



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FORTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume XLVIII

THIRD SESSION

Number 60

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Perry Trimper, MHA

Thursday

March 21, 2019

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Trimper): Admit strangers, please.

Order, please!

I'd like to welcome the Members back to a final day of the week and a nice little break.

We have several visitors today that I'd like to introduce to this House of Assembly. In the public gallery, first of all, I'd like to welcome Gail Dempsey, Executive Director of Epilepsy Newfoundland and Labrador; Sarah Mercer, the organization's Information Officer; and Lisa Pack, Epilepsy Newfoundland and Labrador's 2019 Purple Day Ambassador. They are visiting us this afternoon for a Ministerial Statement.

Welcome to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Also in the public gallery today, I would like to acknowledge representatives from the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have with us the Executive Director Lynn Power, and Communications Officer James Sheppard. They are joining us for the Second Reading of Bill 57, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008.

Welcome to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I've also just had the honour to spend a few minutes with a great group of people. They are representing and are from the Environmental Policy masters program at Memorial University. They're in the public gallery this afternoon.

They are visiting St. John's to participate in the 2019 Environmental Policy Institute Case Competition. This is a collaborative venture between Grenfell Campus, Memorial University and the Planning and Coordination Office, Executive Council.

A great welcome to you all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Statements by Members

MR. SPEAKER: For Members' statements today, we'll hear statements by the hon. Members for the Districts of Lewisporte - Twillingate, Fogo Island - Cape Freels, Conception Bay East - Bell Island, Placentia West - Bellevue, and Conception Bay South.

The hon. the Member for Lewisporte - Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Central Newfoundland Hockey League had another very successful and exciting year with six teams competing for the championship title. Teams included: Grand Falls-Windsor Blades, Northeast Wildcats, Springdale Braves, Straight Shore Beothics and, from my district, Twillingate Combines and Lewisporte Seahawks.

After regular league play, semi-final action seen first place Beothics eliminate the Springdale Braves, while two old rival teams, the Lewisporte Seahawk and Twillingate Combines, battled it out for the final position. After a hard fought series to a sold-out game five, the Seahawks were successful in eliminating last year's league champions, the Combines.

The opening two games of the finals were hosted by Straight Shore Beothics. After very intense games, the Seahawks were heading home with two victories. Game three was equally exciting, but the Beothics were not able to keep up with the talents of the Seahawks and were sweep in three consecutive games.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in congratulating the Central Newfoundland Hockey League for another successful season and to wish the Lewisporte Seahawks

congratulations on winning this year's championship title.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Fogo Island - Cape Freels.

MR. BRAGG: Mr. Speaker, I have to go on the record and say that Member's statement was just bad news for my team.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Badger's Quay Lions Club has been around for years and they continue to impress everyone around them with ongoing acts of kindness and generosity.

Recently, I was invited to attend one of their presentations. It involved a young man, Mark Parsons, who, a few years ago, went for a swim at a local swimming hole. Little did Mark know, that day would change his life forever. Fun and laughter turned into a fight for his life. Mark has been confined to a wheelchair since that day and, as a result, access to outdoor activities would be limited.

King Lion, Eric Sturge, heard of Mark's need to put a lift on his wheelchair van. The Lions met and discussed the needs and decided to help. They started a fundraiser and even canvassed 25 other lions groups in their four districts.

Mark was so humbled, he encouraged them to gift the money to someone else. The Lions would have no part of it. They realized his family had just purchased a new van and the \$3,900 would come in handy.

I thank the Badger's Quay Lions Club, and all other Lions Clubs, for their continued commitment to our communities.

Thank you, 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.

This past Sunday, I had the honour of attending a very special event in my district; and, no, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't related to St. Patrick's Day, but something much more moving and important. I attended the Quilts of Valour presentation which honours and supports injured Canadian Armed Forces members past and present.

Four members from this province were presented with quilts handmade by residents in our communities. The presentation of these quilts represents our community's respect and admiration for those who serviced and continue to serve while showing our desire to support our injured veterans in any way possible.

The stories shared relating to their sacrifices and challenges they faced were heart wrenching, but the stories related to the support they receive from family, friends, the community, but particularly their fellow vets, was inspiring and uplifting. Whether we know it or not, Mr. Speaker, we are all members of this fraternity and have an obligation to thank, honour and support our veterans.

I congratulate the recipients, Mr. Leslie "Bud" Churchill, Kevin Dunne, Shamus O'Reilly, Wade Walsh, and a special thank you to retired veteran Joanne "Gunney" Power for nominating, organizing, MCing and, most importantly, sharing her story as to why these four veterans have made a difference in her life.

I ask all of us to join in congratulating and thanking our Quilts of Valour recipients.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, she's done it again. Olympic Gold Medallist, World Figure Skating Champion, and now a Member of the Order of Newfoundland and Labrador. Kaetlyn

Osmond has consistently and steadily rose to the occasion, to achieve and to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more remarkable about Kaetlyn's journey than her well known athletic accomplishments, is her perseverance.

At the exact moment of her initial rise in skating, she suffered a serious injury, that to many would have permanently ended their competitive pursuits. But she vowed to skate again, which makes her worthy of recognition beyond anything else, and it is this fortitude that inspires so many young athletes across this country to emulate her passion and poise.

It's for these reasons last fall that I nominated Kaetlyn to become a recipient of the Order of Newfoundland and Labrador. I was pleased she was selected, and honoured when she invited me to join her and her sister, Natasha, brother, Gary, and grandparents Claudia and Clem at Government House for the investiture by Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, making her the youngest recipient ever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. Members to join me in congratulating Kaetlyn on making history once again, and I also ask Members to join me in sending a message to all of our youth who pursue excellence in their chosen field; don't ever let anyone tell you that it can't be done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Winterfest in CBS was a huge success this year. The 11-day event kicked off on February 15, and took place at various locations throughout Conception Bay South.

Winterfest has become a tradition in our community. I attended many of the events this year, and experienced first-hand the strong community spirit. I would like to extend my congratulations and special thanks to the Winterfest committee, sponsors, volunteers, as

well as the Town of Conception Bay South, for contributing to the festival's success.

Mr. Speaker, Winterfest 2019 had activities for all ages and groups. I was so pleased to have attended many of the events including the Fred Squires and Annie Parsons Shield Hockey Challenge, as well as the Junior High Challenge. The annual pancake breakfast was a huge success this year with a record turnout at the new CBS arena.

This year, there were some new added activities including a magic show, a Spirit of Newfoundland dinner show, *Stand by your Nan*, a CB Blues hockey game, a pre-teen dance and many more family outdoor activities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add, too, my colleague for Topsail - Paradise also attended many of those events with me. So we do a lot of things tag team.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. Members to join me in congratulating the Winterfest committee and the Town of Conception Bay South for hosting the tremendous winter festival. It was certainly a wonderful 11 days of events for the community, our region and, indeed, our province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Statements by Ministers.

Statements by Ministers

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAGGIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hon. House to acknowledge Epilepsy Awareness Month, and in particular – Purple Day, which takes place on Tuesday, March 26.

Purple Day is an international grassroots effort dedicated to increasing awareness about epilepsy.

Epilepsy can affect anyone, and according to the World Health Organization is the most common serious brain disorder, with no age, racial, social class, national or geographic boundaries. Epilepsy affects over 300,000 Canadians – 10,000 of which are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to recognize Epilepsy Newfoundland and Labrador for the wide range of services and programs they provide, and their continued advocacy work for people living with epilepsy.

I would also like to acknowledge the 2019 Purple Ambassador, Lisa Pack, a young woman from Hermitage, who says epilepsy has never and will never own her life.

On March 26, Confederation Building will be lit purple, and I encourage the Members of this hon. House, as well as the general public, to wear this brilliant colour in support of people living with epilepsy in our province. It's time to end the stigma.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement. On behalf of the Official Opposition, I join with the minister in recognizing March as Epilepsy Awareness Month, and specifically recognizing Tuesday, March 26, as Purple Day.

Purple Day was created by Cassidy Megan of Nova Scotia in 2008, with support from the Canadian Epilepsy Alliance and other epilepsy agencies. It has now grown into a national awareness effort.

Lisa Pack of Hermitage has been chosen as the province's 2019 Purple Ambassador. I thank her for her advocacy efforts, and I encourage all Members to read her inspirational story on the Epilepsy NL website. After reading Lisa's story,

I believe that we can all learn from her wisdom and grace.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

MS. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the minister.

Epilepsy has been such a misunderstood and stigmatized condition. Congratulations to Epilepsy Newfoundland and Labrador, working in so many ways to fight the stigma, and they support children and adults living with epilepsy. They are doing great work, and we all have a responsibility to educate ourselves.

Congratulations to Lisa Pack, the 2019 Purple Ambassador. Lisa's story and resilience is featured on the Epilepsy Newfoundland and Labrador website, and I encourage everyone to read it.

Bravo, Lisa, for the great work.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Further statements by ministers?

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works.

MR. CROCKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hon. House today to inform colleagues about steps our government has taken to manage government assets more efficiently, which have led to considerable savings for taxpayers.

When we announced *The Way Forward* in 2016, we set out to reduce our building footprint by 40,000 square feet. By March 2017, we had surpassed that goal, saving taxpayers more than \$1.6 million a year.

We then set a new goal to reduce leased space by an additional 10 per cent – or 77,000 square feet. By March 2018, we had also exceeded that goal, Mr. Speaker.

To date, we have reduced our leased space by more than 103,000 square feet since 2016. This equates to approximately \$3 million a year in savings.

In continuing to exceed our goals, we have set our sights higher by committing to achieve a new total of 130,000-square-foot reduction of leased space by 2020.

In addition, government has also set a goal to reduce its light vehicle fleet by 10 per cent. To date, 112 of our 1,100 vehicles have been removed from government's fleet since April 2018. This is anticipated to lead to approximately \$500,000 a year in annual savings.

Finally, last month, our government announced a new contract for ferry services on the South Coast of the island. The total cost of the five contracts saves taxpayers approximately \$2.8 million annually.

These three actions combined, Mr. Speaker, will save taxpayers approximately \$6.3 million a year, every year.

Mr. Speaker, we realize the need to balance how we deliver services and being responsible to all taxpayers. The actions we are taking allow our government to deliver services while we're realizing substantial savings.

We will continue to find ways to optimize office space, identify vacant or underused spaces and review our fleet so that we can continue to find ways to deliver services more efficiently.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement. I'm glad to see the provincial government is reducing its building footprint in our province but, sadly, this government seems to have two left feet.

The minister cites a reduced building footprint, this in spite of the Crown Lands office moving to Corner Brook while the Howley Building, which is government owned, stands half empty. In the last red book, they promised \$50 million annually in asset sales. Well, they've fallen well short of that.

As for the provincial ferries, the South Coast passenger capacity, cargo space, cargo capability, vessel size have all been slashed. So government isn't showing its way forward. They are failing forward, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. MICHAEL: I thank the minister for the advance copy of his statement. Saving money in government is always a good idea –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. MICHAEL: – but not at the expense of providing services.

You can say hear, hear again now.

It is one thing to save money by reducing leased space, but the minister speaks of saving money on ferry services. The people of South East Bight are not happy with his savings on their ferry. They say it is smaller and won't be able to handle rough sea conditions the current ferry can. They rely on the ferry.

Yes, saving money is always good, but not on the backs of people depending on government services.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, the lives of a number of dedicated pharmacy assistants have been turned upside down. You stated that the new registration process that you were enforcing would not mean any present pharmacy assistants would lose their jobs.

Do you still stand by this statement?

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

MR. HAGGIE: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the question.

The changes to the regulations about pharmacy assistants and pharmacy technicians falls solely under the purview of the pharmacy board, which is an independent, arm's-length agency. They are the ones that make the determination as to what qualifications are required.

We spent well over \$60,000 to ensure those assistants who wanted to become technicians could avail of training during the bridging program. That bridging program has closed and the Pharmacy Board have deemed that program at an end.

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.

A number of pharmacy techs who have to rewrite their registration exams are being forced to go to another province and incur financial hardships to register because the Pharmacy Board won't allow a rewrite in our province.

Do you think this is right, and will you lobby the Pharmacy Board to allow rewrites in our province?

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

MR. HAGGIE: Thank you very much for this question.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have had extensive discussions with the Pharmacy Board around their examinations. They are adamant that nine years' lead time is sufficient and that they are within their rights, enshrined in legislation, as a self-regulating province.

It is not the role, nor should it be, of any politician to interfere with clinical standards. They set them and I am quite happy that they have done their due diligence. Unfortunately, these people are in a difficult situation and I acknowledge that. We have provided them with financial help.

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.

So the minister is saying it's okay to have a double standard and better services can be provided in other provinces because the legislative piece of information is being shared with an agency. You're the minister responsible and it's your responsibility to ensure we get the best quality health care and the best opportunities for our people who are providing that health care.

Other provinces and even other health authorities in this province are finding ways to continue using pharmacy assistants in the delivery of health care services.

Will you direct Eastern Health and other RHAs to do the right thing to ensure fairness and consistency across the province?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I take great exception to the gentleman's preamble about there being a double standard. There is one standard; it is set by statute by a professional group called the Pharmacy Board. They are the experts. We have seen all too well what happens when the experts are removed from making decisions around areas of professional expertise. I have only to relate to Muskrat Falls, for example, where the PUB was chopped out of that process and we're still trying to untangle that mess.

This is not a double standard. This is within the realm of pharmacists and the pharmacy board and there it lies, 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.

I take exception to comparing the lives of dedicated health professionals who were trained, who have been providing a service and turning around because of a piece of legislation that would ensure some of these will no longer have jobs in the health care profession – totally embarrassing here to be even having this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, it has been identified that there's a shortage of pharmacy technicians. Yet, we have a number of pharmacy assistants who have been doing the job previously and who are now being forced out and replaced with recent graduates who are being offered \$10,000 bursaries.

Is this the best way to retain our dedicated, long-term health professionals?

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

MR. HAGGIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the question.

There was a seven-year introduction to this program and it ran for two years. The Department of Health and Community Services provided the last tranche of money, \$60,000 to enable those assistants who wish to avail of the bridging program to take it at no cost to themselves. That program has now come to a close. There are jobs for those people who wish to remain as pharmacy assistants in some areas.

The facts of the case are, Mr. Speaker, this is about standards that are set by a professional body that is totally independent from government and was enshrined in legislation set up by the previous PC crowd.

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 convenient for the minister when it's politically advantageous to interfere or intercede or lobby on behalf of the health professionals, but in this case it's seems not be an important issue, Mr. Speaker.

Type 1 diabetes is a serious disorder that many Newfoundlander and Labradorians face. In fact, we have the highest rate of type 1 diabetes in the country and third highest in the world. We have heard that a 10-year-old child has been denied replacement of an insulin pump, pending the outcome of a review.

I ask the minister: Is there a change in policy for insulin pump replacement? Surely, it cannot be budget time.

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

MR. HAGGIE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to break that down into two parts because there were. The preamble accuses me of lobbying and interfering in the regulation of self-regulating bodies. If the Member opposite there has any evidence at all, I put him to proof of that in this House. He cannot sit there and make accusations about my name and not substantiate it. I would almost regard that, Mr. Speaker, as a point of privilege.

Having said that, moving on, the issue of type 1 diabetes is important – and again, if the Member opposite has a constituent who he feels has not had due process and has an issue with his pump or supplies for it, bring it to me, that's his job, and I will deal with it.

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.

One day, myself and the minister will have a discussion about Central Health and some of the issues facing there.

Mr. Speaker, research shows that complications from type 1 diabetes can include heart attacks, stroke or kidney failure. I don't have to be a doctor to know that these are serious health concerns. Compliance with prescribed therapy for type 1 diabetes is critical to ensure complications are avoided.

I ask the minister: How many other lives with type 1 diabetes will be denied access to this life-sustaining device?

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

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

Indeed, diabetes is one of our most prevalent chronic diseases, and I would draw to the Member opposite's attention the fact that not only do we have an integrated chronic disease strategy and plan; we also have now a very

active diabetes registry which is held through the Newfoundland and Labrador Centre for Health Information. We can identify type 1 diabetics now with a far greater certainty than we ever could before.

We can point these youngsters to the pump program. We can monitor whether or not their management meets best practice guidelines in a way that hasn't been possible before. We are very conscious of the impact of diabetes on this province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

MR. BRAZIL: And I guess later on I'll have to ask the minister again: Has there been a change in policy? We still haven't got that answer.

In January, the Child and Youth Advocate released her report into *Chronic Absenteeism* in our school system. She reported that at least 10 per cent of the students in the English School District missed at least 18 days of school a year, with over 25 per cent of the students in grade 12 missing at least 18 days.

I ask the minister: What is being done to bring down this number?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the Member opposite for the question. We've worked very closely with the Child and Youth Advocate, and certainly we take the recommendations very seriously.

As you know, absenteeism can be rather complex. There are many issues that determine absenteeism. We work with interdepartmental agencies to identify and address these issues, and we are continuing to work with that. We also reference the Member to the Education Action Plan, where we've identified Recommendation 29 and 30, where we are going to be working with absenteeism and try to

provide the resources and opportunities so that every child is given an opportunity to get an education in this province.

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.

One of the factors cited in the report is inadequate transportation systems.

Will the minister finally abolish the 1.6-busing rule?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I thank the Member opposite for the question. We have had a number of discussions on that 1.6 kilometre. As a matter of fact, I have challenged the Members opposite, what do they mean by 1.6? What do they mean by eliminating 1.6? They don't have the answer. Some of the suggestions to eliminate K to 6, and they talk about safety, which means then students in grade seven, what message are you telling them?

We have provided, and we did something that the Opposition or the PC government never did, and that was implement a policy. They had it for years and years and didn't do anything. Last September, we listened to the people and concerns, and we implemented a courtesy stop within the 1.6. We are now, Mr. Speaker, one of the few provinces in Canada that has the best policy that's in the country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: 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.

Courtesy stops mean nothing if there are no seats for a child to get on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRAZIL: Our philosophy and what we stand for is about safety for the children travelling to and from school, Mr. Speaker, and we'll continue to do that and keep looking for our blue book policy on 1.6 busing in the near future.

The report suggests that 75 per cent of students with chronic absenteeism in grade six will not finish high school.

What is your government doing to ensure our children finish high school?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell the Member opposite one of the things we do have that they failed to get, it's called an Education Action Plan. It's a strategy we put in place. There are 82 recommendations. We went through a Premier's Task Force that identified issues; 82 recommendations that the Premier has been very, very clear on, that we're not going to let them sit on a shelf. We are actually implementing them.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the very short time we've had, we have over 35 that have either been initiated or have been completed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are aggressively implementing our Education Action Plan and we are taking every situation that's dealt with and providing resources, and we are making a difference. Something that hasn't happened for a long time, 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: Can the minister explain why Canadian history and Canadian geography are being removed from the high school curriculum in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have, in the department's curriculum, a department that reviews all courses and looks at what courses are being utilized and what's best practice. It's a continual review of all curriculum that we have – not only geography, not only history – and we make it applicable to today, not back in to 1990. We're looking at what would be applicable to today.

We continually make changes to the curriculum so that we can implement the best possible opportunity for students to get the best education they possibly can so they can integrate into society in a manner that is something that they could really work on and that can produce results, Mr. Speaker. So we continue to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the students will no longer have a choice between taking history or geography and will now have to take a generic social studies course.

I ask the minister: Why has this decision been made to abandon educating children on our history?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are not abandoning our history. We are integrating our history into the curriculum throughout different approaches that we make to educate our students. It's certainly not something we're taking away.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are in fact adding to and we are making provisions so that our students are given the best possible education they can get. We are continually looking at how we can improve our curriculum, how we can improve what we're providing to students so that they can, in fact, Mr. Speaker, get what we would consider to be a world-class education in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BRAZIL: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

We now know how important consultation is to this government, or at least they say it is.

Did the minister consult with teachers, students, parents and educational experts before implementing these changes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development.

MR. HAWKINS: Mr. Speaker, thank you for the question.

We do have within our department professional staff that – we talk to teachers, we talk to school boards, we talk to – we have been certainly talking within the professional realm, and that's why we have a curriculum in the department.

We don't have to have consultation with parents on this. We have a professional staff that provides that expertise for us when we make decisions on any curriculum changes that's available, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LESTER: Mr. Speaker, this past fall, government announced a deal with Timberlands International. This deal gives this particular company access to over 80 per cent of the forest resources on the Northern Peninsula.

Can the Minister of TCII provide an update on processing plant construction, road and bridge placement, and when will the first tree be harvested?

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

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's very exciting to see, for the first time in a very long time, that there's actually going to be some investment on the Great Northern Peninsula into the forest sector by the private sector.

Timberlands International is looking at making an investment and using all their own money to create jobs on the Great Northern Peninsula. Unlike the former administration that used public money to – and put at risk taxpayer money that led to not one piece of investment and no jobs being created and, basically, set the industry on the Great Northern Peninsula into a significant downturn. It was poor planning and it led to great disarray for the people of the Great Northern Peninsula. They certainly suffered under the PC regime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LESTER: Mr. Speaker, we've learned there has not been one piece of infrastructure developed or not one tree cut as of yet, or planned to be cut; yet, 80 per cent of the forest resources on the Northern Peninsula are now tied up for another five years. This has created a huge amount of stress and concern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LESTER: We've heard from the residents of the Great Northern Peninsula who are concerned about this allocation, and it encroaches –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LESTER: – on permits that were originally intended for local residents, local processing and harvesting.

Is there any requirement for any of the sawlogs to be processed on the Northern Peninsula?

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

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Member opposite should get his facts straight. There are a number of local contractors that have permits to the forest and they continue to operate. They also have first right of refusal.

In this particular agreement, that's a five-year agreement with Timberlands International or Active Energy, this group, they would have the ability, over five years, to look at doing sawlogs and other investment when it comes to biofuels and bioenergy. That's certainly something that's important as we look to diversify our economy on the Great Northern Peninsula.

We're looking for business to come to Newfoundland and Labrador. We're also looking for locals to make investment to attract and grow the economy.

This is a deal that was done that cost taxpayers no money and can create jobs for the Great Northern Peninsula and the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

MR. LESTER: Mr. Speaker, almost 80 per cent of the available forest resources have been tied up in this giveaway deal to Timberlands International. Concerns have been raised that only 25 per cent of the available sawlogs, estimated to be at 45 per cent, are required to be turned into valuable timber, creating extra jobs in the area.

How can the minister justify only requiring 25 per cent, which is below the economic rate of harvest?

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

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would say the Great Northern Peninsula currently, right now, has a sawmill in Main Brook that's operating under capacity. It has no operations in Roddickton. It has a closed operation that hasn't operated since 2012.

There is opportunity. One, you can deal with small-diameter wood. You need to have that ability. One, Kurger was unable to purchase because of the mill closing in Stephenville and Grand Falls-Windsor. There was an over supply for small-diameter wood.

This is why we created a forestry action plan to be able to deal with the small-diameter wood. Attracting a company that's going to be able to deal with that will allow for more high-value sawlogs and other production to be created in the forest industry.

Right now, we've seen what used to be 400 jobs dwindle down to just a few, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl North.

MR. LESTER: Will the minister reinforce the requirement that the harvest and reforestation of the people's forest resource on the Northern Peninsula be overseen by a public committee similar to that of the Corner Brook Pulp and Paper advisory committee?

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

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We practice silviculture here in this province. We have very high standards when it comes to

the replacement of our forest. We have certification, ISO standards for our environmental and harvesting practices, and we must retain that. That is something that I was very proud, when I was the minister of forestry and agrifoods, that we achieved that certification and we continue to do so. We work with the industry, we work with all the partners, because it is important that we have those standards.

We also need to look at all of the users of the forests. There are people that are dealing with it in the outfitting industry, people in tourism, other operators and other users of the forests. This is a renewable resource and we need to make sure that we get maximum value from our resources here in this province, and that's why the Minister of Fisheries and Land Resources launched the forestry action plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LESTER: Mr. Speaker, I've read the release and there is no mention of reforestation or management requirements after the initial harvest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LESTER: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the forestry giveaway and tying up the availability of economic activity on the Northern Peninsula, is this deal exempt from the company having to pay royalties on the resource?

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

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Member opposite for interest in the forest industry because that's something that was dearly lacking when they were in charge of government. When it came to under their watch, they saw two mills close. They expropriated Abitibi assets and cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars federally and provincially. It led to significant consequences.

What we've done is we've been working with the industry to focus on forestry. We've had success as a government. The Premier, when it comes to the waiver of tariffs, when it comes to protecting hundreds and thousands of jobs that are directly and indirectly located to the forest sector, we have strong parameters. In this agreement there are measures that must be met to be able to ensure that jobs are being created on the Great Northern Peninsula and that it's done in a sustainable way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

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

The parliamentary secretary for Municipal Affairs indicated in the media he nor the department knew what the numbers were, and they did not know where the revenue from 7,500 residents removed from the waste management would be found.

I ask the minister: Does he know where the revenue will come from?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand that the parliamentary secretary did a fine job yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LETTO: Mr. Speaker, we have asked the Eastern Regional Service Board for a plan, now that they're going to implement the directive that we've given them, and they have to come back to us on April 1.

We await that plan. They're alleging that it's \$750,000.

MR. K. PARSONS: No (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LETTO: I will inform the hon. Member that the \$750,000 would come out of an \$11-million budget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. K. PARSONS: Thank you very much.

As we know, the Minister of Municipal Affairs likes to consult. Who did you consult with before you made these changes to the waste management?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Mr. Speaker, when I became minister, the first group I met with was the Eastern Regional Service Board. The second group was the cabin owners. We met on several occasions after that to try to come to an agreement on how we were going to deal with the cabin owners.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to table this document, so I'm going to read it first. Talking about the regional service board and what they wanted to do, back on November 28, there was a notice of motion brought forward in the future to cease the provision of services, including curbside waste, recycling collection and fire and emergency services on all roads and unincorporated areas not maintained by the provincial government, unless explicitly instructed otherwise by government. Should an unincorporated area want to avail of service from the ERSB, they must form a local service district and then make a formal request to the board.

That's exactly what we have, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

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

Communities, towns and local service districts have varying concerns with the increased cost of waste management and the tipping fees at Robin Hood Bay.

Will the towns and communities have to make up the shortfall?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they have a copy of the letter that I sent to the Eastern Regional Service Board. In that letter, along with the directive on the unserviced roads, was that no fee increases would be levied on the existing waste management patrons.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that as a result of the new vessel being unable to service the Straits of Labrador region, the icebreaker *Henry Larsen* has delivered 60 pallets of supplies to Labrador Straits, with a further 60 to be delivered in the next day or so.

Minister, my question is: Do you think this new \$140-million ferry decision is the right one or was it a very flawed decision?

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

MR. CROCKER: Mr. Speaker, as I've said quite clearly in this House, we're experiencing ice conditions we haven't seen in over 30 years. If you think about the service, we had an 18,000-horsepower icebreaker that got stuck last week. At one point last week, down around the Corner Brook area, we needed to use two icebreakers.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Member opposite to go onto Environment Canada and

look at the current ice conditions that we're facing. When we went out with the RFP – our RFP was built on a previous RFP that the previous administration had put together. Now, we improved it and we improved it a lot because we asked for IA ice class. We asked for certain horsepower. We asked for a vessel that would be the newer – we have a seven-year-old vessel, Mr. Speaker, that previously operated I think in the (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Thank you.

The time has expired.

The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South for a quick question, please.

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Minister, you have a vessel that's not capable of doing the crossing.

So, Minister, the cost of emergency delivery, will this be deducted from the current contract which is over and above the \$1 million per month cost to taxpayers – will this be deducted from that or is it extra?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier for a very quick response, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. EDMUNDS: Mr. Speaker, let's set the record straight here. The motor the vessel, *Qajaq*, has four engines. She has two azipods, with dual thrust propellers on each pod. She's got a combined thrust of 7,500 horsepower.

Mr. Speaker, that's not the problem. The problem is why a top-class Canadian icebreaker with 18,000 horsepower, 11,500 more than the *Qajaq*, 2,000 more than famous *Henry Larsen* cannot get across the Straits. That's the question, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask for order.

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

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

In previous questions on Muskrat Falls power reliability, the Minister of Natural Resources deferred to the PUB instead of giving answers. The minister knows, or ought to know, that the PUB is not the manager of Nalcor, her government is.

I ask the minister, will she explain to the House what Nalcor's plans are to cope with an extended outage on the Labrador-Island Transmission Link.

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

MS. COADY: Mr. Speaker, it is confusing. On one hand, they want the Public Utilities Board involved in Muskrat Falls and, on the other hand, they do not want it involved in Muskrat Falls.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro has put a *Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study* to the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board, who are experts in their field, are very knowledgeable, will review the *Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study* to determine if there's anything further required.

I will say to the Member opposite, she's relying on a 2011 study, a 2011 report and things have changed since 2011. There have been changes. The load forecasts have changed; the availability of power from Nova Scotia has changed. There have been lots of changes, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

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

Yes, there have been changes and there are changes to Nalcor. Nalcor does have a backup plan for coping with an extended outage over the Labrador-Island link. Will she tell this House what it is?

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

MS. COADY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Newfoundland Hydro has put their plan before the Public Utilities Board, Mr. Speaker. I can say to the Member opposite there's curtailment available from various large – Kruger, for example, large companies. We have curtailment possibilities. We have load forecast changes; load forecast has been lower. We have availability of power from Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker, all those things are in the reliability report and is before the Public Utilities Board, which I will say is an independent quasi-judicial body. I believe, and I believe the Member opposite believes, that the Public Utilities Board are experts in this field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

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

She forgot the rolling blackouts.

Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Advocate says back-up power from Nova Scotia is unreliable and the province may have to install gas turbines at Holyrood to deal with the prolonged failure of the Labrador-Island Transmission Link to the tune of perhaps \$500 million, plus annual fuel costs.

I ask the minister: Will these extra capital and operating costs for turbines be factored in to her

government's much anticipated rate mitigation plan?

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

MS. COADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think there's a person in Newfoundland and Labrador who cannot forget blackouts, because we had them under the previous administration in 2014.

Newfoundland Hydro has put a tremendous amount of money into upgrading its systems because of those circumstances, Mr. Speaker. I will say, the Public Utilities Board has required a lot of investment by Newfoundland Hydro to ensure that that doesn't happen again.

The reliability and resource adequacy study does speak to what should happen if, in the unforeseen circumstance, the Labrador-Island Link goes down. If that is not sufficient, I'm sure the Public Utilities Board will make requirements of Newfoundland Hydro to ensure their reliability.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the event of a failure of the transmission line from Muskrat Falls, government claims Nalcor can access up to 100 megawatts of power from Emera, but a break in the line would mean Emera wouldn't be getting the 177 megawatts it is entitled to receive as payment for the Maritime Link.

I ask the minister: What indication does she have that in the event of losing 177 megawatts of power in a Muskrat Falls line break, Emera would have 100 megawatts to spare for us?

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

MS. COADY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I've already gone through that the Public Utilities Board is reviewing this very issue, and they are the experts. They are quasi-judicial. They are independent. They will have their eyes on this.

I will tell the Member opposite, we do have large industrial customers that are willing to curtail – that is under agreement. Mr. Speaker, the load forecast has changed since 2011. We do currently today, and in the last few months, been able to take 50 to 100 megawatts from Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker, all of these things make up that reliability study.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

The time for Oral Questions has ended.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Tabling of Documents

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

To set the record straight, I want to table the minutes of the board of directors meeting of the Eastern Regional Service Board for November 28, 2018; and, I further want to table the minutes of the board of directors meeting of January 30, 2019.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

Further tabling of documents?

In accordance with section 19(5)(a) of the *House of Assembly Accountability, Integrity and Administration Act*, I hereby table the minutes of the House of Assembly Management Commission meetings held on December 19, 2018 and January 23, 2019.

Thank you.

Further tabling of documents?

Notices of Motion.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise again today about the hospital in Corner Brook.

WHEREAS the successful proponents of the new hospital in Corner Brook are scheduled to be announced in the spring with construction anticipated to begin in the fall, and it is estimated to be a four-year construction period, and there are experienced local tradespeople and labourers in the area;

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

To urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to encourage companies that are awarded the contracts for the new hospital to hire local tradespeople and labourers, at no extra cost to the taxpayers, so that they can work in their own area, support the local economy and be able to return to their homes and their families every evening.

Mr. Speaker, it was good news yesterday when the Minister of Transportation and Works said that this will go ahead this fall. That is great news. As I said when I put it out there in the beginning, that it was the word that was put out and I was asked to bring it up, which I did, and

the minister confirmed that construction will be starting this fall. I'm very glad of that, and I know the people in Corner Brook and the surrounding area and all Western Newfoundland are very proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, again, I got to bring up and encourage the government to hire local workers. I know last year there was a bit of a misstep with some people that I was dealing with, who assured me there would be local workers working, which I assumed there were going to be. When it happened, there were very few local workers actually hired.

So, again, I'm raising this on behalf of all the workers out in Western Newfoundland, the Port au Port area, down in Baie Verte, the Northern Peninsula, and the Corner Brook area, that they should be encouraged. Mr. Speaker, there are always ways to encourage local workers, we know that, and we're doing that down in the Burin Peninsula now. You don't hear much about it because we're encouraging local workers to be hired down in that area now. This is nothing that's unusual, but for some reason – and I don't want to cast any doubt on anybody, but for some reason there's no encouragement for the local workers out in the Corner Brook area.

I ask the minister to continue the work he's doing. The Minister of Transportation and Works to continue the work he's doing with the local contractors with Construction NL – Trades NL, sorry, Trades NL – to continue the work he's doing, because I know he's an advocate of this.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that at the end there will be local workers hired on the hospital in Corner Brook, and I look forward – like I said before to the minister, if you need any help, I have a good rapport with a lot of the unions, a lot of local people in the area, that I'd be willing to step in.

So I say we can work together, Minister, to get this done, get this resolved because it would be great for the workers in Western Newfoundland.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works for a response, please.

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

I thank the hon. Member for the petition.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when I was responding to a similar petition, I mentioned some of our large-scale infrastructure projects we're doing in the province and how they benefit not only local workers but local companies as well.

Just as a point in case here, Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation quite recently with the contractor who's actually going to be building the new school in Coley's Point. That conversation centred around things like the local companies that they will be using for the construction of that new school in Coley's Point.

This is a project that we're hoping to see get underway, actually, in the coming days. The people of that area of the province, the Bay Robert's area, have waited a long time for a new school. I can tell them today, it's a project that they're going to see happen, not in the coming months anymore, Mr. Speaker, but in the coming days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROCKER: Mr. Speaker, we have lots of contracts on the go for smaller-scale construction projects, whether it's in Paradise, whether it's in Bay Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, in my own District of Carbonear, we have a great project happening out in Carbonear general hospital –

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Sir.

Further petitions?

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

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

The background to this petition is as follows:

There have been numerous concerns raised by family members of seniors in long-term care throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly those suffering with dementia, Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive debilitating conditions, whereby loved ones have experienced injuries, have not been bathed regularly, not received proper nutrition and/or have been left lying in their own waste for extended periods of time. We believe this is directly related to government's failure to ensure adequate staffing at those facilities.

THEREFORE we petition the hon. House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to instate legislation which includes the mandatory establishment of an adequate ratio of one staff to three persons in long-term care and all other applicable regional health facilities housing persons with dementia, Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive debilitating conditions in order to ensure appropriate safety, protection from injuries, proper hygiene care and all other required care. This law would include the creation of a specific job position in these facilities for monitoring and intervention as required to ensure the safety of patients.

I present this petition presented to me by people from St. Stephen's, Peter's River, St. Vincent's, Hare Bay, from a variety of areas in St. John's, Paradise and Mount Pearl. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Assembly and as critic, when a petition is presented to me, I present it, not as an individual but on behalf of the people who are writing. I ask the House to accept this petition in that spirit of the people who have signed the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go into the details of what people are going through, that's in the pray itself, but I think it's important to realize that the model of large facilities like Pleasant View Towers, facilities like that are now passé, yet here we are in the present still creating large facilities like that. We have a lot of other models of care that could improve quality of life with more home-like settings.

We have them, for example, the Butterfly Home Project in Ontario. There's also wonderful work going on in the UK called Dementia Care Matters. In the USA, which can't match in health care, however, they have a wonderful project called Green House Project. In these situations, staffing ratios meet the needs of the people. People are in a home-like setting and they are getting the personal care that this petition is calling for. I ask the minister to look beyond and look at other models.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services for a response, please.

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

I acknowledge the Member's comments when she said she's bringing this forth on behalf of others. I know she's probably more familiar with the intimacies of health care than some of the people, simply by the virtue of experience. I think it's fair to point out, however, that long-term care in this province is for those people for whom care at home is impractical or unsafe and they require 24-hour care.

I think in the same spirit of offering a different narrative, I would like to point out that as recently as yesterday, Western Health and Central Health each won national awards for the standard of care of the frail elderly, which is somewhat at odds with some of the assumptions behind the comments of the petition.

The other piece is that whilst these institutions, as she refers to them, are large they are what's called podded into families of small groups of individuals, in clusters of less than a dozen, Mr. Speaker. So, there is a family environment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Further petitions?

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to present a petition on behalf of the constituents in my area – I certainly spoke to this before – related to the Witless Bay Line, Route 13, a significant piece of infrastructure, certainly a main piece of infrastructure between the Trans-Canada Highway and Route 10 on the Southern Shore.

I call on the current government to upgrade and perform immediate maintenance. This time of year, with the thawing and freezing, there are significant issues with regard to potholes, and to do immediate repairs to this and a long-term look at upgrades to the piece of highway which is so significant for traffic.

We have a lot of people that work on the other side, on the Trans-Canada in terms of significant industrial sites, other occupations going back and forth across that piece of infrastructure, certainly for the tourism sector as well and the amount of people who travel that.

Now, in previous years, we have invested a little over \$1.5 million. There were a couple of sections done. We've looked, over the past number of years, to complete that and have further sections done, recognizing you can't do it all in the one time but certainly do various portions and upgrades.

I know the minister, I had discussion with him, he actually viewed it, I think, himself a while back and did indicate it to me they were going to look at it at some point to get the upgrades. But it's not in the Roads Program. I've tried to get a rating for the particular road and where it would fall to, comparatively, with other pieces of infrastructure and where it stands in the priority. There are qualifiers in that evaluation related to health and safety, need, economics and those types of things.

So, I certainly call on the minister to take an immediate look at the maintenance required and a long-term look at this season to get some work done on that very significant piece of infrastructure that connects Route 10 with the Trans-Canada Highway.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works for a response, please.

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

I thank the hon. Member for the petition. Mr. Speaker, we do understand the significance of this piece of highway and I can let the Member opposite know that we will be, very shortly, putting an application forward to the federal government under the trade and transportation fund that will actually include this piece of infrastructure.

We realize that this piece of infrastructure will actually play a role in the province's offshore future if you look at the developments in the Witless and Bay Bulls area. So, Mr. Speaker, we see an opportunity with this federal government fund, trade and transportation, to actually take this section of road and actually include it in that proposal to the federal government. So it is a piece of road that we will certainly be addressing in the near future through an application to Ottawa.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

The hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The following petition I present is regarding the Foxtrap Access Road in CBS, which is a vital link to the TCH and the Peacekeepers Way, as well as being a heavily populated area. This road is in need of immediate repairs. It needs asphalt resurfacing, as well as shoulder repairs. This road is listed in resurfacing for 2023 in the five-year Roads Program, but it's not soon enough and it needs immediate attention.

THEREFORE we petition the House of Assembly to call upon government to provide immediate repairs to the Foxtrap Access Road.

As I've stated, Mr. Speaker, and I've presented this petition several times in the House, I have a lot of them from residents in the area and it's a

very important road. It's sandwiched between Peacekeepers and Route 60, which Peacekeepers is the second busiest, Route 60 is the fifth busiest in the province, so we estimate the traffic – I don't know if anyone actually does a traffic count, but I hear on a day-to-day basis about this road and it is in bad shape. The simple fact of the matter, it's a vital link.

I spoke to the minister about this. There has been a lot of good work done in my area over the last year, based on, I guess, the population. It is the second-largest municipality and the roads get a lot of use. This tied to the Peacekeepers Way, the TCH, two high schools in there, and the road is a heavily populated road, a lot of off-roads.

I just want to reiterate to the minister the importance that I feel as the Member and the residents feel that this road needs immediate attention. We understand, four years' time, it's on the list, but four years' time is a long time with the amount of traffic in over that road and its current situation, a lot of potholes, a lot of cross-cuts, no shoulders in certain areas. It's quite dangerous. Vehicles are cutting away from where there's no shoulder into the other lane. It poses a serious safety risk.

With two high schools in there alone, children walking the roads, it's a busy area, and I call upon the minister – like I said, we've spoken, and I encourage him to give this some serious attention in moving it up on the list as it requires immediate attention now.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Works for a response, please.

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

When you think about our Roads Plan and the success we've had with our Roads Plan through early tendering, early starts, we've seen a way that we've been able to reinvest in roads. The Member opposite talks about how – the specific project that he's referring to today is the Foxtrap

Access Road. That is a project that's projected out, I think, four years.

But one of the things that we've done since bringing in our five-year Roads Plan is quite often, due to early tendering and early starts, if we're able to achieve savings through that early part of the construction season, we then go forward and look for projects that are emerging, projects similar to the one the Member opposite is referring to.

So one of the things we've done through the great success of our five-year Roads Plan is having the ability to actually do work later in the season outside of the current year's Roads Plan into outer years.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a project that we realize the value of, and it's certainly something that we will continue to monitor.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Further petitions?

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

MR. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There have been numerous concerns raised by family members of seniors in long-term care throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly those suffering with dementia, Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive debilitating conditions, whereby loved ones have experienced injuries, have not been bathed regularly, not received proper nutrition and/or have been left lying in their own waste for extended periods of time. We believe this is directly related to the government's failure to ensure adequate staffing at those facilities.

THEREFORE we petition the House of Assembly as follows:

To urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to instate legislation which includes the mandatory establishment of an adequate ratio of one staff to three residents in long-term care and all other applicable regional health

facilities housing persons with dementia, Alzheimer's disease and other cognitive debilitating conditions in order to ensure appropriate safety, protection from injuries, proper hygiene care and all other required care. This law would include the creation of a specific job position in these facilities for monitoring, intervention as required to ensure the safety of patients.

Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting petitions on behalf of people in my late mother's neck of the woods, actually: Centreville, Valleyfield, Wareham, Trinity, Pool's Island and so on. We have a couple of people from Gander as well.

Mr. Speaker, again, we present this petition on behalf of the group, Advocates for Senior Citizen's Rights, and their thousands of members that they do have. I recognize that the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi also presented a petition on this earlier, and I do acknowledge the minister's response to it.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to what the minister was saying, there are certainly – I understand that staff are doing the best they can; nobody is questioning that. I think it's great that they received some awards in a couple of the health authorities for certain aspects of work they've done; nobody is disputing it either.

But this is about specific circumstances that people – if you go into their Facebook group, the website they have set up, Advocates for Senior Citizen's Rights, you'll see individual stories of situations where someone who has loved ones with dementia or Alzheimer's disease, and to go into the facility and find the food that was laid out for breakfast still there on the side of the bed on a table because nobody bothered to feed that person, or wasn't able, or they were busy or whatever the case might be, situations of loved ones lying in their own waste for extended periods of time and so on.

This is our parents, our grandparents we're talking about. It's important that we take care of our seniors, and that's all they're asking.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Orders of the Day

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. COADY: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I call from the Order Paper, Order 7, Bill 57.

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

MS. COADY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

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

I move, seconded by the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port, that An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008, Bill 57, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 57, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008, be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008." (Bill 57)

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

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

It's my pleasure to rise in this hon. House today to introduce Bill 57, entitled, as we've just said, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008.

The Registered Nurses Act, 2008 regulates the practice of nursing in the province. The Association of Registered Nurses in Newfoundland and Labrador is the regulatory body created under this act and is responsible for

acting in the interest of the public. It does this by looking, promoting and advancing the ethical and professional standards of the nursing profession, and also promoting proficiency and competence in the nursing profession.

The association's mandate is to ensure that registered nurses who provide care and services to the people of the province are qualified, and that they provide those services in accordance with professional and ethical standards applicable to the practice of nursing.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 57 proposes to amend the RN Act in a number of ways; some major, some minor. It removes the term association from the name of the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador to better reflect its public protection mandate. It removes the requirement to have a legislated standards committee to approve a nurse practitioner scope of practice; and, finally, it makes clarifications around the quality assurance process. And I'll go into each of these now in a little bit more detail.

The most significant amendment, obviously, and most noticeable is the change in the name. The change proposed in the act is to change Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador to the College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador. The association has requested that its name be changed to a College of Registered Nurses to avoid confusion as to the nature of its statutory mandate, particularly as it pertains to the role of other associations and organizations.

The ARNNL have advised that the term association in the formal title of a regulatory authority has led to confusion, particularly amongst the public, as the term association is more often understood to mean an organization that's solely responsible for advocating for its membership. As I laid out at the beginning, the act actually states the mandate is to advocate on behalf of the interests of the public.

The ARNNL has also advised that it's often confused with the other nursing association, which is the Registered Nurses' Union of Newfoundland and Labrador. So a change to the ARNNL name would clearly reflect its distinct role from the Nurses' Union and would

immediately, in the minds of all who saw it, identify this body as the regulatory authority.

The association has also advised that the name causes confusion amongst its own members. It is to attract awareness and understanding about its organization using both public and member surveys. These have shown that the results demonstrate that while the public has a general awareness of the ARNNL, there is a lack of understanding of its mandate with respect to regulating registered nurses, rather than a role as an advocacy group for the nursing profession or as a union. Further, a percentage of members themselves believe that the role of the ARNNL is actually to protect nurses rather than the public.

Change recommended in the statute amendment in the name of the ARNNL is consistent with the names of the vast majority of health professional statutes currently in this province. Of 23 self-regulating health professions, there are only two regulatory authorities using the word association in their name. There's the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Social Workers.

Mr. Speaker, the objects of the ARNNL are set out in section 4 of the act and its public protection mandate will not change as a result of this amendment, Bill 57. Whilst the change in the ARNNL's name is of great significance, Mr. Speaker, the other important amendment to Bill 57 is around the removal of the nurse practitioner standards committee, and I will elaborate a little bit more on that in case people feel that they're losing something by this.

A bit of history: Back in the early implementation of the nurse practitioner role in the province's health care – this goes back now to the late 1990s and early 2000s – the practice of nurse practitioners was in its infancy; and so, as such, legislation and authority for oversight was very prescriptive, and it was that way in order for the ARNNL to meet its public protection mandate. This was new ground. In actual fact, I think it's worthwhile stating at this point, in terms of nurse practitioners in their role and their utility and employment within the health care system, this province leads the way.

If you go to federal, provincial and territorial health ministers meetings, we are the jurisdiction that others come to when asking about issues concerned with nurse practitioners. From Prince Edward Island, which asked me at their last meeting, how on earth do you get nurse practitioners on the Island; to Manitoba, where they actually have the same number of nurse practitioners as we do, but for a population and geography – or, certainly, the population is considerably bigger than us. So I think it's worth highlighting that we, as a province, blaze this particular trail, and at that point prescriptive legislation was deemed a prudent measure.

This, however, still carries on today. So, as such, the RN Act currently requires the association to appoint a standards committee consisting, among others, of a representative of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Newfoundland and Labrador, and a representative of the Newfoundland and Labrador Pharmacy Board. There is also a mix of other members chosen by the ARNNL.

This committee, the standards committee, is mandated to determine a scope of practice, such as the forms of energy that a nurse practitioner may prescribe. By which I mean heat therapy, ultrasound, that kind of thing, the laboratory or other tests they may order, the drugs that may be prescribed, and the circumstances under which those particular drugs may be prescribed to.

The RN Act stipulates that decisions of this practice standards committee shall be made by the majority. However, the kicker in the tail, as it were, was that representatives from the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Pharmacy Board must actually agree with a majority of vote in order for it to become a decision of the committee. This essentially gives those representatives a veto over changes to a nurse practitioner's scope of practice.

Since the introduction of this committee structure, the education requirements and the scope of practice of nurse practitioners have evolved and are much better understood now than they were even 10 years ago, and certainly at the time of the inception of the original legislation.

Nurse practitioners in the province are now required to complete graduate level education, write a national examination and they become an established and important part of the health care teams in the delivery of health care services throughout the province. You would have heard me on many occasions rise to comment on their value and the contribution that they make in all sorts of arenas, and more lately through the Towards Recovery: Mental Health and Addictions Plan, as we were fortunate enough to have some of the first tranche of nurse practitioners complete the Suboxone methadone prescribing courses to enable better access for people with substance use issues.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 57, this amendment removes the committee requirement in legislation; however, it, of itself doesn't purport to nor is it intended to make any change to a nurse practitioner's scope of practice through this amendment. The nurse practitioner's scope of practice is well established in the current education programs and training. Any issues related to nurse practitioners' practicing outside this scope of practice can be adequately addressed by the ARNNL or the college when this legislation passes in accordance with its authority under existing legislation

Both the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Pharmacy Board have advised themselves they no longer see a need for a legislative standards committee which gives them decision-making authority or veto over a nurse practitioner's scope of practice. So, essentially, nobody on the committee wants it. While ARNNL may still decide to maintain a committee in a consultative and advisory capacity, the committee would no longer be established in legislation nor would it have any decision-making authority as such.

Mr. Speaker, it has been the position of our government that the residents of our province should be able to receive health care services from the right health care professional at the right time. This is an essential prerequisite to the primary health care model. To support this, where legislative requirements are impeding a health care professional's ability to practice to their full scope of practice, we need to take steps to address these impediments, and Bill 57 does that.

Moving on to the other amendments in the bill; the other one with a significant impact on the ARNNL's ability to deliver its objects and mandate – again, a little bit of history. In December of 2014, the RN Act was amended to establish a quality assurance provision. The amendments in 2014, which are on the statute books, require the association to establish a quality assurance program which will enable it to address practice issues before they become more serious matters requiring disciplinary intervention. While the quality assurance provisions have received Royal Assent, they have not yet come into force.

The RN Act currently contains provisions which establish a disciplinary process to be followed where it is alleged that a registered nurse has engaged in professional misconduct or conduct deserving of sanction, and that is common to pretty well every other self-regulating profession. This process to resolve an allegation of professional misconduct by the director, it has several mechanisms. It can involve a settlement by the director of Professional Conduct Review, it can involve a referral to the Complaints Authorization Committee to enter into an investigation and, following which, that committee then could make an adjudication tribunal recommendation to set up a hearing.

So the act sets out a number of sanctions which can be imposed on a registered nurse who has been found to have engaged in conduct undeserving of a nurse. They include restrictions on the ability to practice, or even suspension or removal of a licence. As you can appreciate, allegations of conduct deserving of sanction are very serious issues and they are properly dealt with through a disciplinary process.

The problem existed in 2014, was a quality assurance regime. The aims of that would allow the association to engage with a registered nurse to address concerns about that individual's practice before it gets to the point where the big guns and the big stick come out and they end up being sanctioned.

While the ARNNL has been working diligently to develop such policies and to put processes in place to make it ready for quality assurance provisions to come into force, it discovered in the process of doing this, issues with the

adoption of the provisions in the 2014 amendment as they stood. The principle issue was the authority to attempt to resolve issues in the context of a quality assurance process, i.e. we want to educate you, we want to work with you and help you be the better nurse, the better nurse practitioner, it didn't exist. The only option the ARNNL had, if they identified a quality assurance issue, was to go down a disciplinary route, and that doesn't serve anybody's interest. It overuses a disciplinary process and basically stalls the whole principle of quality assurance, which is around much less about attributing blame and fault, and far much more around education and moving towards a better quality.

So, we felt if it's appropriate for the ARNNL to attempt to resolve allegations of conduct deserving of sanction in a disciplinary context, it also makes sense that they should have some authority along the same lines to deal with concerns that don't meet a disciplinary threshold, and that's what these amendments are intended to provide. So because of that, they have requested, and we have put in the amendments, a provision that will allow it to fully carry out its quality assurance mandate. Without that amendment, the process of handling quality assurance concerns is going to be way more complicated, and ultimately not serve the best interests of the public, for whom it is set up to protect.

I am advised that the amendment in Bill 57 that deals with quality assurance is in keeping with the original intent of the amendment in 2014, so it's not contrary to the spirit of either the 2008 act or as amended in 2014. Once this amendment is made, I'm also advised that the ARNNL is ready to have the quality assurance provisions proclaimed into force. So everything is ready, except we have this barrier baked into the 2014 amendment, which we need to deal with, with Bill 57.

So, Mr. Speaker, this clarification and the proclamation of the quality assurance provisions will grant the ARNNL, or the College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador an additional tool to address concerns early, rather than to wait until they become more serious. It will enable the association to fulfill its statutory mandate by ensuring that registered

nurses in the province continue to provide the highest level of care to the patients they serve, and it does this by allowing the association to deal with concerns way earlier, before they become serious enough to be conduct deserving of a sanction, which then goes down a separate disciplinary process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to highlight that Bill 57 will actually come into force in September, on September 1 of this year. The delay in proclamation contained in the bill is at the request of the association and it's done to allow them sufficient time to update their communication promotional materials as well as signage to reflect the change to its name.

This is essentially, potentially, a rebranding exercise for what will become the college, the regulators. It's a huge opportunity for them to go to their membership and the public and clear up some of these dilemmas that exist in the minds of the people of the province, as well as their own members that I referenced in my preamble earlier on.

There are currently 6,400 registered nurses practising in the province and about 170 nurse practitioners. As I say, the same number as in Manitoba pretty well. They practise within our acute health care centres, they work with children and seniors and they are a vital part of our overall health care system. They are becoming more increasingly valuable as we roll out our hub-and-spoke model *Towards Recovery* and mental health and addictions.

The aim of Bill 57, the amended act, is to support the registered nurses that continue to work hard, to continue to provide that excellent quality of care to the residents of our province. It will assist the association in fulfilling its mandate by continuing to ensure that registered nurses are qualified and competent to provide that care and services and to provide early intervention opportunities under a quality assurance mechanism rather than waiting for the big stick and the boot, as it were, if they get that bad.

Officials in my department have worked very closely with the association, and I acknowledge the presence of a couple of their executives in the gallery here today. We've worked very

closely with the association regarding these amendments to ensure that what we have on paper here meets their needs. We really look forward to this opportunity to work together with a new College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador to help what we all have, which is a desire to have a high-quality system, high-quality providers and to protect the public and regulate the practice.

I'm not going to use my full time, Mr. Speaker, much as my colleagues will be sad to hear that I know; they love to hear me read.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. HAGGIE: Don't worry guys; I'll give you your chance.

Basically, I'm just going to round off with one simple request: I would ask all Members of this hon. House to support this bill. It's a major landmark for the nursing profession.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Warr): Thank you.

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's indeed an opportunity and an honour for me to stand and talk to the amendments to Bill 57. I will note, the minister had be at consultation. Sometimes we banter back and forth here about changes to legislation and sometimes it's conversing with the stakeholders – is it beneficial?

In some cases, it doesn't take place and sometimes we banter back and forth about the conversations and the inclusion not taking place, but I understand from the association and from the minister's outlining it that this conversation has taken place. The changes, the amendments that are being made to the legislation are reflective of the changing in standards, the changing in operations, the changes in moving things to another level and putting us on an equal standard, professionally, and from

operational point of view as other jurisdictions. So we welcome that.

As the minister said, he's asking for all his colleagues to support this. Well, I'll start the way I normally would finish by saying we will be supporting this piece of legislative change, but I do still want to talk to the importance of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRAZIL: While it may seem on the surface, in some cases, that it's minor changes, it's never a minor change when you're changing the image of an organization, the ability for the organization to have particular increase in standards and its operational procedures that obviously improve its dialogue, its image in the community, its representation of its memberships and its ability to work with other partners to ensure that they improve the service they provide.

When we talk about, in this case, the Association of Registered Nurses and what that means and what well over 6,500 professionals provide to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, no change is insignificant and no change is considered what people sometimes would say it's just housekeeping. It has a major impact because the influence and the responsibility and what they add to our health care service in Newfoundland and Labrador is immeasurable. So anything that is offered, any piece of legislation, any amendment, any change in policy or any clarification of the standards, the processes, the organization's operational policies are an improvement for a number of reasons.

One, the membership have a clear understanding of how they're going to provide their services and their responsibilities. It gives the general public a better understanding of what the roles and responsibilities of that organization are, and what their expectations of that organization would be. It would open up – I would think and hope, and I've seen the evidence of it – easier, more collaborative dialogue between the line departments, or even in cases here, the regional health authorities, to have an understanding of the role everybody would play in ensuring that

the continuum in our health care system moves on a forward basis.

So while the minister has outlined – and I'll just talk about some of them that I think are important, they're all important, but I think have more significant importance around how this improves the act itself. No doubt, every so many years it's imperative on all of us, no matter what the organization is or us as a part of the general public, to review the legislation that represents a particular policy, an organization or a structured service that we provide, to ensure we've modernized it and it truly represents the clientele we represent, it truly represents the clientele's responsibility or service that it provides.

In this case, that's what I've seen happen with Bill 57. That through a full review of it, and there are a multitude of sections in here – and the particular changes are not only relevant to one section. They cross over a number of the operational and structural processes and procedures of the organization itself.

One, the changing of the name. Some might see that as insignificant, depending on where you stand, but when you're changing your image, you're changing people's perception of what you do. You're changing your ability to, in some cases, offer or provide different services, expand those.

In this case, changing the name to the College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, I think adds us in another level of professionalism. Not that we haven't had 100 per cent professionalism from the organization in the past, but it's modernizing. It puts it in a detailed category that talks to the importance, it talks to the professionalism and it talks to the responsibility. So changing that, while it might seem minimal on the surface, from a logistical point of view I think it has many other more important logistical benefits for people's perception in how the organization operates, how it negotiates, how it develops partnerships.

So we see that as a positive add-on for the organization to change its name. It doesn't take away from any of the history of the organization. It doesn't take away from any of the logistical understandings that the general public would have of what this organization offers. What it

does, they put it on an even keel with other jurisdictions and notes it for what it is; an extremely, highly professional organization that has as its mandate and has as its membership those qualified individuals who will offer a provided service, particularly in the health care area here.

Updating the terminology used to describe the executive members of council – we've changed, and sometimes we go in full circles after decades of organizations operating on the structure of our executive makeup, on the structure of our staffing component, on the structure of the labelling and the different responsibilities of executive members in this. But this puts us inline with other jurisdictions, with other agencies within Newfoundland and Labrador that represent components of the health care profession.

So that to me – while it seems like a change on paper, it's a change in operational procedures and operational structures. The image of the organization stays at the level that it needs to be, the extreme high level of professionalism.

It allows the council, with the approval of the minister, to establish different categories of registered nurses. Because as our health care profession changes, and our demands and our needs, there is always a need for categories. Sometimes people don't like categories because they talk about, it is segregated. I don't believe that, and I know us on this side don't believe that.

We talk about different responsibilities, different training components, different ways of delivering services, different models that can be developed. In any organization, sometimes you carve off who would have the speciality to do that. What's the most efficient way to make that happen? What's the most engaging way to make that happen?

So having the ability for this organization, who are the professionals – it shouldn't be dictated by anybody outside. This organization who has the professionals, who understands its membership's needs, would have the ability to design a mechanism that works and decide what categories are necessary and who would fit into those, and what their responsibilities would be

for providing health care in our province. It allows more than four public members appointed to the council of the college.

I'm a big believer, anything we do in the health care system – I believe in any system that we offer services to the general public, there has to be a collaborative approach here. There has to be the professionals who have the skill set to offer it, but it also has to have the general public, for people who could talk about their particular needs, who could talk about a particular approach to it.

Having a balance of the proper number, the right balance of those who are guiding with their advice or their experiences and for those who have the professional expertise to be able to deliver on those services that are needed. So having that ability to offer that, to me, is a positive.

What I do like – and I'll have a few questions when we get to Committee – is the fact that we're not pigeonholing ourselves. We're not saying it can only be this number, that there's an ability for the committee to look at it. Once this piece of legislation is passed and they're registered as a college, they can then themselves look at the operations of their organization to be able to put in play the structure that would be conducive to being able to then provide the services that they're enacted and that they're entrusted to offer in this province.

Clarify that the disciplinary process applies to any member licenced under the act. We've had some big debate here. I remember one of the debates with the Newfoundland and Labrador Medical Association, and changing the legislation there was, again, around the control over the disciplinary process. Again, I'm a really big believer in two collaborative approaches here. One, there has to be a mechanism for self-policing. Everybody has to be accountable.

In a professional organization, the organization themselves would have the best opportunity to be able to determine the standards. If those were not adhered to, those who do not follow the proper policies, they're answerable, and how the checks and balances are done to ensure that happens here.

Having that policy clarified would make both the government, the department who represents the masses of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador through a legislation and us here in the House of Assembly, making it clear as to knowing that the organization itself has a clear disciplinary process to ensure its members follow rules and regulations. In cases where that doesn't happen, there's a process in play to understand exactly how that's going to be dealt with.

Clarifying the quality assurance provisions; that's always been a question here of interpretation over the years; particularly, when we talk about health legislation. What the quality assurance is all about, and how do we make that reflect exactly the needs to ensure the best quality of health care is being provided and that the outcomes are conducive with the investment. The investment sometimes is human investment. Sometimes it's financial investment; sometimes it's partnership investments.

We like that those issues are being clarified. It's not in any way, shape or form to indicate that they didn't exist in the past, because this organization has been extremely professional and extremely beneficial, if not one of the top beneficial associations for providing proper health care in our province. What this does now is clarify and bring it to the next level.

All these pieces of legislation are always living entities. As we grow, as things change in our health care, as the needs of members' change, as the organization's mandate may take on different philosophies as they partner with other groups, we have to also make sure that we're open to be able to make these changes. Not 10 and 15 and 20 years where it's a dramatic change and there's backlash because we don't have the ability to offer particular services. As we do this, this ensure this.

In my opinion, most of our legislation should have four or five standard things that we review on a biannual basis. Quality assurance is definitely one. Disciplinary processes is another; developing best practices, return on our investments, these types of things. This is a good way of bringing it to the next level; over the last five years or so since we've had any major reviews or major changes.

Remove the requirements to appoint a nurse practitioner standards committee – and I do realize that our health profession is changing somewhat in this province, because we're having to find unique ways to provide services in rural and remote communities, in some of our urban centres, in some of our big health care facilities, and we need to be able to have flexibility to understand how we offer things. So, removing certain requirements to appoint a nurse practitioner standards committee, and replacing it with something that's more conducive and more in tune with how we move the health care profession forward is a positive.

We look at here, the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador has requested a name change. That's what I said at the beginning, the fact that they have made the acknowledgement and the effort to sit with government and say, here's where our organization is, here's what we feel would best represent, in legislation, who we are, what we do and would give us the flexibility to be able to provide the services that we're set up to do in a more equitable way and a more efficient way, and that, I see, as a positive.

The names of the president and president-elect will be changed to chairperson and vice-chairperson. They're logistical issues that were determined by the membership to say this works in the best effect for our organization from a regional, a provincial and national standard, so why we would ever argue with that; I mean, we have to give some autonomy to organizations to best set out in legislation what represents who they are, and that's what this change there does for that.

The change will allow greater than four members of the general public to be appointed while maintaining 10 members elected from and by registered nurses; I see that. You can't in any way, shape or form out-balance the professionals who are set up, and this is their organization, to have it that there might be a group who have more influence on the operation of that organization. But as we said at the beginning, and on the recommendation of the upcoming college, this organization now has the ability to be open-minded to say, how can we best provide the services and represent our own membership within an organization, and having those

viewpoints from different perspectives add to that. So, that's an added change that they have fostered and moved forward.

Amendments would allow the future regulatory – establishing different categories of registered nurses. None are currently proposed; this is to allow future flexibility. And as I said earlier, the delivery of our health care system is evolving on a daily basis. Having a professional organization that represents the largest proportion of those who provide the services in our health care, have to have the flexibility to be able to either change their approach, add new entities, add new categories, develop a new staffing regiment that fits the particular needs in a professional manner. So, this gives them that ability to do that.

The college will have the ability to order respondents to pay costs or part of an investigation and hearing, whether the respondent pleads guilty or is found guilty. This is an internal operation to ensure that members are accountable, and that the rest of the membership shouldn't have to bear the brunt of a financial cost for the organization, or the taxpayers, based on because somebody else who didn't follow the professional procedures and processes that have been outlined by the organization itself.

The nurse practitioner standards committee is repealed. This move is supported by the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Pharmacy Board, who has members on the committee, is viewed as redundant. Standards, scope of practice, et cetera, are set out in regulatory. So what we're saying is now, rather than having something that people could interpret that would either slow the process down or would say that's the angle we'll go, we already have this outlined now in the regulatory of the legislation.

It cleans everything up; it makes it neat. I would hope it prevents misinterpretation or delayed processes of saying no, we have to compare this piece of the legislation or this part of our policy to this. It now clearly outlines exactly the best process to use in these circumstances. So if there's a debate on a particular issue or a differencing of opinion, it's clearly spelled out in legislation. Again, there are a number of in-

house name changes and grammatical changes which just adds to the professionalism.

So looking at this, I will have a few questions just for clarification, because we want to ensure every time we put a piece of legislation in this House that we get the best return for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that we could from it, but we also get the best collaborative partnership with the agency or organization who have put forward their recommendations and who are going to be providing the valuable service that's necessary here.

So as we move forward on An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008 and move it to another level, we look forward on this side to having some more open debate in Committee, but also look forward to being able to support this and having this enacted in September.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

I recognize the hon. the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

MR. FINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to thank the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island for his words and contributing to our conversation on Bill 57, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008. As alluded by the minister, as well as the Member opposite, there are just few changes here, but it's certainly something that was asked of the department to move forward with. I certainly want to welcome and acknowledge the visitors to the gallery here this afternoon as well.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the great pleasure over the last number of months to work closely with the Minister of Health and Community Services and the representatives in the Department of Health and Community Services as the parliamentary secretary to the minister. I know that this is something that was looking forward to – and while it may seem, in some senses, a bit minor and some changes in procedural and some logistical things, it certainly is important. The minister, I think, hit the nail right on the head

with his opening remarks, specifically referring to the name change and changing the name of the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador to the College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador.

This is really a reflection of the mandate and the regulatory authority responsible for the regulation of registered nurse. As the minister had said, it commonly could be referred to previously as more of an advocacy group. By removing the word “association” from its name, we're essentially eliminating some of this confusion.

The name change as well, we're going to update some terminology with respect to the executive members of the council. The Member just spoke briefly about referring to the word president and president-elect, and we'll now refer to chairperson and vice-chairperson respectively.

Further, the bill updates provisions in the act regarding the elections of these two positions, such that a public representative may be elected. These positions will no longer need to be filled by registered nurses, only thereby broadening the pool of individuals who would eligible to hold these executive positions. So, essentially increasing the number of public representative who may be appointed to the council of the college. While the minimum number of four will not change, there will be authority to appoint more public representatives as desired. I think an increase in the number of individuals on the council, essentially it will enhance the representation of the public perspective which aligns with more of public protection mandate of what will now be called the college.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 57 expands the authority to make regulations, with the approval of the minister, with respect to the establishment of various categories of registered nurses. The authority will permit the making of regulations, should a need arise in the future, to establish categories of RNs, where certain RNs may have a particular expertise or specialized training. I understand there is no immediate intention to establish such categories; however, including this provision here in the bill will give flexibility, should any need arise in the future.

There's some clarity around the disciplinary process, Mr. Speaker, with respect to anybody who is currently licensed or was licensed under the Registered Nurses Act. The amendment will clarify that nurses who are granted any provisional licence, pending successful completion of their qualifying examination, may be subject to discipline in appropriate circumstances. This is, again, really provisional in the sense that any disciplinary provisions will only apply to registered nurses and former registered nurses, again. Again, no way to strengthen anything here, other than really put a broader scope on it.

The bill also clarifies the cost of an investigation and a hearing, should there be any type of complaint made by an injunction tribunal, regardless of whether the registrant pleads guilty or is found guilty of conduct deserving of any particular sanction.

Also, some clarity around the quality assurance process. As the minister alluded to in his remarks, the purpose of the quality assurance process is to address areas of concern before they become more serious and may warrant any type of action. This is very consistent with the mandate to regulate the practice of registered nurses in the public interest. Having authority to address concerns before they become more serious is very positive, something very proactive, and something that's been asked of us to ensure that registered nurses continue to provide the highest level of care and services to the people of our province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Bill 57 will remove the legislative requirement to appoint a nurse practitioner standards committee. This committee is currently made up of representatives of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, members of the Pharmacy Board.

The committee was established, I would say, just about 20 years ago, early 2000s, and this was when nurse practitioners were new to our province. At the time, the train of thought was the level of oversight into a nurse practitioner's scope of practice was seen as necessary, but I think we can all agree that since this time nurse practitioners have become very well established in our health care system. They have a very advanced level of education and training in their

scope of practice, and it's no longer necessary to have this type of committee, which was set out in legislation, to determine what a nurse practitioner can and cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, I can speak first-hand to the folks on the West Coast and what the role of nurse practitioners have done with, specifically, to some of our rural clinics. The Member for St. George's - Humber could allude to it as well. I actually just sat down with our local nurse practitioner just a few months ago to have a good chat about some of the good work they do.

That, essentially, sums up some of the changes, Mr. Speaker. I understand there may be more. The Member alluded to some questions in Committee. This is something that was requested of us, to make some changes; certainly, something that is necessary, some logistical things, some procedural things, and of course the name change and a few others.

I guess, to not belabour the point, as both Members have done quite a good job, I'd like to take the opportunity to say thank you to all the nurses in our province for all the work they do each and every single day. A lot of my friends are nurses. I've actually gotten to meet a lot of nurses since becoming a part of the department. Just a few weeks ago I was at the Faculty of Medicine at MUN where we had a scholarship and awards ceremony. It was certainly great to see the top scholars and those who have made the dean's list, and the various scholarships and to hear about their success.

Mr. Speaker, nurses are – perhaps, next to folks who cross-country run – they're the folks who keep those shoes flying off the shelf. The amount of miles they put on their feet in the run of a day is something one can only fathom, I believe, unless you are in the profession.

I know a number of our Members here in the House, the Member for Fogo Island - Cape Freels, his wife is a nurse and his daughter is a nurse. Your family as well, Mr. Speaker. So I know we feel very well informed, and it is these folks who provide the front line service of care. They see babies being born into the world and they see folks pass on in palliative care as well, and they certainly see it all. We are very, very proud of the great work they do. If there's any

way in particular that we can support, and be it minor legislative changes and something that was asked upon of the department and the minister, by all means, we are certainly all ears.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister and the staff in particular who've done work on this piece of legislation. I'd like to thank the Members opposite for what I anticipate to be their full support in the passing of Bill 57.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for St. John's Centre.

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

I am happy to stand and to speak to Bill 57, a Registered Nurses Act amendment.

I would like to thank those who have come to watch the debate and witness the debate, and I would like to thank all those who prepared and gave an excellent briefing on this bill. Thank you to our nurses who – nursing is a calling. Many nurses talk about it as a calling, that it's not just a profession.

All of us have been touched by nurses at some point – literally and figuratively – in our lives, whether through the medical system, through the public health care system. There were times when a lot of us in the House – when there used to be nurses in the schools, and they provided care in the schools. That no longer happens. Some of us learned about sex education from nurses, or health care and prevention.

Many of us know the incredible work that nurses do and how they are the foundation of our health care system. How often have we heard doctors say: well, you know what, really the best one to speak to about that is my nurse, because she or he, they really know, they are doing the day-to-day work. And when we see nurses working in hospitals on those shifts, whether it's Christmas or Easter, or Hanukkah, all the different holidays

that may be their personal holidays; yet, they are there taking care of our sick, taking care of our elderly.

We've also heard stories of nurses working really long shifts, or double shifts for various reasons, or having a hard time getting time off for family weddings or birthday celebrations of family members. So the sacrifice and the commitment, the passion and the compassion that one must have for that profession, for that calling, I think we all are grateful for that.

In some of our communities, nurses are the main go-to for health care. Those communities are small. There may not be doctors in that community. I'm not saying nurses can't give health care, but then are called upon for a real expanded scope of practice, and that they are the trusted person to go to in a community for health care.

So I would like to say thank you very much for the nurses in Newfoundland and Labrador on behalf of the people of the province for their dedicated service. Sometimes what they do is life-saving. It's certainly very, very important.

What this bill is doing – myself and my colleague from St. John's East - Quidi Vidi are certainly going to support this. Our caucus is going to support this bill.

The bill is amending the *Registered Nurses Act, 2008*. It will change the name of the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador to the College of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, because they are a self-regulating body in the province and it still has association in its title rather than the title of college or board.

The association implies more so of an advocacy role rather than the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador's chief role as a health care regulator, and their role as a regulator is so important. It's so important, not only for the quality assurance and safety of those they serve, the patients they serve, but also for the quality of work for their own protection as well. So that they ensure that policies and procedures as well protect them because of often the heavy burden that they carry.

So it's a bit of a separation of advocacy role from regulatory functions, and that's a national trend we are seeing. It's been going on over the last decade, but they will still have advocacy roles. They will weigh in publicly on health policy, such as the determinants of health. That's so important, and we see doctors doing that as well. Primary health care teams, they'll talk about that. They'll talk about prevention. They'll talk about issues that are arising in what they see as they fulfill their work, and that's so important.

One of the things we have learned is how important it is for government to listen to our front-line workers, and how important it is to know that it is nurses who are the experts about nursing. They are the experts about nursing. So how important it is that they do continue a role of advocacy on some of these issues because of their expertise. That expertise comes not only from their training, but also from the experience they gain in the work they do. So that's very important.

The other thing is the update in the terminology used to describe the executive members of the council. That's important. We'll see that their president will no longer be called a president, that there'll be a chairperson and a vice-chairperson. Again, shifting to that area of regulation.

It allows the council, with the approval of the minister, to make regulations establishing different categories of registered nurses. For instance, we're seeing a growth in the use of nurse practitioners, and how wonderful that is. It's progressive. It is best standards, best practices.

As a matter of fact, one of my family members was seen by a nurse practitioner today and she was diagnosed with pneumonia. That nurse practitioner could do that diagnosis, and that nurse practitioner wrote her a prescription for an antibiotic. So how wonderful it is that we see the expanded scope of practice for our nurses, particularly in the area of nurse practitioners. We are looking forward to seeing more and more nurse practitioners and more and more primary health care teams that would include the work of nurse practitioners.

It also clarifies that the disciplinary process applies to any person licensed under the act. Again, we're seeing different kinds of nurses, whether it's psychiatric nurses, cardiac care nurses, nurse practitioners, registered nurses – that this will expand. We'll probably be looking also, more specifically as time goes on, when we see more specialized nursing as well.

It clarifies when costs of an investigation in hearing of a complaint under the act may be ordered, and it clarifies the quality assurance provisions. Again, I feel that quality assurance provisions are not just about the care that is given, but also to make sure that the caregiver has what they need in order to be able to give the care in as best way possible.

We see around the area of nurse practitioner, that it removes the requirement to appoint a nurse practitioner standards committee. Again, because so much work has been done in that area.

Some people often are confused a little bit about the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador. Again, that's the regulating body. The Registered Nurses' Union has a president there, it's Debbie Forward. They do great advocacy work. They do fantastic advocacy work. They handle more around areas of grievances, individual issues of nurses, working conditions for nurses, and nurses' contracts.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's really not much more for me to say about this except that we certainly support it, and I believe everybody in the House is going to support it. It's a piece of legislation that has been carefully thought out. It's looking at some very clear specifics. It's about modernizing the way we talk about nursing and the self-regulation body of nursing.

Again, though, it does give us the opportunity to thank the nurses, all the nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, who serve our people so well, often under very, very difficult conditions with limited resources. That takes real compassion and passion. That's all I have to say.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

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

It's not too often I get a chance, but this is a great opportunity in the House to reflect on the nursing profession. I know most people here today spoke about the change to this legislation, but, Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to take a couple of minutes because every time nursing is mentioned to me, it's a special place in my heart.

The greatest person I ever met in my life and the greatest person I ever knew in my life was a nurse, my mom. She was 32 years as a public health nurse, and back in her day – I listened to the Member for St. John's Centre mention about school. I can remember when I was going to school in my area in Flatrock, I was very good the days that I knew my mother was coming to that school to give needles, because I didn't want to be seen out by the door or have one of the teachers mad with me.

It's a profession that deserves the respect it gets. The people who do the job of nursing, nursing practitioners in this province, I thank you, because I understand. I've seen it first-hand the type of work you do, the compassion that's needed with that profession. It's a compassionate job. It's a job where you have to deal with people who are in dire need; who need a person to talk to, who need a person to ensure that people are looking out for them.

I know my mom, many nights she left the house and went and sat with people; just the point to be able to go and give that person reassurance and stuff like that. She was a very compassionate person. I think to this day, a lot of people tell me that I got some of her traits; I got her traits. Honestly, that's the best thing anyone could ever say to me, that I am like my mom.

I'll tell a little story, it's a funny little story. Because, like I said, the nursing professional, you're such a respect to your community in the job you do. I know the Member for Ferryland, his mom also was a public health nurse for 30 years, and my mom was in public health for 32 years.

My dad was a politician. At the time, I went and I knocked on a lot of doors. I was a young guy, and I knocked on a lot of doors in Torbay, Flatrock, Pouch Cove and that area. I came home one night to him, and I said, Father – he was pretty popular in the area. I said, Dad, I'll tell you one thing, there's one person in this place that can beat you. And he looked at me, yeah, who can beat me? I said that's 'mudder.' Because every house I went to they said tell your mom we'll be out to vote. And it was because she gave so many needles, she did so many house calls, and she showed people respect. Not only did she get respect, but she respected other people.

The nursing profession, I have two sisters-in-law and a niece who are nurses. I think there's no greater profession that you could do as a caring person. I want to thank all the nurses and nurse practitioners in this province who do the job that they do. It's a hard job, but I want to let you know, you're very well appreciated.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure to stand in this House this afternoon and to speak very briefly, I might add, to Bill 57, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say from the outset, that I had a caucus meeting this morning and our caucus is unanimous in supporting this bill; absolutely, it's a great bill.

As other Members have referenced, and we can all tell our own personal stories, I suppose, but I live with a nurse. My wife is a registered nurse. As a matter of fact, a little bit of trivia for you there, she actually graduated with the Minister of Service NL. They were in the same graduation class at Southcott Hall; at the time, was the General Hospital nurses.

So I know first-hand the work that nurses do. I know the toll it takes on you physically. I know the toll it takes on you mentally. I know there were many times that my wife would come home and I'd have to rub her feet and stuff like that because she'd be run off her feet all day long, and I know there's an awful lot to it.

Certainly, I know from the perspective of – even when she was carrying our first child, both children actually, we spent quite a bit of time at the hospital. She had a condition, the minister would know, hyperemesis is what it was called, I do believe, which basically means morning sickness 24-7. She had that on her first, and she would spend probably three or four days in hospital to get IV – what was it called, TPN and lipids, I think? Well, anyway, whatever they called it, but basically IV to get hydrated. She'd go home and she'd be sick for three or four days, and then she'd be back to the hospital for another two or three days, and that was ongoing.

I can remember all the trips we made to the hospital and all the time we spent there. Every time they'd have to give her an IV, if a doctor or resident came in to try to find the vein: no, Sir, couldn't do it. Get the nurse, first shot every time. I have to say they treated us very, very well.

It was interesting, because after the first child the doctor said at the time, the chances of this ever happening again are like winning the lottery twice in a row. Guess what? The second child, the same condition happened all over again. We spent a tremendous time as a result of that.

We also spent an awful lot of time, at one period in our lives, at the Janeway with our oldest. I have to say, the nurses at the Janeway were absolutely amazing. The treatment we received was so good, you couldn't ask for anything better in terms of being professional and being compassionate and so on.

Of course, on the other side of things, with my parents both, who spent – who eventually ended up in palliative care. That's where you see the other side of life, I guess. Again, the professionalism and the compassion and so on that was shown there was second to none.

You hear people all the time who have concerns about the health care system, and most people will tell you the biggest frustration with the health care system is actually getting into the system; actually getting on that list to get that procedure done, to get that diagnosis and so on. Most people would also tell you that once they're in the system, once they're inside of that health care facility, that, by and large, they are treated second to none. The nurses are absolutely a huge part of that, because they're the front-line people. They're the front-line people who are there tending to patient care 24-7.

We really can't say enough, I don't think, about our nurses and the work they do; the hard work they do and the things they have to experience and so on. So anything we can do to support our nurses, to support the nursing profession, if there's anything we can do in this House of Assembly to improve things for them, to set better standards, what we're doing here, better standards, governance models and working with the Registered Nurses' Association – and I'm glad to see there was consultation.

As somebody said earlier, one of the things we sometimes gripe about here on the other side of the House is when you hear that there has not been perhaps proper consultation. Certainly, from what I can gather, there's been full consultation with the nurses' association. These are things they have requested, not just a name change, but to modernize, to some degree, the legislation that covers their operations, to bring it in line with where it needs to be today to recognize the evolution of licensed practical nurses and so on.

I'm not going to get into all the details of every point here. It has been already described by the minister, and other Members have spoken to the details. But from what I have read, what I have listened to and so on, and knowing that the registered nurses themselves are on board with this, then I really have no concern and I will be supporting the bill 100 per cent.

As I said, any time we have the opportunity in this House of Assembly to support groups, whether it be nurses or whether it be our physicians or whatever the case might be, pharmacists and so on, that have such an

important role in our health care system, such an important role in our society, and if we can work with them to create the changes and the mechanisms that are required for them to be able to operate more professionally, to operate more efficiently, to operate in a way which is sort of changing with the times, changing with technology as different roles and responsibilities evolve, any time we can do that, I think that that's what we should be doing.

There are a lot of times that there is stuff here that we will argue back and forth in this House of Assembly on things, that many people would argue don't deserve the time that it gets, but when it comes to things like this, this is what we're here for. So I'll be supporting it 100 per cent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Fogo Island - Cape Freels.

MR. BRAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's an honour to rise this afternoon and support Bill 57, An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act.

The Member for Cape St. Francis really opened my eyes when he talked about his mom and her 32 years in the nursing profession. I'm lucky enough to be married to a nurse for 30 years. Last week, she celebrated 30 years nursing in rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRAGG: She's probably going to kill me; you're probably right.

The Member opposite talked about the care and the compassion. I can vouch for her, for the 30 years that we've been together and she's been in the nursing profession –

MR. K. PARSONS: You have to be a special person.

MR. BRAGG: Living in a small community in rural Newfoundland – you're right, Member.

You have to be a special person. You have to have a heart the size, I guess, of a 45-gallon drum, because the care that I've seen, that's there. Then it rolled off on to my daughter. She's a nurse now at the Health Sciences, but for us in rural Newfoundland – I'll just give you a snapshot of what I saw her do.

The roads have been barred – in our closet, there would actually be a kit in case someone in Greenspond gave birth, or about to give birth. She had a kit brought home, because in those times – and, regardless, the Member for CBS is taking about roads. I'm talking 20-odd years ago we could be barred in then for two and three days.

I saw Beverley have all kinds of things in the house. There was more – and I hope she doesn't get in any trouble for this. There was more band aids and sterile water in our house than probably anywhere else, because she probably took out more stitches – and my neighbours, if they're listening, they had two boys, and every day of the week one of those boys either broke something or cut something.

For 30 years I've watched her and the care she gives. I was forever known in our area as Beverley's husband – that's all. Oh, this is Beverley's husband – that's all. You know what? I was so proud of that, because wherever we went everybody knew Beverley because of where she worked downstairs in the hospital.

I'm so proud of the nurses and what they do, of my wife and my daughter, and an aunt on her side and my side. I'm proud of the work they did because without the nurses and their care, your stay at the hospital would be a lot more uncomfortable.

So to all the nursing staff, I thank them so very much. I commend the minister on this act that he's bringing forward today and I support it fully.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services speaks now, he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

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

It's an interesting twist the conversation has taken; I think prompted by comments about the Member opposite's mom. I don't want to be left out, so I'll just list off granny and my mom and Jeannette at home.

I worked with the Member for Fogo Island - Cape Freels wife as well, she's nothing like a 45-gallon drum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAGGIE: Back to business. I really welcome the support from all sides of the House, and I think it's nice to see how a human touch and some levity has come into something which is fundamentally about protecting the public and maintaining the standards of one our most important group of health care providers.

I'm going to take my seat and put the question, and look forward to any questions that might arise in Committee.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 57 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.'

Carried.

CLERK (Murphy): A bill, An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008. (Bill 57)

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

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

MS. COADY: Now.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, a bill "An Act to Amend the Registered Nurses Act, 2008," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 57)

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

MS. COADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I move for the resolution of the House into a Committee of the Whole, I ask leave, and I believe I have received leave, to move into third reading following the Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Leave?

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave.

MS. COADY: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Community Services, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 57.

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: Those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, the Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (P. Parsons): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 57, An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008." (Bill 57)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just a couple of quick questions here for clarification.

Now that the minister can appoint an unlimited number of individuals to the college, will nurses risk losing control over their own college?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

MR. HAGGIE: Thank you very much.

The intent from the association, as it's currently called, is to increase the number of public interest members. This is in line with a move, really, that runs across regulatory bodies across the country.

I think, quite frankly, they acknowledge that there becomes a certain size of council or board, whatever you like to call it, beyond which numbers themselves will present a challenge, and I don't anticipate there will be a need for fast increase but I think this flexibility will help them. They don't feel jeopardized or threatened by it.

I think that's the basic explanation behind it. I don't think there's anything more sinister, and they certainly have no concerns about it.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just another question for the minister: How will the appointments be made to the new established college?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

MR. HAGGIE: Thank you very much.

There are roles that are defined in terms of the offices that are on the board, ex officio. The public interest members will be – as my understanding – appointed by the government, as it were, IAC. I stand to be corrected, but I'll check on that for the Member opposite.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Seeing no further speakers, 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: Shall clause 2 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 2 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 3 to 34 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 3 to 34 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 3 through 34 carried.

CLERK: Be it enacted by the Lieutenant Governor and House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows.

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008.

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the bill without amendment, carried?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

MS. COADY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 57.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 57.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Warr): The hon. the Member for Harbour Grace - Port de Grave and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

MS. P. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 57 without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed her to report Bill 57 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

MS. COADY: Now.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the said bill be read a third time?

MS. COADY: Now.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, report received and adopted. Bill ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

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

MS. COADY: Thank you.

By leave, Mr. Speaker, Order 7, third reading of Bill 57.

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

MS. COADY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Community Services, that Bill 57, An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008, be now read a third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Before I do that I just wanted to confirm leave?

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave?

Thank you.

It is moved and seconded that the bill be now read a third time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

Carried.

CLERK (Barnes): A bill, An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008. (Bill 57)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act, 2008," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 57)

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

MS. COADY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I moved, seconded by the Minister of Health and Community Services, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 58.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself 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.'

Carried.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, the Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (P. Parsons): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 58, An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012." (Bill 58)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

The Chair recognizes the hon. Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

It's indeed a privilege to get up here again today – and I never said the last time – to represent the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis and the beautiful people in the District of Cape St. Francis.

Minister, this is a move that was done by government, and I'm just wondering: What feedback have you got from municipalities on the change in your legislation?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Actually, we have not gotten any feedback from Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador and from any particular municipality, to be honest with you – at least I haven't. I'm not sure if the department has received anything or if anybody has received anything, but, certainly, it hasn't been brought to my attention.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Minister, was there any consultations done with MNL?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, as you know, the regional service boards are not a part of MNL. We consulted with the regional service board. We consulted with the cabin owners and we got a lot feedback from both and we felt that this was the right thing to do.

Certainly, it was something that was brought in the by-election in Windsor Lake when the Leader of the Opposition put it forward and it became an election issue. When I became minister in November, as I said in my remarks earlier, the first group I met with was the Eastern Regional Service Board and we tried to come to an agreement on how we would deal with the issue.

We were not successful in doing that, but as you can see by the information I tabled today, that

they had every intention of doing so because of a notice of motion that was in their November 28 minutes was that they were moving in that direction. I don't know why they would have backed away from that, but, certainly, they had every intention of doing so, otherwise the notice of motion would not be in their minutes.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: It's very interesting the appointment of the chair and whether it's done through municipalities or it's done through Cabinet. I don't understand why cabin owners would have a say in the chairperson for the regional service board, but that's interesting.

In the amendment, Cabinet has the authority or the ability to remove the chairperson. On what circumstances would you see a chairperson removed?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: All I can say, Madam Chair, is that it would have to be extraordinary circumstances and we have no intentions of removing any chair. It's there as part of the act, but as is noted in the act as well, that every board chair that's sitting right now has the option of working out their term of office, which was four years, and that will remain so as we go forward.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My understanding is this bill is related to the appointment of the chair for regional service board. The minister just did a prior question and referenced cabin owners and advocacy.

I'm just wondering: What's the connection between cabin owners and advocacy and how

we're appointing the chair of the regional service board and the method for that?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: It has absolutely nothing to do with. The reason we're doing this is we're raising the profile of the RSBs. We're making them a tier one under boards and commissions and to be consistent with every other tier-one board that we have. It's done through the IAC, the Independent Appointments Commission, and we feel that the regional service boards can be done and should be done in the same manner.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Again, to the minister, I just referenced that because he said it in his answer. He referenced cabin owners and advocacy, so my question was how is this related to this. I just referenced what he had said.

The second point I just want to ask, the previous process was related to municipal leaders electing the chair. Obviously the fundamental aspect of this, now this has changed and that process now goes to the Independent Appointments Commission, then a referral of names to Cabinet, and then a decision made by Cabinet.

In looking at those two processes, maybe the minister can give some insight into the change from going to a grassroots, democratic process on the ground for municipal leaders electing a chair and having control of that, and collectively them driving the policy direction of the regional service board as opposed to bringing it inside government and making an appointment through Cabinet.

What was the knowledge, or what was the reasoning for that change?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The main reason was that we wanted to make the regional service boards a tier one and, in order to do that, we wanted to bring some consistency to the process. That's exactly what we're doing. We're making them a tier-one board and through that tier-one board the appointments are done through the Independent Appointments Commission. We feel that the regional service boards can be done in the same manner.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'll ask the minister: What exactly is contained in a tier-one appointment, designated as a tier-one appointment which is different from the way its appointed today, which fundamentally makes you want to change it – what's the difference in a tier-one appointment that makes it different from what it is today, to make the process better or more representative of those folks on the ground level, grassroots? What's the difference, tier one?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The reason it's being done is mostly inconsistency. We're trying to raise the profile of regional service boards. The Eastern Regional Service Board is not the only service board we have in the province. We have seven or eight of them, and I've spoken to several of the chairs.

In fact, just last Thursday evening, I addressed the waste management forum in Corner Brook where a lot of the chairs were there. They actually welcomed the process, because I gave them the heads-up that this was the way we were leaning with this bill, and they said it's about time.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Minister, this process you're talking about is going to be done, I believe, under legislation now. It's going to be done similar to what was done before. So it's after the next municipal election when the process will come in place, and people will be selected from different wards, what they're called now, to represent a certain ward.

Also, in the legislation it gives a person who is selected from that ward the opportunity to come and put their name forward as a chairperson. This process then will have to go to the IAC, the Independent Appointments Commission, which then will also have to go to Cabinet.

How long is this process going to take? Because people are going to be elected, there are going to be wards there, and then there's going to be a time that's needed for a chairperson. So how long will they be without a chairperson?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: I'm not sure if I got the full gist of his question, but the only person who will be going through the IAC is the chair of the board.

The other members of any service board are elected through the normal democratic process. That's through municipalities, LSDs or the membership that's on the board. The chair will be done, and it varies how long it takes. It depends on how many people apply, how fast the IAC meets, and it's done through the Public Service Commission as well. So they're involved.

It's a normal process, but as we get to the end of the terms, we'll have ample time to have somebody in place to replace, if need be.

There's nothing saying that the chairs we have in place cannot reapply. We're certainly not saying that. They're welcome to reapply if they so wish. They will be given the same consideration as any other member who would apply through the IAC.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I'll clarify my question. Minister, what I'm asking is yesterday we were told that a person, a ward member on that can apply just like any other person. So once the board – every time when this board is formed is after a municipal election. So we select a ward for – given my area, which is Cape St. Francis – someone from Torbay or someone will be selected on that, but the opportunity yesterday was saying that that person could also become the chairperson if people on the board wanted that person. They could still select a person they want, but to go through this process, wouldn't it be better if we left a person on until a new chair was selected? Wouldn't that be a solution to the issue, I'm asking him?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, and that could very well be the process. We're not saying that's not – that it will not be like that.

We want to have a seamless transition, and if it's required that the chair that's there now needs to stay there for a little bit of extra time, we certainly don't have any problem with that.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Minister, I'd like to go back to a couple of questions earlier. You referenced tier one and you were doing it for consistency purposes and whatnot, which is fine, but, ironically, during debate yesterday morning I had a chance to check on social media, and several Cabinet ministers on your side were encouraging the COATT members to watch the legislative change; tune into the House of Assembly channel to watch this change.

Respectfully, I ask, if this was done for consistency reasons and it was part of a normal process of tier one – this was not driven by cabin owners. Again, it's not about cabin owners, it's about what I was reading on social media posts from Members, your colleagues.

So tell me, was this not done for consistency or was it not done for political reasons? Because I beg to differ. From what I'm reading on social media, I question – I said it yesterday and I'll say it again today, I don't think it was done for consistency reasons, Minister. I really, truly believe this was done for the wrong reasons, and it's what we see in the public domain, people feel that way outside the select group that you're pandering to.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Well, if the hon. Member is going to put his remarks around social media, that's his choice. All I'm saying is we did this because of the right reasons. It's for consistency. It's to make the regional service boards a tier one. If he doesn't want to believe that, that's not my problem.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to clarify to the minister, it's in the public domain; it is evidence, it's there. It's there for anyone to view. So, you can please yourself.

Minister, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business reacted to this legislation

yesterday, as evidenced by everyone in this House who received an email. Have you responded to them, or to their concerns? They're talking about a democratically-elected board that picked a chair, which we feel, and I've spoken on it, and my colleagues feel that was the fairest process.

I've spoken to members of this board, the service board that are elected councillors, they're not happy. They don't feel their voices were heard. They feel they were – you basically didn't take into account – you didn't respect their positions as being duly elected members in deciding on a chair, and you've taken that out of their hands.

Have you spoken to this Canadian Federation of Independent Business? Have you had serious constructive conversations with these elected members who sit on the board? Because I'm hearing – again, respectfully, I'm hearing the opposite, and I've spoken to those people. So I'm only repeating their concerns.

Actually, as a matter of fact, I agreed that I would, during debate, during Committee, I would ask those questions. So these are the reasons why – these have been driven by people on the outside, but they don't feel like their concerns were listened to.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First of all, I have received the letter from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. There is a reply being drafted as I speak, and we'll be forwarding that to Mr. Hammond.

To address these concerns, we feel that the democratic process is still in place. All the members of the board – and they decide how many members they can have – will be duly elected. As I said, and I say again, the chair of the board will be done through the Independent Appointments Commission because it becomes now a tier-1 board.

Madam Chair, I sat down with the full board. I sat down with the executive of ERSB on several occasions, and we all know what the issue was with the cabin owners. They're the ones who brought it up in the by-elections, both in Windsor Lake and again in Topsail - Paradise. They're the ones who brought it up – not us. They're the ones who brought it up.

Are they saying now that they don't agree with what we're doing? The constituents that they represent, are they saying now that they want them to pay the \$180 again? Is that what they're saying? Because that's what I'm hearing; that's what I'm hearing.

As for the board, Madam Chair, I sat down with the board and gave them every opportunity and I listened to every one of their concerns – every one of them. We've made this decision because we feel it's the best way to move forward. It's a process that we've adopted as a government through the IAC, and we're going to continue to do that because, Madam Chair, it works.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Minister, I want to point out to you, we're not talking about the cabin owners; we're not talking about \$180. We're talking about a duly elected board that was elected by all the municipalities in the Northeast Avalon, by people like – all of us here in this Chamber, we elected those people to represent us. They sit on a board, they should have the authority to pick the chair. You've taken it out of their hands. You've given a letter to the CFIB after the fact. So I guess if anyone is watching from the CFIB, you've just given them their letter. I can write the letter for them; everyone knows the answer.

They asked you a direct question. Why don't you let the board, basically, pick a chair? You're just going to give them a letter to say we've done this. We never consulted with you; we don't care about your opinion.

These cabin owners, that's not the issue. I hear their concerns. I hear both sides, the livyers and

cabin owners. We're talking about a board, a duly elected board taking away the authority for them to pick a chair. That's the question. This is not complicated stuff.

You've taken the authority away from this duly elected board, and Municipalities NL opposed this in 2017. Instead now, you're circumventing all of the concerns. You're taking a top-down approach. The IAC will pick a chair of the board, decided by Cabinet. No matter who comes up, Cabinet gets the final say.

Is that democratic, Minister? A simple question. I asked it yesterday, now you're here today to answer it. Can you answer that question? That's what people are asking. It's not democratic.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The answer to his question is, yes.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Minister, a few minutes ago you said that you spoke –

MR. LETTO: (Inaudible.)

MR. K. PARSONS: Okay, I don't mean to get you too feisty over there.

You said that you spoke, personally, to all the chairs of boards – I want to confirm that – about these changes.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: We've notified all the board chairs that this was happening. I didn't speak to them all, personally, no. I spoke to the people that were there at the forum last Thursday and gave them the heads up that this was an act we were bringing in, but all the board chairs were aware that we were doing this.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The minister is getting a bit upset there now. He doesn't care what I say, he doesn't care what I think; but, unfortunately for the minister, we are the Opposition. I represent a district in this province, as well as he does. I'm a critic also for several departments.

So, it's up to him to not care. He's not the only one over there who doesn't care, Madam Chair. So I just want to point that out. If he's getting on with that over a piece of legislation that we are trying to debate in this House and ask serious questions, because of his frustration, I beg to differ on that.

Just one other point. Minister, all these consultations – you tell everyone you love consultations. I've spoken to board members who sit on the board. The second letter you issued on this issue, they were not aware of that. They were aware of your first one, when they gave you a list of roads. That wasn't good enough; you got backlash. Then you gave a second letter, and they were told here's the letter. There was no consultation with this board. This board was blindsided by all of these decisions. Whoever you spoke to, you never consulted. You love to consult but you never consulted.

I'm talking to these people. I'm not on that board. These people are talking and they're frustrated. They're very frustrated. It is fine to say one thing, but you got actions. Again, actions have to match the words. You can't say you consulted with the board when you actually – according to the people I speak to, you never consulted.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's so funny; one minute he's up, they're complaining because I'm doing consultations. The next day they're up because I'm not doing consultations. Which way do you want it?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: I ask the minister: Has a chair been appointed to the Eastern Regional Service Board?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: No.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Mr. Harold Mallowney, who was just elected about a half hour ago, is he the person that's going to be the new chairperson? Do you know?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, I'm not aware that there was a board member elected as chair a half hour ago. That's news to me.

We will follow the legislation as it is put forward. If it's true that Mr. Mallowney is elected chair of the board, I congratulate him and I look forward to working with him.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to clarify here, because the Member opposite talked about Topsail – Paradise and what was heard during the election, and no one

better than myself in this House can talk to what was heard during the election.

The comments at the doors, related to the garbage trash tax – call it whatever you will – was related to the fact that the tax, they thought, should be a user fee. It shouldn't be applied to everyone. It's applied differently across the province. This was the issue. I committed to those residents up in my district that I would help them in any way to come up with a better system of addressing this.

What we're talking about today is about the appointment of a board chair and the process that's being implemented. So I want to make sure there's a separation between the two. Because the tax grab – call it what you want – with the cabin owners, that's one issue that I committed to talk to; this is an issue that deals with the appointment of the board chair.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Seeing no further speakers, the Chair recognizes the hon. Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

MR. LANE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, I ask the minister – I'm just wondering; I want to question the whole idea of a tier-one board because I'm just a little confused about it. Normally, when we talk about a tier-one board, a board of government, we'd be talking about like the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and so on, which are boards of government if you will, but now we're talking about a board which is all going to be elected representatives.

We know in the case of Eastern, the City of St. John's, I think they have 10 members – I could be wrong, I think it's 10. Mount Pearl has one; Paradise, I believe, has one and CBS. There's one in the Torbay area. There's probably one in St. Mary's Bay, Southern Shore, Trinity Bay and so on. Then I think the Chair is number 21, if I'm not mistaken. I think it is 20, and the Chair would be number 21 on the board. Again, I stand to be corrected, but 20 of those people are elected representatives and one person is going to be selected through the IAC.

So I'm trying to understand how you can say the NLC, for example, the Liquor Corporation, how that could be a tier-one board with all appointed people through the IAC but all the municipalities, now you're also saying that's a tier-one board but there's only one person that's being appointed by the IAC and that's the chair of the board. I'm just trying to piece together in my mind how you can say that that's the same and consistent with every other board. If it was going to be consistent with the NLC then everyone on it, it would be 21 people appointed through the IAC, but we're only talking one person.

I'm just wondering if you can comment on how that is consistent and how that makes this a tier-one board.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The only thing I will say to the hon. Member is that this board is certainly unique when you look at other boards. I don't think you can compare the Eastern Regional Service Board to the NLC, which he just did. They do represent different regions of the actual service board and the area they represent. We have no problem with that, having them elect their members from the different regions, but, Madam Chair, we're making it a tier-one board and the chair will be elected through the IAC, as simple as that.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I wonder if the minister could just clarify; in the bill it talks about a person who is chairperson of the board on the coming into force of the act, continues to be chairperson of the board until reappointed, replaced or dismissed.

Can he explain to us the process for a replacement? Would that go to the Independent

Appointments Commission, reappointment, and what process is in place to deal with dismissal?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

To answer his question, yes, it would go through the IAC. The process for dismissal is something that would be extraordinary. I don't anticipate having to do that, or any minister having to do that, but it would be extraordinary circumstances, but the replacement – in any case, in any circumstance, the replacement would be done through the IAC.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. HUTCHINGS: Thank you very much.

Just to clarify, there's a new piece of authority under Bill 58 for dismissal for the term. So, surely, there must be some thought given to or some regulatory framework of what the protocol would be if a dismissal – if it was put in the legislation, one would think it would have been thought out that at some point, based on some actions or some inappropriate behaviour, whatever it would be, that that would justify a case for dismissal, because the authority is in the bill.

To the minister: There's no understanding today of what would constitute reasons for a dismissal and what that process would be. That hasn't been contemplated. Is that what the answer is?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Certainly, it has been contemplated, Madam Chair. Again, it would be under extraordinary circumstances and it would have to be a serious breach of responsibility or whatever in order to qualify or to quantify, or to certainly make it be in a dismissal situation. It's

not something that would be taken very lightly. And, yes, we've had some very serious discussions on, what would constituent dismissal.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to just tag on to this whole dismissal piece. Again, the part I'm trying to get my head around here is if you have a chair of the board – and I'm taking eastern regional because that's the one that all the controversy is about, the cabin tax and all that stuff.

There are 20 people there. These are all 20 duly elected people, including, in this case, like the Mayor of St. John's. So we got Mayor Danny – you got this whole council, actually. The whole St. John's council that are managing a \$200 million budget. They got all kinds of staff and all kinds of operations and running the capital city, and I'm trying to get my head around the fact that if the chair of the board was acting inappropriately or if there was anything that had to do with money being mishandled or whatever the case might be, I'm trying to understand why the board – they wouldn't be the ones to say this chair got to go, because they're representing our municipalities. If they've done something wrong, we're going to let him go.

Why do they need the Minister of Municipal Affairs to get rid of somebody? Why wouldn't they be the people to get rid of him?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

There's nothing in this bill that says they can't, really. I mean, there isn't. There isn't anything in this act that says that – if we have a board, Madam Chair, that has an issue with their chair, they're going to come to the department and express that, and then we'll take action. But

there's no reason why the board cannot start that process. None whatsoever.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. LANE: Okay, you're saying there's no reason they can't. So that means if they can get rid of the person themselves, then why do we need a provision for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to get rid of someone? Because that would mean – it could only mean, if you sort of line this up, that the board, in theory, would have no problem with the person, they've done nothing wrong or whatever in their mind; yet, the minister can still say, no, I want to get rid of this person. That's kind of what this implies.

If you're saying they can do it themselves, then why is there a need for the minister to do it?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, under this new process, the chair will be appointed through the Independent Appointments Commission which would be the final decision being with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

If the Lieutenant-Governor in Council puts a Member in place, they have to have the authority to remove them if the condition is warranted.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I really think the minister now is confusing the whole issue. He's double speaking here out of both sides of his face.

Who's in charge? If it's the Lieutenant-Governor in Council who appoints the chair, who now is really in charge? It can't be both. So let's get some clarity here.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, it's quite clear under section 5(1.1) "... the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may dismiss a chairperson from a board." I never said the board could do it. I said the board could start the process.

If the board came to us, to Cabinet, and they have a problem with the chair, then that would have to be investigated and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council would have to take action, whether it's to remove or whatever.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MS. MICHAEL: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Now we have the answer. They're the daddy, and the children can go to daddy and say: Do something because we're not happy. We got the answer.

I'm going to ask another question. The minister says they're so interested in consultation, yet he didn't consult with all the boards; yet consultation has happened.

I'm wondering, what was the consultation with MNL? Because Municipalities NL had taken a position on this before and didn't like this happening. So what was the consultation with MNL? They certainly can't be happy.

If they didn't respect the members of councils who are on the boards, did they respect the organization of those councils?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Madam Chair, I will answer that simply by saying, I recognize and I consider every organization in this province to be very important. I spent 20 years on the board of directors of MNL. So I know exactly what they do and the good work they do in this province.

To insinuate that we have no respect for them is totally wrong.

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for St. John's East - Quidi Vidi.

MS. MICHAEL: That's a no; that he did not consult with Municipalities NL about this.

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Madam Chair, in terms of the regional service board, I just wanted – again, just for clarification. My understanding, of course, right now, certainly in Eastern, primarily they're dealing with collecting garbage, right? They're collecting garbage and recycling and so on. So waste collection.

Again, I stand to be corrected, but I believe on behalf of the Town of Holyrood, maybe, they're doing fire service for Deer Park, I think. I think they are. I know they've been talking to other municipalities on the Southern Shore, for example. I know there was some discussion about doing – I don't know, but some other things. I know they were talking about maybe looking at waste water, as an example – or drinking water – to say that every town can't afford to have someone checking the water all the time. So they were in discussions about having one person who would check everybody's water regularly and so on. So shared regional services.

When we're talking about garbage collection, when we're talking about water, we're talking about waste water, we're talking about fire services, would the minister agree that all of those services are the responsibility of municipalities as opposed to provincial government?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: I'm not sure where the Member is coming from on this, but the regional service – actually, we just extended the water testers that

we had in place. There are three in the province, we just extended them for another two years. So they operate under the regional service boards, and the regional service boards do have the authority to provide waste management. They have the authority to provide fire services. They have the authority to provide water testing and many others. We're not changing that, that's still there. There's nothing in this bill that changes that.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

MR. LANE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I guess the point I was trying to arrive at and the point I was trying to make is that all the services that I listed, and the minister confirmed, are all the responsibility of municipalities. That's where I'm going with this. This is all the responsibility of municipalities. So everything that this board does is the responsibility of municipalities. They're the ones that do it. So I'm trying to get my head around why the government would want to interfere in any way with municipalities. Because if you could do it with the regional service board, are we going to at some point in time start interfering in councils?

I know that's a stretch, but the point I'm making is it is a municipal level of government. The federal government looks after certain things in our society, the provincial government looks after certain things in our society, municipal governments look after certain things in our society. All the things I listed, and the minister confirmed, are the responsibility of the municipalities, not the provincial government. So that being said, should the municipal governments not be allowed to do their job?

CHAIR: The Chair recognizes the hon. Member for the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Minister, the newly elected chair for the Eastern Regional Service Board, I'm wondering, will his term continue until after the next municipal

election? I'm just wondering because he's new: Will he still remain chair of the Eastern Regional Service Board until after the next municipal election?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Again, I have not been officially notified that there's a new chair of the Eastern Regional Service Board. As soon as I do, we'll deal with it.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Member for the District of Cape St. Francis.

MR. K. PARSONS: So if there is a new chair – you're not aware of it yet – will he still be the chair for the Eastern Regional Service Board until after the next municipal election?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair is recognizing the hon. the Member for Conception Bay South.

MR. PETTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I got a quick question for the minister, I don't know if he's going to answer it or not, but I will ask it.

All this change in legislation, we're changing the process for picking a chair for this board, was this precipitated by the trash tax issue that's been dominated for the last year by cabin owners who've been very vocal and done a good job of presenting their case?

Was this the reason this was done, or is this a plan in place to do for all boards? Because this board, as my colleague for Mount Pearl - Southlands pointed out, there's more than trash involved here; there's waste, there's water, there are fire services. There are a whole range of things this board is responsible for.

Is this the reason why the tier-one process was brought in? Was it to do with the fact of pressure being applied by this group over the trash tax fee cabin owners had to pay? Is that the real crux of the reason why this legislation was brought in here today? Because I'm not sure, I can't see – I've heard lots of questions, but no one's told me any different.

So I'm asking you directly: Is that the reason why?

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment.

MR. LETTO: No.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Shall clause 1 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 2 through 6 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 2 through 6 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 6 carried.

CLERK: Be it enacted by the Lieutenant Governor and House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows.

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012.

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the bill carried without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: Carried.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

CHAIR: Division has been called.

Call in all Members, please.

Division

CHAIR: All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

CLERK (Murphy): Mr. Andrew Parsons, Ms. Coady, Mr. Haggie, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Crocker, Mr. Mitchelmore, Mr. Warr, Mr. Edmunds, Ms. Haley, Mr. Letto, Mr. Browne, Mr. Bragg, Mr. Bennett, Mr. King.

CHAIR: All those against the motion, please rise.

CLERK: Mr. Hutchings, Mr. Brazil, Mr. Kevin Parsons, Ms. Perry, Mr. Dinn, Mr. Petten, Mr. Lester, Ms. Michael, Ms. Rogers, Mr. Lane.

CLERK (Barnes): Madam Chair, the ayes 14, the nays 10.

CHAIR: I declare the motion carried.

The Chair recognizes the hon. the Deputy House Leader.

MS. COADY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 58.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 58.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (Trimper): The hon. the Member for Harbour Grace - Port de Grave and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

MS. P. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 58 without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed her to report Bill 58 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

MR. A. PARSONS: Now.

MR. SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the said bill be read a third time?

MR. A. PARSONS: Presently.

MR. SPEAKER: Presently

On motion, report received and adopted. Bill ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I call from the Order Paper, Order 2, third reading of Bill 54.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 54, An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law, be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

The motion is carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law. (Bill 54)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 54)

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, Order 3, third reading of Bill 56.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 56, An Act Respecting A Pension Plan For Employees Of The Government Of The Province And Others, be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

The motion is carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act Respecting A Pension Plan For Employees Of The Government Of The Province And Others. (Bill 56)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting A Pension Plan For Employees Of The Government Of The Province And Others," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 56)

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I call from the Order Paper, Order 4, third reading of Bill 58.

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, that Bill 58, An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012, be now read a third time.

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

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012. (Bill 58)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 58)

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

MR. A. PARSONS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Placentia West - Bellevue, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is 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.'

The motion is carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, the first day of April at 1:30 o'clock.

Thank you.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 1, at 1:30 p.m.