



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume L

SECOND SESSION

Number 11

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA

Tuesday

November 1, 2022

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

Admit strangers.

In the Speaker's gallery today, I would like to welcome Harold and Marg Warr, and family members Robert Warr, Kathy Warr and Jane Manning. They are visiting us this afternoon for a Member's statement and are also the parents and family of the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay.

Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Joining us in the public gallery today for two Members' statements are Ruby Barbour and family of Dr. Tom Barbour, as well as Kate Hickey.

Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Also in the public gallery, I would like to welcome teachers Cynthia Manning and Mike Kinsella and the Canadian Civics class of Gonzaga High School.

Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Statements by Members

SPEAKER: Today we will hear statements by the hon. Members for the District of Ferryland, Burin - Grand Bank, Bonavista, Cape St. Francis and Baie Verte - Green Bay.

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise today in this hon. House and congratulate the Maddox family on their

opportunity to participate in Canada's game show, *Family Feud*. Jennifer Maddox, along with her daughters Miranda Maddox and Jessica Lundrigan and the daughters' spouses, Kirk Bussey and Shawn Lundrigan, were selected to play on Canada's *Family Feud* after providing videos and auditions which secured them the chance to take part in a well-known game show. Even though husband and dad, Don, didn't actually play, he was their biggest supporter.

The Maddox family were lucky enough to get the opportunity to play for fast money three times, which is the maximum number of times allowed. They fell shy of the fast money the first time, but were successful in winning the other two opportunities. It was a great bit of fun to watch, and even better to know they were successful in winning the fast money on both nights. Great job by all!

I ask all Members of this House to join me in congratulating the Maddox family on their win.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Burin - Grand Bank.

P. PIKE: Speaker, on May 11, 2022, an incident occurred at the Family Resource Centre in Lamaline in the District of Burin - Grand Bank during their day program.

On this particular day, a parent was attending the playgroup session in the morning with her 13-month-old toddler. During snack time, she was feeding her child in his stroller when he began to panic and show visible signs of choking. As she removed him, it became apparent he had stopped breathing.

That's when the family support worker, Ms. Susan Cake, sprang into action and immediately began the Heimlich

manoeuvre. After a few attempts, she was successful in dislodging the item and the child began to breathe. She saved the boy's life because of her first aid training, taking charge and remaining calm in a horrifying situation.

Those who were present that day were amazed by her professionalism. A quote from mom, Valene, on the incident: "I will forever be grateful for the quick action and persistence in ensuring my son was safe. It is an experience she and I will never forget."

I ask all Members to join me and show appreciation to Susan Cake, a real-life hero.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

Dr. Tom Barbour, who served the residents of Musgravetown admirably for 30 years, passed away on December 12, 2021. He grew up in St. John's and was a standout soccer player with the St. John's Guards. While he practised in other locations, the bulk of his career was spent in Musgravetown where he made his home.

Referred affectionately as Dr. Tom, he consistently made home visits to those who had mobility issues or significant health issues. Mr. Wallace Skiffington of Musgravetown recalls that when his mom was dying from cancer, Dr. Tom made many evening trips to his house. He served countless thousands of patients over the years and, literally, saved many lives.

Outside of his medical practice, he also was a charter member of the local Lions Club, serving 25 years – two as president. In addition, he served on the Musgravetown municipal council and was recipient of the

Governor General's Caring Canadian Award in 2004.

He is fondly remembered by the residents of the area as a gem of a medical practitioner who passionately cared for his patients. Dr. Tom was also a wonderful community volunteer.

I ask the Members of the 50th House of Assembly to join me in extending a deep appreciation for Dr. Tom's outstanding medical career and volunteerism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise today to recognize three constituents who are members of the Holy Cross women's soccer team who won the Jubilee Trophy at this year's Canadian championship, held in Vaughan, Ontario from October 5 to October 9.

Connie Lewis and Kate Hickey from the Town of Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove and Ciara Molloy from the Town of Torbay competed against the country's top athletes and made history as they are the first team from Newfoundland and Labrador to win a national women's amateur soccer championship.

Under the guidance of coach Jake Stanford, the team played a 4-0 record and in the final game Holy Cross defeated London Alliance FC 3-0, with a goal added by Connie Lewis.

Connie, a graduate of Fairleigh Dickinson University, who also played semi-pro soccer in Australia from 2018-2020 and Kate and Ciara, who are currently at Memorial University, credit their success to the support from their families and their teammates.

Speaker, I ask all Members of the 50th General Assembly to join me in congratulating Connie Lewis, Kate Hickey and Ciara Molloy on their impressive win of the Jubilee Trophy and thank them for their contribution to the sport of soccer.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

B. WARR: Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and celebrate 90 years in the life of a man who I've tried my best to emulate my entire life.

Born on Pilley's Island September 30, 1932, he went to live with his aunt and uncle in Springdale and grew to know them both as mom and dad.

At the insistence of his mother, a teacher herself, he left his island home to complete his final two years at Prince of Wales Collegiate in St. John's.

After completing his third year in the field of electrical engineering at the former Memorial campus on Parade Street, he was invited to do a work term with Newfoundland Light and Power and that's where he stayed.

Along with his wife, Margie, they returned to Springdale with the first three of their six children in 1964. He became an integral part of the growth of his grandparents' firm and later became president.

His work ethic was not to be matched, as was his role as a volunteer, he freely gave his time and talents to all.

In 2008, his company and their founders were inducted into the Junior Achievement Newfoundland and Labrador Business Hall of Fame.

Celebrating 90 years, 64 years of marriage, six children, 12 beautiful grandchildren, eight wonderful great-grandchildren and one incredible life.

I ask my hon. colleagues to join me in wishing my dad, Harold Warr, a happy 90th birthday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Statements by Ministers.

Statements by Ministers

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL.

S. STOODLEY: Speaker, November is Financial Literacy Month. This year's theme is "Make Change that Counts: Managing Your Money in a Changing World."

The provincial government recognizes the importance of money management and investment education and encourages all residents to take proactive charge of their finances.

During this session of the House of Assembly, our government introduced legislation to regulate high-cost credit lending. This new legislation will make Newfoundland and Labrador the first Atlantic province to implement a regulatory regime for high-cost lenders. This province will also have the most affordable payday loans in the country, as we reduced payday loan rates from \$21 to \$14 per \$100 loaned.

I encourage all residents to seek out forms of lower-interest credit before taking out a high-interest loan. Reading the fine print and understanding the fees and total cost of borrowing can help ensure residents make informed decisions.

With rising costs affecting everyone's budgets, consider reviewing family spending habits and card statements to ensure you're not paying for unnecessary services.

Consider calling your utility company, your insurance company to ensure you're availing of all available discounts, for example the mandatory winter tire discount on auto insurance.

The Financial Consumer Agency of Canada provides valuable resources on topics including managing your money, debt and investments, planning for retirement and protecting yourself from fraud. I encourage everyone to avail of these resources and to "Make Change that Counts" today.

Thank you. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of her statement. Financial literacy is becoming more and more important as the cost of living in this province rises. I hear stories everyday from people who are now being forced to make hard decisions, choosing between gasoline, food and medication.

I note that in her statement the minister encouraged people to review their budgets to ensure they are not paying for – quote – unnecessary services. What people are paying in this province is unnecessary taxes.

I believe that the Liberal government should take their own advice and should start by removing two unnecessary taxes: the carbon tax and the sugar tax. As long as these taxes force the cost of living up, the Liberal government continues to demonstrate they are out of touch with the cost-of-living crisis the people of this province face.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of her statement. We, too, encourage households to focus on their financial literacy. Unfortunately, when our province continues to legislate poverty wages, hard-working individuals find themselves relying on payday loans.

Hard-working residents shouldn't be forced to avail of predatory money schemes in order to put food on their table and pay bills. Combat this, call your MHA, demand wage increases. Help put predatory money schemers out of business.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Are there any further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

SPEAKER: The Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

I ask the Premier: Did he remove himself from the Cabinet meeting when it was decided to lift the ban on wind energy development?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The ban on wind development has been talked about for quite some time. As I've said in this House before and will continue to say, I've always followed the rules and

continue to follow the rules. It's a policy decision of government, one which was celebrated, by the way, by the Members opposite. One which was in their platform during the last election. One that was talked about by the Liberals in this province since 2011, Mr. Speaker. The ban was put in place, Mr. Speaker, to rationalize – wait for it – Muskrat Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Well, I appreciate the answer from the Premier. So he didn't recuse himself from the Cabinet meeting. He's clarified that for everyone.

Premier, you have an opportunity to set the record straight. Will you table the receipts from your fishing trip?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology.

A. PARSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm certainly not going to talk about fishing, but I'm always happy to talk about wind and the opportunities that we face here in the province. In fact, just two hours ago I had another meeting with a proponent that had travelled here, because of the excitement we have in Newfoundland and Labrador, as we move forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A. PARSONS: The reality is that we are at an exciting time. October 1 was when we had 31 proponents express interest in 73 different projects, all over this province including Labrador and in Newfoundland. We are happy now that we're moving forward to hopefully having the land bids put up for December 15. That is our goal. That's what we're expressing to everybody and I'd be happy to continue talking about it.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

I appreciate the minister's tutorial on wind energy, but I'm going to ask it again.

Premier, will you table the receipts from your fishing trip? Simple question.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll say again, I've always followed the rules, will continue to follow the rules. I have nothing further to add on this, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: No receipts.

Speaker, yesterday, the Premier announced replacement of St. Clare's hospital. An announcement that came out of the blue. Marco has been awarded almost every P3 contract issued by this Liberal government, even when they were the more expensive option, i.e., the mental health hospital. In one case, Marco was sole sourced and handed a blank cheque for the new penitentiary.

Is this new hospital project a way for the Premier to hand another contract to his Liberal friends?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure.

E. LOVELESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're proud of the P3 process. Yesterday was a good day for Newfoundland and Labrador and it was a good day –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

E. LOVELESS: I understand that they cannot handle good news. We get that very much. So yesterday was good news. The P3 process is an option that's being explored for this project. And might I add the P3 success that we've had in terms of employment. We had 98.5 per cent on the adult mental health and addictions facility. We had over 92 per cent on the West Coast hospital and I can continue if the Member will give me leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

We know where all of them projects have gone. We know that it's well spoken; it's well worded about what the problem is with those P3s. The minister knows, but this government does a great job in trying to deflect bad-news, good-news announcements. We see it as a pattern.

As reported by *allNewfoundlandLabrador* last night, the CEO of Marco co-signed the Liberal Party's line of credit for the last election. Imagine, he is obviously a close personal friend of the Premier.

I ask the Premier: What ethical walls are in place when dealing with Marco?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure.

E. LOVELESS: Thank you for the protection there, Mr. Speaker.

I'll just say to the interim Leader of the Opposition that there's nothing here, nothing whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the company that's in question here, it's a reputable company that's employing Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and they're doing great work for this province. You should get on the bandwagon and say thank you for the work you do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Speaker, the interim Leader of the PC Party knows a lot better. I've been around long enough to know when I smell something wrong. There's something radically wrong here in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. PETTEN: I mean bad. I've spoke about it before and I'm going to continue to speak about it, but the Premier won't answer the question. So we'll have to let the public judge that, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker, our hospitals are overcrowded and our nurses are pleading for relief. Hospital beds are full with people waiting to move into long-term care homes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: It's amazing how they find this funny.

I ask the Premier: How many long-term care beds are closed in this province?

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

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, there's no question. Everybody knows, the Opposition know, we know that there's a shortage of health care professionals across the country, around the globe. Mr. Speaker, we also know that there are beds available down at the Pleasant View Towers that are available if we are able to get those health care professionals.

I've said before in the House and I'll say it again: We have a number of initiatives in place. We are working hard. It is a priority for government; it is a priority for our health care authorities. We've got a recruitment office within the department. Recruitment of health care professionals in this province is a priority that will resolve the issues of mandatory overtime, of the beds that are available at Pleasant View being able to be staffed –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Speaker, you're building a new hospital now and we can't staff our other facilities. This is the question they don't get, but this is part of the deflection. It's called psychological, but it's not fooling anyone on this side. It's not fooling anyone over here.

Lack of staff is the issue within our long-term care homes and our seniors are the ones paying the price.

I ask the minister: How many nursing positions are vacant in long-term care homes?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me take the opportunity to address the preamble because I think it's flawed in its logic and its reasoning. We have to build hospitals to meet the demands of the people of the province. We can do that, hold that thought in our head, while holding the same thought in our head about growing the workforce, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

A. FUREY: We are doing both; they don't need to occur in tandem. In fact, they shouldn't occur in tandem, they should occur in parallel, and that's what this process is all about. That's what this government is all about, understanding the complexity and meeting it head on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Speaker, I often speak to people in my district whose loved ones are in hospital beds while waiting to move into long-term care.

I ask the minister: How many beds are actually open in the new long-term care home in Grand Falls-Windsor?

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

T. OSBORNE: Speaker, I can get that number for the Member opposite. Obviously, we want to move people from acute-care beds into long-term care beds or into personal care beds. I have asked staff in the department to look at the model of care in both long-term care and in personal care to ensure that we are able to get people out of acute-care beds and into either personal care or long-term care so that the acute-care beds are then available for the people who need them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Speaker, I received a call just this morning regarding a senior who's still waiting in hospital. Central Health says there are only 30 beds being used at the long-term care in Grand Falls-Windsor. Only half of the beds at this long-term care home are open. Why?

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

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you why. Northern BC patients wait to get on a wait-list. A big jump in the number of patients seeking doctors in Central Nova Scotia. Without a family doctor, patients in Quebec are feeling abandoned. Concerns grow, as more and more Albertans can't find a family doctor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I heard the question; I want to hear the response.

The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, these are the headlines from the weekend across Canada. I can go on because the headlines are the same in every single province.

Mr. Speaker, we are putting a very solid and concerted into getting the staff, the health care professionals that we need in this province, but we are faring better than many of the jurisdictions across this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

We're very much concerned about this province. We're not concerned about thoughts in our head. We're talking about action here – we're talking about action here.

The president of the Registered Nurses' Union said that things could get even worse, with 40 per cent of nurses saying that they will leave the profession if things do not improve. That's on top of 600 current vacancies.

I ask the minister: How can patients expect quality of care if the Liberals continue to allow an exodus of health care workers?

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

T. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can read the other headlines from across the country. We are in better shape than many of the jurisdictions across this country, I say to the Member opposite.

But there is a problem and the problem needs to be fixed, and it is that there is a global shortage of health care professionals; there is a shortage of health care professionals in every province of Canada. But we are working on it. We have put a number of incentives in place. We have very dedicated recruitment initiatives that we will be announcing in the coming days.

I say to the Member, the problem will be resolved by getting additional health care professionals that will lighten the load of our very valuable health care professionals that have been carrying a very heavy load over the past year or so, Mr. Speaker, especially with the pandemic.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

We continue to hear excuses. We continue to hear no focus here and we've never heard any results – never. We do ding, ding, ding: no results.

Speaker, the province heard from nurses last week and they are demanding change –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

P. DINN: This is very important, health care, very important, guys. Not a good display for the kids in the audience here – not a good display.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

Move on to your question, please.

The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Some protection, please.

Speaker, the province heard from nurses last week and they are demanding change. Their plan for better health care revolves around three central points: retain, return and recruit.

Will the minister fully implement the nurses' plan for better health care in this province?

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

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, myself and the Premier visited the Centre for Nursing Studies last week or the week before last, and offered every one of them a contract to stay in this province, to work in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, we have –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

If Members continue, they will lose their speaking privileges this afternoon; that goes to both sides.

The hon. the Minister of Health and Community Services.

T. OSBORNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have a number of incentives in place. We understand there is a shortage of health care professionals. We had the Nursing Think Tank to look at the retention issues, the many issues that are facing our nursing staff in this province, Mr. Speaker, and those issues that have been identified are being actioned. Real actions being put in place to deal with those issues, Mr. Speaker. There has been retention bonuses paid out to many of our front-line health care staff as we speak and there will be other announcements in the coming days with our other collective bargaining units.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

Just today, the president of the Nurses' Union spoke out that the long-promised human resource plan for health hasn't happened. While the RFP closed in April, it has still not been awarded.

Why is the Premier focused on infrastructure when he hasn't even started the retention and recruitment plan for health care professionals in this province?

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

T. OSBORNE: There is a core staffing review, Mr. Speaker, the initiative that the

Member just spoke of. Yes, the RFP was put out. It's under analysis. That is under way. There will be further news on that in the coming days as well, Mr. Speaker.

All of the issues that have been in the Nursing Think Tank, Mr. Speaker, are being actioned; they are all being worked on. Whether it's early learning and child care, whether it is workplace issues, whether it's the core staffing review, they are all being worked on because they are important to this government, they are important to our registered nurses, to our LPNs and to our personal care attendants. All of these issues are important to our front-line health care staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

Seniors, students and families are all struggling with the cost of living. Food banks are seeing record numbers of people. The university food bank had to close because of overwhelming demand.

I ask the minister for poverty reduction: Is this how a Liberal government addresses poverty?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much, Speaker.

Allow me to answer that question. I'm pleased to say to the people of the province – and I know the Members here completely understand – that we've provided \$431 million this year to the people of the province to help with the cost of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

S. COADY: Speaker, \$431 million. It ranges from a one time cost-of-living cheque that is

going out now. In the next couple of weeks they should start being received by the people of the province.

We have provided \$500 for those who use oil for home heat. We've lowered the cost of child care. We have lowered the –

L. O'DRISCOLL: (Inaudible.)

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I name the Member for Ferryland. You lose your speaking privileges this afternoon.

The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board.

S. COADY: We've done a 10 per cent increase in the Income Supplement, a 10 per cent increase in the Seniors' Benefit. We have provided a 15 per cent reduction on retail sales tax on home insurance. These are but a few of the measures. We are doing a lot to help the people of the province.

SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Speaker, Liberal decisions are causing the cost of food to soar. I had asked a question to the minister responsible for poverty reduction. I fully realize on the finances of the province and what money we're pulling out of the people's pockets, whether it be the sugar tax, carbon tax, are all adding to the problem that we see in our society today. Speaker, we on this side feel that's not good enough.

With the Christmas season approaching and the demand for hampers surging, what is the minister going to do to make sure the people have food on their table at Christmas?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Children, Seniors and Social Development.

J. ABBOTT: Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to respond.

I certainly want to welcome in the Chamber students from my alma mater. This is a great learning experience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. ABBOTT: One of the things we are certainly focused on is food security in the province. My colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture, is working on that file as well. We will ensure that people will have food, should have food. We're working with Food First NL. We're working with Community Food Sharing Association. We're also making sure, as the Minister of Finance commented, that people have income as well to buy the food they need to be ready for the Christmas season and any other season.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that there's a plan. There are plans out there, but we would love to see a plan of a concerted action to make sure we reduce poverty in the province.

A single mother in the Trinity Bight area is worried about Christmas. There was a time when food banks were well stocked, but volunteers are already sounding the alarm over empty shelves.

I ask the minister responsible for poverty reduction: What does this single mother do who asked me how will I put a turkey on the table Christmas morning?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Children, Seniors and Social Development.

J. ABBOTT: Again, thank you, Speaker, for the opportunity to respond.

Certainly the government is quite cognizant and sensitive to the issues that the Member is raising. We are working with the community groups to make sure that there is ample food available if persons have to rely on the food bank.

At the same time, we are developing our social and economic well-being plan to address these and other issues for the longer term.

Obviously, we'll be starting very soon with the all-party committee on basic income, again to address the needs of our population to make sure there is sufficient income and supports in place to meet their needs.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, not a week goes by that I don't hear from someone who's been mistakenly charged sugar tax. The Premier's sugar tax is being charged on white milk, chocolate milk, sparkling water, 100 per cent fruit juice. I've even seen a receipt that charged sugar tax on tea bags.

I ask the Minister of Finance: What have you put in place to refund the people who have been mistakenly charged sugar tax?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much.

This is an important question. I do recognize that some retailers have been charging

incorrectly. Every time it's reported to the Department of Finance, we follow up with the retailers.

Since March of this year, right – six months ago – we have provided to the retailers all the different correspondences that they require in order to implement this tax come September. There have been some errors.

What I suggest to the members of the public that find these errors is to please go back to the retailer. They will refund the money, and please report it to us as well in the Department of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, that just tells us how poorly planned and terribly implemented this whole Premier's sugar tax has been on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Last week, the future leaders of this province met right here in this Chamber. The Future of The Vote recognized that the sugar tax was a mistake. They voted to eliminate the sugar tax.

I ask the Premier: Will you do the same thing and eliminate the sugar tax and listen to the future leaders of this province?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm always happy to address the issues surrounding this particular health issue, Mr. Speaker.

As I've said many times and I welcome the opportunity to say it in front of our young people today. We lead the country in heart disease, stroke, diabetes, obesity, amputations from diabetes. These behaviours can't stay the same. We need to

make sure that people are making healthy options.

Someone else in this Legislature today suggested that this increases the cost of living. No, it doesn't. It actually encourages people to make the right choice, buy the cheaper drink; the less sugar-enhanced drink so that they can have healthier lifestyles and longer lives, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

T. WAKEHAM: I'm glad the Premier spoke about the issues of too much sugar. We all agree with that, but let me tell the Premier, a World Health Organization study linked the long-term use of artificial sweeteners with obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease and mortality.

Does the Premier realize that his sugar tax promotes the use of artificial sweeteners, pushing people to make choices that could harm them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is no evidence to the fact that this encourages people to pick artificial sweeteners. You can choose water, bubbly water, sparkling water; there are other options available to you to drink. I'm not sure what stores you go to, Sir –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

A. FUREY: – but there are other options.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: There are other drinks available, Mr. Speaker, that aren't enhanced with sugar; they don't have artificial sweeteners. There are other options available in every convenience store around this province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, the Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay is in crisis and were forced to hire a private security team to protect its residents from violent behaviour. The mayor said last week that some nights the RCMP does provide support, but that it's not enough.

Will the minister provide more funding for an enhanced police presence in Happy Valley-Goose Bay?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labrador Affairs.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

I'll at least take the first one; the Member probably has more than one. She raises a question to which is a very complex, challenging matter. I outlined for this hon. House last week that our government have been very focused on this. We have an action team that's working toward medium- and long-term goals. We have an acute response team with four provincial ministers, Indigenous leadership, community players that are meeting weekly on this matter.

We have put tremendous resources in. It's not as simple as a financial fix, Mr. Speaker. We are looking toward a facility, a substantive investment in that area. We are working with our Indigenous partners. We are working with the municipal leadership. We are working with the MHA for Lake Melville every single day on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, for six months the people have been pleading for help and feel ignored by this government. The problem in Happy Valley-Goose Bay continues to get worse. They've had to hire security to patrol an area near a school so that children aren't accosted by people who are intoxicated. The local daycare is now limited in taking children for walks outside.

Will the minister, I ask again, commit to additional funds for an enhanced police presence immediately?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

As my colleague said, we've been working on this for a number of months with regard to an acute-care team and a long-term solution for this problem that exists in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

When I first got involved, there was a request for additional funding so the town could hire municipal enforcement officers. We provided that funding; they hired municipal enforcement officers. The request has been now for additional RCMP funding. As the Member well knows, there was an additional \$17 million in annual budget provided in the budget last year for RCMP throughout the province.

I've also had conversations with the RCMP and there have been increased patrols there and increased individuals have been deployed to Happy Valley-Goose Bay for this specific issue.

But most importantly, Speaker, is what I want to say: We can't police our way out of societal issues, and I'm not going to be part

of a government that orders the RCMP to arrest Indigenous people –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The minister's time is expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

J. WALL: Thank you, Speaker.

This is a public security issue that needs to be dealt with.

Speaker, it is has been over four years since the water bomber has been damaged and taken out of service. The minister said in May he hoped to sell it for \$22 million. Now we learn an aircraft manufacturer has interest in that aircraft.

Speaker, I call on the minister to clarify. Will it be fixed, sold or replaced?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

J. HOGAN: Thank you.

I'll address the preamble, Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to do that because I never got to finish my sentence with regard to this complex issue. I've heard a lot of questions since I've been here about mental health issues and addictions issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

J. HOGAN: The complex issue that exists in Happy Valley-Goose Bay is just that, it's very complex and it's mental health issues, it's additions issues, it's issues that involve CSSD, it's issues that involve Education and it's issues that involve Health. We want to work with all those departments to make sure that we can make the best society and the best community in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

I've said it before and I'll say it again: I am not going to be part of a government to police our way out of this issue and to round people up and throw them in jail, especially when the people that we are talking about are Indigenous people. That's a very colonial and old way of thinking. This is a modern government and we're not going to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Thank you.

Speaker, a province-wide ambulance service and information system, virtual care, collaborate team clinics, improve care for children at risk and guaranteed basic income were the priorities identified in the Health Accord Newfoundland and Labrador, not a new hospital.

I ask the Premier: How did he identify a new St. Clare's Hospital as a priority? Was it actually data and evidence, the same stochastic modelling he used to call an unnecessary mid-winter pandemic election, or what it through divination?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not sure the Member opposite understands the definition of stochastic. Perhaps he can look it up. But nevertheless, in addressing the rest of the question, the

evidence is this: There's 20 per cent extra people in the metro region, Mr. Speaker. The hospital is 100 years old. It's time that the metro region got a modern facility that can meet the demands, not only of the metro region, but of the rest of the province, Mr. Speaker.

This is something that is well overdue. It needs to happen, and we're happy that it's happening under this watch, Mr. Speaker. It's addressing all the issues of the Health Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Impossible – a new hospital is only good if you got the people to man it.

It seems, Speaker, that the Muskrat Falls albatross around our necks has suddenly and miraculously revived and flown away, and we have all sorts of money for tandem and parallel projects.

Will the Premier admit that yesterday's announcement was simply an attempt to distract from the fishing trip at his friend's lodge and the potential conflict of interest?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker

I'd ask the Member opposite: Does the metro region not deserve a new hospital, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A. FUREY: The region has increased by 20 per cent. The demographics are such that it is an aging population that is going to demand more acute-care beds. As part of the preambles of some of the questions earlier where we don't have the capacity, we don't have the beds; this is about addressing that solution while at the same

time growing the resources around human resources to ensure that we have the staff able to meet the demands of the people of the province, Mr. Speaker.

You need to be able to walk and chew gum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: The people of St. John's Centre deserve the staff to man that hospital and the nurses deserve a work-life balance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. DINN: There are four steps to privatization, Speaker: defund; make sure things don't work; people get angry; and you hand it over to private capital.

I ask the Premier, considering his love for the PERT and Rothschild report, and his stated preference yesterday for P3 models: Is it his intention to privatize our public provincial health care system?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

A. FUREY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is a quantum leap, for sure. Let me take an opportunity to unpack some of that. First of all, you have to be able to do things in parallel. You can't build a facility without people. You can't have people without a facility. You need to do them both in parallel. To suggest that the sequencing is simplistic and linear is, frankly, wrong. So this government, right now, is addressing both, Mr. Speaker, and we're happy to continue to.

I'm not sure where the fallacy or the thought comes that we're interested in privatizing health care. Nothing is further from the truth. We want to make sure that we have the best facilities for a sustainable health care system, a modern health care system that

meets the demands of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, Labrador West got a new hospital a few years ago, but it is empty of staff thanks to eight years of Liberal inaction on recruitment in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. BROWN: We're short respiratory therapists, audiologists, family doctors, nurses and hospital support staff; the list goes on since the hospital opened in 2015.

I ask this Premier: Where is the plan to address the work-life balance? We have health care professionals quitting in droves and there is nothing being done about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to read off the list again today. This government, Mr. Speaker, has put in place a number of initiatives to try and deal with the work-life balance, to recruit more individuals, so that our health care professionals who have carried the load have people working with them side by side to help them carry that load.

That is what we're doing, Mr. Speaker. We are working to try and put additional staff into our health care facilities. We are going far and wide and we are doing better than many of the other jurisdictions across the country in meeting that challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The time for Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Notices of Motion.

Notices of Motion

SPEAKER: The hon. Acting Leader of the Official Opposition.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

I move the following resolution:

WHEREAS Memorial University was raised by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as a memorial to the fallen in the Great Wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, that in freedom of learning their cause and sacrifice may not be forgotten; and

WHEREAS as Newfoundland and Labrador's only university, Memorial University is supported enthusiastically by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as our living legacy and entrusted with the responsibility of advancing our province to its full potential, facilitating our unique contributions to humanity and promoting our commitment to excellence throughout the world; and

WHEREAS the "Ode to Newfoundland" – written by Sir Cavendish Boyle in 1902 and adopted in 1904 and readopted in 1980 as the official anthem of Newfoundland and Labrador – has been sung for more than a century as a celebration of this wonderful place and its people and the fallen soldiers in whose honour Memorial University was named; and

WHEREAS the "Ode to Labrador" – written by Dr. Harry Paddon in 1927 – is a long-honoured anthem celebrating the uniqueness of Labrador that could easily be

included by Memorial University together with the “Ode to Newfoundland” to respect Labrador’s place of honour in our province; and

WHEREAS both odes include heartfelt celebrations of the natural beauty of this place with lyrics that continue to resonate universally; and

WHEREAS, as with anthems played elsewhere around the world, there are limitless ways for a university and a province so famed for their musicianship and to be musically creative, modern and free in interpreting such a piece in whole or in part, while honouring in spirit, meaning significance as more than just another piece of music; and

WHEREAS the academic autonomy and integrity of the university are no way undermined by efforts to influence the current decision-makers of the university to revisit and overturn their hurtful and exclusionary decision to discontinue including the ode at the convocation ceremonies.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge Memorial University to include the “Ode to Newfoundland” and the “Ode to Labrador” in all future convocation ceremonies so that Newfoundland and Labrador’s one great university will properly honour the people, the legacy, the beauty, the uniqueness, the potential and the fallen of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Notices of motions?

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

My petition is a request to return Nain High School courses –

SPEAKER: No, still notices of motion.

L. EVANS: Sorry.

SPEAKER: Any further notices of motion?

The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice on tomorrow I will move the following motion:

THAT in accordance with Standing Order 8(8), the spring 2023 sitting of the House of Assembly shall commence on March 13, 2023, but all other aspects of the Parliamentary Calendar for 2023 shall remain unchanged.

SPEAKER: Further notices of motion?

The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I give notice that on tomorrow I will move, in accordance with Standing Order 11(1), that this House not adjourn at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 3, 2022.

SPEAKER: Any further notices of motion?

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

Petitions

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Finally, thank you, Speaker.

My petition is a request to return Nain High School courses back to in-class learning.

The reason for the petition:

The Newfoundland and Labrador English School Board decision to move teachers from Nain High School academic courses to other responsibilities, thereby placing the high school student on to online learning. Parents and students are demanding a return to in-class learning for academic math, English, and science high school courses; and

WHEREAS the Internet wasn't adequate in Nain for students to do in-class online, and the Nain students also have never done CDLI course in the past; and

WHEREAS the removal of the in-class teachers in a community without the capacity or the experience to deliver effective online education has deprived students of equitable access to education.

WHEREUPON the undersigned, your petitioners, call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to advocate for the return of in-person education to students of Nain High School now.

Speaker, this is a very important petition. In September, at the beginning of the school year, there were actually high school teachers ready to teach the core academic math, English and science courses to the students in Nain. Unfortunately, there were vacancies and instead of actually doing a lot of effort and work to actually fill those vacancies, they just took the teachers from the Nain High School students and basically forced our students to go online.

Now, there are a huge lot of cultural differences to learning and one of the things that is actually shown is that online learning is not very successful for most Inuit and Innu because of the language barriers and the cultural barriers.

Yesterday, I did ask the Minister of Education for a return to in-class learning for the Nain High School students. The minister – and I'm going to quote him from

Hansard – said, “Hands on, in-class education is the standard we want to return to. This year, we made that a priority with reopening the schools the way we did and is near back to normal as possible.”

Well, it is not normal for the students in Nain, our Inuit students that were forced to go online. Also, he did continue and say, “The previous education action plan references specifically the need for culturally appropriate, contextual education and under that, there was an Indigenous group formed to advise the department and the school district.” So I am quoting the minister out of *Hansard*.

Did this Indigenous group advise the Department of Education that it was culturally appropriate to put 12 Inuit students in front of a computer, struggling to do online courses? Because in early September, when this decision was made, they were aware of the really bad Internet, the slow Internet.

The minister continues on and says, “... on the basis of subsequent discussions, teacher allocation review and the like, this need for culturally ...” –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Members time has expired.

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

L. PARROTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

These are the reasons for this petition:

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador introduced a 20 cent per litre tax on sugar-sweetened beverages at a time when many families, seniors and residents of the province are struggling with the already skyrocketing increased cost of living in the province.

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

call upon the House of Assembly to encourage the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to cancel the sugar-sweetened beverage tax at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to Members in here earlier saying that the sugar tax doesn't affect the cost of living on people, but people have to make choices about what they drink and not all people in this province are in the same situation. At a time when there are over 150 municipalities on boil water orders, at a time when the cost of milk is unreachable for some people, it is hard for people to make those decisions.

While we understand our health issues, while I listened to the Premier talk about the highest rates of obesity, the highest rates of heart disease, the highest rates of diabetes; I haven't once heard anyone talk about the highest rates of poverty, the highest rates of homelessness, the mental health crisis and the other things that are associated with poverty and the cost of living in this province.

The other thing I'll go back to is that we've also listened to a Premier who supported the carbon tax just five months ago, voted to raise the carbon tax, just five months ago, who is now saying that this carbon tax is not acceptable due to the financial strains that people of this province face, is saying that they can no longer support it, but is supporting a sugar tax at a time when people cannot afford to pay the 20 cents.

It's simple: the timing is terrible. This isn't about health. This is about the timing and the cost of living in this province and a decision that this government has made. They flip-flopped on the carbon tax; they should do the exact same thing with the sugar tax and axe it. The people in this province are asking for it. The petitions are signed from people all across this Island and it's overwhelming the amount of people that are asking for it.

Not only that, when you talk about small business and you go to certain – I've talked to people in my district who run businesses and when they're going to get their syrup for their fountain pop, guess where they're getting it? They're getting it from Amazon. What is that doing for us as a province when they're ordering different things for sale – do you think that they're buying it here anymore?

People have already started buying it online and they're talking about it out loud, and government thinks that this is a way to curb attitudes. We cannot tax people into changing attitudes. It's corrective behaviour. It's not what we should be doing as a government. People should be given a reason to make choices and the tools to make those choices, and taxes are not tools to make those choices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge this government to axe the sugar tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board for a response.

S. COADY: Thank you very much.

I'm sorry that the Member opposite doesn't agree with the Heart and Stroke Foundation, the Diabetes Association, the children's paediatric association, all these institutes recommend a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. Also the former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party – and I am going to quote from him from *Hansard* – he said: "Well, we have a tax for cigarettes, we have a tax for beer and alcohol and we have a tax for recycling. We have lots of fees and taxes that are one-off and I don't know why they couldn't create a sugary drink tax." This from the former leader of the Progressive Conservatives.

But let me quote from a current Member of the House of Assembly, the Member for

Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans. He said – this is a quote – why don't we tax from the garbage our children are eating so that's less accessible and, in turn, it would decrease child obesity? This is a sound solution. So, again, why are we not doing this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

And my petition is:

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest rate of diabetes in the country; and

WHEREAS currently there is no coverage for continuous glucose monitoring systems used to monitor blood glucose on a continual basis by insulin required with diabetes; and

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

P. DINN: I'm getting there. Don't you worry. I'm getting there.

WHEREAS reducing major complications such as strokes, heart attacks, blindness, kidney failure and amputations would result in net savings for a health care system and have a huge impact on those living with diabetes.

Therefore, we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows: We, the undersigned, call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to provide funding programs to those in need of a glucose monitoring system as a proactive approach to allow for better management of diabetes and more stable, healthier outcomes.

Now, I've raised this petition many times in this House. I've quoted Diabetes Canada

many times in this House. This would save this government \$60 million to \$80 million a year –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

P. DINN: – and this government falls back on a sugar tax that's behaviour modification that we won't see the results for years down the road. So if you're going to use what the experts say, use it and come in with a program that has immediate impact on people here –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

P. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

I've got to raise my voice because I can't be heard over these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Member for Topsail - Paradise.

P. DINN: Thirty per cent of strokes are the result of diabetes; 40 per cent of heart attacks: diabetes; 50 per cent of kidney failure requiring dialysis: diabetes; 70 per cent of non-combative foot amputations: diabetes; the leading cause of blindness: diabetes. This government will not implement something that would have an immediate impact and save our government and our health care millions of dollars.

We see PEI come in with a process back in June, subsidizing these – the first in Atlantic Canada – and we can't do that? So how can you depend on this government when they're coming in with a \$9-million tax on people who can't afford it, who got boil-water orders everywhere else? This is a real solution – a real solution and they can't take it on.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

Many residents of the District of Bonavista who earned less than \$40,000 per year and burn oil to heat their homes were not able to avail of the Oil to Electric Rebate this year because they could not access the extra funds needed to do the transition. As a result, with the increasing costs of home heating oil and food, they will greatly struggle with heating their homes and adequately providing for themselves this winter.

We, the undersigned, call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately create an emergency plan to enable those residents earning less than \$40,000 per year to heat their homes and remain healthy this winter.

I want to give two examples, and I would invite the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, or the minister for poverty reduction to respond to these two situations. I acknowledge the lady of whom I will speak about first, watching from home. This is a 59-year-old lady who's on income support and lives in her own house. She burns oil. She couldn't afford to transition from oil to electric because she never had the funds over the \$5,000 that would be awarded. So, therefore, she remains to burn oil to heat her house in the summer. What pay she receives is \$267 every two weeks. But she is given a fuel supplement: \$71 a month. If you add the two weeks' pay and you add the fuel supplement, she will receive \$605 per month living in her own house at 59 years of age.

I would say to you to fill up an oil tank, which has 1,135 litres, on an annual income of \$7,260 is practically impossible. While my time is getting short, I would say this lady would like to hear from the minister, either minister, as to what we would have in store

for those individuals who are out there, because the oil to electric missed the most vulnerable that we had in the District of Bonavista, as well as those that would be in the province.

The other lady I'd like to mention would be a senior that lives in our province – I won't say in my district – who I spoke with. She just had a recent fill up of \$960; \$144 of that was tax. In her opinion, she turns the furnace off when she goes to bed and puts on an extra housecoat so that she can save her oil and to be able to remain in the house she is. So it'd be nice to hear feedback on those situations.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board for a response.

S. COADY: I understand we're time-compressed, but I'd be happy to have a conversation with the Member opposite concerning this. For both of them, they should receive the \$500 rebate that is available through the home heat program.

The first lady you spoke to should've received a \$400 stipend earlier this year that was provided to all income support recipients. Secondly, she should receive the \$500 support that we'll be providing under the cost-of-living program. So there's definitely support available.

For the second family that you spoke about, the second lady, she should receive the \$500 oil supplement, and she will also receive the cost of living, which is \$1,000, so \$500 each.

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

E. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I present a petition. I'll read the prayer of the petition.

WHEREAS our environment must be protected and the *Environmental Protection Act* must be followed to ensure the safety of our environment for future generations; and

WHEREAS the World Energy GH2 has submitted a plan to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to build wind turbines in Western Newfoundland, and

WHEREAS the company director has stated publicly that government told him to register only Phase I of the project; and

WHEREAS the company director stated that they need the three phases to make the project viable.

THEREFORE, we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows: We, the undersigned, call upon the hon. House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reject Phase I of the World Energy GH2 project and complete an environmental impact study on the World Energy GH2 project as one to ensure the complete project is evaluated and the environmental study is not circumvented.

I presented this petition a couple of times, Mr. Speaker. Last week, I presented one and the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology responded. There was someone on Facebook said that the minister disrespected me in that statement. It was on Facebook. I just want to say to that person that there was no disrespect there. That was a joke that the minister said, because it was my birthday. So I just want to put that on the record, that when something gets on Facebook, which is not true, I have no problem calling it out. I just want to put that on the record for the minister himself.

Unlike the Premier of the province, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier of the province got on a television show here, *Issues and Answers*, when asked about why we did just get Phase I and not have it as a whole,

when John Risley said himself that he was told by government. The Premier stated: Well, Eddie Joyce complains about a lot, I don't pay much attention to him.

Premier, do you pay much attention to me now after your fishing trip has been put out there? I guarantee you someone in government informed John Risley that this here should be put in as Phase I; once you get Phase I, you get Phase II and III.

This is the point, that when the Premier wants to attack me personally, attack me because I'm bringing petitions to the House of Assembly signed by residents from all Corner Brook, all Humber - Bay of Islands, out as far as the Member for St. George's - Humber, that area, and I'm being attacked. Why don't the Premier of this province find out who in this government is directing John Risley to circumvent the *Environmental Protection Act*. Why don't he do that? Someone did it – someone did it.

So I say to the Minister of Industry, no disrespect. But when the Premier gets on and wants to attack me, personally, when this here is proof, John Risley's own words, government told him what to do, how to circumvent, it is wrong.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Orders of the Day

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Motion 1.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Speaker, I move, seconded by the Deputy Government House Leader, that under Standing Order 11(1) this House not adjourn at 5:30 p.m. today, Tuesday, November 1, 2022.

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 10, second reading of Bill 19.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Speaker.

I'm pleased to rise today in this hon. House to bring forward a bill seeking the amendment to the *Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act*, Bill 19.

Speaker, the *Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining* –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

We need a mover and seconder for the bill first.

B. DAVIS: Sorry.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture.

SPEAKER: It's moved and seconded that Bill 19, An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act, be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act." (Bill 19)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm way too excited about this piece of legislation, this update that we're doing here today. Can't wait to have the conversation with my colleagues in the House of Assembly and make this process a little better for everybody involved.

Speaker, the *Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act*, or FICBA as we call it, was created in 1971. I'm not going to go through every year to belabour the fact. I'm going to take a few minutes just to go through some of the highlights of what we're doing with this piece of legislation.

This act, created in 1971, regulates the collective bargaining between the fish harvesters and the processors. Since 1971, this act has been amended several times to provide various collective bargaining models for the fishery, including the prohibition of strikes or lockouts by providing binding arbitration, using a single arbitrator, introductory of voluntary fish auction system and binding arbitration using a fish price-setting panel.

The current collective bargaining model introduced in 2006 established a three-person, Standing Fish Price-Setting Panel. This panel is currently comprised of a chairperson and two regular members, as well as two alternate members who are utilized when regular members are unavailable.

The panel's mandate is to facilitate collective bargaining in the fishing industry and set pricing and conditions of sale, when parties have been unable – and this is the key point – to conclude negotiated collective agreements, which it's always – and I can't state more emphatically – preferred to have negotiated collective bargaining agreements. It's always the best.

The act prohibits strikes and lockouts and requires the panel to use either final offer selection or conventional arbitration as its decision-making model. The key industry stakeholders are the fish harvesters represented by the FFAW and the Association for Seafood Producers, or ASP, which represents the majority of the fish processors in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Speaker, we want to ensure that we have legislation that is responsive to the needs of the province's fishing industry. In this July past, I announced an independent review of the collective bargaining model contained in sections 19.1 to 19.14 of the act. Input was received from fish harvesters, processors and their respective organizations, as well as interested parties. Everyone had the ability to reach out to the review coordinator – in this case it was Mr. Dave Conway. I want to take this opportunity to say thank you for his time and completing this important work.

This report on the review was released to the public on October 14 of this year and is available on our department's website. The report contains some 20 recommendations for consideration.

Speaker, based on the analysis of these recommendations and discussions with our key stakeholders, the FFAW and ASP, Bill 19 includes the following proposed amendments: update the act with gender-neutral language; establish a five-year statutory review of the collective bargaining model outlined in the act in sections 19.1 to 19.14; retain the three-person panel with the addition of two alternate chairs; appoint the

chairperson and alternate chairs by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council with direction – and this is a key point – from the industry; allow one member and one alternate member each to be nominated by the certified bargaining agent and the processors organization; indicate that the industry representatives and alternates will be remunerated by the certified bargaining agent and the processors organization; enable the panel chair to have the ability to make binding decisions without the certified bargaining agent and the processors organization representative with a prior mutual agreement between the parties – that's a key point there for that; to permit the panel, at its discretion, to reject both final offers and require the parties to continue bargaining for a limited period of time before submitting final offer, and provide the opportunity for further reconsiderations based on the criteria outlined in the regulations that will follow.

Speaker, it's incumbent on me, as the Minister Responsible for Labour, to ensure that we have legislation that is current and responsive to the needs of the fishing industry and to identify when we have opportunities to improve the province's fish price-setting process, one that better serves the stakeholders that we all represent and, in turn, the people of this province.

I've had detailed conversations about the review and the report and the recommendations with both ASP and FFAW, and both are pleased to see we're moving in the right direction and in support of making changes to the current fish pricing model.

Therefore, I'm proud here to stand in this House of Assembly today with my colleagues to bring this amended legislation. I ask all Members in this House of Assembly to support these changes to the FICBA or *Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act* and I look forward to the successful implementation of these recommendations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I look forward to the questions that will come a little later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you to the minister. It is always a privilege to be able to stand up here and talk about an industry which is so significant to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

On this side of the House, we've said it numerous times that, often, we don't have the opportunities to talk about the fishery enough. So I would hope that today, the collective bargaining is such a significant part of the fishery and it's intertwined into the fishery, that we can have – to borrow a term that's frequently used in the House – a little more fulsome discussion of the collective bargaining and the fishery as it relates.

The thousands of viewers watching today – and there are some fishers as well, I'm sure, that are looking at this. But the many viewers, it's important to share with them that we are the only jurisdiction in the world that uses collective bargaining to set a commodity price.

Just allow me to repeat that, because some may not know exactly what it's all about. We are the only jurisdiction in the world that will use collective bargaining to set a commodity price, and the commodity price in this case would be the fish.

This fish panel will ultimately decide which price is determined and set in order for our fishers to leave the shore and head out and provide a catch. Their catch is their livelihood. If the market swings – some species more than others – we have collectively millions of dollars at stake for a price.

Now, the viewers watching would say, well, what do other jurisdictions do? Well, other jurisdictions, like in Nova Scotia or BC or Iceland, other countries, they'll use what is called an auction system where the fish is landed on a particular day and, on that particular day, they'll know price they're going to get with the quality that they're providing on that given day. That is an auction system that works.

Most would say that seems pretty reasonable. A free-market system where you bring your catch in, if it's good quality, the price that it fetches at that time is what you get for your product. There might be even competition in there. There may even be competition in buyers. I would say that sounds good.

When the minister states that ASP and FFAW says that this is moving in the right direction, I'm sure there'll be opportunities that either the Minister of Fisheries or the Minister Responsible for Labour can certainly address that and say, well, which direction are we headed, and this is the ultimate that these two parties would agree upon.

I would say David Vardy studied this. He chaired a committee which studied this back in '97, '98. David Vardy had a pretty comprehensive study and looked at this price panel. In fact, one of his mandates and terms of reference was to make sure that he had a consensus, try to build a consensus with the harvesters and with the processors. Well, I think David Vardy, to a high degree, achieved that. A current member of the panel, Mr. Earle McCurdy, he was part of that as well, that study.

The study was pretty extensive. They travelled to Iceland. They travelled to Quebec, British Columbia, Japan and they looked at the systems they have; neither one have ours. Now, one would say, there are two trains of thought there; ours is the ultimate or they're on to something to doing that might be a little more productive. I'm

sure the minister will speak to that when the time comes.

A couple of things that he mentioned – and I cite him because everyone was on board, from what I can read in the study, that they had a high degree of consensus between the players. But what he came back with, his findings in relation to the panel, he has stated, "... that the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act was neither an obstacle nor a help in reaching a negotiated price for crab/fish." Just allow me to repeat that: "... that the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act was neither an obstacle nor a help in reaching a negotiated price"

So this amendment to a system that all have assumed, at best, it could go either way: Neither an obstacle nor a help. They also stated that, "The Task Force found, in our consultations, that there was a willingness to try new approaches." So keep in mind this is one approach, the only one in the world, where we have collective bargaining to determine a commodity price. Others have a slight variation of it; ours is exclusive. We're the only ones in the world that do that.

We talked about a free-market economy. Nova Scotia has a free market, an open-market system; they have a system of fish auctions which they utilize. Much the same as what they found is available in Continental Europe. So my first question would be, when we get into Committee: When the parties that Conway found, FFAW and ASP, and when the minister states, in his words, moving in the right direction, I would like to know what the direction is. Is there a plan; what is the direction in such an integral part? Keep in mind every time that needle moves on the price or what is determined and the market shifts, we're talking sometimes it could be tens of millions of dollars of what happens. So that's how significant it is.

He suggested a parallel pilot program, David Vardy. I reference David Vardy

because there were others, the Jones, Cashin, there were other studies that were done as well, but from my viewing and reading this one was pretty exhaustive. It was pretty comprehensive and I would think it seemed like they were all on board, there was a high degree of consensus. So that's why I spent a little bit of time on this particular one.

But they said that there should be a parallel pilot project in the form of an auction conducted electronically for cod on the South and West Coast. Now, keep in mind for somebody now saying that to do that route now, this was back in 2000, 1998, 2000, the pilot project would be planned this year, implementation in 1999.

I had asked a couple of well-known fisheries people, we had a fish forum in Corner Brook. Myself and my colleagues here, we had one in Corner Brook where there was probably 200 people in attendance at the fish forum and we had several people who were involved with the fishery at that forum. Nobody was aware of the result of that auction and that model.

I think the minister might be able to address that when he stands to his feet a little later, as to what the results of that auction were. The one that David Vardy said let's implement. I think it wasn't in '99, but it was years later it was implemented. What are the results? What was it? Because it might help the minister and this government look at moving in the right direction.

I know I don't want to hinge on those words too much, but those are the words: move in the right direction. We want to know what is the right direction? Tell us in the House. I really look forward to that happening.

So this policy that we have here now, this bill, it's really the same as what we've had. There is some tweaking within that panel that we have, but there is mention of exploring some other opportunities, some other realms of functioning that's there. But I

don't think to my knowledge that Conway explicitly stated out, but the pursuit of some other opportunities, it is advised. So when the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Labour, when they respond who's overseeing this bill, maybe we'll hear from them what is on the planning paper beyond this panel.

Anyway, we've got the world's only collective bargaining to set a commodity price. One chap said me, well, why didn't we have that back in Joey's time? And maybe we did. This was back in '71, we're on the verge, and I'm not totally sure, but we've had this for some time.

The minister has stated that what's different now is we've got three members of the panel. We've always had three. David Vardy mentioned in his report that the three ought to be independent. They ought to be seen as unbiased. I think that was a consensus back in 1998 and into 2000 is that this panel ought to be seen as neutral, unbiased, in order to make sure the harvesters and processors got faith in the three and they will be making the decision based on what price will be selected. And that sounded good to me.

I had asked the minister at Estimates, when we sat at Estimates and I sat across from the minister, we had a lot of good answers. I would hope that the questions were half-decent.

AN HON. MEMBER: The questions were good.

C. PARDY: The questions were good.

I had asked the minister at that time, there was a selection made that everyone would notice that as far as being unbiased on this panel, it was gone out the door. It was out the window. Everyone knew that this appointment occurred and the neutrality of the committee was gone, it was out the door, out the window.

I had asked him – and I referenced, I think at that time, David Vardy's committee – his selection, did he see anything with the selection that would cause a little bit of concern based on what Vardy had stated? The minister, at that time, said it was the Independent Appointments Commission that passed the names along to him. I genuinely asked when the Independent Appointments Committee passes the names along did he have any wiggle room as to who he selected? I didn't know, and probably if the minister stands to this feet he might want to elaborate on this a little more now, officially, in *Hansard* that people can hear. His response was he only received enough names for to fill the positions that he had. No more. No less. No wiggle room.

If that is the case, which I don't doubt the minister, that was my understanding and my take away when I left to go.

So the Independent Appointments Commission gave him just enough names to fill the positions that he was looking for and he just filled them into the slot. So it was the Independent Appointments Commission who made a very biased placement on the panel which took it away from its neutrality, but experience of this member, without a doubt – a very experienced member.

So this amendment here now, no neutrality in the panel, totally, here now, we've got three, but the FFAW will rightfully have one now, a member; the processors will have a member; and the chair will be the neutral party.

Now we're down to one. One person makes the decision based on what Vardy thought would be three. I would take my chances on three. Now, that is just my opinion. If I were going to have a decision made on matters that mean millions of dollars, I would take a panel of three that are neutral as opposed to one.

How will the chair be selected? I think people are wondering – the chair will be selected, we're going to have both parties rank them. So the Independent Appointments Commission is now going to give more names than necessary, more this time that you're going to have a choice. Not just one. More names and they'll rank them so the ranking will occur. FFAW will rank them and I guess they'll rank them in numerical order, most points; their top selection will be maybe seven, if there are seven names.

Those they least prefer will be one. Processors will do the same thing. They'll rank the seven of them, if there are seven. They will combine those totals and we have our choice. That seems pretty fair, and I don't envision any problem with that.

But when the minister stands to his feet again – I hope someone keeps track of all this because I'm going to lose track. Can someone jot those questions down because I don't think the minister is writing them down? I should have had them written down.

So when the minister stands, maybe he's going to answer the question: When the chair is selected and the rating system is received, will that person be the chosen one or will the minister or LGIC have any wiggle room to have somebody else there? Will it be strictly on the scoring of the two parties or will there be wiggle room for the LGIC? That's good; I look forward to that one.

Another thing, another question –

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

C. PARDY: You should be writing them down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

C. PARDY: The panel this time will have access to an accounting firm or a certified, professional accountant. I would say if

you're dealing with 13 species that go before the panel, if it's 13 plus – so if you're going with that many species and you're going to have the accountant, I wonder if the minister has done a cost-benefit analysis on what it's going to cost having this chartered accountant that would be there.

I would think you're probably going to need one on a, pretty well, frequent basis because these decisions are timely and they've got to occur pretty quickly. Because, as a business person in my district always says, time is money. If you're going to wait on a decision on the pricing or going to be late on getting your species up and running, quite possibly you're losing when the market is the hottest.

Conway also states that you could reject both offers. FFAW comes in with a price, processors come in with a price, but the chair determines that they're way out in left field and he would disagree with both. Well, this chair would have the power to send them back to negotiate because, as the minister rightfully said, we want them to bargain in good faith amongst each other. If we can get an agreement that way, that's always the preferred manner of which we ought to get an agreement and 100 per cent correct – 100 per cent correct in that.

So we have pretty wild price swings in a lot of these commodities. All you need to look back on is 2019 with the snow crab. Did it ever swing? And for anybody who is a fisherperson – I had a fisherman in Elliston who contacted me. He called me by first name and he said I've got to get my crab pretty quick. Because, he said, they're never going to pay this price for the crab. He was worried that the price was going to collapse before he captured his quota.

Keep in mind that they've got trip limits. So this guy, he couldn't go out and fish when he wanted to fish, to a large degree, because the processor had to have a schedule because he could have too much

fish at the plant received. Everyone was on a schedule, but this inshore fisherman, he wasn't prioritized because it appears that who's prioritized would be those who would have the larger catches. The inshore fisherperson weren't prioritized because they didn't have the large catch, but those coming in with 15,000, 20,000 pounds of crab, then they're prioritized on what they got.

So he was worried, but thankfully he had the whole summer because the price didn't drop and it stayed high. He was a happy camper. Even expressed then and said well, surely goodness, it won't happen again next year. Well, it did, but a little more consistency in the following year.

When the minister states that going forward we're going to have an increased focus on actual negotiations, we've been doing that since '71. I know that we can put mediation, and we've used mediators always before too, but by golly, we've always had trouble in the fishing industry with the prices.

So if I were to do a confession route now to say that we're going to have it a whole lot different with this new amended policy, I think not – I think not. But that doesn't mean that what we have here in amendments are off track, but I really don't think this is going to do the job. It will keep the status quo and we'll move to continue what we've always been doing since '71 when Joey Smallwood was here. We'll remain the only one setting a commodity price through collective bargaining.

I had an individual ask me – and when the minister gets to his feet, he'll probably answer this question – what precipitated the review in the first place? What was it that caused it, really caused it, that we were going to have this review and we need to take some action on this? Was it the government's master plan and this was a piece of it? And if it is a master plan, we would love to see it because the people of the province ought to see plans that are

affecting the livelihoods of fishers in our province.

Another thing that I think that the minister is going to mention that was mentioned in the Conway report in the bill – yes, I think it's in the bill as well. It talked about having a formula and looking at working on a – yes, it is in the bill – formula, but Conway had suggested that. Conway had suggested in the report to start working on a formula now for snow crab. Start it in October. October is passed. So when the minister stands up, he might say it's already begun and I'd be the first one to give him an applause.

But October and November are the two months that he wanted to make sure that they were working on a formula that could be ready for the '23 season. It'd be nice to hear that when that occurs. Remember that we used a formula for lobster, we used it for halibut, and though they're much smaller fisheries, I don't see many issues in those than what we have with the snow crab.

I just want to re-emphasize again that when we look at fluctuations in the price for snow crab, then we are talking about tens of millions of dollars in swings.

The process we would have in Nova Scotia would be that the fisher comes into the wharf and the crab on that particular day is \$6.25. Well, guess what the fisher gets when he lands his product to the wharf. Would say \$6.25 chances are, unless someone is going to pay more for that crab, but \$6.25 is what he gets. When our fisher comes into our wharf in Newfoundland and Labrador, it depends on what the price was and whether either one of those associations are going to challenge that price with their one option of challenging it and when they're going to do it.

So if it's \$7 a pound, and we know the price is going down, they can issue their challenge right then. They'll probably get a drop, a reduction, in what the price would be. The problem with that is that if they wait

another three weeks, the price is down further. That is the one option that they have is recourse.

I can understand harvesters saying, quite possibly in the market, they could land their catch in Nova Scotia on a given day with the free market and auction system and they could get their \$6.25. But it's possible you land that product in Newfoundland and Labrador, the price that was settled was \$5.75 or \$5.90, at least for that period of time. Once the fish is landed or the crab is landed, that is the price. There's no going back to get a retraction or say, listen, on the market there's going to be another dollar. There's no recourse for the harvester to go back to say I landed my catch a period of time ago and here's the amount that I've gotten.

If I'm to be corrected on that, then please correct me because I've been corrected lots of times in my life, but at least the explanation on that.

I had a fisher, which I talked to earlier this morning; I don't mind telling you who it is. Is he in the District of Bonavista? No, he's not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hawke's Bay.

C. PARDY: Not in Hawke's Bay.

He's the guy I sat by the side of: Kevin Parsons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

C. PARDY: I touched base with Kevin Parsons. If Kevin is watching here now, we look forward to seeing him tomorrow, because he's going to pop in for a visit tomorrow. We always look forward to seeing Kevin.

Kevin mentioned about the trip limits. When we talk about the trip limits, just let me give you this explanation from harvesters and whether this Bill 19 addresses this.

So they talk about trip limits. A harvester, they've got a quota for snow crab of 60,000. He's got a quota of 60,000 and says he could catch 20,000 a trip. Three trips he could catch his quota, but he can't do that in three trips. Because there are trip limits, he would be restricted to 15,000. So he's got to make four trips. One would say, what's the difference between three trips and four trips? Well, according to Kevin Parsons that extra trip would cost the harvester about \$7,000 to \$8,000 in fuel.

Now, I would say to you, when harvesters talk about trip limits, they would like the conversation to say: What is government or what is the minister doing to help in that regard? Is that part of the master plan? If it's not part of the master plan, then I would say it ought to be part of the master plan because trip limits are significant. But it's not in the document. There's no reference in the document. They may have had conversations with the processors but it's not in the document.

I look forward, Speaker, to hearing the answers to some of those questions so much that I'm going to sit down now. I'm going to take my seat and at least when we go to Committee there'll be a chance for some more exchange and discussion of goodwill, but, hopefully, progress because the fishers of Newfoundland and Labrador and the processors want progress.

So maybe the minister can start with: How are we moving in the right direction? That would be a good start.

Thank you very much Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The Chair is recognizing the hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: As the Member for Exploits, I'm certainly glad to get up and speak on the fishing industry, but to follow my colleague

from Bonavista, after he has the minister baffled, I'll try to finish him off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give the finishing blow.

P. FORSEY: It's always good to speak on the fishery. We brought in a PMR last week, of course, about the fishery and we got up and spoke on that as well. The fishing industry, of course, we all know is a very, very important industry to our economy, a very important part of Newfoundland and Labrador. What we can do to make things better, make it right, is what we need to be doing for the fishing industry, for our fishing harvesters, for everybody involved in the fishing industry so that we can certainly avail of the best pricing, the best quality of fish and the best way we can make it a part of our industry.

But this act, as the Member for Bonavista already stated, it's no big change in the act with regard to the collective bargaining panel. It basically stays the same. It does consist of three appointed members. That member is a chair and that chair will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor on recommendation from the minister. Another member will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor on recommendation from the bargaining agent. The other member will be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor with recommendation from the processors and then they will get a five-year term to do that.

So the panel would consist of basically one person directed from the bargaining unit, which is appointed there by the panel of the bargaining committee, then we have another appointed by the recommendations from the processors and then we have the chair appointed by government. Now, this committee will set the fish-price standards, which need to be taken seriously and the panel needs to do the best they can with the pricing of our fish.

The cost incurred by the processor to have the person on the panel will be – the

remuneration will be the expenses of the bargaining unit and the cost for the member for the processors, the remuneration will be paid by the processors. So the biggest change with this here is probably just a save to government. There's no change in how the system worked. There's basically no change in how the process worked in due course. All the chair members right now, they are cost shared, basically, through government bargaining unit and the fish processors. But the panel itself is split in that direction.

But the bargaining process would be then that the chair of the committee would have the option, without the members of the panel, may hear and consider the parties' positions on price of sale and make a decision with respect to the matters in dispute.

It really gives the ultimate say to the chair to make a decision without talking to the members of the board. So the chair, which is appointed by government basically, through the Lieutenant Governor, with recommendation through the government, has that option to make decisions through the price panel without the input of the other members. Which, to me, seems to put a lot of emphasis on one person with regard to setting price wages for our fishery. Whereas, he can override the other two members of the panel. So that puts a lot of power in the hands of one person.

D. BRAGG: Read that again. You read it wrong.

P. FORSEY: I may have read it wrong.

B. DAVIS: (Inaudible.)

P. FORSEY: Okay.

That's the way I read it in there, but you can certainly correct me on that.

Anyway, that's what we were looking at in that one there, but like I say I can be

corrected on that, and I'll wait for the minister certainly to correct that. But it's a panel that, through every year, every fall, every spring, we'll end up with the same old story. We'll end up with people in disputes of we're not getting the right price. We can't go fishing. We'll wait until the price goes up and then we'll go. By then, the price is gone down. So the panel has to make some decisions on that as they move along and they need to make them quickly.

Other than that, there's not a big lot of change in the panel itself. It's a panel that is very important and needs to be appointed with the best possible quality people that we can have to make our fishery be constant and make sure we're doing the best decisions and the best prices that we can have for our fishery. With the panel being appointed by three people after the selection of a number of members, we'll just hope that the panel – and if I'm correct with regard to the chairperson, those decisions can work.

We need very exclusive decisions made on the price panel because of the price that the fisherpeople need during the year and we need our fishery being stable and everybody being treated fair and working together.

With that, Speaker, I'll take my seat and let somebody else have their turn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Thank you.

If the hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour speaks now, he will close debate.

The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to clarify one thing. If you look at the Explanatory Notes section, what you're talking about, MHA for Exploits, I can see

how it would be a little confusing on that, but what it is, is that there can be a chair-only panel set up. Meaning if both parties – I'll use the example ASP and FFAW – jointly request that, that can happen. Only if they jointly request it. That would mean that the chairperson, if they have a comfort level – say for instance a year from now or two years from now they get a comfort level that the chair that they select is getting the opportunity to have their confidence, well they could choose to have that person make that choice, which is fair enough.

I do want to say thank you to those that spoke about the debate for this. I look forward to Committee. There's a lot to unpack with the MHA for Bonavista's some 40 minutes of talking on this issue. I'm going to try to go through bit by bit for this, and obviously if I miss something, which I probably could do, we can pick that up through Committee if you don't mind. Please feel free to ask that question.

Well, maybe what we'll do is we'll go through Committee side of that, but I do want to let you know that one of the recommendations that's outside the legislative piece is the fact that we're going to try to establish a formula. So both parties have agreed to that. Our conciliation officers already reached out to them. They're just working on the dates now to get that process started. So that's very positive news and I'll take my seat and just move into Committee so we can have those questions addressed that you brought forward.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 19 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.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK (Barnes): A bill, An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act. (Bill 19)

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

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

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 19)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I move, seconded by the Minister Responsible for Labour, that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 19.

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

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

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

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (Trimper): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 19, An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act.

A bill, "An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act." (Bill 19)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Chair.

Let's see if I can make myself somewhat coherent. At least as coherent as the Member for Bonavista, which I doubt very much in this case.

So just a few things with regard to this, certainly in line with the changes. Basically, this bill then implements changes to the membership selection of the price-setting panel as per recommendations made by the independent consultation. We know that this year has been an extremely chaotic year. I don't know if there's ever been really a smooth year. But obviously there's an intent here to try to make the process fairer and maybe to avoid protests outside the Confederation Building.

I will say to this right here about the current minister, the last time when we were out on the steps – now I will say, Chair, that he did inflame the crowd a bit, but I got to say the one thing that gained some admiration from

me is that he actually went down to the people, he just got upset and he had the conversation with them. I will give him credit for that. I don't know if I ever stated that publicly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. DINN: But it takes a little bit of courage and character to go down there, more than that, to go down there and face some of our harshest critics. So I'll give you that.

So, certainly, with regard to some of the issues here, I guess, it's going to come down to, these are words on paper, but how are they going to be actualized in real life is going to be the issue.

Certainly, there are some concerns with remuneration under 19.1 in terms of who – and if you look at 19.1 in general, Chair, it has to do with the remuneration for the board, and I'll come back to this later on, in terms of what are the current expenditures and why now? If it's a 50-50 split then companies would share expenses.

So if you look at the seafood processors and you have three or four companies there, they can split that fee easily enough. It can probably be a tax write off; however, for the FFAW, let's pick a number out of the air, if it's \$100,000, then the FFAW is on the hook basically for that \$50,000. Keep in mind that the FFAW does represent more rural areas and it certainly would have an impact on the services they offer to their members.

It's currently paid for by the province right now, which in many ways you could argue is a drop in the bucket, in some ways, compared to the landed value. I heard the Member for Bonavista talk about \$1 billion. It could be a lot more than that; it should be a lot more. I agree with him that if managed right that should be a major, major source of revenue.

There is a concern, then, the way that structure is set-up. Basically, it's set-up for an equity. The cost sharing on one hand seems equal, but it's also inequitable. In this case, what we're looking at here is maybe keeping the system the way it is. That would allow, certainly, the FFAW who basically services members, members in rural areas to be able to offer the programs. They basically take their – not from profits, they get their funding from their members.

So 19.13, then, basically the processor shall not lock out its workers, or if I get the exact wording, a processor shall not lock out a fisher. There is a concern there that in this there are other ways that processors can act in that they can decide to take fish from outside the province and process it and hold the resource until they need it at such time, but that basically puts fishers at a disadvantage.

So these are some of the concerns that we're hearing from, certainly, the FFAW and fishers. Basically, the question that it comes down to, then, and maybe this could be asked: What would basically stop the processor from trucking in a resource?

You can't tell a harvester not to fish and then basically truck in the resource. There's some prohibition, I guess, from a fisher from selling outside. So the question that I would ask here is: What's stops a processor from trucking in the resource and basically not taking the resource from local fishers?

In 19.15(3) and (4), it talked about "On application under subsection (1) or (2), the panel may reconsider its decision and may confirm or vary the decision taking into consideration the criteria it may establish and in accordance with the regulations."

It's not until you read these sometimes, just how convoluted it sounds.

"Notwithstanding subsection (3), the panel shall only reconsider its decision where the criteria for reconsideration prescribed in the

regulations have not been met.” And there’s some concern for clarity as to what does this mean? What is the criteria and will that language be in the regulations? What about the second reconsideration?

In (5) on the next page – I think it’s page 8 – “The minister may make regulations.” There is a concern about some transparency around that in terms of how will the minister make these regulations and some clarity as to what is the criteria for this and will that process be transparent?

I apologize, when I think of fishing, by the way, when I was first teaching on the Southern Shore, my students would remind me, when I said I’m going fishing: No, Sir, you’re going troutting. Fishing is what we do out on the water. I’ve always remembered that. I was schooled, you might say.

In 19.17, on page 8, it talks about every five-year a review. How is that review to be funded and what will this do to solve the immediate problems that we have in the fishery? Certainly, there is a concern here, too, maybe if you can address it, I guess looking for clarity around the definition of regulations and, I guess, what these regulations might look like and how they might expand them.

So I’ll sit here, I’m sorry if this sounds a bit convoluted – I’ll try to get all my questions in now. I do have an amendment to come, which ties to some of the points I’ve raised but I’ll introduce that at a time when we come to that clause.

Those are the concerns certainly put forward by the FFAW in terms of transparency and more or less clarity.

Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There were a lot of questions there. I’m going to jump up, and if you would give me the indulgence, I’ll sort of tag team some of the questions with my colleague, because there is some crossover here. Some of the concerns you brought forward not necessarily related to the legislation but are, I guess, close to it.

I know how there’s some working together with the legislation with FFA as well. I know we work closely together, but this 19.1 to 19.14 is in my purview and there are some things that have been discussed today that are outside my purview but are in the ministers. He’s agreed to jump up and answer those questions as well when they come in.

I think a couple of the questions that you raised, MHA for St. John’s Centre, the Leader of the Third Party, was the cost. I think I made note of that one early. The cost last year, which was the highest cost ever, we’re only saying that it would be the individuals that are brought forward by those representatives, we’ll call them, for both sides, the harvesters and the processors, would be those representatives that would be paid for. That cost last year, which was the highest it ever had been, was \$45,000 split between the two organizations to fund.

But as I’ve talked to both organizations, I said we’re willing to work with them in a transitional period to try to – we understand that legislative calendar doesn’t necessarily match the budget calendar for organizations, so we’re willing to work with them. I’ve talked to both of them that we’re willing to work with them on a process on how we can move forward with that and maybe support the transportation aspect or the cost associated with the administering. But we’ve had those conversations.

I think you jumped around a little bit there – and I apologize for that, but if I miss

something, don't hesitate to go back. You mentioned about the five-year review. I think, if I read it correctly from what you were saying, what happens if we need to open it earlier than that. No issue. We've talked to both the stakeholders on that and that's not an issue. We've picked the five-year review based on our consultations with them.

The recommendation that came out of the Conway report didn't specify a time frame. I think when myself and the minister met with Mr. Conway when he presented the report to us, we asked that same question, what specified time. And he said: Well, I think it'd be best to talk to the parties involved. So we did. We talked to the parties involved; came at it similar to what we look at for WorkplaceNL for the statutory review, which is every five years.

But one of the things that were raised by both parties was what happens if there's some turmoil in the industry that requires immediate action. We still have the ability for the minister to open up the act, to get in to fix it, like we did this year, which didn't have a statutory review period. The minister has that ability and, with this piece of legislation, the minister would always have that ability to do that.

I'm going to sit down because I think there were a few questions that went over to the other colleague. If that's the leave for us to be able to jump back and forth to answer those questions, if it's okay with the Opposition, it would be perfect for us, if that's okay.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture.

D. BRAGG: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and I thank the Member opposite for his questioning, or his fishing expedition, as they would call it.

The fishery employs approximately 17,500 people in this province. This legislation

brought in by the hon. Minister Responsible for Labour affects the industry in which I represent like nothing else. Getting the price right, getting the fishery started on time. This is why we got where we are today. If you read that report, it says: "The current fishing industry collective bargaining model has met its fundamental purposes, which are to start the fisheries in a timely matter, set minimum prices and prevent strikes and lockouts."

Is this the perfect be-all to end-all? Maybe not. But after consulting with everybody in the industry – and mostly that will be the ASP, Association of Seafood Producers, and the FFAW – the FFAW represents the fisherpeople, which is both the plant workers and the harvesters, I might add. So this is vital that we get this right because without getting this right, we have no fishery. Close on 18,000 people in our province would be out of work or work interrupted.

The one thing that the Member opposite asked is like, I guess, owners of fish plants telling harvesters not to fish when they are trucking in fish. Now, most of our grief this summer came out of the crab fishery and it was the fluctuation of the crab prices. Last year, it shot up and this year the markets dried up. So we were caught last year at a good price. And when I say last year, I am talking about 2021. The 2022 season ended up to be more turbulent, let's just say.

So the fishery is behind us right now; it is a great time to review. Mr. Conway did a great job and everybody involved. We can talk about other avenues to get it out there but you can't get it out. Like the Cashin report, the Vardy report was – I think three various reports. Cashin's was basically fight it out, which is free market. So we are doing what industry wants us to do, which is the main thing.

But I'm going to get back to bringing the fish in. So bringing the fish in – and, most time, I would assume you're talking about crab that

came in last year from PEI because we buy a lot of crab from PEI to bring in to this province. That is negotiated outside of this deal. We are worried about the billion-dollar industry right now and making the most of what we can for the people of our province. Whether you're working in the fish plant, whether you work offloading or you work on the deck of a boat, you're an owner or you're an owner of a processing company, we want everybody to succeed there. This is almost like a wheel. If you break a spoke or bend a spoke, it throws off the balance. We need everything to work here as best we can.

I am not aware of any place where fishermen are told not to come ashore. I know the PEI crab fishery usually starts before any fishery or crab fishery in the province.

Now, you also mentioned about trucking out. Trucking out would mean the 6,000 or so people in this province would lose work, and that is not where we want to be. I'll go back to the wheel; it needs to rotate and it needs to work nice and smooth. We need to process – the bottom line is we need to get a fair price for our harvesters, we need work for the people in our fish plants and we need strong companies in our province to produce crab.

I hope that would have answered some of your questions, Sir.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you.

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Chair.

Answers to get more questions. Three things – and I think it was to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. When I was asking about the five-year review and in the interim, it was more or less dealing with the problems that may arise in the

interim. I think the minister had mentioned that there would be some flexibility and working with the parties concerned. I don't know if I heard that.

A question I'm asking them is that as we go forward with this legislation, if changes need to be made, is this a living document, more or less, that we can adjust. I understand – I think it was the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture that said, look, this is about avoiding lockouts and keeping people working. Those things are not good for anyone and it's about keeping the economy chugging along, but making sure people have a decent living and the businesses are able to have a reasonable expectation of profit as well.

But I'm just wondering in that context is this a case of okay, here's the legislation, but let's say within the next year or by the time the spring rolls around, we already see problems we need to tweak this, either in the act or in the legislation; is the minister suggesting then that there's a possibility we can keep on adjusting this until we get as close to perfection as possible?

I have a few other questions, but I'll wait for that answer.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The answer, very quickly, is yes. Obviously we're willing to work with the stakeholders. We've shown that with the independent review that we brought forward. Based on them coming forward in meetings both with myself and the minister on a number of occasions saying this is broken. We like it, but we know that there are better ways to do things. That's why we brought this independent look at it.

Obviously both sides don't always agree, but they did agree that they needed to look at this. So we've looked that. Many of the

changes that are brought forward here, if you've heard the commentary publicly, both parties, both sides have said they agree with the principles of the report to make it better. Is it going to be the be-all and end-all like the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture had said? No, absolutely not. As I've heard from many people in many meetings with both the FFAW and ASP, the negotiations in fish are challenging at the best of times because there's a lot at stake.

The hon. Member for Bonavista mentioned on a number of occasions in his 40-minute speech about the fact that this is millions of dollars at play. I would argue in some species, it's tens of millions and even hundreds of millions of dollars in play on decisions being made by this panel and getting it right is very, very important.

That's why it's such a piece that when you work – it's a living document, as you said, legislation – we have the ability to work with the parties to try to make it right. You've also said that the regulations are not included with this yet but they will be worked on. They're going to be working with us on that. I've already had those conversations with both sides to work through those processes and we've committed to do that.

I'll sit down now just to give you an opportunity to ask some more.

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Chair.

I have two questions for the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture with regards to the trucking in the fish. I agree with you, you're trying to strike the balance with the minister, sorry. But I guess the question comes: Is there anything in this right now that would prohibit a processor from, let's say, look, we've got this source from outside, we'll hold resource from within the province and deal with them later, but

we'll take care of the outside resource first? That's the question.

I don't think anyone's suggesting that we should be able to truck the stuff out and leave our own plants high and dry, because, as far as I'm concerned, the resource that's adjacent to our province; we should be maximizing the benefits to the people of this province for sure.

So that's the question: Is there anything there that would allow a processor to say, do you know what? PEI has an abundance of this right now; we've got to get this while we can. We're not taking any fish from fish harvesters here until we can get this straightened away. So that's the question that was being asked. I need some clarification around that.

Secondly, when the minister says that we are doing what industry wants us to do. I just need some clarification around the word industry. I'm assuming that the minister's talking about the industry as a whole as opposed to the companies. I just would like that clarified, if possible.

Thank you.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture.

D. BRAGG: Thank you very much, Chair.

I guess I'll work backwards. When I say industry, I will always mean the Association of Seafood Producers and the FFAW. So the unions that represent both the harvesters and the people working in the fish plant and the people who own the fish plants, I guess. That's what I would refer to as industry. We had multiple meetings over the last – I know we've had too many to count since I've been here.

The other thing is the trucking in of fish. I'm not sure, and I may be corrected, but my staff has not advised me of any case where a plant would've processed, say PEI crab,

and not been able to process Newfoundland crab. If that happened it would be a one-off or a two-off, it's not something that traditionally happens because usually that fishery is open long before our Newfoundland and Labrador fishery for that species.

I'm only talking crab there because I don't know of anything else that would have been trucked in. I know capelin don't get trucked in; cod gets shipped into some various plants. It's never a concern there with work because it can be frozen or kept in a freezer.

So unless you knew of a specific fish plant, then I could dig a little deeper.

Thank you.

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

J. DINN: And that's fair. I guess what I was asking though is there anything in the legislation that would prohibit that? That's what it comes down to. In other words, that would stop that.

While there may not be a case of it, and that's a good thing to hear, does the legislation preclude that or prevent that from happening? In other words, process our own first.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Nothing in this piece of legislation at all that would ever allow that to happen.

CHAIR: Any further speakers?

The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Chair.

It was good to hear the minister talk that the fishery ought to be worth more than \$1 billion and to acknowledge that, because I think we didn't have that acknowledgement in the past, but we do now.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

C. PARDY: We didn't hear it, and if *Hansard* can show it, produce it, but I can't recall that. We tried to make a case for that.

The budget for the panel process, am I correct to assume that \$45,000 was – and that was the most ever was last year and that was the bottom line for the panel?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: I'll take them one at a time because, Mr. Chair, sorry about that, because the hon. Member for Bonavista tends to come with five million questions. All of them are very, very important, but I'm not good at the rapid fire, so I'll come back quickly with the answers that I can.

Yes, that was the most paid last year. It was \$95,000, but that included the panel chair and a stipend for that. I can actually give you the exact amount if you'd give me one second.

The panel is usually around – well, less than \$95,000, that includes travel, the representatives from the harvester's background currently as it exists, the representative that has a harvester's background, representative that has a processor's background, they're alternates as well as the independent chair. That panel, as it exists and constituted today, cost \$95,000 last year.

What we're suggesting in the legislation now is only that the representatives from the two agents, the bargaining agent for the processors and the bargaining agent for the harvesters, would pay for their representatives. So that would be last year's

model, \$45,000 between the two of them, divided.

That's the answer to that question, but more importantly than that, I think the panel is also provided support by – we have a conciliation officer that sits with the panel. We have secretarial support that is already provided by government as well. So over and above the \$95,000-ish, there are more resources that are put into that panel as well because government understands how important this is as well. We're trying to invest in that as well.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Does the minister have a complete total on what the panel cost? All those would be an important piece of information. What is the cost for the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador for this panel to be operational?

And that's fair, whatever supports you would have. Remember, you're adding now an accountant as well, which I'm sure you probably had access to in the past. But this is one now where it seems like an emphasis is going to be on a Chartered Professional Accountant to be available when needed and I would think it probably ought to be needed.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry for rushing in there.

You mentioned the accountant earlier and I'm glad you brought it up again. The accountant is more available for the panel to – I don't want to say educate themselves on that, but it is more an opportunity for the educational purposes that may be required. The panel would be able to avail of that accountant if the resources that were on the panel, the people that were put forward, didn't have a background in budgeting or

didn't have a background in those areas. Not to say that they wouldn't, most likely they would, but we wanted to make sure we covered all aspects of that.

Also, you may need an accountant if you had more time frame leading into the panel and wanted to do more delving into things, not for a particular decision point because in a negotiation process you wouldn't have time to have an accountant go through all the, I guess, receipts on both sides in that negotiation period. It was more along the lines of if the panel required something for information purposes, like we'd like to know more about this particular species after they have already made their decision or in advance of that. That could be utilized for that purposes as well.

I couldn't agree with you more, it's really, really important that the taxpayers of the province know exactly what is being contributed to that. So right now it costs \$95,000, plus those secretarial supports. I'll check that information for the House. I'll try to get it today. I don't have it right now, I may not have it by the end of debate, but I will provide that to the House of Assembly at a future time, if I don't have it before we finish debate here. But it would be almost doubling that for sure, my guess is, because the conciliation officer and things along the side of that would be in that vein as well.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: So the estimate, Minister, would be roughly, approximately \$200,000?

B. DAVIS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, so that we can enter that into *Hansard*, please and thank you.

B. DAVIS: \$205,900, so almost \$206,000 – a little shy.

CHAIR: I'm sure that Members in the future will be poring back over, would want to see your response, so thank you for that.

The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Chair.

When we look at the selection for the chair, we're doing the ranking system. And my question in my preamble was the fact that when that comes to you and you exercise your – I don't know what that method is. There's a name that we used to do in the school system where we did that process. There's a name.

B. DAVIS: Metrics.

C. PARDY: Well, it's in the metrics. At least we didn't use that.

Anyway, when you do that system, are you bound by it, or will it be the LGIC or the minister who would determine who it is at the end, or will you be bound by the one scoring the highest?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

A very good question. That's going to be picked up in the regulations, as we talked about before, but it will be in consultation with the two parties that are involved on setting how the ranking system would be. But in rudimentary terms, the parties would be given a list of agreeable applicants or agreeable arbitrators that would come forward. Those individuals would be interested in doing the work and then they would rank those individuals based on a ranking system that we would develop with them. Then when that comes back in, it would just be simply adding up the total, whoever is on top, wins.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: The Chair spoke very wise words that you want to get your answer into *Hansard* and that's good, Sir – that's good.

I now ask a question: In your preamble when you introduced the bill, you had stated that both parties thought we were moving in the right direction. Can you qualify or quantify what moving in the right direction means?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I hate characterizing other people's feelings about what we're doing as a government or legislation, because they have the ability, quite honestly, to go out publicly and say that, and both parties have. They've said that they agree with the approach that we're taking from a conversational point, about making this system better. But in the report on page 22, I thought it was very thought provoking that Mr. Conway brought this forward based on his consultations with the 100-ish or so people that reached out to him or had meetings with.

Number 86: "There is no realistic hope that a return to the free market system of bargaining will result in anything other than" – and this is important – "periodic strikes and lockouts that cripple the conduct of the fisheries in this Province. The collective bargaining relationship between the current parties to negotiations is similar to or arguably worse than the collective bargaining relationship that existed surrounding the snow crab strike in 1997."

When you read things like that after an independent person does a report, that's a telling sign that, obviously there is movement – they may not love the approach, and I think the Minister of Fisheries said this before that it's probably not the perfect situation, but it's better than what is out there right now. Unless someone in this House can tell me some

other way, because both parties can't ascertain or describe a better way of doing it then, that would be better than what we have.

So we are making some minor tweaks as I think the hon. MHA for Exploits had mentioned in his fine remarks. I half expected the Member for Ferryland to stand up and say this, too, because I know his feelings about the fishery were very strong. So I really appreciate his comments because we've had many sidebars on this very topic.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to answer the questions.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Chair.

I referenced David Vardy's study. Remember now, I think if you compare the both studies between Conway and Vardy whom I'm sure – I think Conway has spoken at length to Vardy as well. But Vardy made it clear in his that the task force found in our consultation – I may say extensive consultation – that there was a willingness to try new approaches. I would think the harvesters that I talk with, they stand by that.

That is just something I would reference to know that if we're going to be settled as to what we've got and the rest of the world are out doing their thing and we're not trying new approaches or piloting something, a new approach, then I find that we may never get ourselves out of this one that we been in since '71 because there are probably better approaches out there that might serve the industry better – maybe.

It's not for this Member to say it is, but I'm saying unless you try new approaches you don't – so were there any pilots that are planned for to try any new approaches such as the auction system?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To the thousands of viewers that are watching at home right now, tens of thousands, maybe –

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't forget the Linthornes.

B. DAVIS: – and the Linthornes, for sure. We have to highlight that for sure.

I think I would go right back to that paragraph 86 in the report. Through his extensive consultation – I know you've referenced Mr. Vardy and he's had a conversation with Mr. Vardy, Mr. Vardy is a very knowledgeable individual, works very hard, understands this industry better than many, many other people in this province. There are many other people who have different ideas on where we should go. This is based on the most recent data, the most recent opportunity of consultation that Mr. Conway brought forward, talking to both the FFAW and ASP, who are our main stakeholders, but obviously the people who they represent as well.

Everybody in this province had the ability to submit documents to Mr. Conway. Everyone had the opportunity to be consulted. I know there are other organizations that exist strongly in your district who made representation to Mr. Conway as well, and they're reflected in the report as well.

My suggestion is that we've moved on this as the recommendation based on what the stakeholders were looking for.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: One thing that came up in the Conway report – and I think it may be in the bill, too – is you're going to strive to have the information that the panel has. The

panel has always struggled with in the past of the information that was available. Some thought one party may not have been as transparent as what they ought to have been with the panel.

Is there any initiative here in this bill to improve or minimize that feeling where the information is not transparent or enough information has not been presented for decisions to be made?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As I've said before, both parties have reached out with a more fulsome review that they would've liked to see outside the purview of this piece of legislation. What the hon. Member is asking is outside this purview of the legislation. I know it's one recommendation that Mr. Conway put forward that deals directly – not part of this legislation, but the review, based on what he's heard from the parties that he interviewed and worked with and reached out to him, he suggested that would be one of the recommendations that would be taken away to look at.

I know that the FFAW and ASP have both been talking with the Minister of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture about other things that could make that job a little easier for not just a panel but in general terms from that standpoint. I know the panel has, on occasion, put in their reports that they've tabled that they didn't have the information that they would have liked to have.

I understand that. It's outside the purview of this particular area, but I know the Minister of Fisheries is well aware of that and has, on a number of occasions, met with both parties on it.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: It states in the bill that the minister may make regulations, shall is not there, but shall in a legal sense is that you are – they may. What's the thinking here?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

B. DAVIS: I think it's written by the – I'm going to say by the drafters, but there will be accompanying regulations. It's referenced in this bill before that it will be done.

Those regulations, as I've mentioned to MHA for St. John's Centre and the Leader of the Third Party, we will be working with the individuals, both stakeholders on those because there are 20 recommendations that came out of the Conway report. I think six or seven of them are legislative in nature. There are some that are regulation in nature. There are some that are going to be policy related. There are some that are going to be how we can improve the system outside of that process.

So those will all be looked at, all those recommendations. I'm not going to stand here today and say that all are going to be put in place. All I'm saying is that we're working with the stakeholders to ensure that everyone is looked at and evaluated and seeing if we can move forward with those.

One of those would be – we're looking at a formula for crab. You mentioned the fact that there were formulas in a couple of other areas, I think it was lobster and lump –

AN HON. MEMBER: Halibut.

B. DAVIS: – and halibut that seemed to work well. I'm excited that both parties have agreed to meet and discuss that with our conciliation officer. I'm hopeful that they'll come up with a process and a formula that will be beneficial to both sides, where they can reap the benefits of rewards that will come if the price goes up and obviously share in the downturn if it does happen that way.

That's the worst-case scenario. We want this industry – and just so it's on the record, no one on this side of the House, and I'm assuming nobody on your side of the House, want this to be anything other than as many billions of an industry as it possibly can be. It's \$1.1 billion or \$1.4 billion now – \$1.6 billion now. We want that to double or triple in the next number of years and anything we can do to support that, we're going to try our best to. I know that ASP and I know that FFAW are going to want the same thing.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: I'm not sure with the membership of CNL, why would Conway not have met with CNL who represent many harvesters?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

He did.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: In the bill, and forgive me if I can't find it. If it's not there, I stand to be corrected and I do apologize, but it mentions now instead of using the word "jeopardize," we're going to look at "extenuating circumstances."

Can you qualify or give some ideas as to what these extenuating circumstances would be?

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: Thank you.

Two different things were jumbled together there, Mr. Chair. Jeopardize or jeopardy was taken out, not because Mr. Trebek

passed away. It was taken out because the function of the panel, they didn't use it anymore. It wasn't part of what they were using anymore, so that's why that's been removed.

So the actual "extenuating circumstances," or I'd like to – maybe I'll find it here in one second, I want to get the words correct "force majeure" or "exceptional circumstances." I think what we want to do is give the opportunity for it to be the next level that would be above market or currency prices. So we don't want, I guess, in Legislation – in regulation there will be more teeth around that.

But we've said to both parties, we're going to work with you with the regulations on how that looks and feels for the panelists to look at, but that could morph. As the Leader of the Third Party has said, this is going to be a bit of a living document. So those regulations may morph a little bit over time to better reflect what's actually happening in the marketplace for both parties.

They may come forward and say well this is an important piece that we need to look at now because it's changed. Whether it would be, you know, fishing grounds in a particular country getting decimated because of climate change, which we hope never happens here but it could happen. Or there could be a massive storm that dictates that the price for seafood would go up or potentially go down. So those are things that the panel would look at. We're going to try to rectify some more teeth around that in the regulations with the two stakeholders.

CHAIR: Next speaker.

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: Clauses 2 through 4 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 2 through 4 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 4 carried.

CLERK: Clause 5.

CHAIR: Shall clause 5 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

J. DINN: Okay, I'm looking at 19.1. That's where we are right now?

CHAIR: Clause 5.

J. DINN: Clause 5?

CHAIR: The Member for St. John's Centre.

J. DINN: Okay.

So with regard to that, I brought up the concern here already with regard to the cost, as to where the cost can go. I understand that the cost right now, I don't know if I heard the number \$45,000 or up to \$95,000 it is for the panel.

Keeping in mind the significant economic benefit of the industry to the province that it brings in a significant amount of money

when you look at taxes and everything else and people spending money, you name it. And considering the fact that, as I noted earlier, the FFAW has expressed a concern that a 50-50 cost sharing is not necessarily an equitable solution, it maybe equal but it is not equitable, simply because it derives its income from the dues and the revenue from its members and many of those members may be seasonal. It may not be something that they necessarily have the wherewithal to deal with, but, more importantly, when it comes to the FFAW, the programs it offers to its members could be severely impacted.

So with that in mind, Chair, I'll put forward the following amendment, seconded by the Member for Torngat Mountains: That clause 5 of the bill be amended as follows: By deleting the proposed paragraph 19.1(7)(a) and substituting the following: the remuneration of the members, as opposed to the chairperson, the panel shall be paid from the money appropriated by the Legislature for that purpose; and (b) by deleting paragraph 19.1(7)(b) and (c).

Again, seconded by the Member for Torngat Mountains.

CHAIR: Thank you.

The Committee will recess to consider the proposed amendment.

Thank you.

Recess

CHAIR: Thank you.

Order, please!

The Committee have reviewed the proposed amendment and we find that it is in order.

The hon. the Member for St. John's Centre, if he has any further remarks he still has time on the clock.

J. DINN: Thank you, Chair.

I certainly heard in the comments by the Ministers for Environment and Climate Change and Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture, certainly not directed but in spirit, that there was a willingness to look at some flexibility and how we can better improve this legislation. I would urge them to keep this in place the way it is and to maybe go back to the table and have that further discussion with the FFAW and the ASP and see if this arrangement or another arrangement would work better.

The question is, 50-50 is equal but 50-50 may not be equitable especially when you're looking at a not-for-profit organization such as the FFAW, which, basically, that uses its funds to serve its members from the most part, advocating on their behalf. I understand that. But for the most part, when you consider that many of the workers are in rural areas, you have an organization that advocates on their behalf, that advocates and probably operates programs for them. I think, in this case, it would put at a severe disadvantage the FFAW in this case and detract mostly from the programs that they can offer their members.

So from my point I view and maybe the fish harvesters themselves, this is something that would keep this equitable, level the playing field, I guess, on both sides. From what I understand listening to the minister, the amounts are not great and from a government budgetary point of view, you're right, but from an organization that's serving its members, it represents a significant cost.

Chair, I urge – I hope that the Members opposite will see this amendment in the spirit which it's put forward. Not so much as an attack on the clause or the bill, but as a way of maybe making it a bit more equitable. I don't believe for a minute that there was an attempt here to put the FFAW at a disadvantage. I do not believe that. But I think it's just pointing out that it does have some ramifications.

I think, also, from the point of view of getting the best possible process and avoiding whether it's the work disruptions, the strikes, the lockouts, you name it, and keeping the industry as a whole moving along in some stable and as conflict free as we can make it, this is an option here that we go forward. Not saying that this can't come back in some other form, but maybe it's worthwhile going back and having that conversation.

I would certainly encourage the Members opposite and all Members in this House to vote in favour of this.

Thank you.

CHAIR: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank the hon. Leader of the Third Party for bringing forward an amendment. I do want to say that there are some slight changes by bringing forward this panel. We're taking away, I guess, the Independent Appointments Commission putting forward these individuals that have harvester background and producer backgrounds, to bring forward individuals that are direct reflections of the organizations in which they represent.

So for the independence portion of this, I can't support the amendment as it exists, but I have committed and I have committed to both sides, that knowing full well that you're bringing forward legislation and the legislative calendar does not always coincide with budgetary calendars, that I would be willing to work with them, for a transitional opportunity, to support them if they have that as a problem that they can't fund it from a travel perspective or a process. But at the end of the day, every panel that is set-up, this process is consistent with labour arbitration processes across the country, across the globe. It's in line with other labour arbitrations that were

done before. The panel is arbitrated in the past.

We're looking at the opportunities, and I've said before, as the hon. Member for Bonavista mentioned earlier, the total cost of the panel is \$100,000, that would be for the panel directly. There's also another \$105,000 or \$106,000 that the department covers as well from conciliation support and secretarial support for the panel. All we're suggesting is that on a go-forward basis the representatives of the two parties would be funded by the two parties that they're representing. That is in line with labour legislation, labour arbitration that's been out there before. But knowing full well that this legislative calendar doesn't coincide with budgetary calendars, we're willing to work with the two stakeholders. We've said that, I've offered that to both of the stakeholders to look at that.

I don't know if there's anything else I can add other than the fact that I think in Mr. Conway's report on page 25, section 109, the final offer selection process involves a form of labour arbitration. If we're going to bring it in line with labour arbitration, then I think that's how we do it in this process.

We're going to cover the cost of the independent chair that they will be selecting and recommending to us. We're also going to cover the cost of those vice-chairs that will be coming forward out of this process as well in the absence of the chairperson and we're also going to continue to fund the secretarial support and the conciliation support that we already are doing currently right now.

That's where I stand on that. My fact of the matter is it's an independence thing and I think that's where we need to get. But we are more than willing, as I've said to both parties, to sit down and chat with them about how we can get a transition period that's going to support both parties in their transition to this new approach.

CHAIR: Any further speakers to the amendment?

Shall the amendment carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

CHAIR: The amendment has been defeated.

On motion, amendment defeated.

CHAIR: Shall clause 5 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 5 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 6 through 13 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 6 through 13 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clauses 6 through 13 carried.

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

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: An Act to Amend the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act.

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 Bill 19 carried without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 19.

CHAIR: It has been moved that the Committee rise and report Bill 19.

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.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Lake Melville and Deputy Chair of the Committee.

P. TRIMPER: Thank you, Speaker.

The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and asked me to report Bill 19 carried without amendment.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill 19 without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

S. CROCKER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

S. CROCKER: Tomorrow.

SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

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

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 1, third reading of Bill 7.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill 7, An Act to Amend the Schools Act, 1997, be now read a third time.

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

The hon. the Leader of the Third Party.

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

It is insufficient that we've put forward legislation and really not have a plan. This has probably been the hallmark, whether it's about a hospital, a school or an education, to bring a plan in to amalgamate the school district into the department.

Speaker, the Members opposite like to talk about how this is a narrow piece of legislation and are quick to jump to the issue of relevance. What it comes down to, though, that behind this is the tremendous lack of transparency in this. There seems to be a complete absence of any plan underlying this major legislation, except, of course, the words "trust me."

Now, I didn't get elected to come here and play around, especially when it comes to education; but we have been told in this House, in the justification for this narrow, localized legislation that it's about avoidance of costs. It's about benefiting teachers. It's about finding synergies, of creating consistencies. These are all words that were used by the Members opposite to justify this. Not our words; their words, their rationale, their justification.

Yet, when we asked about further details on these, Speaker, we were told it's not about cost-saving measures. We can't talk about collective bargaining. It's off limits. Our questions are too broad for such a narrow piece of legislation. Yet, they bring forward these reasons that call for the need for questions.

Back in 2021, related to this narrow piece of legislation, as the Members opposite like to call it, is going to have significant impacts on the school system. We asked for a plan back in 2021, and we took the government at its word that, well, we'll have a better idea once we get into it. A year and a half later, we're still no further ahead. We still don't have a plan, as we integrate, what will be the impact on human resources. Or which district buildings are going to be closed, if indeed they are going to be. What does a superintendent mean exactly?

We know, Speaker, that there's a consultant's report on it. We can't get access to that either. Just a promise of consultations with stakeholders.

Speaker, we even asked here, assuming that and taken at the word that indeed the consultant's report – which, by the way, I should point out only came up accidentally in Estimates this year. We can't see it because it's privileged but we can't even find out if, indeed, this consultant's report is being used to guide the transition. It seems what we're told that that is also a matter of Cabinet confidentiality. A simple question as to, in this process, even if the integration of the school district into the department was a recommendation of this consultant's report and how it was to be done.

We know that you can integrate the district into the department all you like but if you're not addressing the culture that existed prior to it and that I would argue still exists, Speaker, and it exists within government and within the department of don't ask, you're not getting it, it's pointless, make do with what you have, recycle the resources

you have or redeploy the resources you have, I will argue that integrating the district into the department is doomed to failure. It will not put the necessary resources into the teachers' hands as has been promised. It will not find the synergies. It will not help create consistencies. I can tell you, I think without a plan, without guidance, it opens this up to more political interference. I won't go through the list. There are plenty examples of how this government has interfered politically with the education system.

We know, also, that the Francophone school district stays separate. Again, I've got to go back to this decision. If integrating the district into the department was such a good idea – indeed, to use their words, it's going to be about avoidance of costs, giving teachers the resources they need, of finding synergies, of creating consistencies; all words and language used by the other side, Speaker – then I would assume they would've been on board from the get-go. But I would say that they see, obviously, pitfalls and see no merit or advantage in coming under the department, and probably feel that their students and teachers are best served where they are.

I go to here right now, even the lack of elected trustees and how long will this be in effect and the lack of vision for the future of this district. Make no mistake; I'm no defender, necessarily, of the NLESD. It has its problems. What it really comes down to, and why I will not support this, is the typical lack of a plan of being able to put something down a year and a half later to outline where we're going, other than: trust me.

I cannot support that. The education of our students is far too important. The work of our teachers is too important. The education of my grandchildren is far too important to be left to, trust me.

Thank you, Speaker.

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

P. LANE: Thank you, Speaker.

I said when I spoke to this on second reading that I was really torn on this one. But at the end of the day the more I've thought about it, like my colleague from St. John's Centre, I'm really not able to support this either.

I can't say for certain if it's going to be a good move or if it's going to be a bad move. The problem I have, quite frankly, as my colleague has said, there's been no plan put before this House of Assembly. As in some other bills we're going to be dealing now with regulations to deal with everything, it'll all be in the regulations. Of course, this House of Assembly will have no say in the regulations.

We have a consultant's report that supposedly is the impetus for this, or informed this decision by government to get rid of the school board, a report that was paid for by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Yet, here we are, as elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, expected to simply take it on the government's word that this mysterious report made this recommendation. It's in all of our best interests, it's in the best interest of our students, yet we cannot see the report.

Now, I could understand, in terms of the Rothschild report to some degree, the rationale of why we couldn't see the report, because it is containing commercially sensitive information that could – we're talking about the sale of assets. It could damage –

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I'll remind the Member to stay relevant to this bill.

P. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point I'm trying to make is that I can understand with that report and some other reports why it would be important to withhold that information, because getting that information out there could somehow cause some damage. In the case of the Rothschild report, government would argue that putting the numbers out there would put us at a disadvantage if we were to decide to

–

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I remind the Member to stay relevant. This is regarding this particular legislation.

P. LANE: I'm making a comparison, Mr. Speaker, between that report and another report and the rationale from hiding it.

SPEAKER: You don't need to go into detail with the report.

P. LANE: Democracy in action.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make here is that I see no good reason, no justification why this particular report that we're talking about here would be hidden from this House of Assembly. That's the point I'm making.

I cannot think of a justification as to why we, as elected Members making a decision to scrap a school board and bring it all under the department of Education – I can see no justification why, if there is a consultant's report that was paid for by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador informing that decision, why we cannot see the report. To simply say it was a Cabinet document is absolute BS. Sure, we could say everything is a Cabinet document. Every single piece of paper that comes before the government, we could take it and just bring it to a Cabinet meeting and call it a Cabinet document, and we're all left in the dark. We can't see anything.

I mean that's what's happening here. So we're just supposed to trust the government

– say, trust us; it's in the report but you can't see the report. I'm sorry I can't support that. I am not going to vote to make a decision that's going to have such a huge impact on our province and on our children based on some, we're going to say an anonymous report that I can't see. How in good conscience could any Member stand up and vote for that?

We want you to vote on the blind basically. It's just on the blind. It's no different than going to a poker game and saying, you know what, I'm all in. I haven't even looked at my cards but I'm all in. That's what we're at. That's what we're at and I cannot support it. The other issue, of course, I have that's been mentioned is now we have an advisory committee –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The level of chatter is getting too loud.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

P. LANE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the protection.

Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to say there before I got drowned out by all the noise on the other side, was that we have this advisory committee now that's going to give advice to the minister. Now, that's going to replace what was an elected school board. Whereas with an elected school board, if they make recommendations currently to the minister about certain issues and the government does the exact opposite and they don't agree with it, at least you have an independent person who can come forward and let the public know what's going on.

But under this process with this advisory committee, we'll never know anything that's going on. We'll never know any concerns. There could be all kinds of concerns brought forward and it just gets dismissed.

They send for the report – oh, we'll table it at the Cabinet meeting so we don't have to talk about it. That's what we'll do. We'll take all the advisory for it and we'll table them at the Cabinet meetings. Now we can't get access to that either.

So all these decisions are made and the public has no idea what's going on. The Opposition, whoever the Opposition is going to be whenever that time comes, can ask all the questions they want here in this House of Assembly. People can put in ATIPPA requests or whatever – sorry, can't see at all. It's nothing. Can't talk about it. It's all a big secret. It's being done in the best interests of the children of this province, but you don't trust us.

I've been burnt in this House many times on trusting people; yes, Muskrat Falls was one of them. There have been things that have gone on the last couple of years where we trusted that side of this administration and it didn't pan out the way it was supposed to pan out either. So I'm sorry I don't trust you. I apologize; I don't mean that personally for any particular individual. A few I do.

But in general, I cannot just simply take government's word that everything is going to work out okay. I would be derelict in my duty if I simply said I'm going to vote for this on the blind because the minister says it's all a good thing.

Other members sort of said this is in the best interests of our children; this is going to improve educational outcomes. When we asked, well, tell us how that's going to happen, nobody can give an answer. Nobody could give an answer as to how this is going to help teachers, how it's going to help students, how it's going to put more resources in the classroom, how it's going to deal with children with special needs and how it's going to help families like the Churchills. There's no explanation available as to how this move is going to do anything to help any of those situations.

You say that it is, but when asked tell us how: can't tell you. Nobody has an explanation. Maybe it's in the report that we're not allowed to see. Maybe it's all there. That might have all the answers. If you've got a road map in that report, we can't see it. Heaven forbid the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have the ability to know how the government is going to deal with their children's futures. Heaven forbid we have that information. Can't have it.

So I will end with that, Mr. Speaker, and simply say that in good conscience, I cannot – maybe it'll work out. I hope to God it does. Maybe you have a plan that you haven't shared yet. Maybe this report got all the answers. I hope it does. I really do.

I wish you the best of success with it, but I cannot vote for something when I don't even have one clue – one iota – what the plan is, what is in this report. I can't vote for it. I would be neglecting my duty if I just simply voted for it on the blind. Been there, done it, never happening again.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

I just want to speak a little bit on this Bill 7. It brings forward amendments.

I just want to mention what the Member for Bonavista said yesterday. I was listening to him and he said: fell victim to wanting more, expecting more. I know education is very near and dear to his heart and just listening to everyone in here, I think education and any kind of reform is something that we need to actually take seriously.

Also, he talked about we may not be getting the representation, talking about the regional voices, referring to what the Member for Bonavista was talking about.

Regional voices are very, very important and I know the value of that in my district. Yesterday, the Member for St. John's Centre talked about the collapsing of the school boards into one, loss of those regional voices that's so important.

What regional voices mean to us is their knowledge and their advocacy. It's a bit concerning. So looking at this Schools Act now, it's being amended to make further preparations for the integration of the Newfoundland and Labrador English School District into the Department of Education.

So I hope it's not at the expense of further erosion, the loss of that regional knowledge and advocacy, because it can impact. We just have to look at my district. Last year, the students showed up in September to find out that all their online learning courses were in Newfoundland time slots; loss of regional advocacy, loss of regional knowledge and advocacy, so important.

The students in my district – because of that loss, because of the collapse of the school boards into one – were actually leaving their in-class courses a half an hour before they were finished to get online with all the students who were doing it in Newfoundland time slots. Then, when they were finished, they came back to in-class learning to be a half an hour late. So that was a loss and we talked about it. We brought it here to the House of Assembly and nothing happened. A whole year passed.

So those students were sacrificed because of a loss of regional advocacy, that knowledge. Just now, I'm talking about in my district students that had teachers for their core academic high school courses that they need to graduate so they can go on to post-secondary, is nowhere to be found. In actual fact, their futures are in danger now because their teachers were taken and they were put online, even though there was a knowledge of the slow Internet. Nothing was done to increase the slow Internet and two months have passed.

Now, all of a sudden, they're going to fix the Internet.

All the stuff that's in this Health Accord talks about the social determinants of health. Education is a big part of it. Also social exclusion is a big part of it. All of these things here are written in books. This government talks about them when they want to talk about it. It reminds me of when I was growing up, people listened to you if you were saying something they wanted to hear, but if it was something they didn't want to hear, they basically didn't listen to you.

So just getting back now to some of the background leading up to these amendments, the Premier's Economic Recovery Team examined K-to-12 education systems in the province and what it was. It was to find areas in which the school system could be reformed in order to improve student outcomes.

With the Premier's Economic Recovery Team, they acknowledged that reform –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The level of chatter is getting a bit loud. I can't hear the speaker.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: So even the Premier's Economic Recovery Team acknowledges that when there are reforms in the school system, it should be to improve student outcomes. We need to have that regional knowledge and advocacy. That's so important.

In the Greene report, it talked about streamlining administrative structures by eliminating the two school districts to spend less on administration. So it's talking about money. Now, I heard over and over again, on this side, that this is not about saving money, but in actual fact we all know the truth of it. This is actually being done to save money.

It's really important for us to be able to speak out. This legislation is not well thought out or is not communicated well to us. This legislation provides a number of changes to the government structure for the K-to-12 system for the Newfoundland and Labrador English School District.

The one thing I want to mention before I finish is talking about the Provincial Advisory Council on Education. This legislation creates that advisory council. That's as per the recommendations coming from the Greene report. What this advisory council does is provides school councils and parents with a voice on educational issues, and ensures regional representation.

I just have to look at what happened in my district. In actual fact, will this change? Will we have a regional voice? It's actually a little bit scary. One of the things that we're looking at now, as a lot of legislation comes forward there's not much actual information in there. They say, oh, we're going to deal with that in the regulations, but that's lazy legislation and, in actual fact, it's not good legislation.

The composition of the Provincial Advisory Council on Education, the selection of the members – so these people here that are going to actually represent our inclusion for rural areas, for northern areas, for all the different areas here. The regional voices, the selection for those members and the duties of this council are vague and it's left to the minister to sort out later in the regulations. That is basically reminding me of just last week when we were discussing the legislation for gender pay equity. No

consolidation done; no actually meat on the bones for the legislation that we can discuss here in the House of Assembly. We, as elected representatives, can make sure that it's done right. But, in actual fact, it just goes on to be sorted out later in the regulations.

So really, I consider that lazy legislation and, basically, that's becoming a trend here and it's actually very frightening. It's alarming. Because the legislation has to come before the House that we discuss. The legislation does not and, unfortunately, most of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador don't understand that. They don't understand why it's so important for us to see the legislation.

With that, I'm just going to say, being true to my conscience, I can't support this legislation.

Thank you, Speaker.

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

E. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm going to stand and have a few words and I also can't vote for this bill because of some of the reasons. I'm just going to bring up something, Mr. Speaker, and I'll go through the notes and why I can't support it. The minister said yesterday the document that was given to government is now Cabinet confidentiality. It's Cabinet confidentiality, so we can't see it.

So if the minister is correct that it's Cabinet confidentiality, I just want to put it on the record. There are six backbenchers who haven't seen the report who will stand up and vote for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

E. JOYCE: If there are six backbenchers who seen the report, it's not Cabinet confidentiality. There are six people who are on the backbenches who are voting for this

here, according to the minister, have no idea what the recommendations were. They're just putting their hand up and saying, me too. You can't have it both ways. Because if there was a briefing done to the six backbenchers on this report, the Opposition is entitled to it also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

E. JOYCE: So it is an important issue. I just want to say to the six backbenchers, the minister said it's Cabinet confidentiality, you have no idea what's in that report. Just like the people over here, no idea. But you're putting up your hand and you're going to change the whole school board system in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador on "trust me."

Let me tell you, I've been in government a long while. There are some times you question too much and you get yourself into some hot water with your colleagues. There are times when you've got to stand up and say to your colleagues: We've got to make a big decision; I want the information – I want the information.

According to the minister, they can't get the information because it's part of Cabinet confidentiality now. Think about that when you vote. Think about it. Because if the six stand up now and vote for it, you're voting for something that you've never seen. You don't know what the recommendations are. You don't know what was in that report, which the taxpayers of this province paid for.

AN HON. MEMBER: Trust me.

E. JOYCE: Trust me.

But this is a bigger thing for the caucus because not only now have the Members on this side not seen the report; there are six more who's added to it. So if the minister is correct – which I am not saying he's not – the majority of people in this House of Assembly have not seen that report and this

is going to get through the House of Assembly.

But what is sad, though – it is sad. We're going to change the education system in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador by a minority of government who've seen the recommendations to do it. It's sad. When you actually think it and think about how the minister, now, hamstrung the six backbenchers in the back. Just think about it. Those seven – and how many people over here haven't seen it? So what's that, three, five? I mean just look at it. The majority of people haven't seen it. The minority is going to rule this House of Assembly on something that we can't see; the taxpayers haven't seen; the elected school board hasn't seen, who has been disbanded.

Tony Stack and his crew haven't seen it because it's Cabinet confidentiality. It is. And I've seen the Member for Burin, yesterday, talking about the school councils. They haven't seen them and he's bragging about the school councils. There are great school councils, but let me tell the Member for Burin, if the school councils are good enough to run the schools, if they're good enough to run the breakfast program, if they're good enough to help out with extracurricular activities, they're good enough to see the report on how they're going to change for the children's future. That's what I say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

E. JOYCE: When you sit back and think about it, here we are praising all the volunteers up on the school councils, praising up all the people on the school councils, talking about how great that they're doing, yet, Mr. Speaker – I know the Members opposite over there and I know it's hard for them to listen to this. It's hard for them – and I'll say this for the Member for Burin because the Member for Burin was the one saying it yesterday. You cannot say to a parent whose kids are involved with the

school system, who they're giving their heart and soul to the school system, we're going to make changes here that's going to affect your kid, but we can't show you. It's just not right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

E. JOYCE: It's just not right.

So when the Members over there stand up and start praising up these parents, start praising up these school councils, put a caveat there – put a caveat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The level of chatter is getting up too high.

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

E. JOYCE: Put a little caveat in there: You're doing a great job, but we don't think you're good enough to see a report that's going to affect your kid. It is sad.

If we all had this report, and we put the report out in public and there were good ideas, we would go with the good ideas. Absolutely, we would go with the good ideas. But I can guarantee you when I asked the question yesterday, who was consulted, table it; it's not tabled who was consulted for these changes.

You look at the elected school board; it's elected across the province. We went out and we voted for an elected school board. Just think about this. We elected a school board. People elected to run our school systems around the province, they didn't even know that there was a school being built up in Portugal Cove-St. Philip's and now they're putting they're putting an advisory council in. So what are you going to advise them on? Seriously, this is the education of the province. This is good for the next number of years until someone

else makes major change again. This is serious.

This is gone beyond saying oh, we're just having minor details here. This is gone beyond. I'll guarantee you that if anybody here went out to the school councils that I know and told them that we want you to trust them and you're not good enough to see that report, they wouldn't make it outside the school. They wouldn't make it out because the parents would be grilling them – what's in it? How's it going to affect my child? How's it going to affect my child in high school? How it's going to affect my special-needs child? When you can't tell them that, there's something wrong. There's something fundamentally wrong.

When you're talking about our future, you're talking about down the road, our future is our children, and the people – there are two groups who have the most influence on kids; it's your parents and your teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

E. JOYCE: I had teachers – I know Brother Art Spurrell; he was a mentor to a lot of us. If Brother Spurrell was alive now, we're telling Brother Art Spurrell we're going to change this system, but you are not good enough to see this report. You're not good enough to find out this information. You can't go to Ron Kelly, another mentor, and you can't say you're not good enough. It is sad, you know.

I remember Brother Spurrell keeping us in on Friday nights so we wouldn't go out drinking beer and getting in trouble. Saturday the gym would be opened and Saturday nights, then Sundays – talk about how a teacher had influence on you – the bunch on the basketball team, sometimes we didn't apply ourselves, but he used to have tutorials for us on Sunday afternoons so we could all pass math. And you're telling me that those teachers shouldn't look at this report and offer recommendations to government on what should be done.

When you sit down and get back to rhetoric in this House, it is sad, I can tell you. It is sad, Mr. Speaker, and this is why I can't vote for it. When I look at Brother Spurrell and I look at Ron Kelly, both who passed away, and when you tell me that people like that, who are still in the system now, that you cannot trust them to help you advise what should be in the system, there is fundamentally something wrong.

I can keep going through a lot of other things but I won't, Mr. Speaker, because I got my point now that there is no one good enough to make any recommendations, only the Cabinet, not even the backbenchers because they don't even know what's in it. So the minority of people in this House of Assembly will make a decision on the school board, all the changes to the school board across the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, without a majority of the elected people in this House of Assembly partaking, having any say into it whatsoever, knowing what was in the report and anybody who has any influence over people like me, who were students in school, that needed the support – there are many around now, out in the system, that can offer the expertise that they have – that they're not good enough to see a report. They're not good enough to have the report. It is a sad day for the educational system in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I say to the Members opposite, when you stand up and say we have to have the best system that we need for our youth, because our youth are the ones that are going to be our future, they're going to be the leaders in our future, just remember, you are not giving them the best opportunity that you can give. I can tell you that right now.

This is not being political; this is factual. This is actually factual, because I can tell you, if you're keeping something from the people who can make the decisions, the people in the classroom, or the parents and that you're going to affect the kids who got

special needs, kids who need that extra hand who's right on the borderline, but you're going to make changes now that are going to affect those kids that are on the borderline that will not bring them up over, and you're going to say we're making the best decisions for the education of our youth, you are not. Trust me, you are not, and it's a sad day.

I can get into a lot of politics about it, no doubt I can. I definitely can. I can sometimes give it as good as I can take it here in this House. But this is too important for me to stand up and play politics with say trust me and all that. But you sit down and seriously – I know you're going to say it's only me up talking again, but I can guarantee you –

P. LANE: Don't listen to you anyway. The Premier doesn't, right?

E. JOYCE: Well, that's true. The Premier doesn't listen to me anyway. But I'll say to the Premier, come out in the district and meet some of the parents. Come out in the district. The Member for Burin, you should have confidence in the school councils. Let's see if you're going to stand up now and vote against it, because these school councils never had input into it. They can't even see the report. Let's see if the Member for Burin is going to stand up now. You're talking about the school councils. Let's see, I bet you he's going to stand up and vote for this.

But yesterday he said the school councils should be consulted. They know it, they bring education to the system, they help out in the school, they make the schools stronger, but you can't see a report. You're not good enough to see a report.

I can tell you there are times you go on the record for stuff that happened in this House. This is one of the times that I'm going to go on the record and tell you that this decision is going to hurt the education in our province for years to come. Because what

you're doing is you're giving the authority to one person and one person only. When you take that from the CEO of the school board to a superintendent, the superintendent takes direction from the minister. That's the way it is. No ifs, ands or buts.

I'm just saying here now in closing, Mr. Speaker, I think I've made my point, that this is one of the days that I'm going to stand up and say, look back five, 10 years down the road and say this decision in this House of Assembly, without proper consultation, without having the input from the people who have the expertise and the people who have influence on the kids, the parents and the teachers, this is going to be detrimental to the school system.

Remember I said it; remember I said it in this House. The same I said on two or three other occasions. Muskrat Falls was one; Bill 29 was another; selling off FPI was another. There are three or four times, five or six times when I stood and said it's detrimental. This is another time when I'm saying, down the road, this is detrimental.

I say to the Members opposite, it's not too late to say let's take this off. Let's find some way that we can have public consultations. Let's have some public consultations on this here to get the best input because it's not us. Most of us people in here now – like I know myself; I'm in my latter years. But when you're talking about somebody who's starting kindergarten now and you're making decisions, by the time they get up to high school, when you take effect of what you're doing here today for control only – and the reason why it's being done changed yesterday at least four or five times, the change, why it was done.

I'll take my seat, Mr. Speaker. I hope the backbenchers who never seen the reports are going to stand up to vote against something, because if you do put your hand up and say you're voting for it, you're voting for a report you never even seen. You've never even seen, never got briefed on, because it's Cabinet confidentiality. Let me

tell you right here, right now, I know teachers, I know parents and I know people who are in the school system who can give great advice to this government. They can give advice to the government that's going to be help in the school.

So I'll sit down and take my seat, Mr. Speaker. I'll say to the Premier of the province, I know you don't listen to me because I complain too much, but please listen to the parents. Listen to the teachers. Listen to the teachers who shape people in their lives. Let them tell you. Listen to the parents of students with special needs, which I deal with. Listen to those parents, how we can make this better.

Again, I know I may be speaking on deaf ears, but I want to put on the record this is one day that education in five or 10 years down the road, I'm going to be able to stand up and say this is where it all started, on this vote here today in the House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Seeing no other speakers, is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

SPEAKER: Division has been called.

Call in the Members.

Division

SPEAKER: Are the House Leaders ready for the vote?

S. CROCKER: Yes.

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

CLERK: Steve Crocker, Lisa Dempster, John Haggie, Gerry Byrne, Bernard Davis, Tom Osborne, Siobhan Coady, Pam Parsons, Elvis Loveless, Krista Lynn Howell, Andrew Parsons, John Hogan, Sarah Stoodley, Derrick Bragg, John Abbott, Brian Warr, Perry Trimper, Paul Pike, Sherry Gambin-Walsh, Scott Reid, Lucy Stoyles.

SPEAKER: All those against the motion, please rise.

CLERK: Barry Petten, Helen Conway Ottenheimer, Paul Dinn, Lloyd Parrott, Tony Wakeham, Jeff Dwyer, Pleaman Forsey, Loyola O'Driscoll, Craig Parady, James Dinn, Jordan Brown, Lela Evans, Eddie Joyce, Paul Lane.

Speaker, the ayes: 21; the nays: 14.

SPEAKER: I declare the motion passed.

CLERK: An Act to Amend the Schools Act, 1997 (Bill 7)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend the Schools Act, 1997," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 7)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I call from the Order Paper, Order 2, third reading of Bill 8.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 8, An Act to Amend the Credit Union Act, 2009 be now read a third time.

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.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act to Amend the Credit Union Act, 2009. (Bill 8)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend Credit Union Act, 2009," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 8)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 3, third reading of Bill 9.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 9, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, be now read a third time.

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.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act. (Bill 9)

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 9)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 4, third reading of Bill 11.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Energy and Technology that Bill 11, An Act Respecting the Winding Up of Judgment Recovery (Nfld.) Ltd., be now read a third time.

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.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act Respecting Winding Up of Judgment Recovery (Nfld.) Ltd. (Bill 11)

SPEAKER: This bill has now been 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 Winding Up of Judgment Recovery (Nfld.) Ltd.," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 11)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 5, third reading of Bill 14.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Digital Government and Service NL, that Bill 14, An Act to Amend the Real Estate Trading, 2019, be now read a third time.

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.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act to Amend the Real Estate Trading Act, 2019. (Bill 14).

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act to Amend the Real Estate Trading Act, 2019," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 14)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

S. CROCKER: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety, that this House do now adjourn.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

This House do stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 10 a.m.