



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

---

Volume L

SECOND SESSION

Number 20A

---

HANSARD

*Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA*

Tuesday

March 21, 2023  
(Night Sitting)

The House resumed at 5:45 p.m.

**Resolution**

**SPEAKER (Bennett):** Are the House Leaders ready?

*“Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

*“That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend *The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957*, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations.”*

**L. DEMPSTER:** Speaker, I call from the Order Paper, Motion 4.

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

**CHAIR:** Shall the resolution carry?

**L. DEMPSTER:** Speaker, I move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Ways and Means to consider a resolution relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, Bill 28.

The hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**D. BRAZIL:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**SPEAKER:** The motion is that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

I just want to spend a few minutes talking about the financial situation we are in in Newfoundland and Labrador and the benefits here of paying our bills as part of the process but, more particularly here, finding ways to pay the \$500 –

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

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

All those in favour, ‘aye.’

**CHAIR:** For Stephenville.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**D. BRAZIL:** Oh, Stephenville. Sorry, I apologize.

**SPEAKER:** All those against, ‘nay.’

**S. COADY:** Stephenville Airport Corporation. We are just going to vote on it. Then you can do your good speech.

Motion carried.

**CHAIR:** Any further speakers to the Bill 28?

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

Seeing no further speakers, shall the resolution carry?

**Committee of the Whole**

**CHAIR (Trimper):** Order, please!

All those in favour, ‘aye.’

We are now debating the related resolution and Bill 28.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, ‘nay.’

Carried.

On motion, resolution is carried.  
A bill, "An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957." (Bill 28)

**CLERK:** Clause 1.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 1 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

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

**CHAIR:** Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

**CLERK:** An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957.

**CHAIR:** Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

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

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

**CHAIR:** Shall I report the bill 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 resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Chair, I move that the Committee rise and report the resolution and Bill 28.

**CHAIR:** The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 28 carried without amendment.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

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 Committees.

**P. TRIMPER:** Thank you, Speaker.

The Committee of Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

**SPEAKER:** The Chair of the Committee of Ways and Means reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that the bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

When shall the report be received?

**J. HOGAN:** Now.

**SPEAKER:** Now.

On motion, report received and adopted.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, that the resolution be now read a first time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the resolution be now read a first 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:** "*Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

"That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend *The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957*, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations."

On motion, resolution read a first time.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, that the resolution be now read a second time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that this resolution 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:** "*Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

"That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend *The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957*, to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain corporations."

On motion, resolution read a second time.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, for leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, Bill 28, and I further move that the said bill be now read a first time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the hon. the Government House Leader shall have leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee

Act, 1957, Bill 28, and the said bill be now read a first 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.'

The motion is carried.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board to introduce a bill, "An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957," carried. (Bill 28)

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957. (Bill 28)

On motion, Bill 28 read a first time.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board, that Bill 28 be now read a second time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the said bill 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:** A bill, An Act to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957. (Bill 28)

On motion, Bill 28 read a second time.

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

**J. HOGAN:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board that Bill 28 be now read a third time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that Bill 28 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 Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957. (Bill 28)

**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 to Amend the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 28)

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

**J. HOGAN:** Thank you, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Motion 2, that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider a resolution for the granting of Supplementary Supply to His Majesty, Bill 25.

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

**S. COADY:** Thank you, Speaker.

I wish to inform that House that I have received a message from Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

**SPEAKER:** All rise.

As Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, I transmit Estimates of the sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31 March 2023, by way of Supplementary Supply, and in accordance with the provisions of sections 54 and 90 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*, I recommend these Estimates to the House of Assembly.

Sgd.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lieutenant Governor

Please be seated.

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

**S. COADY:** Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the hon. the MHA for Mount Pearl North, that the message, together with a bill, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

**SPEAKER:** The motion is that the message together with the bill be referred to a Committee of Supply and that I now do leave the Chair.

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.'

The motion is carried.

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

### Committee of the Whole

**CHAIR (Warr):** Order, please!

We are now debating Bill 25, An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.

### Resolution

*"Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

*"That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to His Majesty for defraying certain additional expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 2023 the sum of \$20,000,000."*

**CHAIR:** Shall the resolution carry?

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

**S. COADY:** Thank you very much.

For those that are just tuning in, this is for the ratification of a special warrant required for the cost-of-living rebate.

Chair, thank you for allowing me to speak this evening. On October 5, in the fall of last year, our government announced that due to additional revenues coming to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador that we would be providing a one-time cheque of up to \$500 and we would provide that to eligible residents of the province. This one-time benefit is one of more than half a billion dollars in targeted short- and long-term measures since March of 2022 to help residents with the cost of living.

When the program was announced we projected that 392,000 residents – there are only 520,000 of us, Chair – would avail of the program at an estimated cost of \$194

million. Again, I will say last year, we were able to have additional revenues come to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and utilize those revenues by providing this cost-of-living cheque.

The \$194 million we estimated was based, as I said, on 392,000 residents. The number was based on Canada Revenue Agency data that we had at the time. However, more people than expected filed their 2021 income taxes, which meant that more people were eligible to receive the benefit. Chair, I will say I think that's a very positive thing, because we would want our residents to file their income taxes because some of them would be able to avail of other programs and services within government because they filed. I'll use an example: Income Supplement, Seniors' Benefit are all based on income tax information, so hopefully some of these people who now have filed will be able to take advantage of some of these other programs.

Additional funds, because more people filed, were required in this fiscal year's budget to provide the cheques to all eligible residents. Approximately 411,000 residents in total. Chair, we based the program – we had information from Canada Revenue Agency that said 392,000 residents and that would cost approximately \$194 million, and in actual fact 411,000 residents were eligible. That's a very positive thing, I think.

In December, knowing now that more people had filed and more people were now eligible for this program Finance requested budgetary supply through a special warrant. That is the process in which we get additional funds to fund additional program costs. This provided the ability to Finance to continue issuing the cost-of-living cheques without delay.

Chair, the House was closed and we would normally do that through the House through additional Supplementary Supply, which is what we are doing now, but because the House was closed we used a special

warrant, and now we debate Supplementary Supply.

The most recent estimated cost is \$205 million. Once the program is completed, we will be able to confirm the total cost. I will tell this House that there are approximately 100 late filers that we have not received and we have not provided their cheques to because we're going through getting the final CRA data. There are approximately 100 late filers.

So that's the number of people that are still awaiting their cheques. If anyone has not received their cheque at this point and are awaiting it, they should call the 1-800 number. I'll provide it here: 1-877-729-6376. If you have not received your cheque at this point, please call the number because it either is a wrong address or maybe you're one of the 100 late filers that we're still waiting on information from CRA.

I'm going to repeat that number because I think it's important for all of us: 1-877-729-6376.

So, as I said, the most recent estimated cost is \$205 million. Once the program is completed, we'll be able to confirm the total cost. In accordance with section 28(4) of the *Financial Administration Act*, the special warrant that provided additional funding for the cost-of-living rebate program while the House of Assembly was not sitting is required to be tabled in the House of Assembly.

Special warrants provide an ability to approve additional funding when an urgent or emergency occurs while the House is not sitting. This special warrant approved in December of 2022 provided an additional \$20 million to fund additional costs associated with the cost-of-living rebate program to avoid delay in getting these rebates out to the people of the province. We wanted to make sure they received their money so no delay would occur because if we had delayed, it would have been not

until March of this year when we would have the opportunity to come back to the House.

To give legislative effect to the special warrant, it has been parliamentary practice to have such warrants ratified by the House of Assembly, and that is what we are doing this evening. Therefore, a Supplementary Supply bill is being tabled in the House of Assembly to ratify this special warrant. Doing so will serve to confirm the amount issued by this special warrant, which supports the principle that in a parliamentary democracy appropriation of public funds is vested in this Legislature. This is also consistent with the spirit and intent of the *Financial Administration Act* which provides that appropriations be approved by an act of this Legislature.

Chair, again, as I said, we based our information on Canada Revenue Agency information. We had anticipated about 392,000 residents would be eligible for this cost-of-living cheque, and indeed 411,000 residents actually filed and were eligible and that's why the cost has gone up. If we do not use the funds anticipated, then, of course, they just rest. Right now we're anticipating that it will be \$205 million. When in fact we had appropriated, using the special warrant, an additional \$20 million on top of the \$194 million that this Legislature had already provided.

Again, I will say there are about 100 late filers that we're still waiting to provide them with their \$500 or up to \$500 and anyone who has not received their cheque to please call that 1-800 number that I did provide and I'll do it again here: 877-729-6376. Anybody who's missing their payment can certainly call that number and we'll endeavour to get it to them as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you. I implore the House to support this motion. Obviously, we all supported the motion to provide the cost-of-living cheques in the fall of this year. This is just an update and a requirement to add additional monies based on the fact that we have more filers

than we thought we would have, which is a very positive thing in my estimation.

Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Chair is recognizing the Leader of the Official Opposition.

**D. BRAZIL:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's indeed an honour to speak again in the House of Assembly. I do first apologize to the House for being overzealous earlier and giving my shortest speech in my history of 13 years in the House of Assembly. Not that the Stephenville piece of legislation wasn't very important, because I support that and as a former minister did my part to make sure that that valuable asset to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, not only the West Coast, is still in tact and hopefully moves to a positive venture in the near future as part of that.

But I did reflect when I think about being overzealous to get up and speak and I talked about my shortest speech, which I just gave prior to that, and I'll talk about one of my longest ones on a piece of legislation. One day, the Justice critic a number of years ago inadvertently was not in the House to speak on a very important bill, and I was Deputy House Leader at the time, and the bill, it was said to me you need to get up and speak. I got up and spoke for 11 minutes before somebody passed me the bill, and then spent the rest, the other 49 minutes going right to the hour speaking about the bill as I tried to get more familiar, keeping in mind the Justice portfolio wasn't my forte by no stretch of the imagination.

I remember the Justice minister at the time referring to the speech as the best speech he's heard since Billy Madison gave a speech a number of years ago and it took a while for people to understand what that meant. But if you ever want to go back and look at the movie, *Billy Madison*, and the



speech that was given then, you'd get a better understanding. I made sure after that any piece of legislation which I spoke on that I knew what it was about. I guarantee you that.

So that was my longest speech and I was urged on by my colleagues to see if I could do the full hour on a bill which I knew nothing about as part of it. But it speaks to the volumes here of the legislation and the importance. We couldn't just dismiss the important piece of legislation at the time because it was important. Even if I wasn't fully briefed on it but it was important to the House and for information to get out there and it gave an opportunity for the minister then to rebut some of the things I had said about it as part of that.

When I reflect on what we're doing here today, the special warrant, for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador I'll first start on a positive note. I'll try to stay positive as much as possible but there will be certain tidbits or idiosyncrasies that I will want to bring to the forefront when we debate what we're doing here. Any monies that go back to the pockets of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians is welcome, it is welcome by this side of the House and we see it as a positive as part of that.

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

**D. BRAZIL:** I'd clap over here; I wouldn't clap over there right now because I'm not finished yet. There is still a *Billy Madison* part to come a little bit later.

But again, the issue in Newfoundland and Labrador is that we have some challenges in our economy; we have some challenges about the cost of living. A lot of it we probably can't control; there are entities outside of our province, this country, internationally, that we can't control.

But there are certain things that we can do to ensure that the quality of life that people have is based on their ability to pay their

bills and the financial burdens would be minimal as we look at what we're doing here. The financial support here of \$500 is welcome – 100 per cent welcome. There is not a Newfoundlander and Labradorian that I have spoken to over the last number of months who haven't welcomed receiving that cheque; some much more than others. Some do question whether or not they even need it; they could use it. There is a difference between can use it versus actually need it for survival as part of that.

In a gesture of good faith and it speaks volumes to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador supporting each other, a multitude of them, those who are in middle income or the higher end, just below the threshold, have said they would have preferred if more of that money went to people on fixed incomes or lower incomes to sustain the impact that the economy is having on them. That made me feel good as a Newfoundlander and Labradorian that people still care about what is happening out there. As much as everybody would like \$500, everybody could use it for something, no matter what it was.

So that was a positive thing that I saw from Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. We saw what happened on the Southwest Coast, back in September, how Newfoundlanders and Labradorians come together in an hour of need. So this was another example of how people would support.

I've had people say I donated it to charities. I've had people say I went out and bought \$500 worth of groceries and gave it to a food bank. It makes you feel good in Newfoundland and Labrador. My concern is that we shouldn't be there. The resources we have in this province, the skill set we have here, we shouldn't be at a point where we have to be giving money to people so that they can still just sustain a basic level of life, a level of quality of life, particularly those on the lower income, the working poor and on fixed incomes.

That's the concern that I have here about having a plan and a strategy that guarantees that people in their hour of need are taken care of but, more importantly, the plan that says we should never get to that point where people have to make a decision between healthy food, heating their home, their medication or being able to do basic things that they normally would, if it's buying a gift for a grandchild.

That's the fear I have in this province. With our natural resources, the abundance of it, and the skill set we have and the fact that we're known nationally and internationally for all the positive things that, at the end of the day, we still have these multitude of challenges when it comes to having to ensure people have a basic quality of life when we're in an hour of need.

So there has to be a better plan of action here and we're all responsible for trying to come up with that plan of action. If it's through a budgetary process, if it's through legislation, if it's through ensuring that anything that we buy or sell or any contract we do nationally or internationally is in the best interest of the people of this province. That should be the main objective of everybody in this House and every Newfoundlander and Labradorian as part of this process.

While we welcome the money, and no doubt I've seen smiles on people's faces because around Christmastime it was a great, additional financial lessening of burden for people here to be able to get over that hump and I do appreciate that.

One of the other ones that I have to give kudos to the staff in the Department of Finance for. There are a multitude of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, particularly situations in people's lives, they moved – CRA only tracks you once. They'll track you on the last address you gave them. So there were people expecting a cheque and the cheque probably went out; due diligence, staff did their thing, got it out

but it went to an address. Then it was about, does the person there put it back in the mail? Is it a delay on that getting back? If it never gets back and somebody takes it and inadvertently throws it in the garbage or does something else with it, unfortunately, what impact does that have on the person who needs that \$500 and who legally are entitled to it? What happens there?

I will give full kudos because I had the privilege of working with the department on a number of files in my own case and the minister made me aware of one in my district. I think it was Tibb's Eve, on a Friday afternoon, when Confederation Building was closing down we managed to, working closely with her officials, get that cheque for this young, single parent family member. That speaks volumes of what the civil service here –

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

**D. BRAZIL:** – are willing to do in their department, knowing the need that was there as part of that process. So kudos to that part of the process as part of that.

I still have to talk about the need we have here and that we have to have a plan of action that works for everybody. There has to be a system to know how much money we owe; who are we paying it out to; who is entitled to it; and how is it going to best be suited to help those individuals out as part of that.

There are days here that I think things are under control. Then there are a lot of other days that I shake my head and say, is there a plan of action here? While the intentions are good and well intended, I'm not quite sure they're always going to be beneficial because of some of the drawbacks of not planning in advance.

You've heard me say it and you've heard our side of the House say, look, we're collaborative. We're open. We'll co-operate as much as possible to do the right things.

We'll worry about politics when it's time to worry about politics. We need to know that there's a strategy and share that strategy. Maybe we can add a tidbit to improve it. We talk to a lot of people out in the general public, as I know your Members do over there. A lot of great ideas out there. The solutions to everything in our province that need to be solved are out there with the people who deal with it on a day-to-day basis.

So a little bit more openness on what's happening and some of the challenges that you're going to have here. You know, at the end of the day, this is about ensuring that the quality of life in Newfoundland and Labrador is much better in the future than it is in the past. I had a person say to me that we should be looking for the future. The next generation of those who sit in the House of Assembly, the next generation of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians should be planning for the future. Our future should be so bright. If it's Upper Churchill, if it's Muskrat Falls, if it's Lower Churchill, if it's wind power, if it's our fishing industry, our agricultural industry, our aquaculture industry, the mining industry, all the things that we have here, all of the natural resources. If it's our skill set, the tradespeople here, the skilled Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, aerospace, IT, all the things that we have in this province should be the precursor for a future that's so bright in Newfoundland and Labrador that the tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who went away because they were forced to go away, because of the economy or opportunities employment-wise, would flock to come back home. And for a period of time, we had that. For a short period of time, we had that in Newfoundland and Labrador. People were coming home in droves. The skill set was coming back. Young people were coming back to Newfoundland and Labrador, or they weren't leaving.

We need to be able to get to that process again. My hope and I know the hope on this

side would be that somewhere along the way we come up with a strategy, we come up with a collaborative approach, there's a plan of action, that we're not being reactive every time but we're being proactive.

I would like to have a philosophy that we live by that says your best day in the past will be 10 times better than the best in the future. That's where we live now. I'd rather have it spin the opposite way; that, at the end of the day, your worst day in the past will not be as bad as any day in the future.

To do that, we have to have a plan of action. I don't know if we have that in this House right now. I don't know if the government has that. There's my criticism here. I'm not quite sure they have a plan. There's one to announce a lot of things, but does it solve any of the issues that we have out there? \$500 would be a band-aid solution, but we need a full strategy. How do you keep the cost of living down? How do you make sure the carbon tax doesn't drive people out of their homes come July, August, September, this time next year? How do they heat it? What choices do people have to make there? There has to be a plan of action that works for everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador.

While we're going to support the extra \$20 million that's necessary to ensure everybody gets their cheque, because people need those cheques, I think if this is going to continue in the future – and I think right now because the economy is not stable enough that people would understand that the cost of living is going to be under control, they're going to need these supports. We'll probably ask you that question in the very near future: Is this going to be in the budget on Thursday as part of the process? But I would hope there's a better plan that ensures that those people who need it the most are going to get it. Or the organizations, agencies or programs that can best service those people are the ones that are supported also, so that there's a plan of action.

The old cliché give a man a fish, you feed him for a day; teach a person to fish, you feed them for a lifetime. We need to get a little bit more preplanning on what we're doing here in this House of Assembly. I'm asking the government, I'm asking them to dig down, be creative on your strategies and think it out. Don't just react. Start being proactive on what you're doing there. Use the asset you have. The assets are the people of this province. The assets are on this side of the House of Assembly here. We're open to do what needs to be done.

I do ask in the future that whatever it is that you do, you do it in the best interests of the people so that your worst day in the past becomes your best day in the future. That's how we're going to get Newfoundland and Labrador to where it needs to go and guarantee that people in this province have a better quality of life in the future.

Mr. Chair, on that note I will be supporting this, because I do think it does help. I do think there needs to be a better plan. There has to be a different approach to what we're doing here. There has to be a longer plan so that the \$500 cheques are giving to a charity to do something else that it benefits, that the people of this province don't have to rely on that to feed themselves, to be warm in their homes or to make a decision between medication or not having proper medication.

Mr. Chair, we look forward to this and, more importantly, we look forward to the budget on Thursday to see if the strategy is there to assess and help the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

I'm recognizing the Member for Bonavista.

**C. PARDY:** Thank you, Chair.

For all those people viewing at home, a short time ago, they watched our leader with the shortest speech ever but it was me, as the Member for the District of Bonavista, who mentioned to him we're on Bill 25. How well he handled it. The only thing he said to me was that we need to send you back to school. Fantastic, he was overzealous.

I think we're all onside with this bill. I harken back to the budget last year when we were looking at it and day after day we were driving home that the budget needed to contain a cost-of-living piece that helped out those people that were out there. What the government rolled out was the \$500 cheque per resident of Newfoundland and Labrador under the monetary threshold.

That was what the plan was at that time. I was surprised that the amount was given out – that, at our office, even those that were receiving cheques had passed away in the previous calendar year. That was surprising, but I am sure it was helpful. But that was a surprise element that I know we had not discussed in the House.

We talk about a plan and I think whatever you do in life, you need to make sure that you've got a solid plan. I had been in the House for a little over three years and listened to the discussions that we had. I often look at rural Newfoundland and many people in rural Newfoundland would look at it and say, are we part of a plan? We all know that we have declining and dwindling populations in rural Newfoundland. Is there a plan to arrest it? Is there a plan that is going to mobilize some instruments in order to grow and retain the population that we have in rural Newfoundland? That is a fair question. I think any litmus test of a budget or a government, good governance, is that there is a plan; you can see a tangible plan.

Many people in the District of Bonavista are a little worried that there is no plan. Let me go through a couple of items that they would discuss with me, as their representative in

the House of Assembly, as to what would cause them concern.

Residents in the District of Bonavista, that live in Bonavista and other communities on the peninsula, are aware now that it is quite conceivable that they don't own the land of which they have lived on and the generation before and the generation before the generation prior, they don't own the land. Is that comforting for the people in Newfoundland and Labrador? They are concerned about Crown lands.

In 2015, before the current government came into power, there was a working group on Crown lands from real estate agents to lawyers. It was a group that spent a considerable amount of time, filed a report to government on how to fix and address the Crown land issues. But that was eight years ago. We still have people who would be in the District of Bonavista and other rural elements of the province who are cognizant they don't own the land of which their house resides on. That's unfortunate.

I presented a petition today, and I appreciate the minister's response because he said his department officials were looking into it. We have communities in rural Newfoundland, Bonavista not excluded, Brooklyn, Harcourt, Elliston, that there are no driveways which would have the 115-metre clearance on both sides for a driveway, to access the main road, to be installed. They apply for and denied. Highway access, I would think, is an issue in rural Newfoundland. We have large swaths of land in rural Newfoundland in the District of Bonavista that you can't get access to the main road because they don't meet that regulation.

Is that a factor in the viability and the growth of rural Newfoundland? I would say it sure is. One hundred residents in the community of Harcourt, neither one meeting that regulation, neither one. But the department would tell them no more development in Harcourt because you don't meet that

regulation, when there isn't one landowner who currently resides there who would have that ability of 115 metres on each end.

I spoke in this House on several occasions previously about an Advanced Education, Skills and Labour office back then when it was called an AESL office in Bonavista. In the budget of 2016 government closed the office in Bonavista. It served 100 people per day. The records would show 100 people per day it served and the mandate and the news release that was sent out stated that we saw changes to the delivery of employment and income support services throughout the province. The regional services are provided primarily through telephone, email, online and outreach.

So 100 clients a day in Bonavista, close the office, move the residents, who were employees at the AESL office, an hour and a half up to the neighbouring community and said you can operate from here, but our mandate is that you can fulfill your obligation to these clients by telephone, by email and outreach. So what happens now is that these individuals work an hour and a half away. They travel down to serve the population every two weeks. They serve them and then I guess they go home because they're from the lower part of the peninsula.

I had asked the minister in a previous government, what were the savings? We have office space in Bonavista of which they could be housed in government, like at the College of the North Atlantic. They could have operated out of there. But when you think what their mandate is, is to work with individuals with income support, students, persons with disabilities, people with literacy challenges, single parents, apprentices, underemployed individuals, it was a valuable office that was removed.

I mentioned a little earlier about seniors that would have to get a driver's licence or a renewal. Currently, at the time, they can't do that in the community of Bonavista. I

mentioned to a couple of doctors and one in particular said that's shameful. If a senior who resided their whole life in Bonavista has got to go up to a neighbouring community, in an area that may not be familiar to him or her, in order to get their driver's licence renewed, I would say that is not very complimentary to the seniors that would be in the District of Bonavista on the lower part of the peninsula.

Health care, we talked a lot about it. My colleague from Ferryland was talking about the ambulance service. I referenced before that if you have Halifax Street, Ottawa Street in St. John's, you're seven to 10 minutes. I know we can't expect seven to 10 minutes for a response in the District of Bonavista. A lady last week collapsed in her house, her family was present and they called the ambulance. They had to call again after 30 minutes but, at the 45-minute mark, the ambulance showed up. The hospital was in diversion and had to be transferred. That lady, Ms. Elliott, is still in ICU at Clarendville, G. B. Cross.

Those are the realities that when we look at rural Newfoundland and planning for rural Newfoundland and have only touched on some that would come to the forefront in discussing them.

I want to conclude by saying hello to Wilmore Coole. Now, if you don't know Wilmore Coole, he is from Newmans Cove. I went to a fire department banquet and ball in Five Coves, on the Bonavista side of the peninsula, Newmans Cove, Birchy Cove, Amherst Cove, Middle Amherst Cove and Upper Amherst Cove.

Wilmore is 88 years old. He was there in attendance, not as active as he was but, boy, did he look great. Thirty-nine years of service and he watches the House of Assembly all the time, he stated.

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

**C. PARDY:** So a big hello to Wilmore and I think my time is up.

Chair, thank you very much.

**CHAIR:** The Chair recognizes the Leader of the Third Party.

**J. DINN:** Thank you, Chair.

I want to pick up on the theme of the Leader of the Opposition which is about a plan of action, about planning.

As a former teacher, I can tell you our life was very much determined by plan. Either it was the long-term plan for the year, which you had to lay it out for students; short term, or what you were planning for this week, tomorrow; or even medium term, whether mid-term report cards, the Christmas break, you name it, there was always some planning.

There was always something somewhere along the line, Chair, that was unexpected. An emergency at home or the AV equipment wasn't working and you had to come up with a plan on the spot. But for the most part, we had a pretty good idea of where we were going and how we were going to get there and if we were doing our jobs right, then our students had a pretty good idea as well.

I guess what I am looking at with the cost-of-living cheques is – I'll be the first to say that the people who got them, no one is going to turn down a \$500 cheque. They'll find use for it, whether it is for donating to a cause. Or maybe putting a little money down on the credit card. Or, as some of my constituents did, finally paying for much-needed dental work because they didn't have dental coverage.

I guess that is where I am looking at the long term versus the short-term relief. This measure was touted as a one-time benefit. I think we've got to stop looking in terms of one-time benefit and if we're going to do

one-time benefit, how we can plan to do it better.

Certainly we found, in how this rolled out, that there was a problem accessing cheques, from many of our constituents they didn't get it for whatever reason. They had to go through the process of verifying that they didn't receive the cheque. There didn't seem to be a plan about how we're going to make sure that women who might be fleeing violence that their cheque didn't end up in the hands of their abuser. As I understand it, some of the challenges were in printing of the physical cheque and the cost associated with that.

I can't help but think certainly that going through CRA or through an electronic deposit would have helped avoid many of the challenges. Maybe there would still have been the need for government-issued paper cheques, but for the vast majority they would have been a lot smaller and could have been done electronically through CRA.

It's interesting that PEI at that same time in October, at the end of October – and I guess they're looking at making sure that their people have the money in hand before Christmas – an increase to the sales tax credit, if you look at up to \$500 or more for people. But they went through CRA, since CRA would be responsible for the tax collection.

My point here is that we could have avoided a lot of the logistical issues here for people and maybe alleviated some of their anxiety. But that's to do with how we roll it out and maybe, in future, government needs to start looking at it, well, how do we do this, minimize the cost? I would also assume that the minister didn't wake up one day and say I think I've come up with a great idea; let's give out cost-of-living cheques. This is not something that would have just happened spontaneously. There would have been some discussion on this and it could have been handled in advance.

Long term – I'll go back to the fact that one of my constituents in particular, much-needed dental work. Not cosmetic, but it was affecting her health. I think when we're starting to look at relief for people, it's going to have to come down to the things that are going to have a long-term impact on their health and well-being and on the province itself. Because while my teeth may be healthy, someone else's teeth is going to affect their ability to work, their ability to have good health, their use of the health care system and their own quality of life.

Drug coverage – in terms of the number of people who are without drug coverage such as insulin. Income support – and I'll have more to say about this in our budget but the fact is that if income support had been indexed from 2014, when it was the last increase, it would be up to an extra \$100 per cheque, per person to help them make ends meet now, but we're not.

Guaranteed basic liveable income, affordable housing – if there's a crunch on it, we've heard it here. The Minister of CSSD has said it and I know he's committed to housing. We do keep him on his toes but in the last major cold snap that we had, we shouldn't be saying in hindsight we should have been better prepared. I think from here on in, we've got to look at a long-term strategy.

I can see sometimes government does short-sighted things. I'll go back to the clawing back of CERB payments from Income Support recipients. There was an opportunity there to say yes, maybe some of these people should not have applied but they did. In many cases, what the people were using CERB for wasn't a trip down South. It was actually to maybe eat out – something they had never done – buy new furniture, a new bed, new clothes. It was basically for necessities. Maybe buying the things that they couldn't buy their children before, for that matter. In clawing it back, it created unnecessary hardship. We might say, well, abuse is abuse. Well, I can look at

lots of corporate abuse and we seem to be less upset with that.

I'll finish off with this and I read this article out with regard to how a guaranteed basic income could put food banks out of business. Well, I like the idea of a consumption insurance that a basic income would support or would take care of.

I'll grumble at the price of food, the increase in the profiteering that takes place there. I may grumble at the increase in fuel prices as the result of corporate greed there. In the end, I'll still buy what I need to buy to put food on the table, but for many people, the people who call my office, even before inflation, their food budget took up an enormous part of their overall family budget. They had no room in which to absorb the shock.

So I think, in many ways, we can't be thinking in terms of the disaster insurance, the one-offs, the \$500 cheques, the food banks, the charity aspect of it; we've got to look at how do we make sure that, in the end, people are protected from these shocks so that they are healthier, that they don't rely on the health care system as much.

The question comes down to – and look at this, we've seen lots of announcements, but what is the overall commitment then to a long-term plan such as the Health Accord Newfoundland and Labrador? Because that does lay out a plan. Sixty per cent which deals with the social deterrents of health. If we're going to fix the health care system, then we've got to go one step beyond offering the retention bonuses to making sure that we fix the problem in the long run so people don't have to rely on the health care system and they're healthier as a result.

I'll leave this last point, in my last 20 seconds or so. Financial support of not-for-profit organizations: They do tremendous work that would fall in the lap of government

if they didn't have them, but if you do not index the financial support you give them, then it amounts to a cut and it severely hampers their ability to do the work they set out to do.

Thank you.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Chair is recognizing the hon. Member for Harbour Main.

**H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER:** Thank you, Chair.

First of all, I'm going to take a page out of the MHA for Bonavista's book and acknowledge one of my constituents who is watching here today: Mr. Pat Healey of Holyrood. I had the occasion to be with him and his wife Loretta on Saturday, at which time they celebrated their 60th wedding anniversary. Congratulations.

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

**H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER:** Mr. Healey himself will be celebrating his 90th birthday this summer and he has been a keen watcher and observer of the House of Assembly proceedings every day. So we're very happy that you have joined us here today, Mr. Healey.

Today, I think that the important thing for me to focus on is, with respect to this particular bill, I'm going to also take a page out of the leader's book as well in terms of trying to take a more positive approach to affairs that affect the province and the people of our province. I do think it's important that we look at, for example, this \$500 rebate, and do acknowledge that there was a positive benefit to many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, who are definitely in need in view of the cost-of-living struggles that they are facing now. It was definitely appreciated



and a great benefit for many of the people in the province.

However, I think it's also important when we do look at different policies that are in place, we have to also assess them. I think it's a really important role of the Official Opposition to do that. We need to question and we need to challenge some of the policies and the decisions that are being made. I think one of the main themes, it seems to me, is very prominent is with respect to whether there has been a plan. We see this example of the cost-of-living rebate, the \$500, and certainly it did go back into the hands of the people. As that's been stated by our leader, that's a good thing.

However, we also need to look at whether there has been a comprehensive plan. We all know the importance of planning. We all know that having a plan is important, because first of all it will set goals. I think I can speak, I'll say, on my own behalf, and I'm sure that all of the Members here in this hon. House of Assembly have as their perhaps primary objective and goal is to improve the quality of life of every single resident of the province that they represent.

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

**H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER:** I would say unanimously that is something that we all hold very dear to our heart is about improving the life and the quality of life of every resident. We know that there are many complex and complicated issues that face the people of the province. But if we don't have a plan, Chair, to break down those problems into smaller problems, those complex and complicated ones, then we're not going to be in a very good position.

We need to have a plan that reveals all the weaknesses that may exist. We can't just steamroll ahead and hope that things are going to work out and make funding announcements, one after the other, if there isn't a coherent, consistent, comprehensive

plan to follow and that involves thinking critically, that involves forward-thinking that doesn't just remain reactive.

There has to be planning. There has to be a very deliberate and intentional plan. Otherwise we're going to see things, as we often do, in the provision of services to our people and that's the tremendous waste of taxpayers' money that we see going on, and I would argue that's because there's no plan, Chair.

So we have to make sure that our resources are being spent where they need to be spent. We have to ensure that we take more resources and we put them where they're needed. Not putting them where they're not necessary. That's what happens, I would argue, when we don't have a comprehensive plan. We also know that planning reduces risk. It's a very critical piece to ensuring that risk is reduced.

That will bring me to the last point that I wish to make, which is in regard to the cyberattack. Now we see that the current Information and Privacy Commissioner was challenged in court by the provincial government. They sought an application challenging, basically, asking for the court to rule on the issue of whether there was reasonable apprehension of bias or an actual apprehension of bias.

So just to help you understand what that concept is, basically, it's questioning whether there is impartiality and whether there is a fair process or there's fairness on the part of the Commissioner.

Chair, that is of concern to me for a number of reasons. We see that the Commissioner has issued a press release addressing this issue and rejecting the claims of the government that there was any reasonable apprehension of bias or any actual bias. However, in the public interest, he made the decision, and in accordance and in compliance with his statutory mandate, he basically has recused himself and will not

be pursuing or not leading this investigation into the cyberattack. So the investigation will be completed and it's of utmost concern to him, according to his release, that this be done in a timely manner, that there be no delays, that a report be released to the public about exactly what happened with the cyberattack.

So he has recused himself. He's not having any further involvement in the investigation. Why? Because he wanted to avoid any lengthy delays and any expensive court proceedings. So I commend the statutory Officer for taking that courageous stand, Mr. Chair. He has now delegated his authority to someone else to conclude the investigation.

But in the two minutes I have, I just think it's very important for us to ask a few questions. Why was this issue raised now or March 15? Why was this brought before the courts at this point in time? The Commissioner has been involved in this investigation for more than a year now. All parties, including government, knew about his role at that time, a year ago, at the beginning of this investigation. So the question has to be asked: Why now? Why on March 15, actually, was this proceeding taking the independent Officer, statutory Officer, to court questioning whether there was a conflict of interest and apprehension of bias?

In his defence, he said that he reviewed precedent, gave it careful consideration. He concluded that any former roles that he had, had no reasonable apprehension of bias. He could recall no instance at all in which decisions were taken about cybersecurity during this period, while he was in these particular roles. I just wonder – it just seems strange to me why this is happening now.

So those questions have to be asked. It goes to the issue of transparency and why is his knowledge, which he had in his previous roles, being interpreted as a

negative and not that it was very much a beneficial attribute for him to have.

On that note, I would ask the government to try, when they're going forward – we need to have transparency. We need to promote accountability. We need to have a way to measure government's performance and guard against any possible misuse of power.

Thank you.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Chair's recognizing the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

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

To move on with the list, the next thing I want to talk about, Mr. Chair, and this is probably, I would say, next to health care and I guess cost-of-living issues in general, the next biggest issue that I keep hearing from people, my constituents and others as well, but a lot of people in my district, the Southlands area in particular I think, is child care accessibility. I know it's been raised here over and over again. We haven't really gotten a lot of what I would call the answers people certainly would want to hear.

I know there have been some measures taken and I'll give credit to the former minister. I have to say that when he was minister I had a number of issues raised as related to child care, more so with child care agencies, and I have to say that he was very accommodating in meeting with him and ironing things out.

I know this new grid is coming out. I'm hopeful that it's going to really be something meaningful. I understand that government is looking at encouraging more people to be ECEs and going to expand the classes and so on. But I was really shocked when I heard the minister in answering a question, I

don't know if it was last week or the week before, I believe he said – I don't want to put words in his mouth – 500 ECEs have left over the last year or so that they're trying to attract back. I was really shocked, to be honest with you, to hear that there had been that many ECEs over the last year or so who actually left their profession altogether and these incentives are put in place to try to get them back.

It really begs the question, I suppose: Why did they leave and why wasn't something done sooner? But at least I'm glad to see something is happening and I'm hopeful that when this wage grid finally comes out that it's going to be something that's going to be very meaningful.

Even as late as today, I've gotten two emails a day from people who are ECEs in my district, talking about the fact that they still have a number of issues. It is not all wages; wages are certainly part of it but they feel generally that they've been disrespected. In the words of the person who emailed me, I won't read it, but bottom of the barrel when it comes the system. That is how that individual described how she and her other colleagues feel like they have been the bottom of the barrel when it comes to the care and education of our children, which is very unfortunate.

So I'll look forward to the budget, but I do want to raise it here again in the House, put it on the record because, again, I've had so many parents, young families, reach out to me and professionals. I've had two doctors from my district who have told me that here we are talking about we have a health care crisis and we need doctors. I'm a doctor and I can't go back to work because I had a baby and I have nobody to look after my child. That's pretty sad. I've had nurses; I've had other health care professionals.

So here we are trying to attract and retain health care professionals. Here we are throwing out \$100,000 bonuses, \$200,000 bonuses and so on to get doctors and retain

doctors and here I have two doctors, for sure, in my district who have emailed me who are telling me that they want to go back to work and they can't go back to work and be a doctor because they have no child care. That's a reality. As I've said, I've heard from nurses and other health care professionals as well who are in the same boat so we really have to figure this out.

While the \$10 a day is great, it's great if you can avail of it, but I tell you I heard from a couple of people recently who said it was like rubbing salt on the wounds. It really pissed them off, quite frankly, because you are hearing about everyone is so happy: my God, I got \$10-a-day daycare, isn't it wonderful. But here I am, I have no daycare, I either have no daycare and I can't work or my spouse can't work, whatever that case may be.

Another issue which is happening is people are forced into leaving their kids in these unregulated settings where they feel they are being totally taken advantage of because they are being charged what might have been, say, \$40 or \$45 a day in some of these day homes, now it's going up to \$55, \$60, \$70 a day and then all these demands like I want two weeks vacation, I'm taking all stat holidays, I want a week of sick leave. If anything comes up besides that you can't send your child but you have to pay me anyway. If your child comes to my house and they're there for 60 per cent of the day and then I get sick or I have to leave, you're going to have to come get them and you still have to pay me anyway. If you don't like those terms, you can take your kid home and I'll get someone else who will do it. I've gotten emails on that.

I have personal experience in my own immediate family with child care with that circumstance in place with all these wild demands you never heard of before. Now, I'm not begrudging somebody the fact that even if you have a home daycare that you're not supposed to be like a slave or whatever, I'm not suggesting that. But, my

goodness, whoever heard of that before? Someone with a home daycare and now they're saying I'm having two or three weeks annual leave. I'm having all the government stats. I'm having sick leave. I'm having family leave. I'm having all this stuff and you're going to pay me, even though now you're going to have to take a day off work because – I had in my family one day, we had a situation where they said my brother is getting married so I'm taking Friday off. My brother is getting married, I'm taking Friday off so you can't send your child here today but you have to pay me anyway. That's a special circumstance that came up.

This is the kind of stuff that parents are being forced and they have no choice. They have no choice but go along with this stuff or have nobody at all. It's crazy.

I don't know if all Members realize that some of this stuff is going on, but I'm telling you it really is. So we have to figure this out. We have to figure this stuff out.

We're talking about the economy and growing the economy and growing the workforce and how many people could be contributing and want to be contributing to the workforce but they're not able to because of this stuff that's going on because they have no child care. It is a big issue, a big issue.

Now, Mr. Chair, I went on a bit longer than I thought I would, I'm running out of time on this time up but I'll be up again.

I'll just make a quick reference to home care – or no, I'll leave home care. I'll make a quick reference to long-term care. I did ask the minister about this and I brought it up in the House. I just want to say on behalf of the group, Advocates for Senior Citizens' Rights, who continue to reach out to me. They continue to be an active group. They have a big following on social media and so on and they've asked me to keep raising these issues and I will. I stood here in this

House of Assembly for months on end with petitions around the plight of seniors in long-term care, particularly those with dementia and Alzheimer's disease and the requirement to have proper staffing ratios.

We brought it specifically, specifically they had it in their petitions and I spoke about it in this House of Assembly numerous times, the issue around if you're going to have common areas and there are people there that could potentially be violent or not know what they're doing, there has to be supervision so that someone can't hurt themselves or hurt someone else.

Here we are now the last couple of months, we're after seeing – there was another one in the news, I think it was today or yesterday of a lady that got beat up or whatever, someone attacked her on a dementia or Alzheimer's ward or whatever the case might be.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** In Botwood.

**P. LANE:** Out in Botwood I think. Yes, out in Botwood.

So this is another one. I understand we're doing the review. This is not me saying this I would say to the minister, this is the group Advocates for Senior Citizens' Rights who quite clearly told me to say they're sick of reviews. They're sick of it. They've been reviewed enough. Get the proper staffing in place at the long-term care homes. Make sure there's proper supervision to protect the seniors. We don't need a review to do that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

I remind the hon. Member his speaking time has expired.

The Chair is recognizing the Member for Torngat Mountains.

**L. EVANS:** Thank you, Speaker.

I just want to talk a little bit now on the cost-of-living rebate and also to let everyone know that in my district those \$500 cheques, those one-time cheques were really welcomed. They helped out a lot and people really appreciated them. So there are no complaints from my district.

But the reason why they were so appreciated is because of the high cost of living. When you look at the Health Accord, it talked about the overall health of the province and fixing the health care system. They talked about social indicators of health.

In my district, the reason why those one-time cheques were so welcomed is because of all the high costs. The cost of heating your home, the cost of buying food to feed yourself, to feed your children, a place to live, a safe place, quality of life and mental health, Chair.

Chair, just getting back to the cost-of-living rebates. This is a one-time payment for people, but that's going to do very little to help the people in my district. This summer the cost of gasoline was frozen at \$2.457 a litre for people to go out, because they couldn't afford to buy food at the store, they needed to hunt and fish, which is really, really important, Chair. The gas was frozen at \$2.457 a litre. When I looked at the Island, the Island portion of our province, when I looked at communities that were totally remote, isolated, could only get there by boat, they were paying a lot less for gasoline, but in my district we were frozen at \$2.457 a litre.

Now, when the price freeze went off for the summer and they put on the winter freeze it was at \$2.063 a litre. So the problem that my people are facing – God bless the province for giving us a one-time payment of \$500, but in actual fact when you can't afford to go out and hunt and fish in the summer and you've got to advertise on

Facebook for a gas buddy so you can actually share the cost of gasoline to go out and try to get a little bit of fish to feed your family, to prepare for the winter, to go out and get some waterfowl like ducks and some geese so you can actually feed your family. It's really, really, really shameful when we've got to be so appreciative of a one-time payment of \$500.

You know, there's something wrong in the province. We look at heating our house in the winter. When we look at the heating our house in the winter, our stove oil is froze at \$2.40 a litre and I challenge you to find anywhere else in the province that comes close to that.

When we look at our temperatures in the winter, we need stove oil because we can't afford the gasoline to go out and haul wood. Then if you actually can afford the gasoline, who's going to actually haul the wood? We are reduced to being reliant on manpower, the physical abilities for people to be able to go out and cut wood, chop it up, bring it back to the community, bring it into the house, put it into the wood stove.

In actual fact, a lot of our communities are dependent on stove oil because we can't afford to heat our house with electricity because when we go over that little small life block of 1,000 kilowatt hours, we go up to 19 cents a kilowatt hour. Where else in the province is anyone paying 19 cents a kilowatt hour to heat your house? Nowhere. It's really, really discriminatory.

Really, when we talk to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, my fellow MHA sitting next to me was there, the reason why we're paying 19 cents a kilowatt hour is they don't want us to use electricity to heat our houses. Chair, you were actually in the room. They said that they didn't understand the implications of the hardship they were forcing on the people in my communities to actually be reliant on stove oil or to burn wood. Why is that such a challenge? The challenge is mental health issues and

physical health issues are the result of us not being able to heat our house, to feed our families and have a safe place to live.

The federal government's housing advocate came to the District of Torngat Mountains and Nunatsiavut Health and Social Development got waivers from people in the community so that this housing advocate in the federal government could actually go into their houses. Do you know what the advocate said? She's having nightmares because of the living conditions that people were living in. My brother is the Finance minister for Nunatsiavut and he told me that she said she's really, really worried about those people. She's still having concerns about them because of the living conditions that they're living in.

Why is it so expensive to have a house on the North Coast? It costs \$250,000 for the building lot. That doesn't include putting the house on top. There are a lot of things that are not fair, that are not right and it doesn't appear to be above board. Why is it so expensive? Because in actual fact it was only after land claims and Nunatsiavut got its land claim settlement and actually had a bit of money to spend to develop its communities all of a sudden these huge costs are there.

Another big thing that's impacting our quality of life, our ability to feed our families, the ability to buy nutritious food, is we are paying huge costs. The AngajukKâk of Makkovik actually said we are paying the costs of having the South Coast have full access to the Trans-Labrador Highway. I have to tell you, we congratulate them and we support them having access to be able to drive between their communities and to go to the Island and to go to other communities in Labrador. We actually support them in that and we appreciate the fact that they have that liberty.

But we don't have that liberty. In actual fact we look at that, one of the costs of that, what the AngajukKâk of Makkovik was

indicating was because they have the highway they took away the North Coast freight boat that we had access to. Everybody had the freight boat when nobody was connected by road, but now everybody else but my communities are connected by road and we don't actually have the freight boat anymore and we pay huge costs for food, we pay huge costs for household goods, we pay huge costs for our snowmobiles that we need to haul the wood and hunt and fish, and our ATVs and anything we get into our communities, even paint. Everything has gone up.

In actual fact when we look at it, we've gone backwards. Actually in our communities we are worse off than we were in the '70s. In the '70s, we didn't even actually have TV. That's how backward the development in the communities were, but in actual fact our quality of living was much, much better and our overall health care was much, much better because we could afford to heat our houses, we could afford to feed our children and we could afford to be living in safe housing.

Another thing, too, is looking at electricity. Electricity now we're paying 19 cents a kilowatt hour. The average in Canada is 13 cents a kilowatt hour. On the Island, they don't pay any more than 13 cents a kilowatt hour right now as far as I know. So it's really, really important for us to be able to show that, the disparity for the North Coast communities in Northern Labrador, is really unfair and unjust and it's impacting our quality of life and it's actually impacting our health.

Just looking at our ability to travel – just recently, we had a heritage forum where Nunatsiavut was sharing information amongst its people. They scheduled it; it had to be cancelled three times because of the weather. People can't travel and people can't do normal business. There was a hockey tournament in Nain. Some people went down there and they were basically stuck there for almost a week.

Look at the Labrador Winter Games now, trying to get home to the North Coast. Everybody is stuck because of the weather. Patients trying to travel, being stuck because of the weather. Basically what's happening is the quality of our life is severely impaired and something needs to be done about that, starting off with the cost of being able to heat your house. If you can heat your house, you have more money to be able to buy food so you can feed your children so that they can be healthy, so you can be healthy and also your elders can be healthy in the community.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR (Trimper):** Thank you.

I now call on the Member for Stephenville - Port au Port.

**T. WAKEHAM:** Thank you, Chair.

The debate this evening is around the additional \$20 million for a program that was launched, as the minister had alluded to, last October. There's no doubt, I mean, it's been an extreme benefit to people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I've always said, any time you can put money back into pockets of people of Newfoundland and Labrador, it's always a good day.

I do believe, though, that unfortunately this program was rushed and there was a need to rush it, but at the same time, that's probably what some people have a concern with.

I'll just give you a little story. I had a gentleman in his 80s who called me – he's not in my district; he was from the West Coast. He called me up to talk about the \$500 cheque he got. He was very grateful to have gotten that \$500 cheque. He was very grateful to have gotten it, but what concerned him a little bit about it all, was down the road, three houses down, there was a couple who were making \$80,000 a year each and they got \$1,000. He couldn't

understand how they could get \$1,000 when his total income for the year was \$24,000.

That has been some of the problem when we do things perhaps faster than we ought to do or without having a plan about how we might do it. The budget is coming. We've been told to stay tuned because the reality of it is the conditions that led to government giving out this \$500 have not changed. We still have inflation. Yes, it has gone down slightly but it is still extremely high. People are still concerned about how they're going to heat their homes. People are still concerned about the high cost of food.

Those issues have not gone away so it is going to be very important on budget day to see how we address some of those issues on a more permanent basis. But part of it is the fear that people have about what will happen to their prices come July 1, when the carbon tax increase comes into effect.

There is no denying the impact that those types of increases have on people with fixed incomes and there are a significant number of people in this province who have fixed incomes – retirees on fixed pensions; others on the lower income scale. So they are extremely nervous about how they are going to be able to afford this.

We will hear that the carbon tax is a federal program or a federal tax, but it is going to have a significant impact on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. So as we stay tuned for the budget coming on Thursday, we will listen to see and hear what may be there because these types of programs that have been offered in the past are definitely going to be needed again in this fiscal year. There is no doubt about that.

Lots of times we have heard lots of discussion about things we cannot control. We have heard lots about the health care and the shortages of staff. It is happening all over Canada. Okay, we can all agree with that but there are things in health care that we can control that would make life easier

for people. Some of those are simply things like the nurse practitioner, the fact that if you're a senior in my district it's \$35 a visit and \$300 for your membership fee to join the clinic. In other districts, it's \$65.

I recognize the challenges of understanding how we might fund nurse practitioners for those programs, but surely we have to find a way. So I am cautiously staying tuned to the budget so that I might hear something that will find a way so that the people who are having to pay \$35 or \$65 to see a nurse practitioner, no longer have to do that.

On the subject of nurse practitioners, the collaborative health care clinics or the renamed Family Care Teams, as of today, require to have services of nurse practitioners. Yet, we graduate somewhere between 12 to 14 a year. If you talk about 35 clinics scattered all over Newfoundland and Labrador and if you average one or two nurse practitioners in each of those clinics, how many years is it going to take before we can fully staff those clinics? It's going to be a significantly long period of time.

There has to be a way. How do we increase the number of nurse practitioners that we actually graduate every year? But the other piece of it is, if you turn around and look at all of the nurse practitioners that are currently employed in our health care system, in our four regional health authorities, how many of them are actually working in direct patient care or primary care?

How many of them are actually part of a medical team right now in our health authorities? Because I have been told there's at least \$250,000 being paid out right now as a supplement to managers, a wage differential being paid to managers who have a nurse practitioner reporting to them. Because these nurse practitioners are not reporting as part of a medical staff, they're incorporated into some department somewhere else in the system, some manager of something.

Now, that could be fact checked I'm sure because my number may or may not be right anymore, but the principle is if we have nurse practitioners that are in our system right now, currently employed with the regional health authorities, how do we move them into direct patient care? Because that has to be part of the solution. That is something again we will look at with a new regional health authority, how will that roll out? But it's clearly part of the solution.

Finally, one big item in health care that impacts a lot of people, more so those of us that live outside of the Avalon Peninsula, those that live in Labrador more than anyone else, those that live on the Northern Peninsula, those that live in Western Newfoundland and Port aux Basque, and all of those people know where I'm going with this, I'm talking about medical transportation assistance.

Medical transportation assistance, this is something that is within the control of the government to do. It doesn't depend on anywhere else in the country. It's a made-in-Newfoundland-and-Labrador solution that can be brought home on Thursday. So we will stay tuned to see if, in fact, with all of the monies that have been thrown around, with all of the monies and announcements that have been made in the last four to five weeks, is there a way that we're finally going to say you won't have to worry about whether you can afford to get to your medical appointments because we're going to step up and do it for you.

Just this past week, I spoke with a 74-year-old lady from the Northern Peninsula who has to take her son to St. John's for a treatment and she always has to take him. She was being told that she couldn't fly, even though the weather was predicted to be bad, even though she's driving from St. Anthony with no escort, her and her son, from St. Anthony to St. John's and was being denied medical transportation assistance for a flight. Instead we're going to put her on the road with her son.



Now, you tell me where that makes any sense to anyone in this House of Assembly. It does not and it should not. We should be there to say you don't have to worry about that, we'll make sure you're safe. We'll make sure you get that flight and we'll make sure you get there, because that is why governments are there, to help the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to help people and to make those decisions and this is one decision that is completely within your control and there's no excuse not to do it.

Thank you, Chair.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Chair now calls on the Member for Topsail - Paradise.

**P. DINN:** Thank you, Chair.

It's a pleasure again to get up and speak to this hon. House discussing Bill 25, granting of Supplementary Supply to His Majesty. It's a big concern that we've noted many times throughout this House today, the focus on health care and a focus on cost of living.

Of course, the cost of living really affects everything. It's far reaching when you look at affordability and individuals who can't access services and programs because of affordability.

Food, of course, is a huge piece of everyday life for us all. Everyone has to eat, but not everyone can afford to eat. I mentioned in this House before, many of us can go home and ask: What's for supper or what's for dinner or what's for lunch? Whereas there are others in this province, believe it or not, who ask: Is there anything for dinner? Is there anything for supper? Is there anything for lunch?

So when we look at the cost of living and granting additional funds to help address

that, I do hope that government takes a more precise approach in ensuring that those in most need, those most vulnerable are getting the better benefit of this, as my colleague from Labrador had spoke to earlier today. She talked about the \$500 cheques being well applauded in her district, but, again, her district is very different from other parts of the province.

In her district, people are struggling and the \$500 cheque, I would say, went as far for them as prices could allow up in Labrador because, as we know, the cost of food and the cost of goods in Labrador are astronomical when you look at – I know she shared in the past some pictures of the prices of a pork chop or something that we take for granted here and the prices are just unreal.

Related to that, of course, my colleague from Stephenville spoke about MTAP – spoke about travel. To just get to Labrador, it's amazing. I can fly to Calgary and back for less than a flight to Goose Bay. It's amazing when you think about it, your own province. Then if they have to travel for medical reasons, there's a higher level of stress and anxiety placed on individuals.

Think about extracurricular activities that you want to put your children in. I mean, for some, that's just not even a thought because they just simply cannot do it. Yet, we talk about the social determinants of health and trying to keep children active and healthy, and if they don't have that as a choice, what do you do for them?

I mentioned earlier today about the two extremes on the continuum. We have our young, our youth, our children, our infants and, on the other end, we have our seniors, our elders who are in the golden years of their lives. Both those groups are extremely affected by the cost of living.

As we know, we talked about child care and the \$10-a-day child care. How yes, it was supposed to come in and it was supposed

to be a blessing for us all and provide some affordable child care, but it's actually probably created some more obstacles in terms of the availability of spaces and those having to pay huge sums for unregulated spaces to look after their children, or they make the decision to not work and to stay home with their children.

Again, that comes down to affordability and making having children and having a family affordable. That's what it comes down to. As we spoke and we heard today, many people in this province, many young couples who want to start a family are held back because can we afford it, and secondly, is there someone to look after our children. In a province that's so desperate to increase our population that should be an area of focus.

If you swing to the other end of the pendulum, of the continuum and you talk about our seniors, you're going full circle and you have seniors on the other end of this. Many who are on fixed incomes and many who you see they're making choices between if they can eat or how much they can eat, whether to turn the heat up in the house or not, what they do with their medications. Do they ration their medications? Do they dilute their medications? Do they fill their medications at all? Again, this is a cost-of-living issue for our seniors.

Then, if you're lucky enough, like our Member today from Green Bay, with their parents in the gallery, if you're lucky enough to have parents that are at their age healthy, able to get around, of sound mind and body and still recognize their kids, it is a blessing. But if you have elderly individuals who are suffering from other ailments – and we hear a lot on long-term care homes about those suffering from dementia – you have to find a place for them to go to be looked after and cared for, but that comes with a price. If there is not an available place for them to go, someone has to look after them and that means either the support of your family

members or affording someone to come in and look after your adult.

In a lot of ways, child care and adult care are very similar in that you want your loved ones looked after and cared for, and it is difficult to do if you can't afford it or you don't have the supports. Here we are in a province with the oldest population, we're aging, and our baby boom wave has hit the shores long ago. We need to be ready – well, we should have been ready to deal with that. So here we are treading water at the best of times to try and address that issue.

On the other side of that, of course, as I said earlier, we're a province that is desperate for young families to come to the province and young families that are already here to stay here. For them to be here and to be contributing individuals to the province, to the economy. That's what we want. But we're not going to do that if we don't make the necessities of life to them affordable and accessible.

That is everything from child care positions where people can put their children, affordable programs, affordable prices where kids can live, work, play, and everyone can excel in their environment. The cost of living is something that is putting a drain on us and especially those who are most vulnerable. I can't imagine how some of them continue day in and day out. As I mentioned earlier today, all that puts an immense strain and anxiety on individuals which creates other problems. Not only physical health issues but your mental health issues. I can't imagine every day being concerned about whether I'm going to heat the house, whether I can eat, whether I got medication, whether my children are going to be cared for and whether I can go to work. These are very basics that no one should have to get up any day and worry about it or try to make a choice on it or flip a coin or whatever they do to get through the day.

So hopefully, in the budget coming down in the coming days, we are going to see some real action towards that.

Thank you.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

I now call on the Member for Labrador West.

**J. BROWN:** Thank you, Chair.

It is once again a privilege to speak here in the House on this particular thing. You know, it was good that there was something, but we could have used and thought about the bigger, broader picture of the cost of living in this province, poverty and how do we address those kinds of issues.

I stop to think about my own district in the sense that I'm blessed in Labrador West. We do have a very thriving mining industry, going on 75 years-plus of mining in the region; but, at the same time, I have extreme poverty in my district. It's not as blatant as one might think it is, but we have long wait-lists for housing. We have people couch surfing all the time that we have to deal with. We have those who are in a very hard situation, but I do have large amounts of wealth and prosperity at the same time. So there's a huge disparity that's there and you layer that on top of the massive cost that is to live in a region like Labrador West.

We have some of the highest rent in the province. We also have some of the tightest housing stock. It's almost near impossible to find any place to rent or anything right now. Even after some of the units that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing fixed up, we still have a wait-list. They fixed up so many, but we're still in a crunch in the wait-list of people who actually need housing, people who are staying with family, people

who are going from house to house, you know, doing that.

So that's the thing that we do suffer with. When I see this one time cost-of-living cheque, fine and dandy. That's great for that one time, that one period of time on a calendar, but at the end of the day we've got to stop and say, what about every other month? What about every other month that people are in a hard situation at this time?

My colleague, the Leader of the Third Party, mentioned that we're talking about excessive amounts of greed in the corporate world that's actually affecting everybody in this province right now. We're seeing massive amounts of profit being generated. Yet, we see nothing come back to us or the country at this time to rationalize why are you gouging people at such a vulnerable time. That's what we're seeing. It's amazing to see, both in the resource industry, but also in the food and grocery industry that, you know, these are pressures that are being applied to the province. I mentioned it before speaking, that we have a duty as a province to also insulate our residents from some of these global factors.

So I did mention before, the question is why aren't we doing long-term measures? Why aren't we doing things that plan out and say, you know, this is how we're going to get people on a more stable footing? You look at the cost of heating a home. My colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, mentioned about the cost of heating a home in Torngat Mountains. It's very expensive, but you've also got to look at the cost of living in Torngat Mountains, which is very expensive. You couple that on top of, you know, the traditional ways of the people on the North Coast.

So we have these pressures that are being applied there, like that cost of heating. So why aren't we taking a step back and go: what measures can we do to make sure that it's easier to heat your home? Something that a lot of people take for granted, but for

some people it is a very real factor that they have to plan out how they're going to heat their home. Can they afford this much oil this week or can they afford to turn the heat up from 16 to 17? These are things that some people who are in very tough situations think about that other people just take for granted.

We'll go back to talk about greed in the resource industry. We look at oil companies right now and what they're charging for a very important thing for heating your home. You know, 20 per cent of this province heats their home by oil heat and the cost has ballooned to an astronomical kind of reality here. So we take a step back and realize this is one basic need, with a lot of pressure on it, that maybe in the long run we look at okay, the cost of heating your home, that's one thing.

Then there are people who heat their home with electricity. That's a very large portion of this province that does that. Even though it's a bit more stable of a price, at the same time, some people still have a hard time paying that bill and heat their home with electricity.

So this is the solution that I put out is to remove HST from that bill. That is a long-term measure that can actually help so many people; it helps them right there on the piece of paper that comes in their mail every month. That's a measure that we could actually take as a province that actually helps people, directly helps people that are very vulnerable right now. That is just one of the many things that we could also look at.

Heating your home is a basic thing, but having a home is a very important thing as well. There are a lot of people in this province that don't have a home or a very stable home. You look at the cost of renting. I just mentioned that I come from a place that has some of the highest rents in this province, but even in the City of St. John's right now, it is very expensive to rent here in

the city. This is where we need to take a big, broad look at housing as a holistic thing of how we can get more people into affordable housing and stable housing and for some people a long-term housing plan.

I still have people on a wait-list in Labrador West. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing did some work, got some more units opened up, but we still have a wait-list for people looking for housing. So clearly there is a need; clearly there is something that needs to be done about stable housing.

My colleague for Torngat Mountains always mentions about stable, affordable and accessible housing in the North. That is a serious plan that needs to be made by this province and even the feds, to talk about how we provide housing to those who are vulnerable in the North.

Just getting a lot cleared is \$250,000; just to get a lot cleared to put a house on. That is some serious issues that we should desperately be addressing because it talks about affordability. It talks about putting a roof over somebody's head. You talk about affordability, but it also culminates with your health and your well-being so this is where we really need to take a serious think about.

We talk about one-time measures, \$500 cheque, fine, but there are a lot of long-term measures that do go back into the idea of affordability, but also your health and your well-being. So we talked about housing; we talk about heating the home.

Another thing that shocked me is that we've seen measures that go out there about inflation and stuff like that, but I have never seen the cost of groceries come down at all. I have seen them go up since all these measures have come into place, but I have never seen them actually come down. That's another serious look that we have to do is accessibility to food, accessibility and affordability. Because once again it also affects our health as a whole.

We've seen the rise in actual farming and stuff like that, but, at the same time, is it happening fast enough? Are these individuals who are actually going to take on agriculture and stuff, are they being resourceful enough to actually take on the task of bringing up our provincial food stock? Because we still import a lot of food into this province. We need to actually look at a bigger, broader plan of how do we produce more? I know there's some stuff being done. But it does go back to the same thing.

We have the \$500 cheque, that's one space in time, one month in time, but in the long run of things, if we look at our farmers and look at how we can get that food into the hands of everybody at a price that is, not what we're currently seeing on shelves and the amount of greed we're seeing currently in the grocery market.

But at the end of the day, a long-term plan on food accessibility actually is also a plan on affordability. Because we all know that if it's done here in this province it's actually going to reduce costs for the people that actually need it. This is the thing we're looking at is, we have a serious problem with food security. But at the same time, we also have a serious problem with food affordability.

This is where we need to take the step, how do we make sure that the farmers that are in this province have the ability to do it, but they also have the ability to do it in a way that is going to bring down the cost, going to bring down the price. This is where I think we need a bigger, holistic plan on health.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Member's time is expired.

Thank you very much.

I now call on the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands.

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

Glad to have another opportunity. Mr. Chair, I want to talk about home care. Before I do, though, I just feel like I have to comment.

When I first got elected here 11 years ago and we're after going through a lot of changes, different Members, a change of government, leaders and all that stuff. But there was a time in this House of Assembly when we got into budget time we'd be debating the budget, we'd be debating bills and whatever the case might be, there was always a back and forth. I don't know about other Members, but I really feel this is missing.

I'm not saying this to now try to get everybody all upset and be controversial and whatever, but there used to be a bit of a back and forth that if someone said, well, I have these concerns about housing and this or that or whatever, then the minister or someone would get up and sort of counter it. You'd get both sides of the equation and would feel like you're having a legitimate debate.

But I've got to say, the last couple of years, it seems like all we're doing is this side gets up every time we've got a bill, every time it's the budget or whatever it is, and we're all just putting our concerns on the record and everyone here is just ignoring it and then there's zero response. There's nobody getting up to refute anything being said to let us know that maybe there's something we're getting wrong, something we're missing. I would really love to hear a few Members on the other side tell us how we're wrong. I'm sure it can't all be doom and gloom. I know it's not all doom and gloom.

For one thing, I'd love to know what's going on. The Member for Port aux Basques was a very eloquent speaker. I'm not just picking on him, but I've got to say I'd love to know some of the positive stuff that's going on with our oil and gas industry, with rare earth minerals. I'd love some updates on all that

kind of stuff. I know he can supply it. I know he's more than able. But it seems like everybody over there, they've been told to just sit there, zip it, say nothing and just let them talk to themselves until they get tired and then we'll go home. I don't know, I just had to say that.

Anyway, I just want to talk about home care because this is something I've had a number of people reach out to me about as well. My colleague from Topsail - Paradise has raised this issue. Last time he was up, he talked about the child care and the home care. Actually, it's something I've been on *Open Line* the last two weeks talking about, this very thing, about both ends of the spectrum. So we know the challenges in child care and we know that there is a new pay grid coming out for ECEs, and hopefully it's something that's going to be meaningful to address that side of it. But there has been things done in terms of child care. There has been things; the cost is now down to \$10 a day. Now we need to improve the accessibility side of things. Hopefully, the new pay grid will help with that and other initiatives.

But, on the other end of the spectrum, we have our senior citizens and I'm talking about our vulnerable senior citizens. Senior citizens who require home care. It doesn't necessarily have to be a senior citizen. As a matter of fact, the last gentleman I spoke to a couple of weeks ago, I ran into him at an event or the grocery store or something, I can't remember. Anyway, he came up and approached me and he said: Can you bring up the issue of home care?

In his case, he's an elderly gentleman but it's his child, because he has a child with Down syndrome and a multitude of issues. I think Down syndrome is part of it, but that's not really the debilitating piece because a lot of people with Down syndrome, from a health perspective, they're functional and so on, some very much so, as we've seen at the Special Olympics and so on. His child had a number of different health issues and

so on and special needs and, basically, requires 24-hour care.

So here's an elderly couple and, from their perspective, the issue of home care is not around an elderly spouse; it's around a child with special needs. You don't have to be a senior to be impacted by home care, I guess, is the point I'm making and that wasn't his case.

He told me that he doesn't use a home care agency. Because you have the option here. You can use a home care agency – like Serenity Home Care as an example. That's one in my district. Or you can choose to hire someone yourself, privately or whatever the case might be. At the end of the day, he wasn't using an agency, but based on the amount of subsidy and so on that he receives from the government, he's only able to pay the worker \$16.50 an hour and zero benefits, no holidays, nothing. That's what he told me. So that's it; \$16.50 and then that's it.

He told me that the amount he's received, like to be able to give an increase or whatever hasn't changed – he told me six years. I'm only going by what he told me. The minister might say no, it was four years, three years. Maybe he got an increase last year and he forgot about it, I don't know. He told me six years.

The point of the matter is that at \$16.50 an hour to care for somebody with complex needs, whether it's a child or an adult, just think about it now – and needs vary from person to person, of course. For some people who need to be cared for, the person who is providing the home care need to have like special training in terms of connecting medical devices or hooking up tubes, or cleaning wounds or doing whatever it might be and some of it can be quite complex and quite scary.

There are people who have seizures regularly and you've got to deal with that kind of stuff. There are all kinds of issues.

Still, you're into this situation where these people that are providing this critical care, which is really an extension of health care, it's part of the health care – it may not be happening in an acute-care hospital or a long-term home or a personal care home, but it's still health care.

We actually say we want to keep people in their homes as long as we can and they're getting paid, in this case, \$16.50 an hour, zero benefits, nothing. So how are you supposed to get anybody to work and to care for our most vulnerable, our most frail, our most elderly, our most disadvantaged, how are you going to get someone to do it for that kind of pay? Isn't it a sad reflection on our society as a whole when we place a greater value on someone working in a coffee shop? Just think about that for a second now.

I'm not against someone getting paid well in a coffee shop. I mean, I've worked Tim Hortons day and McDonald's has a day that you go and you help out behind the counter. I forget what it's called. Happy days, is it? Or McHappy or something. I've done it and I mean, those people working there in those shops, they're run off their feet. So don't get me wrong; I'm not begrudging them whatever they get. God love them; they work hard.

But my point is in terms of placing a value on the importance of that work, that we place as high or higher a value on someone working in a coffee shop or a fast food restaurant than we do caring for our moms and dads or our grandmothers and grandfathers or a sibling or whatever, people with special needs and so on. We are placing a higher monetary value to do that. There's something wrong with that picture, particularly as it's part of our health care system.

I know when I asked the question in Question Period, the Minister of Health did say that the budget was coming and stay tuned, I think, was what he said. So I'm

going to stay tuned. I know there are a lot of asks and I know there are a lot of needs, no doubt about it. It all got to be paid for and it's all coming out of the one pot and, quite frankly, I'm trying to figure out where we're getting all the money to be paying all the money out for doctors and everything we're doing now. We must have pumped some oil in the last few months. I know the prices are good, but we must have pumped some surplus of oil, the money that's flying around now like crazy. I hope we did. I'm glad we did.

Like I said, I know there are a lot of asks but I've got to say to the minister that I really hope that when the budget comes out, there's going to be something there that's going to be significant for home care workers in this province, whether they work privately for someone or whether they work for a home care agency. Nothing against the home care agencies either. They can only pay based on the subsidies that are coming in from government. If government are not giving them the money, they can't magically find money or grow it. They don't have money trees either.

So, hopefully, there is going to be something substantial for home care.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

The Member's time has expired.

I now call on the Member for Ferryland.

**L. O'DRISCOLL:** Thank you, Chair.

It is certainly a good opportunity to get up again and have a few words based on the district. I will certainly go back to touch on the ambulance issue for sure. Like I said, it is a big concern and speaking to one of the Members across the House here, his granddaughter was here the other day. It is pretty terrifying when something like that happens to somebody in you family. That is

the point I'm trying to make. It's terrifying for anybody to have that happen.

In the district when you have people calling, they're concerned; they're not sitting there waiting for it to happen. There is something going to happen along the way and it's a big concern in my district for an ambulance. I will keep harping on it; I'm not going to let it go.

Hopefully, it will get to a point that we will get an ambulance that is going to be staffed here; that is our issue, getting it staffed. It is incumbent on government to be able to do that. It's very important for the people in the District of Ferryland to be able to have that and have some comfort. I mean, whatever happens when the ambulance get there, that's to be determined, but at least to have the opportunity to be able to get an ambulance there, that is our main concern. I'm certainly going to keep at it and I'm certainly not going to let it die.

I did hear a couple of Members also talk about child care. I can relate to that and I get the gears over here from some of my own Members about child care. I've been on it since I came in and they've been wondering how many kids I got, but I have two grandkids. My daughter had her name into a daycare in Bay Bulls before the child was born. She just finally got in in January with a new daycare that has opened up in Witless Bay called The Rielly Roost. It's great to see a new daycare in the area.

It is certainly appreciated that they are there and they spent the time and the energy that they had to put in to renovating that building, the fire suppression. All that stuff is expensive. They are making a lifetime investment, for sure, in the area. So they did get into that daycare after nearly three years. The youngest grandson is in full time and the oldest kid is only in for half a day because they take some of the kids coming out of school after they're finished kindergarten or Grade 1, after 2:30. They're

there until the evening or 5:30 so they only accommodate them for half a day.

That is even an inconvenience to the parents that have their kids there for half a day. They have to have someone pick them up, whether it be a grandparent or whether it be a babysitter that they have lined up at 12 o'clock to go get them. It's great that they're in the area, but it is a little bit of an inconvenience that they're not there for the full day.

In Bay Bulls, where they were before, there was a 48-spot daycare in the Livestyle Centre. She's been on the list forever. This one happened to open up and she had her name in there as well and they did get in there.

So the daycare issue is a big, big issue. You can offer \$10 a day, that's a great plan. Certainly, everybody is going to applaud that, everybody. The problem is, again, we'll lean back to plan. The plan is \$10 a day – great. You can have it for nothing if you can't get them in there. There's no room.

They should have been looking at facilities to be able to do this. So it's easy to say we'll give you \$10 a day. It can be \$100 a day, if you don't have anywhere to put them. Now with the subsidy that some of these places got for \$10 a day, there's some daycares that are open from 8 in the morning until 4:30. Now that's not very convenient for people that are working from 8 to 4:30.

Some of the calls I get, they're having to wonder if they're trying to force these out so they can go back to be charging \$75 a day for a kid and people will still buy it. If they shut down \$10 a day and they get someone that wants to pay \$75, they'll be filled because they've got people that need daycare. It's not suiting everybody.

They haven't thought it all out. The plan is what we're getting at. It's the plan. It's the same as my ambulance issue. There's no plan. It's the same as the doctors, no plan.



Things change. Every time you ask a question there are different answers.

Fee for service, I think they said, on the doctor. I've been speaking on that for a year and all of a sudden, two Fridays ago, they come and tells me there's a fee for service available. That's not what she wanted. They were looking for rural retention bonuses and then they throw that out there. It's totally – I don't know where it came from. That's the kind of plan.

Now we've got a rapid response unit. Where is it going to be in the ambulance part? I'm after switching from daycare and now I'm back to the ambulance again, but where's the rapid response team going to be? Is it roving through the district? They throw that out. That came out of nowhere. Right out of nowhere, that came out. Again, I'm talking about a plan. They put out the rapid response team, roving in the district. The first question that came that night: Where did that come from? That was on *Open Line*. I was at home. The minister was on *Open Line*, waiting to go on and calling to tell me to tell me he's going to make an announcement on a rapid response team.

Now that's the kind of plan. That's what I'm talking about a plan. It's not him. It's the whole government. You've got to have a say in this. There's no plan to it. To come out and say that on an *Open Line* call to give you a heads-up that they're going to come out with a rapid response team. Does that sound like a plan? That sounds like a reaction. That's what it sounds like. Proactive instead of reactive. I hate to be saying it but that's exactly what it is. They're reacting to stuff. It's just like throwing something at the wall and hoping it's going to stick. That's what it's like. That's exactly what it's like.

Hopefully now this budget, when we get it, it's going to be a good budget and we'll be able to get our Members up on the other side. Last year, they didn't think their budget was that good. They didn't get up to speak.

So maybe this time with a real budget they'll be able to get up and brag about what's going on. I'm certainly happy to hear that. That'd be great and I'm looking forward to it.

As the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands had said, last year, I had said the same thing, if the budget's so good how come no one's getting up and talking about it? No responses, no nothing. Normally that's what riles us up over here to be able to get up and speak, to hear what you're saying. Maybe we'll get that this time on this budget. It's going to be that good there's no way you'll be able to stay in your seat; you'll have to get up. There's no way it can happen.

I'll talk about schools in the district. I said I was going to touch on this and I'm not going to let it go, because I have a Member here on this side that has some benefit as well.

In 2015 – it's before I came here, so it's nothing to do with me being here, but we had a school in the budget in 2015 that was axed. It was gone. In Mobile, it was gone. Up in Mobile area that was the school, 2014-15, they squashed that when the budget came out. It was supposed to be there, absolutely, yeah.

What happened is the Member for Baie Verte - Green Bay, he got – and he needed it, I'm not saying you don't need it. You got renovations to your school out in your area and good for you. Renovations in your school in your area somewhere that you got some renovations that are happening or they're going to happen.

**B. WARR:** It's going to happen.

**L. O'DRISCOLL:** Yeah, right, it's going to happen. Hasn't happened yet.

The Member for Harbour Grace - Port de Grave, brand new school. If I'm not mistaken, I believe the Member for Cartwright - L'Anse au Clair has a new school as well in her district since 2015. If

I'm not mistaken, I thought I heard you speak about it last year or the year before. Funny, they all happen to be Liberal districts, but that's fine. We can move on past that. I'm running out of time now.

Now there's going to be one in Conception Bay East - Bell Island, there's going to be a school. That just happens to be in the Premier's district. He just happens to live there. It's in his district, but the Premier happens to live there. So that's four schools that were gone and the one that we had was squashed.

Now, I haven't been up on that at all because it hasn't been an issue, but it got squashed when the Liberals came in and there've been four new schools built that haven't been mentioned. But I will say in touching on that, because I did have a conversation with somebody, it might've been in our caucus, I'm not sure who it was. When you build a school or come up with building a school, I don't see why they don't think about putting a daycare attached to the school and be able to take care of it from there and have an after school program.

If you're going to do it – now everybody wants one. He wants one in his district, you want one in your district, you want one in your district, but if you're going to build a school, I think you should build an after school program to take care of the kids that are from kindergarten to Grade 6, I'm going to call it elementary school. I think it would be a great idea.

Now, I'm throwing it out there. It's a good idea that somebody should have a look at. If you're going to award a school, put an after school program or a daycare in it. Let's see if we can do that.

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

**L. O'DRISCOLL:** Now maybe the Member for Conception Bay East - Bell Island might

be the first fellow to benefit from that, I'm not sure. But we're not getting any benefit.

I will touch on the fishery a little bit – I'm not going to have enough time; I know I only got a minute – but I know that the fishermen were out protesting yesterday and they got good right to protest. The inshore fishermen that I've spoke to are down to 10,000 or 11,000 pounds of crab. In 2016 and '17 – I'm going to say '17, in that area, just speaking to them – because again, when you get into it, it's pretty complicated when you look at it, there's no question about it, in regard to adjoining biomasses and all that stuff.

In 2017, the inshore fishermen had 34,000 pounds of quota. They got cut because a rare phenomena happened in 2017 or '18. The crab dropped and there was no crab in the area. So they dropped the quotas. They're down to 11,000. Now, 11,000 last year was \$77,000. If it's \$3 a pound this year, it's \$33,000. They're cut in half. They've got to hire someone to go out there – I'm trying to get through this quick because I'm running out of time. They've got a person that they've got to hire with half the amount of money to be able to do the job that they've got to do. Their quotas were cut. The crab is in the area. When they throw out a balloon, they're tied up to the next person that's in mid-shore. They're full of crab. They won't increase their quotes and they should be increased.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Sir.

**L. O'DRISCOLL:** Thank you.

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

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much.

I now call on the Member for Humber - Bay of Islands.

**E. JOYCE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm just going to stand and have a few words and talk about what the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands was speaking about. I see the Minister of Children, Seniors and Social Development. This is an important issue that was brought up to me on several occasions. One is the raise, and it's funny because the two or three calls that I got, one is the raise for the people who are doing home care. It is important and this person – six of them were taking care of one kid with special needs – they haven't received a raise in six years.

I know the minister is aware of it, but is there something we can do because a lot of those people that they care for do have complex needs and you need some training for some of the needs that they have. So it's something that I hope the minister will look at and maybe it's in this year's budget. Hopefully it is, I'm not sure. But it's something that I've got to raise.

The other issue I would raise to the minister – and this is an issue that's not brought up very much. It's an issue which is very personal, not for me, but for a lot of the residents. It happens, I think, 21 or 22 times across the province, where someone with special needs or someone with extraordinary needs, you can hire a family person. The problem, I say to the minister and to the government itself, is that some people, when they get into a certain state, when they got to do personal hygiene, it's tough to let some stranger do the personal hygiene with you.

I know it is a grey area because then you are hiring family members. But a lot of people who need this personal attention and the personal hygiene, they want a family member doing this work. I just raise that with the minister because it has been brought to my attention by a lot of people that they don't want someone that they have to get from home care and maybe the next day they have someone else from home care. If there is any way that you can incorporate that, okay, you get a certain

amount you can hire – and if it is a family member who is already working that is different, a certain income, but it is a serious issue.

You take any of our mothers in this room and if they needed some personal care, they want their daughters to do the personal care. The continuity the Member mentioned is true, the continuity to it. But we look at it across the province and it is brought to my attention and right now – and I have been on several occasions – if you need to hire a family member, you need to go through a full appeal system. You may win some and you may lose some, but you can. It can be done, but it is a process that you have to go through.

It was brought to my attention by several people that the money is there. The money is not the issue; the issue is that you can't hire someone that is related to you to do that work and to take care of your personal needs. In a lot of cases, people won't call in workers as much because it is personal and they're embarrassed and they want just family members to help out with that.

I say to the minister, I don't know if there was ever a review done in the department on that lately or if there is anyway where you can look at that. That is an issue that has been brought to my attention on many occasions. As we get older and there are more needs, that is when family members say, well, Mom don't want so and so. Mom doesn't want someone they don't know. Mom wants someone that, okay, she has a sister or something; she has somebody who is not working that they can help out.

It is dicey. It is, because then all of a sudden you are paying family. But the money is there anyway, and that is always the argument. If the money is there to help out with these four or five or six hours a day, if there is someone who is not working and someone who needs the funds and they're a family member, can we look at some

parameters whereby you can hire family members?

It is being done now, but there is an appeal process that you go through and it is done a lot in rural Newfoundland where you don't have the home care workers and their services.

So I ask the minister if there is any way that that can be looked at and do some evaluation through the department because one of the people that called actually wants me to drop up to see if there's anything I can do with it. The only thing you can do is make the application. It's going to be rejected by policy, which is understandable. Then you have to go through the appeal process. If you can't justify that yes, we can get a home care worker today – now tomorrow may be a different home care worker. There's no continuity, as the Member mentioned. Then they won't really say I don't want anybody. I'll try to do it on my own or I'll try to get some family member to come up when they're ready.

So it's a touchy situation. It's something that's very personal to a lot of people who need that special assistance. I know some people who are very, very much in need. They can't wash themselves sometimes. They can't take care of themselves sometimes and they can't get out on their own. Yet when it comes to their personal hygiene, they want someone they know, who they feel comfortable with. It's to keep their pride and to keep their dignity that they need.

So I'll sit down and take my seat, but I just ask the minister if there's any way that your department can look at something like that for the people that really need it and the people who want to feel good about themselves. When you bathe them, they don't want someone they don't know. They'd rather have a family member.

I ask the minister if there's any way that the department can review that and if there's

anything that can be done to help that out. It would be greatly appreciate it. I would be fair to the minister. It is a situation where people may take advantage –

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

**E. JOYCE:** Pardon me?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Health.

**E. JOYCE:** The Department of Health.

There is a way that they can get it done but it is a dicey situation, I would say, because then you might get people taking advantage. There are a lot of people who aren't taking advantage, who really need it and really like to have it just to keep their dignity and their respect for themselves so that they have a family member where they feel a lot more comfortable. I don't think anybody in this room that has a mother or a sister would not want a family member to help take care of them than somebody coming up and – now they're professionals when they do it. They are professionals when there doing it, but it's just that pride part that they need.

So I'll take my seat and I just want to express that view because I was asked to do it and the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands brought that up earlier. He brought that up earlier and I just want to echo what he was saying about the need for the raise. Six years, they haven't received a raise, and also for finding some way we can get personal hygiene done by a family member somehow to help with that situation.

I'll take my seat, Mr. Chair, and I'll just thank you for the opportunity to raise these issues on behalf of the one person who has a lot of physical disabilities. There are six of them at home taking care of a kid with special needs who haven't received a raise in six years.

I'll take my seat and thank you very much.

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

**CHAIR:** Any further speakers?

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against?

Motion is carried.

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service." (Bill 25)

**CLERK:** Clause 1.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 1 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

**CLERK:** Clause 2.

**CHAIR:** Shall clause 2 carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

Clause 2 is carried.

On motion, clause 2 carried.

**CLERK:** The Schedule.

**CHAIR:** Shall the Schedule carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

The Schedule is carried.

On motion, the Schedule carried.

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

**CHAIR:** Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

The enacting clause is carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

**CLERK:** WHEREAS it appears that the sums mentioned are required to defray additional expenses of the Public Service of Newfoundland and Labrador for the financial year ending March 31, 2023 and for other purposes relating to the public service.

**CHAIR:** Shall the preamble carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

The preamble is carried.

On motion, preamble carried.

**CHAIR:** An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.

**CHAIR:** Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

The title is carried.

On motion, title carried.

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

All those in favour of the motion?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

The motion is carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Chair, I move that the Committee rise and report that they have adopted without amendment a certain resolution and recommend that the bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

**CHAIR:** It is moved that the Committee rise and report that they have adopted without amendment a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Against?

Motion is 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 Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted without amendment a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

**SPEAKER:** The Chair of the Committee of Supply reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and directed him to report that the Committee have adopted a certain resolution and recommend a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

When shall the report be received?

Now.

On motion, report received and adopted.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, that the resolution be now read a first time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that this resolution be now read a first 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:** *"Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

"That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to His Majesty for defraying certain additional expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 2023 the sum of \$20 million."

On motion, resolution read a first time.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, that the resolution now be read a second time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that this resolution 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:** *"Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:*

"That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to His Majesty for defraying certain additional expenses of the

public service for the financial year ending March 31, 2023 the sum of \$20 million."

On motion, resolution read a second time.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Speaker, I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, for leave to introduce the Supplementary Supply bill, Bill 25, and I further move that the said bill be now read a first time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the Deputy Government House Leader shall have leave to introduce Bill 25, Supplementary Supply bill, and that the said bill be now read a first time.

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

All those in favour, 'aye.'

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

Motion carried.

Motion, that the hon. Minister of Finance and President of Treasury Board to introduce a bill, "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service." (Bill 25)

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service. (Bill 25)

On motion, Bill 25 read a first time.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, that the Supplementary Supply bill be now read a second time.

**SPEAKER:** It is moved and seconded that the said bill 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.'

The motion is carried.

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service. (Bill 25)

On motion, Bill 25 read a second time.

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, that the Supplementary Supply bill 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.'

The motion is carried.

**CLERK:** A bill, An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service. (Bill 25)

**MR. 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 for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Additional Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending March 31, 2023 and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill 25)

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

**L. DEMPSTER:** Thank you, Speaker.

I move 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.