the acknowledgement of the great work being done in our mining industry by the individuals who are in there, by the investment corporations that are taking a chance in Newfoundland and Labrador, but by the communities who are fostering the ability for our industry to thrive and to be the best in the world.

That's a testament also to our educational institutions here for being able to develop the proper mechanism and the core studies to not only make our employees and our individuals capable of being able to provide the services needed in the industry in Newfoundland and Labrador – which I might add, is very diverse. When you talk about – and my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, had outlined and the Speaker, or the Acting Speaker now, who spoke earlier, talked about the different types of mining industries we have in Newfoundland and Labrador, how diverse it is. So it becomes a very unique approach to offering the skill set, but our education institutions have worked with industry and we've come a long way to be able to do that.

Before I get into acknowledging how we're moving forward, to really move where you need to go you need to look at the past. I've been fortunate enough I guess, I grew up in a mining community. My great-grandfather, my grandfather and my father were all miners and, fortunate enough, mined in various parts. They mined in St. Lawrence, they mined in Buchans, they mined in Labrador City, they mined on Bell Island, obviously, and got an understanding of what it means for communities, and what it means for the community itself to embrace people coming from other backgrounds, from other communities, from other countries.

I saw that growing up in my own community of Bell Island, what that meant. Sometimes you

live in a community and you think you're isolated and things are different. They may be different in the approach and that, but the dynamics are similar.

I spent time in Labrador West in my career in the '80s, and got a real understanding that – with the exception that things had been a little bit more modernized because it was a new company opening and starting at a different level, the same traditional nuances existed in that community as they did, that I saw growing up and had heard the stories from my father and grandfather about what was traditionally a mining community and how, unfortunately, years ago there was segregation from labour to skill. But as technology moved and things advanced, everybody in the mining industry honed their skills and had a very valuable importance to the development.

The top engineers were of no more value than the person who were doing the labour work in identifying where the first pit was going to be dug, as part of that, and doing the actual labour work – and for those who were the blasters and the drillers and all the different techniques that are needed, but the skill sets that are very important to that.

In my travels, particularly in the '80s, as a civil servant, I got to visit a lot of what was still existing, at the time; but got to visit a lot of the older sites that had been closed from the '30s and '40s and '50s, and even the '60s and '70s, and got a real understanding of these communities and what it meant. But got a real understanding of what it meant from a financial point of view, and from access to other types of services.

These communities not only would be the financial stability for its citizens, but they were also the other parts of the necessities in life: the social recreation, the companies work with the communities to be able to provide the services there. The health care – the proper delivery of health care to ensure that the employees were healthy and safe. By having that, it opened up that all the citizens had access to it.

So all these communities evolved and evolved into a point where the services for citizens, particularly those who went from the traditional

fishing outport type of communities or fishing-related communities, that they could diversify to a certain degree. And while there have been sporadic times where the fishing industry has been very lucrative, but for the mainstay it's been a fairly – especially going back 30, 40, 50, 60 years ago, it was even keel; you didn't gain a lot unless you owned your own vessel. So it was sustainable based on that principle.

In the mining industry, at times, it was very lucrative. Most communities, one of the highest paying incomes was in the mining industry, and a very good opportunity that you could make additional monies by either the skill set that you had or how much you wanted to put into the amount of time working, in overtime or the energy levels that you wanted to use.

Now, don't get me wrong, I heard the stories and I realize how our forefathers forged the mines that we now talk about or opening up the doors for the more lucrative ones we have here that are more mechanized, how labour intensive it was and some of the sacrifices that people had to make. People would be away from home or they'd be in the mining camps, because access through roads and even through vessels and these types of things wasn't as open as it is now. Our network is much more fluent. The access to information and being able to fly in and fly out and drive in and drive out, obviously your infrastructure was more conducive to the mining industry being attractive.

That's why we have so many people now making a living from it. We have now an established international market where Newfoundland and Labrador is not only seen because we have the raw materials, that's very important and that's the draw, but they're also seeing that they have the expertise.

I only recently ran into an old colleague of mine who since retired from another career and is working in a mine in Yellowknife, and just decided to go up there – not on a whim but because he went to a recruiting agency. When he said he was from Newfoundland and Labrador and came from a mining community, they automatically gave him a note – he had no direct skill set in the mining industry, but coming from a mining community in Newfoundland and Labrador, they identified that you understood

what it took from a commitment point of view, what it took from a skill set, and you could understand the ability to be trained because you've either seen your father, your friends, your uncles, your grandfathers, your mothers, your sisters, your aunts, whoever, somebody who has worked in that industry, having a particular skill set.

And one thing I found about mining communities, they talk a lot about what they do. They have no qualms when they're sitting around in their social thing, they'll talk about the skill set. And if you're a young person like I was growing up, you listened to what a blaster did, and a driller did, and a mucker did, and a track layer did, and all the things that were part and parcel of what that was.

So now as we moved in the 21st century, we talk about better uses of technology, and I think it's an easier transition for young people because they're so apt to understand how technology works, how you use a joystick now, how a computer can also analyze the grade of the pit, or the opening or the structure of rock, or the geological makeup. So, we've come a long way, and by educating our young people we have a great, bright opportunity here to have them engaged into it.

It's not what it was before that you needed the strongest, the youngest because it was labour intensive. There's still a labour component that's very important, but it's about your own skill set, and the skill set is based on – the only limitation is what somebody wants to put into it. Because our training facilities do a great job in screening and proposing and outlining exactly the types of careers. There's always a career there that can fit any individual, no matter what their pre-disposition for the kind of work they want to do, or their intellectual understanding, or their desire to do certain things. So we have a great opportunity to do it.

When I looked at some of the data here, like that there are 4,800 people employed, I think we're doing a disservice to ourselves. We know that's a direct number, but we know the tens of thousands. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, you know in your own district, you know what happens in Baie Verte, you know what happens in those areas about the spin-off positions, the jobs in gas

stations, in the restaurants, in the hotels, in the trucking industry, in the provided support services, in the construction industry. These are all very important parts of continuing the value of our mining industry.

We've come a long way in the last two decades, particularly, in ensuring, when a mine is developed and we look at that we're going to develop the mineral resources that we have, that we maximize the benefits for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I give credit to all administrations – the previous one, the previous one before that, the present one – of ensuring that the royalty regimes and the benefits are particularly weighed towards the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And we know we're in business. The opportunity here is to open our mining industry to attract those who have hundreds of millions, or billions of dollars to invest here.

But, at the same time, for them to understand that we're open for business, as long as it also benefits the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. At the end of the day, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are better off without doing any serious damage to the ecology of Newfoundland and Labrador, and to the footprint we have here. That's been a mainstay for the last number of years.

Mr. Speaker, 50, 60, 75 years ago, that was not a priority; the priority was to ensure that people have sustainable employment. And we understood why that was part of it. People had to come from harsh times, poverty was rampant, health issues were already a challenge, that you wanted to improve that, so you're willing to sacrifice certain things. We're not at that point anymore; we don't need to do that. We're more aware of things, we're more established, we have a reputation that we're going to stand up for what's right and we have a reputation to be able to negotiate, in good faith, so everybody gains at the end of the day.

So, as part of this process, what we're putting forward here, and what I like about the resolution put forward by the Baie Verte - Green Bay MHA – very important piece of legislation put forward by a genuine Member of this House of Assembly, who understands the values of a

mining industry. So when we talk about where we're going with this, we're talking about taking what we've already established and what we've learned, building on what exists presently and noting that there are other great potential opportunities here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

They don't have to be massive – Labrador cities, or the Incos, and these types of things. Mining can be as simple as 15 or 20 people working to acknowledge and develop a resource, to 1,500 people doing the same thing. It depends on the value of that particular resource, the access to it, the impact it's going to have and the value to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to do that piece of exploration and to do that development.

So when we talk about the mining industry – and we all talk about it, and we banter back and forth about diversification as part of our process, and we know we can't live only by oil revenues and we know we can't only live by the fishing industry and we know we can't only live by the forest industry; but, again, we have another industry. And when you start looking at it and you start naming off those, diversification happens just by nature, because we're a resource-based, resource rich community. We need to keep developing those, though.

We need to be able to keep developing so that we gain three things from it. One, our exploration is done in a very equitable way, it's done in a very environmentally friendly way, but it's also done in a timely fashion so that we don't lose opportunities to other jurisdictions that we could have here. Because we're working on the global market now. People know who we are, they know what's available. They know if we're not able to work with them to develop a partnership, they'll move somewhere else. So we have that as one of the key things.

The second we have is that we already have an established workforce, a very capable one, a very professionally trained one. So we need to keep utilizing that skill set, and don't let it get outdated from an aging population.

As our older workers start to move on and pass their skill set on, let's ensure we modernize the next generation coming up, and we can do that by developing partnerships. We develop them in

our high school levels. We develop them in our post-secondary levels. We develop them with our municipalities who have a real stake in what happens. And we develop them with developing the partnerships with industry, and it's very easy to do when we control the bulk of what's happening. We have the raw materials; we're in the driver's seat.

As we move forward to doing – perhaps one of the most important things to really guarantee diversification is secondary processing. We need to be able to maximize, not just the raw materials leaving our province, but the value in long-term sustainability, in using our skill set, using the technologies we develop, using the raw materials to be able to negotiate that secondary processing and continuous sustainability in our communities. It guarantees continuity and it gives us the maximum return on the asset, and the asset here is our mineral resources.

So we've worked at that. We've looked at it for hundreds of years in the fishing industry. We've looked at it in the forest industry, and sometimes we've been successful. Sometimes there have been challenges. Because you're competing on a global market and the world changes, and it needs change.

We've been looking at it – when you look at it from other industries, the aerospace industry. You got to be able to keep ahead of it. You got to be able to keep drawing on it. But I think our best opportunity is in our mineral industry here, because at the end of the day, we have a key opportunity because we have natural resources. And they're so vast, but they're so diverse that we can draw – we don't have to be beholden to one entity when we negotiate because it's open to different types of companies from all parts of the world who have all kinds of resources to invest, that we can be at the table and control the outcome at the end of the day.

So as my time winds down, Mr. Speaker, I just want to note we have great people doing great things in our mining industry here, and we have a great opportunity to ensure the next generation even has a better opportunity to be part of this great industry.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. SPEAKER (Warr):** Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

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

I want to thank the Member opposite for his comments, the most recent ones, because I tend to agree, a significant amount of focus we put on our natural resources is so very important to us.

Mr. Speaker, it would remiss on my part if I didn't speak today on this private Member's resolution, because in Central Newfoundland the mining industry over the years has been very, very important, particularly in the Buchans, Badger, Grand Falls-Windsor, Millertown area.

Mr. Speaker, as I try to make some of my remarks – I don't know what's happening here, Mr. Speaker, but the wrong light is on. It's the wrong light. I can move down there if you like but –

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

We're recognizing the hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

**MR. HAWKINS:** Here we go. Now I have the light.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**MR. HAWKINS:** I finally see the light.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the mining industry has been significant in the Central region of the province. As I sort of want to talk a little bit about – probably a little bit of a different angle in that realizing a lot of times communities really work and function based upon how well the mining industry is doing, when in fact a community is based, the resources – and the community is really impacted by just how well the mining industry is going.

Mr. Speaker, that's not untrue for any of the natural resources. I just go back a few years; I go back to 2009. We all know what happened in 2009 in my community with the pulp and paper

industry, a natural resource industry. We know that, really overnight in a sense, 700-plus people within the Central area had lost their jobs. That was a significant impact on my community and the surrounding communities. Of course, my colleague from Exploits as well is full aware of the impact it had.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 2014-2015, as the resources with Duck Pond – as you take resources out of the ground you know that ore doesn't produce baby ore. Once it's out, it's out. You know that's it; it's done. It's gone. So you have to prepare for these situations. Mr. Speaker, then in 2015, with the closure of Duck Pond, another 365 people had lost their jobs.

I speak about that because it's really – I wanted to reference that because it's important for us not to lose sight of the fact of how important natural resources are. How important this industry, the mining industry, the forestry industry, how important it is to all of our communities. Of course, our hon. Member opposite on Bell Island is full aware as well of the devastating consequences that can happen when you depend upon one industry.

Mr. Speaker, we believe, or I believe – I work and live in a world of optimism. I'm always the eternal optimist. When I look at something that can be negative, I want to see what the positive pieces can be.

Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled when the Minister of Natural Resources and the Premier, when we talked about Mining 2030 and the vision that we have going forward. It really does put a bounce in your step. It really is encouraging, because we know that in fact there's a lot of prospecting going on. Because a lot of times, Mr. Speaker, we tend to focus on the actual production, but before a mine can actually get to the production stage there's a lot of prospecting that goes on.

These are individuals that are looking at opportunities. A lot of prospecting we know does not always add to a natural mining operation, but a lot of these mining operations would never happen without prospecting. Today, the tools that we have, the geoscience, the tools we have to better improve our prospecting opportunities we know are paying dividends. With the information that we have, that it's

certainly looking very positive for Newfoundland and Labrador and, Mr. Speaker, very positive for your area, for your district, as well as for my district, and we know that there are companies that are actively engaged in looking at moving now into the production stage.

I want to reference, for a minute, because Buchans and Millertown, of course, are located in my district. For many, many, many years the people of Buchans and people of Millertown – Millertown in the logging industry and Buchans, of course, was a community, really, built around the mining industry. We know what happens when operations close down. Sometimes it takes a long time to rebound from that. I just need to applaud my residents in Buchans who have stuck with it, who have stayed in the community, who have made the community work. The longer that we're able to sustain and live within these communities, the greater our opportunities to see improvements.

Over the last few years – it's not a big operation, but certainly I just wanted to make mention of the Barite Mud Services that have been operational in Buchans for the last several years. When the Buchans mine closed in 1984, there was roughly about 4 million tons of tailings that were left over. So Barite Mud looked at this as an opportunity to utilize these tailings, which in fact is helping the environment as well, and also they utilized some of the older infrastructure that was there.

So they've been employing 35 people within Buchans over the last couple of years. I know that they've been facing some challenges lately and, hopefully, that operation will be back next year in full operation again. And 35 jobs for a small community is significant – significant for Buchans. I know that we have been working with this particular company as well, over the years, to ensure that we're able to work with them to provide employment, because employment is very, very important, important in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, when I visit my district, when I go back into my district, I get a sense of the excitement that's there because I think we have turned a corner and there are tremendous opportunities from prospecting and from looking

at the resources that are available that's in the ground. I'm encouraged by that, and I know that there's a fair amount of excitement on Marathon Gold, there are opportunities there and, hopefully, that will be operational fairly quickly. These are business people who are making investments because they feel that the return on investment is going to be beneficial to them as a company.

Mr. Speaker, I was so excited when we made reference to the fact that, in *Mining the Future 2030*, we are going to be looking at improving the number of women that are involved in the mining industry.

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

**MR. HAWKINS:** It's really encouraging. Our numbers are not all that great; I think it's 21 per cent in Labrador City in iron ore, that women are involved, but we really want to get to 30 per cent. I'd like to get to 50 per cent because I think it's very important for us to provide these opportunities, and the more women that we have working in these industries, I think the better it is for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I guess one of the exciting things that I see coming out of *Mining the Future 2030* is the fact that I don't think it's an unrealistic goal. We are targeting five new mines by 2030. Now, that's about 12 years out, but I think it's realistic because I know from the time of prospecting and getting the proper investments that are necessary, it usually takes several years before you get to production. But I'm very excited about this, Mr. Speaker. I'm very optimistic that we will in fact be able to get to five new mines that will be operational by 2030.

That will bring a degree of excitement, it will bring a degree of confidence, because I know that people are excited about the opportunities that exist. One of the areas, we have to make sure that our colleges that are providing the necessary training for young people so that we are prepared. I know when we look at the numbers for Vale, very exciting, Mr. Speaker, that they're going underground and all the opportunities that that will provide.

Mr. Speaker, I know at some of the colleges we have state-of-the-art technology simulation.

When I was down to Labrador City and the CNA, I had the opportunity as minister to go in and look first-hand at the technology we have and the simulation. I was really, almost like a child on Christmas morning, because they gave me an opportunity to go and drive these large trucks down into the mine. The instructor said: Now, make sure that you don't go over the side. And, of course, I was very, very cautious, and then you bring in all kinds of conditions.

It's absolutely phenomenal the tools and the technology that we have, so that our young people – and not only young people, our older people that are interested in re-training – have these necessary tools so that they can provide the service for us. These are areas, Mr. Speaker, that I know that we have concentrated on over the last number of years, to improve and make sure that we do have the necessary tools in place so we do have a workforce that produces the way that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have produced for many, many years.

We're proud of that, Mr. Speaker. I know that as we continue to look at investments in this province, I am encouraged by the amount of excitement that surround our oil and gas. I'm excited about the number of investors that are interested in the oil and gas industry. I'm excited about the geoscience. I'm excited about all of the offshore – and we're looking at opportunities to expanding our offshore, going beyond areas that we have never been before, or any other places in this world, really.

These are exciting times because it does, indeed, build confidence that in Newfoundland and Labrador we do have a bright future for our young people, and these are in natural resources. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Natural Resources have been doing a tremendous amount of work over the last three years. I really applaud her for all the work that she's done, because it's been very, very important that we focus – we have to be focused on how we want to move our industries into the future. I think it's really important for all of us to really look at that, and to put the necessary energy – no pun intended – to ensure that we do have very capable opportunities for our future.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is running out. I just can't believe that time has gone so quickly.

But I do want to say that I think that we are positioning ourselves, as a province, to be a leader in Canada. Because when we look at our mining industry, we look at the natural resources that we have, we are, indeed, leaders in this country. I'm encouraged by the forecasting that we have done for mining in 2030 – the forecasting that we've done to lead the country. That's an objective. Again, it is achievable because I firmly believe that the information that we have and the research that we've done will back up that we are indeed going to be leading this country when it comes to our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, again, thank you to the Member for bringing the private Member's resolution and I'm certainly pleased to support and to vote in favour of that today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

I, too, am pleased to stand today and speak to this private Member's motion which is before us. I'm glad to speak to it for many reasons. It gives an opportunity to speak to the policy that government is involved in right now in terms of growth and development in the mining industry in our province. I think it is important for us to look at the various industries that exist in the province, especially those industries in our natural resources because they are key to our economy. There's no doubt about that. And it's important for us to look at them and look at the development of those resources from a broad perspective.

So, the private Member's motion this afternoon, which is merely saying let's support government's policy, while it's only doing that, it is giving us an opportunity to look at various issues that are involved. While I will support the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I do have points that I want to make that some may say are negative but they're not; they're cautionary points.

I was really pleased to see that the Member for Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans didn't mind speaking to the realities that have been part of our history here in this province. We have had a long history with the mining industry, but it is a history that is filled with cautionary tales.

Some may look at me and say: What does she know about mining? She was born and raised in St. John's. But, in actual fact, for two years I lived and worked in a mining community. The Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay knows what I'm talking about. I lived and worked in Baie Verte for two years.

Just on a personal note, it was interesting when I went to teach there, my father was quite upset because he said: Lorraine, there's nothing there. He was remembering when he was a teenager and went up on the boat with my grandfather to Fleur de Lys where my grandfather had the store in Fleur de Lys. All my father could remember was from the 1920s going into Baie Verte in a boat. I had to assure him that I was now in a town that had – it was quite an active, little town. So my mother had to say: Look, we're going to drive to Baie Verte so you know she's fine. And that was 1967, I don't mind saying.

So I lived and worked in that mining community in its early stages, actually. I know both the benefits that can come to a community and to an area and also, in terms of cautionary tales, what can also happen that's not so good. We do know what happened in Baie Verte with the asbestos and with the effect on the lives of not just workers, but also of family members. And that's a reality. We can't run away from that reality.

As well, as a person who was born and raised in St. John's, I had relatives on Bell Island. Going to Bell Island was just a normal part of my life and every summer, as I got older, I would spend time over on Bell Island with my cousins and I knew what that mining community was like in those years when I was a teenager: vibrant, alive; about 15,000 people. But then in the 1980s, I was working with people on Bell Island who were trying to figure out how they could keep the community alive. So I do have an experience of two of our major mining communities in this province.

We all know that one of the realities of mining is the boom and bust reality. And not just boom and bust reality in terms of long term – in 1960, fully alive and doing very, very well and in this year, 2018, no mine in the community – but also on the ongoing annual life of a mine, you also have the boom and bust from the perspective of the vagaries of the industry, because the industry is dependent upon what's happening with regard to global market prices, and that's the reality.

So in saying we're going to move forward and develop and make sure that our mining industry becomes more robust, we also have to remember how we do that and how we do it in a way that's good for the communities where the mines are, or the closest communities to a mine, if the mine is not right in a community, such as Voisey's Bay. So that it's good for the communities, that the mine is good for the workers, and that the mine is good for the province. All of that has to be considered.

Right now today in the House, the Premier stood and spoke about being in China, and talked about the China trade trip that took place, which was fine and dandy. I'm glad to know that. One of the things that were mentioned was the whole thing of mines in China and mining companies in China.

One of the realities that has happened for us here in the province over the last while, last decade – more than a decade, a couple of decades – is that we are getting now in the province multinational corporations that aren't based in Canada as the owners of our mines. That can bring with it problems because you have companies who are coming from a country that may not have the same policies, regulations and even values that we have with regard to the environment and with regard to labour, labour rights, with regard to occupational health and safety, et cetera. That's a reality.

So if we are going to be moving in that direction of getting more companies come in from places where their values are not the same, then we have to make sure that as a province we put in place – in agreements with those companies – an assurance that they will understand what we value for our environment, that they understand what we value for our communities and what we value for the workers who go into those mines.



Not only the occupational health and safety but diversity in the workplace that's been talked about here today, diversity with regard to gender, and diversity with regard to our Aboriginal peoples because most of the mining ventures, the biggest ones, are taking place in Labrador. So we have to be concerned about the issue of diversity from the perspective of Indigenous peoples. So there are many issues that we have to be concerned about as new companies are coming in.

I think things are going pretty well now in Labrador with regard to Vale, but when Vale first came in there were issues that had to be dealt with. The long strike in 2010 and the commission that was set up under Commissioner Roil was basically dealing with issues that that international, multinational company didn't understand. They didn't get it.

As a matter of fact, Commissioner Roil actually says in his report from 2010 that we have to be aware of making sure that multinational companies that come from places that do not have the same values we are, understand they have to operate out of our values. That has to happen. I think more and more that is happening, and I don't think the reality today of 2018 is the same reality for mining as it was, for example, when I was in Baie Verte in '68.

I think it's different and our values are different. Companies now and the governments are more aware of what has to be done to take care of people. Mentioning mining companies or communities, I also lived and taught in St. Lawrence – now that I think about it. It's a very interesting history that I have because of having taught in the province.

There's something that does exist in our country which I think is extremely important, and that companies coming in need to become aware of – I understand Vale is part of this venture that I'm going to talk about. We have a mining association, of course, in Canada. In 2004, the Mining Association of Canada, which is called MAC, established what's called *Towards Sustainable Mining*, the initials are TSM, the TSM initiative.

Now, it's a really important initiative because it does talk about what is needed for sustainable

mining. I have here the sort of framework that is part of this TSM initiative, which is part of the Mining Association of Canada. It's a commitment to responsible mining. It is a set of tools and indicators to drive performance and ensure that key mining risks are managed responsibly at the facilities of the various mining companies who are members of the association.

Adhering to the principles of TSM, members of the Mining Association of Canada demonstrate leadership by: "Engaging with communities." Extremely important. "Driving world-leading environmental practices." And third, "Committing to the safety and health of employees and surrounding communities."

These are really high level goals for them to have and for them to sign their name to and say we want to adhere to this and we are going to use the tools and practices that are part of the TSM venture. The issue – I guess if we wanted to say it's an issue, and I think I do want to say it is – is that this initiative is a voluntary initiative. The protocols and tools for the companies are excellent, and I know people who have analyzed them and do find them excellent. They make sure that the activities of a mining company are carried out in a socially, economically and environmentally responsible way; however, it's voluntary.

You know, I'm thinking – and again, this is not something we can only do here in one province. I think it's something that has to be looked at by our country on the federal level. I think we need to say to a company that's coming in to get our resources, to use our resources and in many cases to take those resources out – not even do secondary processing here in our own province – I think the time should come, and I mean it should have already happened, when it said the Mining Association of Canada, that the initiative that they have is not voluntary. That if you're going to be a member of the Mining Association of Canada, the minimum you have to do is follow the TSM initiative in order to come and use our resources and to interact with our communities.

So I think I would like to see our province become very proactive in its discussions on a federal level with regard to what we need in our country and in our province to make sure that we

don't ever again have the kinds of things happen that have happened, both with regard to the occupational health and safety of workers and also with regard to communities. I mean, it's not perfect right now, even when you have a company like Vale. I'm simply naming them because they are members of MAC and they do follow the TSM initiative.

You know, even now, I still talk to people from Happy Valley-Goose Bay, for example, who were members of the council at the time, some probably still are – one of them, anyway – who talk about the burden that was on them when Muskrat Falls started, a heavy burden on them. And Muskrat Falls is not mining, but it's a good example of trying to come up with the infrastructure and deal with the heavy burden on their communities.

Now, we do know that under our environmental assessment you do get benefits agreements going on. You had it with Muskrat Falls, too, but with Voisey's Bay, for example, benefits agreements that were put in place and I'm happy to say that some of the goals of those benefits agreements, such as Indigenous employment and employment of women, have been met.

I think it's important as we move forward that we make sure that what's first in our mind is the good of the people. What's first in our mind is the good of the communities. What's secondary is the company itself, but making sure, yes, they have to come, they have to make money, we know that, but they can't do it at the cost of the lives of our communities or of our people.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

It's certainly an honour to rise in this hon. House today and support the mining initiative in *The Way Forward* plan. First of all, I'd like to thank the Minister of Natural Resources and the former parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources for the hard work they put in in creating the plan forward with new mining initiatives.

A couple of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to attend part of the Canadian Institute of Mining conference. It was overwhelming to see the amount of interest and the attendance that was there with some 750-plus participants. As the plan was unveiled, what struck me was the four pillars or the process of guiding principles. And they were: the competitiveness and efficient regulatory processes; the public geoscience, marketing and education; Indigenous and community engagement; and pursuing innovation and emerging technologies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues have probably covered off most of these guiding principles. So I'm going to talk a little bit about the Indigenous component and community engagement, and how important mining is to this province and how important mining was to the district that I represent.

It was just over 24 years ago now that two gentlemen by the name of Al Chislett and Chris Verbiski flew over a little hill just North of Voisey's Bay and, as we say, the rest is history. I guess to go back a little further to 1973, 1975, the Labrador Inuit Association had registered its land claims agreement, and in our experiences it takes a major development in any region to fast track a land claims agreement. The Voisey's Bay Project was our fast-track project. It was because of the discovery at Voisey's Bay that the Labrador Inuit Association, which is now the Nunatsiavut Government, had to build a fast-track Land Claims Agreement. And, along with that agreement, was an Impacts and Benefits Agreement with the Voisey's Bay Project. We just used the present name of Vale because it did change hands several times.

I actually had some experience working there. I did work at the project for three years; I guess we can call it back in the old days now. I can remember that I was hired on as an environmental monitor, and that was you monitor, on behalf of the Labrador Inuit Association, all the baseline activity during the environmental assessment process.

Mr. Speaker, there were some weeks I logged 50 hours of helicopter time, and exceeded most pilots, if not all, on site. I travelled 21 kilometres every day in January and February by

snowmobile to go to work, and I travelled 21 kilometres every evening to go back to Nain. So it was a bit of a challenge at times.

During the summer months, I think I slept in the core shack with a shotgun and a flashlight and a radio because, as an environmental monitor, you're sometimes put on black bear duty, which was a big problem in that area. I should say that I had to put down one black bear out of the three years I was there, which is not bad, but it was a concern.

The other thing that I wasn't ready for was the amount of exploration activity that came behind the Voisey's Bay discovery. I can remember trying to keep tabs on some 35 exploration camps. In the community of Nain, at one point, in one day, we have 184 aircraft take-offs and landings. That's counting twin otters, sea planes and helicopters. So it was a busy time. We've come a long way in terms of following an Impacts and Benefits Agreement, and creating the employment for people that live in my district.

I'd just like to mention names like Maria Lyle from Nain and Fred Rich from Rigolet who have been there for over 20 years. They were there during the exploration phase of this, and they're still there, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to talk about people like Peter Lyle or Cyril Lane, who started in as heavy equipment operators and are now site managers. They're actually the pit managers at the project.

I'd like to talk a little bit about people like Dean Decker and Paul Mitchell from Makkovik and Nain that went in on a training program on site and are now working in respective fields with five years' experience. Paul, I might mention, went in as a mill operator and is now advanced to electrical technician programming.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the Labrador Aboriginal Training Partnership, which is funded through the province and through the federal government, that has paved the way for many, many of our young people to get the education and get the hands-on experience on site and are continuing to move forward. As a matter of fact, they're doing consultations now on an underground strategy where they can get some training.

Mr. Speaker, at the conference, there was a young girl from Makkovik, Nina Ford, who has just started work at Voisey's Bay and has become an inspiration for many Indigenous women. She's working as a heavy equipment operator at Voisey's Bay. I'd like to talk about people like Leigh Levens, who works in the environmental department, who's got a lot of experience. We got young women like Allison Winters, who's aspiring to become an underground operator.

So, Mr. Speaker, the initiatives are out there and I'm certainly going to support this private Member's resolution. I actually urge all Members to support this PMR. You know, the mining industry is subject to a lot of ups and downs. It's a volatile market. We've seen the good times and we've seen the bad. We've seen it Labrador West, we've seen it Voisey's Bay and we've seen it all around this province. Mr. Speaker, I think the launching of *The Way Forward* plan with respect to mining is one that will find some balance in the volatility as we go forward, and certainly I am in support of this.

We look at new mines that are coming, as the minister mentioned, new openings in Labrador West and in Southern Labrador and Port aux Basques. The future is bright in terms of mining. It's our job to try and gauge the ups and downs and move forward through the volatility.

Thank you.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

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

I think I would be remiss if I didn't get up today and speak for a few minutes on this private Member's resolution. It's one that certainly I help put together as the parliamentary secretary in Natural Resources and I was very much a part of the announcement on *The Way Forward*. I was very pleased to be there that day with the minister and the Premier to announce our *Way Forward* in the mining sector.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to say it again, how important mining is to communities. When you

have communities that are built around mining, it's certainly the backbone of any community. Labrador West is certainly very indicative of that.

I want to thank the Member, my friend from Torngat, for giving me a few minutes here. He alluded to it; it's not all clear sailing and the mining industry is very cyclical, it's up and down and it has been since its inception. I remember being there in 1982 when we saw probably one of the worst downturns in mining history. It was a scary time for our community when you lose 700, 800 people to layoffs in one smack. It goes to show how devastating it can be.

Mr. Speaker, it can also be very valuable to a community and it is to Labrador West. In this *Way Forward*, we envision a bright future for communities like Labrador West, Baie Verte and other communities – St. Lawrence – that are dependent on the mining industry as their mainstay.

I think what we've done here is very realistic. It's indicative of what we see today, the potential that we have in the mining industry. Envisioning five new mines between now and 2030 is not out of the question at all. I look forward in the next few months, hopefully, to see the stacks at Scully spewing out the smoke, which means that the mine is operating. We look forward to that day. We see potential in Alderon in Labrador West. We see potential in gold on the Island in the Buchans area, and certainly the Baie Verte Peninsula has a lot of growth there and a lot of potential in the gold industry.

So, Mr. Speaker, mining is a very important part of our economic growth. It will play a major role in the future, as does oil and gas, but mining will certainly play a major role in our economy going forward. I want to thank the minister again for her vision of this industry. I want to thank Mining NL, who was very much a part of this as well. It's a very important organization for us.

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

**MR. LETTO:** When we see the numbers that's been attached to this, like five new mines, 6,200 people employed in operations, including 30 per cent women, which I think is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report that IOC, which is now operating in Labrador West, their percentage of female employees in the non-traditional trades and whatnot and in the occupations is now in the 21 per cent, 22 per cent range. So they're making great progress and they show how important women are to the mining industry.

Doubling our annual exploration expenditures to \$100 million, which means a lot to many communities, \$4 billion in annual mineral shipments – Mr. Speaker, the numbers speak for themselves. We need the mining industry. It's going to be a very important part of our future. There are communities, like I said, like Labrador West, who depend on that. We look forward to the day when we will have five new mines in the province, and the value of our mineral sector and our mining industry will increase substantially.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to stand today and support this resolution brought forward by my colleague from Baie Verte - Green Bay, and I look forward to the support of the House on this resolution.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay to close debate on his PMR.

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

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

I won't take all my time, but I have to say it was intriguing as we took a mining tour of Newfoundland and Labrador, just listening to all the speakers. I certainly appreciate their comments, every one of you who took the opportunity today to debate the resolution.

I want to thank the hon. Member for Ferryland, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, the hon. Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island, the hon. Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development, the hon. Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi, the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains, and my good friend, the

hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment. We have a lot of fun, Mr. Speaker, with our love of the industry.

I listened from your chair, actually, to the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island, and obviously he knows what he's talking about when it comes to the mining industry. Obviously, he comes from a mining family, and that's certainly what it's all about. I don't come from a mining family. I come from a mining town, but I do appreciate what mining companies do for towns, and it's something I didn't address in my previous comments.

I know the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development mentioned the community of Buchans. Mining towns over the years, I guess you always became accustomed to mining towns having good hockey teams and good curling rinks.

I mentioned earlier on, Mr. Speaker, my first visit to a mining town was in Gullbridge up in Gull Pond; Gullbridge Mines in Gull Pond. I went with my parents at an early age who decided to take up the sport of curling, and curling always became synonymous with mining towns.

The Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi had mentioned her attachments to mining towns over her career in teaching. I've had that discussion with her before. I knew she had taught at Baie Verte. She brought up the boom-bust reality, and she talked about the benefits and the issues. Especially, she brought up the asbestosis disease that's attached to those types of mines.

I will let you know that through the Department of Natural Resources we have addressed that issue. We have addressed that issue with the minister's staff, and we need a tailings management strategic plan. From my understanding, NRCan out of Ottawa are actually going to provide a strategic plan going forward to deal with the asbestos tailings from the old asbestos mine, which was the Advocate Mines in Baie Verte. And I thank you for addressing that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of some of the companies as well. I had an opportunity to speak with the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Industry

and Innovation and we talked about the supply chain, and supply and services, within some of our communities, and the synergies that are created from the mining companies and these companies providing services.

I just want to highlight, in my hometown we have four drilling companies that are all over the Province of Newfoundland, and certainly in the Big Land of Labrador as well, providing their drilling services. Actually, I go back to the old Brinex base camp, which was the British Newfoundland Exploration company, and I go back as a young boy seeing the Brinex base camps set out all over our district as well.

I want to talk about the analytic services. Eastern Analytical in Springdale is providing maybe one of only two analytic services, assaying lab in Springdale. I think there are only two in Atlantic Canada – I stand to be corrected on that. I want to congratulate that company as well, because they were just recently notified at the CIM conference that they were given the prestigious award of service provider of the year.

While I bring up their name, I certainly want to bring up the name of Guy J. Bailey Ltd., as well, because they were honoured as well. Guy J. Bailey Ltd. out of Baie Verte employing hundreds of people on the Baie Verte Peninsula. They supply all the heavy ore haulers that haul the ore from the mine to the mill. They were just recognized as well for the good work they do.

I want to encourage all my colleagues here in the House of Assembly, if you haven't had the opportunity to visit my District of Baie Verte - Green Bay, there are some great places to visit, including the Miner's Museum in Baie Verte. I'd certainly encourage you to go down and visit the community of Tilt Cove. We still have four people that reside in the community of Tilt Cove and according to my good friend the mayor, Don Collins, we're going to have to blow him out of it because he says he's not leaving – albeit, Don's not getting any younger as well. I had a chit-chat with him three or four weeks ago. But he's in love with the community and I share my love of his community as he does of his. So, I certainly encourage you to visit that area as well.

The Soapstone Quarry down in Fleur de Lys – and the hon. Member for St. John's East - Quidi

Vidi mentioned that as well – it's a must-see. So if you get the opportunity to come by, we'll certainly treat you to some of the history of mining in my district.

Mr. Speaker, again, I come from a district where we rely heavily on the resources of fishery, forestry, agriculture, aquaculture, and certainly we throw mining on top of that. Right now, in my district, it would be our number one resource.

I just wanted to add again, talking to the Minister of TCII, talking about adventure tourism. We've discussed this, both he and I. On our trip to Anaconda, we had the opportunity to sit and talk about adventure tourism and visiting old mining sites – my district would be an absolute gem for doing this. So it's something that I want to discuss with people in my district to, hopefully, get the ball rolling on adventure tourism as well.

Mr. Speaker, before I clue up, I just wanted to go back to some notes that I made with regard to Maritime Resources located in Green Bay. I sort of concluded my last remarks on the Hammerdown gold mine. The Hammerdown gold mine has the potential to convert Maritime into a junior gold producer. The junior gold producer means that they must produce gold at a commercial scale, and they must also produce an annual volume of 200 ounces or less of gold.

The pre-feasibility study shows a variety of highlights for Hammerdown. Ore mined at Hammerdown would be trucked and processed at the Nugget Pond mill through an arrangement with Rambler. Mine life in the RFS is approximately five years and produces an average of approximately 35 ounces of gold per year, with an all-in, pre-tax cost of approximately \$955 per ounce.

The total development and capital cost estimate for the five-year life of the mine is \$67.8 million. Mine life for the current plant at Hammerdown is five years, producing approximately 174 ounces at an average of approximately 35,000 ounces per year. The study was successful in demonstrating a viable mining operation with low up-front capital and a short timeline to start of the gold production.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is within my district. There are nine other producing mines across the province who are also producing great results, as we heard from our hon. colleagues here today – results that we see in job growth, economy growth and mining growth. Just take a look at the current gold prices in Canada: an ounce is \$1,606.41; a gram is \$5,165; and a kilo is \$51,647.25. Let that sink in.

*Mining the Future 2030 – A Plan for Growth in Newfoundland and Labrador Mining Industry* is looking extremely bright for the mining industry in my district and in our province, thanks to our government's vision and strong ability to set a positive path for the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given to me by my colleagues to bring this resolution forward. I certainly appreciate the support that I've been given from my colleagues across the way. With that, I'll take my seat and thank you for the time.

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

**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 Deputy Government House Leader.

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

Given the hour of the day, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment, that we do adjourn for the day.

**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 being Wednesday, and in accordance with Standing Order 9, this House does stand adjourned until tomorrow, at 1:30 o'clock.