



Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

FIFTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Volume L

SECOND SESSION

Number 89

HANSARD

Speaker: Honourable Derek Bennett, MHA

Thursday

November 14, 2024

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

Admit strangers.

Before we begin this afternoon, in the public gallery today, I would like to welcome Kaylee Mercer, who will be the subject of a Member's statement this afternoon.

Welcome, Kaylee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Kaylee is joined by her mother, Linda Dalton; her aunt, Diana Woodford; and Lieutenant Tanya Kane, Unit Public Affairs Representative from the Regional Cadet Support Unit, Atlantic division, with the Department of National Defence.

Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Statements by Members

SPEAKER: Today we'll hear statements by the hon. Members for the Districts of Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans, Humber - Bay of Islands, Labrador West, Lake Melville and Harbour Main.

The hon. the Member for Grand Falls-Windsor - Buchans.

C. TIBBS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Edgar Power of Grand Falls-Windsor has contributed 31 years to the students of Central through the art of teaching. Starting his career at St. Mike's, Edgar eventually made his way to Exploits Valley High, where his dedication and knowledge would impact many students over the past years.

From his Bachelor of Arts degree in economics and business, Mr. Power created a business plan workbook that

would guide students through the process of creating a business plan. This led to his students winning provincial business competitions, with many going on to start their very own business.

Pulling from his Bachelor of Education degree, Edgar created a webpage for a world geography course, which was later used right across Newfoundland and Labrador.

No stranger to hard work, Edgar delivered pizza for the first two years of his teaching career, helping the family business.

Edgar Power has given a lifetime of service to his community, which also included coaching minor hockey and volunteering with the 1916 Beaumont-Hamel Army Cadets.

Through kindness and his passion to ensure others succeed, Edgar Power has been an inspiration to his students, his peers and his community.

Please join me in thanking my very good friend, Edgar Power, and wishing him well through his much-deserved retirement.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

E. JOYCE: His smile would light up a room, his kindness was unmatched, his warmth would make everyone feel special and his love of life to make people happy through his music is the best way to remember Dave McHugh.

Dave was an outstanding musician who used his gift to promote love, kindness and you felt this, when you were in his company, through his infectious smile.

Dave was a renowned musician and will be remembered for his music and his encouragement to young musicians to pursue their dreams. He inspired so many young artists.

Evan and Becky lost a great father. Mrs. McHugh lost her son. Susan, Paula Brian, Mike and Cathy lost a beloved brother and we have lost a true ambassador to our province.

Dave was the kindest, warm-hearted and genuine person on this earth.

We will all miss you, my friend, but I know heaven is full of smiles and laughter as you walked in and were greeted by your father, and your music is bringing smiles to all.

I ask all Members to join me in passing along our condolences to the McHugh family.

Thank you, Dave, for making this world a better place and you will never be forgotten.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise to acknowledge local United Steelworkers 5795. This year they are celebrating 65 years of representing the past and present constituents of Labrador West who have worked at Iron Ore Company of Canada or Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway.

The local USW 5795 was formed in May 1959. They have represented various steelworkers over the years. Many of them are the pioneers of our community, who have formed Labrador West into the community it is today.

USW 5795 has been the backbone of our communities. They have done various

charitable work within our communities such as donations to the food bank, seniors' Christmas lunches, the Christmas hampers and, most recently, they've started a school event on the first day of school for students attending Menihek High School, welcoming students back by treating them to a large BBQ.

The dedication they've shown throughout the many years of service to our community has created history within our communities, and we're very thankful for everything they've done.

I'd ask all hon. Members to rise and congratulate local United Steelworkers 5795 on their 65th anniversary.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Lake Melville.

P. TRIMPER: Speaker, on the 4th of July 2024, Sue McLean and her husband, Ross, were at their cabin on Sealing Point, 22 kilometres from Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Around noon, Sue fell and was seriously injured. Persistent winds and rough water prevented using a boat for transportation to the hospital over the next 24 hours. With her worsening condition, 444 Squadron was then tasked to retrieve Sue from her cabin.

As the winds continued, the CH-146 Griffon helicopter was forced to hover while two combat support med techs repelled to the ground. After securing Sue in the stretcher basket, she was hoisted to the aircraft and flown to 5 Wing Goose Bay, where an ambulance was waiting. Sue has since recovered.

At the recent Remembrance Day service, on Monday, I was pleased to introduce Sue McClean to Major Erin Pratt, the Commander of 444 Squadron. Every single

member of the squadron contributed to the successful response of this emergency in July. From the aircrew on the Griffon, the technicians who keep these aircraft operational, through to those who handle the ambulance and other equipment.

They work as a professional team – one that we are very proud of in Labrador.

STRIKE SWIFT STRIKE SURE: 444 Squadron.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: It is an honour to stand in this House of Assembly and share the remarkable accomplishments of a young woman in the District of Harbour Main. Kaylee Mercer of Harbour Main-Chapel's Cove-Lakeview is an 18-year-old who just recently graduated Roncalli high school in June of 2024.

Kaylee has been extremely active in her school and her community. Throughout her school years, Kaylee was on the student leadership team, was a member of the volleyball, softball, basketball, badminton, soccer and ball hockey teams. Outside the walls of her school, she received her National Lifeguard certification and worked every summer from the ages of 14 to 17 as a lifeguard.

Kaylee is also a member of the Southern Cross Sea Cadet Corps, where she holds the rank of chief petty officer first class and the position of coxswain, the highest rank and position that a cadet can hold. She has earned many awards and medals throughout her cadet career, including the Lord Strathcona Medal, which is the highest decoration a cadet can attain.

Achieving five scholarships, Kaylee is currently attending Memorial University and plans on becoming a primary-elementary teacher.

Please join me in congratulating Kaylee Mercer on her outstanding achievements at such a young age and wish her great success with her future goals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Statements by Ministers.

Statements by Ministers

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

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

I rise today in this hon. House to recognize November 10 to 16 as Nurse Practitioner Week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. HOGAN: Nurse practitioners are essential contributors within our health care system. Whether employed in emergency departments, program areas such as cardiology, long-term care, mental health and addictions or in primary health care, nurse practitioners provide a high quality of care for patients in our province.

Our government recognizes the tremendous service of nurse practitioners who are critical to the operations of our Family Care Teams. These teams are expanding access to primary care by having already connected over 60,000 residents.

We are proud to support nurse practitioners with initiatives and incentives such as new collective agreement provisions, signing bonuses to work in Family Care Teams, incentives for retired nurses to return to the workforce and grants for nurse practitioner students.

During Nurse Practitioner Week, we reaffirm our commitment to expanding opportunities for nurse practitioners and building a stronger health care system that works for everyone.

Speaker, I ask all hon. Members to join me in thanking nurse practitioners for all they do to support the health and well-being of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

I'd like to thank the hon. minister for an advance copy of his statement.

Speaker, I join the minister in recognizing all nurse practitioners in the province, whether in the public or private practice. These skilled professionals fill a critical role in providing front-line health care to residents around the province. Actually, I was disappointed and surprised not to see a proclamation from the minister for Nurse Practitioner Week. Perhaps it was a scheduling conflict.

Speaker, I also note the continued 80 vacancies we have in the province, which could help alleviate the health care crisis that we hear about every day from the media and calls and emails to our offices.

I will say again, I am at a loss to explain why government will not let nurse practitioners in the province see patients and be compensated. We have nurse practitioners in Corner Brook and other places that could help with the doctor shortage, yet this government continues to put up roadblocks versus solutions.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement.

We thank the nurse practitioners of our province for all they do to keep us in good health. We would like to return the favour by calling on this government to finish and release its health care human resources plan. That would go a long way to alleviate the pressures they face at work and provide them with the supports they need to carry out their duties to the highest standard possible.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Further statements by ministers?

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

G. BYRNE: Speaker, our government is bringing in a series of sweeping, positive changes to the administration of Crown lands that will quicken regular applications while supporting long-term possession of the land your home is built on, even when that possession doesn't meet the previous legal tests that blocked that possession.

For the last five decades, ever since 1976, when government decided to abolish, to terminate adverse possession of Crown lands, government after government has endorsed the 1976 decision and made it their own.

Speaker, we are not every other government.

The Primary Residence Property Title Program is a game changer. Any qualifying applicant who built, bought or inherited a

house and land and is now living full-time in that home will be issued a quitclaim deed, forever eliminating the Crown's right to that property. The applicant will show that they paid taxes to their municipality and establish reasonable proof of primary residence as of October 15, 2024, and it is theirs.

Once approved, if the applicant is a senior in receipt of the Guaranteed Income Supplement, the GIS, they pay nothing for this deed except standard processing fees.

No applicant will pay full market value and, to support housing security, the deed will be based on a percentage of income, starting at just 5 per cent of the normal price.

For 50 years, this Legislature said don't do this, take the land away and take these families to court with no other recourse. Speaker, we are not listening to that advice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Exploits.

P. FORSEY: Thank you, Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement.

Families who have lived on their land for generations have been in heartbreaking situations where they have had to spend enormous amounts of time and money to try and get their true, clear title of their own land. The Liberals have left people suffering far, far too long.

The quitclaim process is a glimmer of hope, finally. With this proposal, there still remains a lot of questions. Also remaining are the concerns of the Auditor General regarding the Liberal's inability to administer Crown lands.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

I thank the minister for an advance copy of his statement.

While we're happy to see reform of the Crown lands system, we believe that the current design of this program misses the mark. The maximum area is too small, because we know of rural lots with wells and septic tanks that cover a plot larger than the stipulated 1.86 hectares.

We, therefore, ask the government to return to drawing board on this policy and correct it.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Are there any further statements by ministers?

Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

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

T. WAKEHAM: Thank you, Speaker.

The details of this Liberal land fiasco continue to emerge and are slowly coming out. Yesterday, we learned from the minister that the government actually sold this land back in 2016.

I ask the minister: Can you clarify how much land was sold and for how much?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Member opposite for the question.

He was accurate in his description. The land was sold by the province to a private owner back in 2016 and we are purchasing a portion of that back to be part of the new acute-care facility that we're building.

It actually lies between the Outer Ring Road and our land which we own, the Crown land, and Kenmount Road on the other side. So it's the buffer between. We're purchasing most of that back or a portion of what we sold back in 2016.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: So, Speaker, we understand that the Liberal government sold the land in question for \$84,000 an acre and are now buying a portion of it back for \$365,000 an acre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

T. WAKEHAM: What a deal.

I ask the minister: How is this the best deal for taxpayers?

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

F. HUTTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The land which we sold eight years ago was, obviously, eight years ago and the value of it was quite different.

Since that point in time, the owners of that land have taken water and sewer from the end of the city's service on Wyatt Boulevard, all the way up the rest of Kenmount Road and in Nils Way. Those businesses there, they are provided water and sewer systems as a result of the expenditure they have made. As a matter of fact, they still operate that water system. It is not part of the St. John's infrastructure.

So the land is more expensive now because of the passage of time. We've seen an increase in prices of housing and an increase in the price of land. It is also now serviced land, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, it appears that the company is going to make a significant profit on the land that they purchased eight years ago.

I ask the minister: Can you table an independent appraisal of this parcel of land that you are now buying?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, in real estate there is an old expression: location, location, location.

It's located on the border of Mount Pearl. It's located on the border of Paradise. It's located on the border of St. John's. It is at the intersection. It's also neighbouring with CBS.

I wonder if the Member for Topsail - Paradise doesn't want a hospital to go in there, on the doorstep of their district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: Does the Member for Topsail - Paradise not want it on his doorstep? It is at Kenmount Crossing –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I can't hear the minister speak. You have 15 more seconds, Sir.

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, it also allows us to unlock and help fix an issue that the folks in Topsail - Paradise have long lobbied for: a change in the infrastructure at the interchange of the Outer Ring Road and Topsail Road. We plan to do that and it's going to accentuate the ability to get into the new hospital site.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, I listened to the minister's comments but, at the same time, 720 Kenmount Road was sold in October of 2022. That's right next door; 55 acres to be exact. Speaker, 720 Kenmount Road: 55 acres, 2022, \$575,000. Yes, 55 acres, \$575,000; \$10,400 an acre.

I ask the minister: Do you still think you got a good deal?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, we do. We do think we've got a good deal because what we're going to do is we're going to provide enhanced health care service to thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: The accessibility for the people who live in the communities I referenced earlier, in the cities of Mount Pearl and St. John's, CBS and Paradise and the rest of Newfoundland and Labrador because it's right on Route 1, the Outer Ring Road, the highway that connects every community in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, 720 Kenmount Road also had direct access on to Kenmount Road, so there we go. Let's also talk about 543 Kenmount Road. There's 70 acres for sale right now at 543 Kenmount Road for a price of \$1.75 million. That's \$25,000 an acre.

Again, I ask the minister: Are we getting the best value for our dollars?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

Are Members ready?

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure.

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, we are getting the best value. Because, as I mentioned, the location of this will service not just the three of the largest municipalities, really four of the largest municipalities in Newfoundland and Labrador, about 270,000 people, almost half the province are going to live within about a 15- to 20-minute drive of this facility. They can access it through the Outer Ring Road. They can access it through the other busy road in the province – one of the busiest – Kenmount Road.

Yes, it is a good deal and it's a good deal for Newfoundland and Labrador residents who require a better health care service. We're going to provide it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, the minister keeps alluding to the great location, great location. Well, in that location, there's actually 130 acres of Crown land.

Why didn't the government actually use their own Crown land to build the new hospital?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, when we did the news conference a little over a week ago, there was a map right on the podium. It shows the land we're purchasing, it shows the land behind it, which the Crown owns. We have to get through the Crown land in order to get to this land, so that both accesses can be from Kenmount Road and the Outer Ring Road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, again, I have to question: Here we have 130 acres of Crown land and we're talking about needing access. Well, why not expropriate and take back the width that we need to put a roadway into 130 acres of Crown land that we already own?

I ask the minister: Why didn't you consider that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member opposite makes expropriating sound as though it's free. When you expropriate land, you pay market value, which would've been much higher – much higher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

F. HUTTON: It's not free land. When you expropriate the land, it's not free. You have to pay for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure.

F. HUTTON: When you expropriate land, you pay fair market value. When you have willing vendors, you can negotiate. We negotiated a lower price than the asking price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, no commercial appraisal that he can present in the House of Assembly to tell us exactly what the value is. We know what they sold it for eight years ago. We know what they're buying it back for, at three times the amount of what they actually sold it for.

So the minister can stand up and say that, yes, we're getting good value, but where's the evidence that it is good value? Other pieces of land sold for much less.

Now, the minister also talked about the water. So we've been told that it's actually going to require a new water tower to be built on Kenmount Road, costing \$15 million to \$20 million that will be required to provide water to this hospital site.

I ask the minister: Can he confirm this?

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, in order to unlock that other land that's up there and to make it more usable for people who want to build homes, expand businesses as the city continues to grow out, again towards CBS –

I saw the MHA for CBS laughing. Does he not want to have expansion there? Does he not want to have a hospital next to his district, for his residents? Does the Member for Topsail - Paradise not want this?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

F. HUTTON: We have to have a water tower in order to bring water in. The actual cost is still being worked out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, we want the best value for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: So I will ask the minister again: Can you confirm the need for a new water tower that's going to cost somewhere between \$15 million and \$20 million to put on that site, and who is going to pay for it?

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, we will need a water tower for the area, and we're working on the cost of the entire hospital.

It makes sense, and for other development that we plan to do there. Because we're progressing as we try to expand and build new infrastructure for the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, so now we can confirm that it will require a new water tower to be built. Just think, if we only expropriated the small amount of land we needed to put in a roadway to the 130 acres

of land we already own, we could have put a water tower up there.

So I ask the minister again, who's paying for the new water tower?

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

S. COADY: Thank you very much, Speaker, for the opportunity to speak to this very important issue.

Number one, there is no doubt we need new health infrastructure – no doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

S. COADY: This government has built a new hospital in Corner Brook; this government has built a new mental health facility.

Number two, in this particular area, this is an area that requires a transportation corridor. It's located next to Paradise, next to Conception Bay South, next to Mount Pearl, all the major intersections. This is a good piece of land that requires this new hospital.

Number three, we're being very consistent in the land purchase, not unlike what's been going on in this province for decades. I can tell you even going back to the Corner Brook hospital, Speaker. This is a consistent policy development.

Speaker, all I can say is we need this infrastructure; we need it in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

T. WAKEHAM: Speaker, again, I will go back to the fact. The area has 130 acres of Crown land that could have been used to build the new necessary hospital to replace St. Clare's, which we all agree with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

T. WAKEHAM: But what we're talking about is value for money. We have 130 acres of Crown land that we could have accessed with a land expropriation and done it a lot cheaper. As a matter of fact, we could have probably had enough money leftover to pay for the water tower.

Again, I ask the question: Who is paying for the new water tower?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Immigration, Population Growth and Skills.

S. STOODLEY: Thank you, Speaker.

As an MHA responsible for Paradise, I can tell you that Paradise has been asking for a water tower. I have just searched my email for water tower and I have a letter from the Town of Paradise in 2019. One of the things they asked government for is a water storage tank because the residents of the Town of Paradise need another water tower.

I fully support and it makes sense, Speaker, that we need another water tower for the residents of Paradise and the residents of the Avalon Peninsula.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

It will be an interesting debate – I don't know if you'd call it debate or not. We're not talking about the need of a new hospital –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

B. PETTEN: – we've always spoke that we've needed another hospital; we need more health care. Actually, I need a lot more health care in my own district, not out on Kenmount Road. I need it in CBS, not Kenmount Road, Minister.

We're talking about a flawed process, Speaker, and that's what government neglects to acknowledge.

Speaker, yesterday, the minister admitted that staff of the health authority personally profited by renting houses and apartments to agency nurses the health authority had hired.

Speaker, can the minister tell the House now how long this went on under the Liberal watch?

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

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

The Member asked me to table a letter and, actually, he texted me yesterday to ask for copies of letters to show the trail of how this played out. I provided him with copies of those letters last night, so he probably already knows the answer to this question, but, anyways, we're here in Question Period and it doesn't stop us from saying things more than once or asking questions more than once.

The issue was raised by the Nurses' Union back in March of 2024 and immediately after that a former minister of Health wrote back to the RNU, wrote to the CEO of NLHS, wrote to the chair in NLHS and wrote to the Auditor General that these allegations had been made. As I said yesterday, throughout the course of the next few months, NLHS did an investigation and found that there was violations of the *Public Procurement Act* and Conflict of Interest Act and then those leases were terminated at least on or before August of 2024.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

Yes, he did provide me copies of letters, but the one I wanted was what the findings were. I never did see that and I guess we'll keep asking questions. We might see it eventually.

Speaker, has the minister ordered the health authority to recover any monies inappropriately paid to these individuals?

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

J. HOGAN: No, Speaker, I haven't had that conversation with NLHS. As I said, what NLHS advised was that they had found there had been violations of the Conflict of Interest Act and the *Public Procurement Act* and, as a result, those leases were terminated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

Minister, can you tell this House how much was inappropriately paid out to those leases?

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

J. HOGAN: Speaker, as I said, the leases were terminated by NLHS once they did their investigation. The leases were terminated because there was a violation or what they felt was a violation of the Conflict of Interest Act and the *Public Procurement Act*.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Obviously, we don't know how much. A lot of unanswered questions, obviously. It's good to see they were on the ball with this one.

Speaker, have any of the employees involved been disciplined or fired?

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

J. HOGAN: Speaker, the Member, as he acknowledged, received copies of letters from me last night. One of them was a letter that was addressed to the former minister from the Auditor General. I will table this, but just to read it into the record: "Thank you for your recent correspondence regarding concerns about Newfoundland and Labrador Health Services and the use of agency nurses in Newfoundland and Labrador.

"I'm writing to inform you that I have directed my staff to initiate a performance audit of Health Sector Contracts, and we will begin determining the scope of this audit in the coming months."

I thank the Auditor General for accepting this letter and looking into this matter. I look forward to her findings on this as well.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: I got that letter, that don't tell the findings.

Minister, has anyone been disciplined or fired? That was my question, not reading out a letter.

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

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

I do look forward to the Auditor General's report. There haven't been findings yet from her report. She's looking into this. Again, I appreciate that the former minister wrote this as soon as it came to his attention and I look forward to the Auditor General's report when the findings come in.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Speaker, it's troubling that the minister knew that this was done wrong. It was not ethical, it was conflicts of interest. They knew that and they cancelled the leases. Yet, they won't say if there has been any action taken.

This happened months ago, now you're going to wait for the AG. The AG already told you there was something wrong and you cancelled leases, yet you can't tell this House and the people of this province was anyone disciplined or fired. I think the minister does know the answer, or he should know the answer; he ought to know the answer because he's the Minister of Health.

Maybe he'll provide the House one more time with that answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. HOGAN: I stood up and said it doesn't stop us from answering the same question or asking the same question. So I'll give the same answer to the same question, that I look forward to the Auditor General's results

and her findings. I know she will do a thorough investigation and when the findings come out we will act on each and every one of those findings.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

Unbelievable, but I guess the people of the province will have a decision on this lackluster, nonchalant response I'm getting from the minister. They're watching, too.

Yesterday, the minister said there was a violation of the *Public Procurement Act*.

Can you explain that, Minister?

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

J. HOGAN: Sure, I can get information on what specific sections of the act that the conclusion was that they were violated. Those were decisions by NLHS. Happy to talk to NLHS and get more details about that. Of course, he can read the *Public Procurement Act* if he wants to himself.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: You wonder why we have a health care crisis and we're dealing with scandal after scandal. When you hear responses coming back from the Minister of Health and Community Services like that: go read the *Public Procurement Act* yourself.

His name is over the door. We can read it; we have researched; we know. But he's the one who said it's a violation.

If you say it is a violation, you obviously know what was violated. So why can't you disclose that to the House? I think that's not fair to this House and the people of this province to stand up and give responses like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. PETTEN: It's ridiculous.

Will the minister order the health authority to publicly disclose the investigation they conducted?

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

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

I wasn't the minister at the time, but I do recall that it was that side that asked for the Auditor General to investigate agency nurses in this province. Now that it's being done, that's not what they want. You got to pick something and stick to it; you can't flip-flop like that.

The second thing I want to say, he said he was disappointed when he responded to my Ministerial Statement today. I'm disappointed. You want to talk about delivering health care in this province. What he said: he was disappointed that I don't support private health care in this province, Speaker. That's what he wants; that's what he said.

Despite the fact that the Health Accord doesn't talk about fee for service for nurse practitioners, it talks about a family-based care team. That's what people in the province want. He wants, and I assume the rest of his party wants, people in this province to pay for their own health care. We will never support that, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: It's not the last day of school yet, Speaker. It's not the last day of school yet. Relax everyone.

If an orthopedic surgeon can bill government for their service, if a private doctor can bill government for their services, why can't a nurse practitioner bill government for their services?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. PETTEN: That's what we're asking, Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Decorum.

B. PETTEN: Decorum. I think, Speaker, keep them in line.

Speaker, neither a former minister nor the current minister proactively disclosed this abuse of taxpayers' money for almost seven months.

Why is that, Minister?

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

J. HOGAN: I'll answer the first question: Why won't we support nurse practitioners in fee for service? One answer is that the Health Accord doesn't call for that.

I know the Member opposite said he supports the Health Accord; he think it's a great document and a great plan.

That's not what we're doing with health care in Newfoundland and Labrador. We're moving to a team-based approach and away from fee for service.

The other reason I don't support it is because when I met with the Nurses' Union,

they said they don't support it and it's not what they want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

J. HOGAN: So if the Member had a meeting with the Nurses' Union and was given different information than I was, I'll be happy to talk about that, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Thank you, Speaker.

Yes, the Health Accord. We'll repeat and we repeat again and again and again it's not the Health Accord; it's the execution of the Health Accord. It's poor execution. That's our problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

B. PETTEN: Minister, why, after almost seven months, did nobody disclose this information? I think that's the problem here. That's a major problem. This information was withheld.

How come it wasn't disclosed publicly when it was received?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. HOGAN: First of all, Speaker, the last time I checked March to August isn't seven

months; it's five months. But anyways, details. Second of all, no one was hiding anything. The minister wrote these letters; they were publicly available.

Of course when he asked for the letters yesterday, he had them within the hour. These allegations were public. Everybody knew about them. They called for the Auditor General to look into them. The Auditor General is looking into them but, apparently, now that's not good enough for them, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Speaker, I won't belabour this point anymore but just to be clear, the Auditor General reported back to the minister of Health and said there were issues. They said there are serious conflict-of-interest issues. They then cancelled those leases.

That's what we're asking, how come that wasn't disclosed then? We'll wait for that AG's report and respect what she's going to report. We want to know why that wasn't disclosed then. Why did we only find out yesterday in the House of Assembly when the minister stood up and answered my question?

Speaker, did the minister's silence back in August have anything – and I wonder anything – to do with the Waterford Valley by-election?

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

J. HOGAN: I can't let this point slide.

The Member just got upset because he said: When he stood up in the House and asked a question, I answered it. This is what Question Period is for. I appreciate the

questions and I'd like to answer them, and this is how it works.

And to say that that's not how he wants it to work anymore, I don't know. What else can we do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

B. PETTEN: Mockery makes everyone look like a fool. When you get a Minister of Health standing up and trying to mock me and play with my words in this House, we say it's theatrics in this House. You can say what you want.

I said the minister yesterday gave me an answer, then he gets up and tries to twist it around. Show some respect to the people of this province; show some respect to the Opposition. We have a job to do and you have to provide answers. Answer the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. HOGAN: Speaker, I'll just take the opportunity to say I'm very proud of the Health Accord NL. It's a great plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

J. HOGAN: I'm happy that physicians are going to work on care-based teams, and nurse practitioners and nurses and all kinds of allied health professionals in that document.

The Health Accord is working. We're getting there. We're recruiting doctors. We're recruiting physicians. We're recruiting nurses. Health care is getting better. Most importantly, public health care is getting better not private.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. WALL: Speaker, the minister indicated earlier this week, there are only 54 guests at the airport inn after almost a year of owning this hotel.

Given the total cost to taxpayers at \$13 million per year, this equates to \$240,000 per person per year, I ask, is this a cost-efficient model?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Housing, and Mental Health and Addictions.

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

As I said the other day when the question was asked, and I'll still repeat it, that the whole purpose and the rationale for the facility at 106 Airport Road is to support individuals coming from long-term homelessness into stable housing.

We are providing wraparound services. We're providing a facility that is current, maintained quite well. We're providing security. We're providing housing supports. We're providing medical supports. We're providing counselling and that all costs money, Speaker.

We had the choice to go build something or rent something, and that's what we're doing, Speaker.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. WALL: Speaker, we certainly appreciate End Homelessness St. John's that have stepped up and are cleaning up this situation.

Speaker, I ask the minister: Has he reviewed the list of almost 3,000 people – 3,000 – on the housing wait-list to see if we can accommodate any of these families at the airport inn and get them off the street?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Housing, and Mental Health and Addictions.

J. ABBOTT: Speaker, I mean, the reality of what we're doing here – and I think the Member has gotten the two, sort of, client groups or programs mixed up. The folks that we're dealing with at 106 Airport Road, Horizons at 106, are people who are on long-term homelessness, are in that state. They are not folks that we are addressing through our rental housing, through NLHC. That's a totally different program, totally different list of individuals. The folks who go through our central wait assessment are not the folks that are awaiting to get an apartment with NLHC.

Speaker, it's two different programs, two different sets of groups of individuals we're working with. I think we're both doing well, but we have improvements to make on our wait-lists for NLHC for sure.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, does the Premier think the people of the province are stupid? This was a question a group of people at a convenience store I dropped into wanted me to ask in the House of Assembly, after they listened, with disgust, to the flimsy justifications for the land deal for the new St. Clare's hospital.

So I ask the Premier, on their behalf: Does he have so little respect for people's intelligence that he believes they will

swallow the pathetic rationale his government is using to justify the H3 Development land deal?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

F. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, we have the utmost respect for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: – the people who voted for us on this side and on that side of the House. We understand the health care needs have increased as a result of our aging population, our aging infrastructure. As a result, we are going to construct a new, state-of-the-art, acute-care tertiary facility for the entire province, which borders on three of the four largest municipalities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have utmost respect for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians; that is why we're doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

J. DINN: I would say the people of the province strongly disagree.

Speaker, the saying the fish rots from the head down is a metaphor for leadership.

Are the disturbing revelations regarding the travelling nurses' accommodations and the St. Clare's land deal a reflection on the Premier's ineffective leadership and the crumbling ethical walls of his party?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy Premier.

S. COADY: Thank you, Speaker.

With respect to this House of Assembly and to the people of this province, I am answering this question. I will say that there's a great deal of respect for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador from this side of the House. We have placed a lot of emphasis on cost-of-living supports for the people of the province. We have fundamentally changed health care.

The Premier, when he first became Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, set out on a path of having a Health Accord. The only province in this country that has a substantial plan that is now being implemented – and I congratulate the Minister of Health for doing that. We're the only ones that have opened new hospitals, opened new schools and put supports in place for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member of Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, we're continuing to hear from unions and workers that there are exceptionally prolonged delays with the Labour Relations Board for union certification votes that are taking place, delaying workers from experiencing their charter right to form a union. In a process that should take up to five days, as stated in legislation, it's taking as long as three to six weeks before a vote is even happening. This is unacceptable. Unions have reached out to the minister, yet their concerns have fallen on deaf ears.

I ask the minister: Why isn't these serious issues being addressed with the Labour Relations Board?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. Member for a very valid question.

We've done significant work with the Labour Relations Board. We've made substantial improvements over the time through my meetings with the unions through our stakeholder groups when I was minister of Labour. We've had significant gains made in that.

I know there's room for improvement. We're always looking for room for improvement on that. I know they're getting back to their full complement.

I thank the hon. Member for a great question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you for that, Minister.

But the unions, like I said, they've come to us recently. They're still having issues with that.

Speaker, here's a solution for the minister: card check. Unions agree that card check allows workers to form a union without employer interference and allows for a smoother process. This province had card check but it was removed by the former Conservative government and supported by the Liberals in 2014.

I ask the minister: Why hasn't this government reintroduced card check to help the process of unions?

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister Responsible for Labour.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker, and I thank the Member for the question.

What I will say is this government is committed to ensuring that labour legislation in this province remains relevant and responsive to the needs of workers and workplaces throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

We've had conversations with the Federation of Labour and it is important to ensure that an appropriate balance is maintained. We're listening to these groups, as my colleague alluded to, but always trying to strike that balance between the rights of workers and the rights of employers.

Although we're not contemplating any changes right now, Speaker, I say to my hon. colleague, at this time, I always do welcome the opportunity to discuss.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Tabling of Documents.

Tabling of Documents

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

I have four letters I mentioned in Question Period and I think one or two, maybe three of them, were asked for yesterday to be tabled.

The first is a letter to the former minister of Health, dated March 15, 2024, from the president of the Registered Nurses' Union.

The second is a letter date March 21, 2024, to the president of RNU from the former minister of Health.

The third letter is dated March 21, 2024, to the Auditor General from the former minister of Health.

The last is undated but my understanding it was received in the department by the former minister of Health on April 2 from the Auditor General.

SPEAKER: Also, I have a document to table.

In accordance with the *Citizens' Representative Act* and the *Transparency and Accountability Act*, I hereby table the 2023-2024 performance report and annual report of the Office of the Citizens' Representative.

Any further tabling of documents?

Notices of Motion.

Notices of Motion

SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Culture, Arts and Recreation.

S. CROCKER: Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Arts Council Act." (Bill 98)

SPEAKER: Any further notices of motion?

The hon. the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Family Violence Protection Act." (Bill 97)

SPEAKER: Any further notices?

The hon. the Government House Leader.

J. HOGAN: Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move, in accordance with Standing Order 11(1), that this House not adjourn at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, November 18, 2024.

SPEAKER: Further notices of motions?

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

Petitions.

Petitions

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

E. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm going to present a petition again on behalf of the group of the persons with exceptionalities on the West Coast. I'll just read it quickly.

Therefore, we petition the hon. House of Assembly: (i) determine – with input from families – and hire the necessary human resources;

(ii) develop a consistent communication plan – daily and weekly – that is upheld between schools and families;

(iii) take sole responsibility for providing inclusive education to all students throughout Newfoundland and Labrador;

(iv) provide a safe space for educational staff to encourage – without fear of reprimand;

(v) implement annual policy review to evaluate the effectiveness of inclusive education and make necessary adjustments based on feedback and outcomes.

Mr. Speaker, I stood on several petitions, including my colleague the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands on this. This is on

behalf of the families and I have to give the Minister of Education a lot of credit.

When I first presented this petition, she stood up and she said, no, send me each one individually and that she will look at it. I provided her with it. The minister is looking at each case that was provided from the group. The minister also committed to look at the review and how the process starts for September for the families.

This is a great step. Minister, this is the way government should work, when there are concerns brought to the floor of the House of Assembly, the minister stands up and says, yes, there are problems, I want to deal with them. I want to help the families.

So I just have to say thank you, Minister, on behalf of the families. They're well aware of your involvement and they're grateful and very thankful of your involvement. They have enough stress of their own without having to go through this and trying to wait until September to see if their kids, who do have special needs, if they will have student assistants, if they will have some special needs assistance provided over and above.

This situation with Jordan's Principle, I know the minister is going to provide the funding to get all the kids back in school with proper services in the school.

Minister, I can't do nothing but applaud you on that and thank you for taking this issue so serious because it is so tough on the families and you are to be commended for that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Bonavista.

C. PARDY: Thank you, Speaker.

We currently have a grant program to transition residents of our province who burn oil to a heat pump. The reasons for this are obvious in that heat pumps are more user-friendly for the environment and as importantly, cheaper for those residents who struggle with the elevated cost of living; not-for-profits are integral organizations that operationalize themselves to serve these same residents in improving their well-being and providing life-saving interventions when needed; there are no grant programs available for oil transition to these not-for-profits.

We, the undersigned, call upon the House of Assembly to urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to implement a grant transition program for the not-for-profits like our fire departments, our Lions Clubs, our seniors' clubs, et cetera, so they are able to continue to provide their valuable services more efficiently.

I mentioned this yesterday in an address and talked about the evolution of the Oil to Electric Rebate Program and we moved along. This is one suggestion that I would add, and I added yesterday, I'd like for the government to have an analysis and a look at it.

The two areas that I used yesterday as an example in the District of Bonavista would be Five Coves, a regional fire department with a community centre attached that burns oil that serves five communities, five entities. Reg Durdle oversees that and is looking at the cost of heating the fire department as well as the community centre as being problematic to serving the residents of the area.

We know that we're in a cost-of-living crisis. We talk about the uptake on our food banks in Newfoundland and Labrador. Gary Patten, who looks after the food banks in Port Rexton, that serves the whole Trinity Bight area, would say that they spend far too much money on heating their food bank

because they have the oil but they don't have the resources to transition to electric.

The genesis of the oil to electric is to help residents out. If we help out these not-for-profits, we are in de facto helping out the residents of which these not-for-profits serve.

So I would ask government to look at the consideration of adding these not-for-profits this year, so that those who are able to join can do so and better serve the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you, Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

I want to thank the Member for bringing that petition to the floor because I agree with all of the points that my hon. colleague across the way said.

With the high cost of living, we understand that many people are being impacted. We have met with groups. We've heard people in communities – I've had lots of emails come into me just since I've been there in the department since the 19th of July, and we are moving in this direction.

Right now where we are, Speaker, is we're just waiting on confirmation from the federal government, and I'll keep the House updated on that. That is exactly the direction where we plan to go, and we know that it will have far-reaching benefits out into community.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

L. O'DRISCOLL: Thank you, Speaker.

The background to this petition is as follows:

St. Shotts Road on the Southern Avalon is in need of major repairs. These roads are in deplorable condition to the point that it's a safety issue. This road is relied on by residents and visitors on a daily basis, and with a World Heritage UNESCO site in the area, there is an increased volume of traffic in the region, as well.

Therefore, we petition the hon. House of Assembly as follows: We urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade this piece of infrastructure for the safety of the residents and visitors to allow a safer commute on this roadway.

Speaker, I've certainly done this petition a number of times for sure. This stretch of pavement is 35 to 40 years old and it is deplorable. If you drive across it, it is deplorable. We have visitors that go there to the UNESCO site that come from both angles: they come from St. Mary's Bay side and come from the Southern Shore side.

We have the whale watching in the area as well. The people know when you look at the news during the summer, the whale watching is incredible and the amount of people that go up there is incredible. It's unbelievable that these roads would be in this condition.

It's a long time without being done. They go up there and they do patchwork and they do an admirable job for what they got. They go up and try to smooth it over, fill in potholes. It's probably one of the most calls I get in my office is about the road conditions up in that area. It's terrible.

If you don't drive across it, you don't know. But if you get up there, it's absolutely deplorable the road conditions out there. It's

terrible. People are nervous and if you drive in the daytime, you have a chance to get around it. Drive up there on a night like last night – dark, foggy, pouring rain – you don't stand a chance.

How slow do you go across the country? It's 20 to 30 kilometres an hour to get across it. It's incredible how bad that road is. So hopefully the minister, in his wisdom, can get this pavement done. Add it to his list of roads and make it a priority to get this done for this area.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

Here are the reasons for this petition:

Anti-scab laws have existed in Quebec since 1978, in British Columbia since 1993 and the federal government has introduced Bill C-58 to prohibit scab workers in federally regulated sectors.

The use of temporary replacement workers during a strike or lockout is damaging for the social fabric of the community, the local economy, as well as the well-being of residents.

Anti-temporary replacement worker legislation has been shown to reduce lengthy and divisiveness strikes in labour disputes.

Since 2015, the right to strike has been clearly protected under the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* because it helps stabilize the power imbalance between workers and the employer.

The use of temporary replacement workers undermines that right.

Therefore we, the undersigned, call upon the House of Assembly to urge government to enact legislation banning the use of temporary replacement workers during a strike or lockout.

I know the federal government has gone ahead and did this and a few other provincial jurisdictions have gone ahead and done this. Once again, we're calling upon the House of Assembly to ban this practice and to follow in line with other jurisdictions across the country, including the federal jurisdiction.

We've seen this time and time again. We've seen incidents in our own province and outside of this province when it comes to labour disruptions and the use of temporary replacement workers during a strike.

We have now, I call him, the new minister. I know I've had discussions with the former minister on this. Once again, we, as a province, bring this petition to the House to have this practice looked at. Hopefully, we follow along with our federal jurisdictions and our federal cousins and move along with jurisdictions like British Columbia and Quebec when banning temporary replacement workers during a strike or a lockout.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

L. EVANS: Thank you, Speaker.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador who urge our leaders to advocate on behalf of residents of Northern Labrador for the PUB to review the decision to apply a price freeze on summer products – motor fuel and heating home – in Zone 14. Zone 14 is composed of six communities in Northern Labrador.

In the past years, there was no price freeze on fuel during the summer months in Zone 14. That is, historically, the maximum retail price adjustments by the PUB were not suspended during the summer months, instead the prices were adjusted weekly, just like the rest of the provincial zones.

In June 2021, and then again in June 2022, the PUB suspended the maximum retail price adjustments, resulting in questions from residents as to why this was done.

Our communities rely heavily on hunting, fishing and gathering food, therefore we are heavily dependent on gasoline to be able to access our natural food supplies.

We feel the summer price suspension was put in place without adequate consultation as to the impacts this summer price freeze would have on our people.

Now, Speaker, this petition is signed back in 2022. The reason why I'm presenting it today is because there are signatures on here, where people signed and wanted a review. I'm reading the petition today to bring attention to the lack of consultation the PUB does for my district.

I wrote a letter about the prices of fuel in the spring of 2020, when we were at the height of the COVID pandemic, when we didn't know about the virus, there was no socialization and it was a huge opportunity for people to go out in the warm spring to hunt and gather food and not even be in violation of COVID protocols.

This was the first week of April that I wrote a letter saying that in Zone 14 we were paying substantial prices for fuel. Cartwright, in Zone 11, were paying 53 cents less per litre for gasoline. In Lake Melville region, they were paying 67, almost 68 cents, a litre less.

So I basically wrote a letter to the PUB about the price differential. Because, during that week, the retailer wrote and asked for

the prices in Lake Melville and in Southern Labrador to be increased by 30 cents and it was approved. I wrote the same letter to the PUB. They came back and said we're going to do consultations in Labrador. I wrote them back and said: During COVID? You can not do consultations during COVID.

I asked them not to do it and, again, they're doing another review for the whole province and they're saying the same thing again and I'm saying you're not (inaudible) –

SPEAKER: The Member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

L. DEMPSTER: I lost my opportunity to respond. Maybe I will have an opportunity next week, Speaker.

SPEAKER: Did you want to respond to that?

L. DEMPSTER: Yes, I prefer.

SPEAKER: Okay, sorry.

The hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs.

L. DEMPSTER: The Member, a fellow Labradorian, across the way raised a topic that is a huge bone of contention for me as well, so I empathize with everything that she said.

I think from the time I walked in, in the fall of 2013 – it's a long time – I've been frustrated with the PUB, with that whole process, calling on a review for years. Finally, in the middle of COVID, in the early days of COVID, when prices went up 30 cents a litre overnight, that spring they initiated a review. It is not another review. The challenge is they've taken so long with the review that they're doing – and I want to say to the people of the province, I, too, have written multiple letters and twice I have gone out

and sat before them and made presentations.

We have a small population spread over a large land mass. We have one supplier in Labrador. We have a company in Quebec – and I have not been shy to talk about it – that seems to just purchase from the supplier in Labrador and then applies to the PUB and that section is unregulated and it is driving up the price.

This summer, we just finished a billion-dollar road network from Labrador West to the Straits – a billion dollars – and we're still paying tanker prices, which is a problem, Speaker.

So I placed a lot of questions before the PUB and then they asked me to follow up with a written submission. I would encourage the Member for Torngat to submit more than a written submission as well, because the more that we can get in, the better. Because all summer my folks were paying almost 30 cents more with a road connection than right up in the north in Nain. There's something wrong with that.

I'm going to continue to do what I can as the minister for Labrador and I encourage my Member to do the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Orders of the Day

SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

Orders of the Day, I call from the Order Paper, Order 1, Address in Reply.

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

F. HUTTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I didn't get an opportunity to –

SPEAKER: Before we start, would you like the podium or ...?

F. HUTTON: Pardon?

SPEAKER: You don't need the podium, do you?

F. HUTTON: No, I'm fine, thank you.

I didn't get an opportunity to do this in our last sitting, but I would like to join my recently elected colleagues in giving a quick maiden speech, I guess they call it, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in this hon. House of Assembly to, first and foremost, thank the voters of Conception Bay East - Bell Island –

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: – for the opportunity to stand here as their MHA. I understand and fully appreciate the fact that it's their trust and support that allows me to come to work here each and every day for them.

Now, it was only about a year ago that I began the process of seriously thinking about running for elected office. As I'm sure it was for most people in this hon. House, it was not an easy decision and certainly not one that I made on my own. With the support of my wife Bonnie, our family and friends, people in the party and, of course, the district association, the choice became easier.

Last December, when I announced my intention to run at The Grounds Café in the district, a reporter asked me what I thought the difference would be between being a journalist and being an MHA. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, there is no big difference because people usually don't call reporters, they don't reach out to the media or MHAs when everything is going right in their life.

They call, they reach out when they need help, and you answer the phone.

That was really my intention when I left my 30-plus year broadcast career back in May of 2020. But it was supposed to be behind the scenes helping Premier Furey. When he asked me to help in 2020, I asked why he was doing this. His answer was simple, he said, to help the province and to help leave it a little better than we found it.

At that time, Mr. Speaker – we can all remember, we still talk about it – we were facing some major challenges, not just financially, we were heading into a global pandemic. It was a time of great uncertainty, not just here in Newfoundland and Labrador or Canada, but around the globe.

While I didn't realize it at the time, my experience as a journalist prepared me for that role, as an advisor. My career in TV and radio gave me an opportunity to get to know the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It gave me a chance to gain their trust. It gave me a chance to really get to know the province that I call home.

I often think of something that happened to me in British Columbia about 36 years ago when completing a broadcast journalism program in Vancouver. Our instructors took us on a tour of the lower mainland and the interior. The idea was to tour TV, radio stations, newspapers to get a sense of where we might like to work when we graduated.

About three days in one of the instructors said, I've noticed you'd not been handing out any resumes. My response to him was I have no intention of working here, I intend on returning home to my family and friends and my home province the moment I graduate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: That's exactly what I did, Mr. Speaker. I came back to Newfoundland and

Labrador and almost immediately began working at NTV. The rest, as they say, is history. That's where I spent almost 24 years.

To this day, I owe a debt of gratitude to the late Geoff Sterling, an entrepreneurial icon in Newfoundland and Labrador, and his son Scott, for allowing me to tell the stories of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, to hold up a mirror every day and show the province what was going on in our world, in their world and in our backyards.

It was an absolute privilege to work with so many talented people, too many to mention, but I should say that I keep in contact with many of them and still consider them close friends.

One of them was Lynn Burry, she was the legislative reporter when I joined NTV back in 1990, very early 1990, in January. She taught me so many things about what went on in this Chamber, which, by the way, at the time, was not here, it was still located upstairs on the top floor of the Confederation Building.

Mr. Speaker, it's worth mentioning that one of my first visits to the Chamber as a very young reporter when it was upstairs was to witness, then, Premier Clyde Wells give an impassioned speech about the Meech Lake Accord. There was a crush of local and national media there. It was a big deal at the time.

Of course, Premier Wells at the time was one of the only premiers, or the only premier, to oppose the Accord. I remember that crush of reporters gathered around, then, federal Cabinet minister and Accord supporter John Crosbie as he walked away saying the province had made a mistake.

A little over two years, I sat in a large salon, at what is now the Delta Hotel, and watched the same person, John Crosbie, close down the cod fishery, something we never thought in this province we would ever see. What

followed could only be described as mayhem, standing just a couple of feet from locked doors, as angry fishermen at that point in time pounded on the door to get in and presumably get at John Crosbie who had delivered that devastating news.

In true Crosbie fashion, though, he refused to be taken away out a side door. He walked through the main lobby, again with a crush of reporters and people and, this time, the police and security around him.

It was a historic moment, one that I will never forget and I was right there in the midst of it. It was a turning point for this province and, again, an uncertain time for Newfoundland and Labrador, but we persevered.

About five years later, ironically, I was outside that same hotel just down the street when we celebrated first oil at Hibernia in 1997. We all know how that story has unfolded for our province and what it has meant for our economic bottom line.

Covering stories like that, Mr. Speaker, fostered my interest in politics, campaigns and elections, but I never really thought at the time that it would lead me here. I absolutely loved my job. I loved interviewing people. I loved the writing, the editing, the live broadcasts and the people I worked with. It was not work; it was fun. I enjoyed going to work every day and I still enjoy going to work.

Along the way, I also came to love this province even more and, of course, its people. The people who invited me into their homes each and every night to give me the ability to tell their stories: some sad, some happy, some tragic and, gratefully, some that were very triumphant.

I've often been asked if I have a favourite interview over a 31-year career in media, what stands out. It's hard to pin down one thing from the thousands of people I interviewed, there were just too many, but it

would be a safe bet that it would be an interview with someone who most people here do not know or can remember or even heard of. It's not one of the many prime ministers or premiers I sat down with; someone with a story of resilience, someone who overcame adversity, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Just the other day, I was at The Rooms for an event and someone approached me to remind me that I had interviewed their son and her about 30 years ago. At the time, he needed life-saving surgery on the Mainland. It was before the Internet, before Facebook, before group funding. They needed help; they needed the public to know. She wanted to tell me that he is now 37, he's doing fine and he has a child of his own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: It took me a minute but I actually did remember interviewing her afterwards because there were, as I'd mentioned, thousands of interviews that I've done over the course of my career. She said thanks and we parted ways, and as she walked away, I thought it should have been me saying thank you to her. Thank you for trusting me at a vulnerable time of her life to tell her story and to get it right.

That's, again, what I mean about the parallels of these two jobs. You get a call when people need help and you step up. My life as a journalist gave me an opportunity to visit so many places and get to know so many people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

When I began my role as Premier Furey's senior advisor back in the summer of 2023, it allowed me to continue making those connections, seeing old friends, making new ones, building relationships and trying to help; that's what I've done.

So when the time came, last November, to make that decision about whether or not to run in Conception Bay East - Bell Island,

while I say it was difficult, it actually became easier as I thought about it and I knew in my heart it's what I wanted.

At the time, I thought back to something John Steele said to me when I was considering leaving NTV, which was a huge part of my life, to accept a new opportunity as news director at VOCM. It was a big personal decision. He said, step out on the ledge. I said – and it is true – I'm afraid of heights. He said, then don't look down, look forward. It was great advice and I think of it often because it reminds me that you can do anything when you have a supportive family, friends, team caucus and constituents around you.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the people who helped me get to where I am in life today and it is, of course, my parents, Dr. Charles Hutton of St. John's and Lillian Snelgrove of Catalina. They instilled in me and my siblings a sense of respect, above all else, respect for others and respect for yourself. I've tried to do that and pride myself on that principle in my career as a journalist and now as an MHA, treating all people with the same respect, dignity and being fair.

I often think of the moment that led me to this point. It happened in the mid-1960s, even before I was born. My parents had a house in Portugal Cove. They are gone now but my sister lives there and I live next door. With three children, at the time, in the mid-60s, they decided to move to Montreal for the opportunity for my father to advance his career in medicine. With three children, they went there not knowing what would happen. My arrival, I was the surprise. They told me that afterwards.

Although Dad worked at a hospital, Mom insisted on coming home to give birth to me here in Newfoundland and Labrador. Coincidentally, it happened to be 1966, but she said it had nothing to do with that. She said she wanted all her children to have

birth certificates that said Newfoundland and Labrador on it.

She was born in Catalina in 1932. She was fiercely proud as a Newfoundlander, before we became part of Canada, and I've probably told that story countless times because I am proud of it and I'm happy she made that decision. It's our home.

My wife, Bonnie, encourages me unconditionally. She's been very patient as the life of a political staffer or a politician, as everybody in this room knows, can be very difficult and it takes you away from your family and home events many times. Our children, Matthew, Claire, Ben and Jenna have also been very supportive.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention, there's a Roll of Members list on the wall in the corridor by the windows outside of this hon. House that lists the name Charles Hutton, MHA for St. John's East from a by-election he won on November 10, 1894. He was my great-grandfather and Charles is my middle name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

F. HUTTON: I'm sure sitting as an MHA 130 years ago was quite different, but perhaps very similar in that the people elected then, like now, were here to help. Here to help the people that put them there, here to help shape the laws and policies that impact our daily lives and, I'd like to think, with the hope of leaving the place a little better than when they found it.

Mr. Speaker, unless you're Tom Osborne, for most of us our time here is short. Recently, we paid tribute to Kevin Parsons and earlier this year it was Derrick Bragg, both wonderful men. They are gone far too soon but they left their mark, as we hope to do. Those losses should remind us daily that the privilege of sitting or standing in this House is fleeting.

We need to work together in a responsible and respectful way to advance this place we all love and call home. Ultimately, in my heart, I know everybody in this room, all parties, want what's best for Newfoundland and Labrador. I certainly do.

To my constituents, to my family, to honour the memory of my parents, my great-grandfather whose name is outside this room and those late Members I just mentioned, I pledge to do just that during my time in this hon. House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

What an inspiring, moving maiden speech that was. It was worth waiting for. I do wish the Member very, very well. We've had a few chuckles along the way. Often when he was with the Premier and he's walk in a room to meet with somebody and they'd be like, that's Fred Hutton.

Oops, sorry, I wasn't supposed to say his name. I withdraw that.

Anyway, I do wish him well. I think that his heart is in the right place and after listening to his story that he comes by his little interest in politics in a very natural way.

With that said, moving on, I hope the next speaker will be as inspiring.

I call from the Order Paper, second reading of Bill 94, calling Order 16 from the Order Paper, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment, Bill 94.

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm very excited to stand here, although I wish it was before Fred Hutton, not after.

SPEAKER: Mover and a seconder?

B. DAVIS: I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Fortune Bay - Cape La Hune, that Bill 94, be read a second time, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that Bill 94 be now read a second time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment." (Bill 94)

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in this hon. House today to speak about an important new proposed bill. As I mentioned earlier, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment.

Speaker, in 2020 a mass shooting in Nova Scotia made clear the danger to the public when someone unlawfully intends to impersonate a police officer. In this case, it was that of an RCMP officer, constable Heidi Stevenson, and 21 other individuals that lost their lives.

During this investigation, the RCMP learned that the shooter was an avid collector of police memorabilia and possessed many police items from various police agencies, some of which were used during the mass shooting.

This event devastated a community, the Province of Nova Scotia and the entire

country. It was the deadliest mass shooting in Canadian history. In response to those concerns around this individual's access to police assets, Nova Scotia introduced the *Police Identity Management Act*.

I stand here today proposing that Newfoundland and Labrador follow suit.

Speaker, while it is already illegal to impersonate a police officer, we know more needs to be done to stop this disruptive behaviour. The *Law Enforcement Identity Management Act* aims to keep law enforcement items out of the hands of people who would use those items to harass or harm others. This proposed legislation would give the RNC and RCMP additional tools to ensure individuals cannot use law enforcement items for the wrong reasons.

The act is intended to increase public safety by restricting public access to law enforcement items and paraphernalia, thereby decreasing the likelihood of its use in unlawful activities. This act includes restrictions on the use, possession, sale and fabrication of law enforcement articles, uniforms, markings and vehicle equipment; requiring the law enforcement agencies that are subject to this act to have asset management and disposal policies; as well as enforcement procedures and penalties.

So what does this actually mean? The act prohibits display of the word "police" by "non-police." This will supplement the provision that already exists in the *Criminal Code*. To be clear, this is only prohibited in that the display of the word and emblem would be misleading the public into believing a person is a police officer. It will not stop children who may want to be police officers at Halloween, and we know we see many of those in our communities.

Regulations that prescribe any additional agencies under the act will be developed after the bill has been approved. Municipalities and municipal enforcement

groups will be consulted during the development of the regulations, and I've had calls with many of them who are very supportive of this piece of legislation.

Speaker, we could also know that there are members of the public that have an appreciation for police articles. This legislation being introduced to help support public safety, collectors of memorabilia will be able to maintain items that they currently have at the time this act comes into place, if the item is rendered unserviceable.

That means permanently altering it so it cannot reasonably be confused with a police article or uniforms. If a collector is unable to render the item unserviceable, they may forfeit that item to the police agency for destruction. If you currently own a police vehicle, you can continue to own it, as long as it's decommissioned, without markings, decals, imprints or equipment.

The film and television industry and sector in our province is doing very well, growing each and every year. This legislation includes an exemption for the film industry to ensure that they can continue to use police articles in their productions. This same exemption is currently in place in Nova Scotia. We will also consult with the film and arts and culture industry during the development of the regulation to make sure we cover off that side for them. There will be also a notification process developed that will be prescribed in the regulations.

The retention of ceremonial uniforms is important for retired police officers. This allows them to continue to participate in parades and other ceremonial events that honour their colleagues in the line of duty. You don't need to look any further than in our own communities for Remembrance Day.

Speaker, we worked very closely with the RNC and the RCMP throughout the development of this legislation. Both police agencies currently maintain asset

management policies and my department will continue to work with them to ensure that there is ongoing compliance with these new regulations for legislation.

This legislation is different from Nova Scotia because it also includes the restrictions on other items for law enforcement agencies, not just police. These other agencies will be outlined in regulations. We will work with each and every one of those agencies who would like to be included in this legislation through the development of those regulations. Decisions on the inclusion will be made based on a variety of factors, including the risk to the public.

Speaker, the legislation allows police to search and seize items that they believe to contravene the act. These processes are in place to allow police to issue violation notices and allow the public to forfeit those item or items in their possession without prosecution under the act.

Speaker, as previously noted, targeted stakeholder consultation will occur in the coming months to inform the regulations of the act, including the use of enforcement items such as dramatic works, which we talked about, film and television industry, as well as the possible restrictions to other law enforcement agencies items.

We will also ensure that the public education materials on the development of this are done to make sure the public is aware of this new law.

If this legislation is approved – and I hope my colleagues in this House will see fit to approve this today or in the next couple of days – Newfoundland and Labrador will be the second province in Canada to introduce this legislation, after Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker, the public safety of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians is paramount for our government and I know everyone in this House.

I ask the hon. Members to vote in favour of the *Law Enforcement Identity Management Act*.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Speaker, I'm very pleased to speak on this bill. I have to say, first of all, that I will be supporting the enactment and the passing of this on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Let me first say that there's no doubt that this legislation is consistent with Nova Scotia's *Police Identity Management Act*, except for the specific piece that the minister just referenced, with respect to it applying to not just police, but others outside of law enforcement, and that will be outlined in the regulations.

When we look at this, it is very difficult really to see the impact of what happened on April 18 and 19 of 2020, which was the most lethal mass shooting in Canadian history. So this bill has really sprung from that horrible, devastating incident that involved 13 terrible hours in a rampage that occurred in several communities in Nova Scotia. The perpetrator in this incident shot and killed 22 people, and wounded three other people before being killed himself by the RCMP.

So when we look at how this came about, and I think it's important to look at the context here, the goal of the Mass Casualty Commission in this inquiry was really all about improving community safety and well-being. There were clearly many gaps and errors that were in existence, and that were uncovered in response to the mass killings. We know that there was failure in communications; we know that there were other significant errors that occurred, and really problems that existed, that allowed the response that occurred to be as it was.

But this inquiry was an important step because it was the first step really to try to improve prevention and to allow for timely intervention if something like this were ever to happen again. One of the things when we look at the Mass Casualty report, we see that the police were recognized as being a very important part – and we know that to be true ourselves, that the police are a very important part of the community safety net.

The important responsibilities that the police have to ensure public safety is well recognized. But we also have to realize – and I think we all do – that these responsibilities are shared with all community members. In addition to our community and people in our community, other organizations and institutions, as well, have responsibilities to join with the police to ensure that our communities are safe.

I guess when we look at this, we need to acknowledge the importance of collaboration with each partner in our community to ensure that safety is really the focus of it all.

When I look at this legislation and this bill, which would enact the *Law Enforcement Identity Management Act*, we see a number of things that are very important. When I also look at what happened with respect to the mass shooting and the impact that had in terms of the danger, first of all, to the public that occurred because of the perpetrator's use of, for example, a replica RCMP cruiser, as a result of a disguise that he used and the danger that occurred to the people who were involved and to the public at large, it also had another significant impact, I would argue, and that is the fact that it led to public distrust or mistrust of the RCMP and of law enforcement in general.

I think those are things that really are the foundation of the act that Nova Scotia had passed, the *Police Identity Management Act* and now us, as the second province, following suit. That is a very important thing

for us to be doing and we certainly support that.

When we think about how important this piece of legislation is, it's not only when we look at what happened, the tragic event in Nova Scotia, but this could happen anywhere in our country and in our jurisdiction. I might bring attention to something that happened just here in Newfoundland and Labrador, back in 2017.

Now, of course, in terms of comparison, there really is none but it does show that this is something that has to be addressed. We know that it was reported in the media that a 19-year-old had been charged with impersonating a peace officer in the Springdale area. What happened, the facts of that incident were that a couple in the area, they ended up reporting a very bizarre traffic stop that occurred with respect to when they were driving.

They had been pulled over by an unmarked police car with flashing lights. The person, the 19-year-old, identified himself as a representative of a provincial security company. So he had stopped this couple in their vehicle and he showed them a false ID with the Newfoundland and Labrador logo. He then asked the driver of the stopped car for his licence and for his vehicle registration. Then after that was provided to this individual, he agreed to let the couple go without a ticket for speeding. He said because the registration was valid.

This couple continued on driving, but they knew there was a red flag here, that this was a very bizarre incident that occurred, so they immediately called the RCMP and then the police identified the suspect and arrested him. So we see the danger that is present and is possible, for example, when you don't have enough strict precautions or laws in place to protect against that.

Now, I must say that when we look at this, we know that police impersonation is a very serious public safety issue. When we look at

it, we also understand that we have to balance interests here, the issue or the interest of public safety versus the rights of collectors and the interests of collectors who want to own items of police paraphernalia.

Those are competing interests, but it would be my submission, in this case, for example, when we look at what happened in Nova Scotia and what the potential danger is there, not only for the public, but as far as the possible result of lessening public trust in our law enforcement, that there really can be no question that this is an important piece of legislation that has been presented.

When we look at public mistrust of the police, we know that what happened in Nova Scotia, of course, the people who were impacted in the communities and the family and friends in the area, and I would even submit even outside the area in other places, in not only Nova Scotia, but throughout the country and perhaps the United States, that created fear and anxiety amongst people.

As a result of the mass casualty, not only some of these people, but perhaps people in marginalized community groups who have perhaps been over policed, for example, they also, as a result of this mass casualty, would experience some real concerns and fears about law enforcement.

Also, this legislation is important because what it does is it looks at police services and it holds them as well to a higher standard, to not inappropriately manage inventory and disposal of, for example, police vehicles, equipment, clothing and all of those things. So it also will elevate that standard for police services to make sure that they are preventing the casual and perhaps inappropriate disposal and mismanagement of their inventory.

We know that it is difficult to regulate access to many specific types or items of police paraphernalia. But I do think that this

legislation will be a very important step in doing just that.

On that note, I must say that we will certainly support this legislation. There are many questions that come out of the legislation that we will be asking of the minister, so that we have a full, clear understanding of the exemptions, for example, that exist to the act. To make sure that those exemptions provide the appropriate flexibility that's necessary; yet, at the same time, addresses the public safety issue, which is the paramount and overriding interest that has to be upheld in this legislation.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Speaker.

I just have a few words on this. I thank the minister for bringing this forward. This comes from a very, very tragic event in Canadian history. My heart goes out to the people of Nova Scotia who went through such a horrific experience in 2020.

I'm glad that we are bringing something similar to this into our province; it's something that is needed. It came out of a joint inquiry between Nova Scotia and the federal government about this and about disposal of police assets after their time of use.

One thing I do have a few questions on, you see it, there are uniforms and items and stuff that go to surplus and things like that, it's sometimes very similar to army surplus as well, so I do have some questions for the minister and that.

Before I sit down, I do want to speak to one another thing. On top of this, another thing that did come out of the inquiry was intimate

partner violence and violence against gender-diverse peoples and stuff like that. It's another thing that does go hand in hand in what happened in that tragic event.

Speaking about that event, you can't miss talking about improvements in the court system, but also improvements in law enforcement when it comes to intimate partner violence and violence against gender-diverse individuals. That was a tragic catalyst that led to such a horrific event in the communities in Nova Scotia.

So on top of this thing, we have to take a moment to reflect on that as well and to see, as a House and as a group of people, how we can improve the lives of those individuals, but also to make sure that those who are committing those crimes and those who are victims of those crimes are dealt with, and also the people that we have to support afterwards. So I did want to bring that up as well because we are talking about such a horrific event in Canadian history.

Here in NDP caucus, we do support this bill and understand where this is and why this is coming forth, and also make sure we look at the other recommendations that came out of that report out in Nova Scotia, as it does open up a lot of eyes on things we could do better when it comes to those horrific events and how to support those who were left behind, I guess is the best way to put it.

Thank you so much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

P. LANE: Thank you, Speaker.

I'll be supporting Bill 94 as well. Speaker, for me, I guess, this is somewhat of a no-brainer. I have some questions around the implementation and what regulations might look like and so on, but given what's already

been said about the tragedy that occurred in Nova Scotia when somebody decided to impersonate a police officer, obviously, we can see why there's a need for the legislation and why Nova Scotia has done so. Of course, if it can happen in Nova Scotia, it can happen here in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I think sometimes – certainly in the past, I think, more so – we always felt that we're here on this little Island, we were protected. I think we were the last police force to actually have guns, the RNC were – for a long time they didn't.

Times have changed and I think we've come to the realization, certainly in more recent years, that anything that could happen anywhere in Canada or the States, wherever, could easily happen here as well. Unfortunately, we have that same criminal element and I think with the drug problem that we have here in this province, which is huge, in my opinion, that criminal element has only gotten worse.

I can remember growing up here, I don't ever recall hearing anything about drive-by shootings, cars going down the road and shooting at people's houses and everything else. I think we have an incident, someone driving down Topsail Road and they got shot at three or four times. That wasn't that long ago. Kenmount Terrace, I can recall being another area where they shot at their house several times and so on.

We all know that this stuff, I'm sure, is probably drug related and there's organized crime at play, as well. So anything that we can do, obviously, in this House of Assembly in the name of public safety, I think we need to do it. I would suspect that other provinces are going to adopt this legislation as well.

Just a couple of things that kind of come to mind, and I guess we'll get to it in Committee of the Whole, perhaps, but just off the top of my head, I did hear the

minister – because one of the first things that came to my mind was, what about Halloween? The minister said, well, a kid has got his Halloween costume on, he wants to be a police officer. That'll be fine.

Then, of course, you always coming up with the what-ifs. So one thing that kind of came to my mind when you said that, well, what about if you're at Mardi Gras? What if you're at a Halloween party? And we're not talking about kids, now we're talking adults that are at a Halloween party or they're downtown on George Street to the Mardi Gras and they're dressed up like a police officer, something like what. What about Karaoke Kops, the bar, they've got cops on it?

I'm just throwing it out there. I'm just kind of wondering about how that stuff would work when it comes to adults and, again, we can get to that in Committee of the Whole.

I obviously recognize, as well, that retirees would want to – especially if they're part of the honour guard and things like that, there are people who are retirees from the police force that would maintain a dress uniform. I'm glad to see there is an allowance for that, but I do also kind of wonder in terms of controls, how you can control that.

Because I know from personal experience, many years ago now, I had worked at the RNC in a civilian position for a few years, I had two brothers in the RNC, my father-in-law was an RNC officer as well, I know that in those days, in particular, and even later days I can remember guys talking about having too many shirts. They gave me shirts and I didn't even want the shirts, but I can't get a sweater when I need one, but I have 10 shirts even though I don't need any shirts. My closet is full of shirts, they're full of pants and they're giving me more. I need a parka because it's ripped and I can't get a new parka.

At the end of the day, the bottom line is that they had closets full. I know my brothers and my father-in-law had closets full of

uniforms. Certainly, the shirts and so on would have RNC badges on the shoulders or whatever the case might be.

How are we controlling that? I'm just throwing that out there. So if a guy retires or a girl retires from the RNC, they have to turn in all their uniforms that they had. Who is keeping track of all those uniforms? Even if we say to a retiree, you can keep a uniform for nostalgia's sake or maybe you're part of the honour guard, when they stop doing that, if they do, do they turn that uniform in? If they happen to pass away, for argument sake, which could happen, and now the kids are there cleaning out the house and they're picking through mom or dad's old uniforms that they had and they just throw it out with the goodwill or the garbage or whatever the case might be, or there is a garage sale or who knows what. How do you control that type of thing?

I know we can't control it totally anyway, but these are things that just jump out to me, just wondering how you would do it.

With vehicles, I think vehicles are pretty clear how we could control that and that would be the police force itself. But, again, I throw out here, I know I've seen somewhere at a car show, I think it was this summer, someone had a car that had police or it had sheriff or something. It was like an old – it might have been American, for that matter, I'm not even sure if it was even a Canadian vehicle or an American vehicle, but it had police or sheriff or something on it. It had the lights on it and everything on it. It was at a car show, part of a car club.

So that's another one that just kind of comes to mind as some of the things that we're trying to control. I mean, obviously, the overall intent is for the law enforcement agencies to keep good inventory of what they have, in terms of who it has it, how they're managing it. If they're going to discard something, they're going to get rid of a vehicle because it's too old or it's broken down or whatever, making sure it

doesn't have police written on it, all those types of things.

From that perspective, I get it. I think that's primarily what we're trying to do here, but I just throw it out here that there are still lots of opportunity perhaps, unless it's very tightly controlled, with former members of the police forces, retired members of the police forces and so on that might have lots of memorabilia and uniforms and things like that laying around the house or whatever – do they turn it in? Or if they pass away, do their kids have to turn it in? How do you control that kind of stuff from getting into the wrong hands? I guess that would sort of be the overall theme of my questioning. I'm assuming there would be regulations for this. Maybe all these things are addressed; I look forward to hearing if they are.

But beyond that, I think it's good legislation. It's very unfortunate that we even need to be talking about this kind of stuff, but I think we've all learned, over time, that there are bad people in this world and some of those bad people live right here in Newfoundland and Labrador unfortunately, as well, that are fit to do anything. Anything we can do to try to protect the public from those individuals, then we need to do it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER: Seeing no other speakers, if the Minister of Justice and Public Safety speaks now, we will close debate.

The hon. the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I won't speak very long, because we're going into Committee on this and I want to give everyone the opportunity to have questions. I do want to thank the hon. Member for Harbour Main who brought up some very good points throughout, the huge impact that this incident had on not just the community in Nova Scotia but the entire

country. We were all – I hate to use the word “riveted,” but glued to our televisions and phones to find out what was going on. I share her sentiment that it was devastating.

This will allow timely intervention, some of the things that we’re putting in place now that will correct some of the issues. I look forward to the questions from my hon. colleagues because many of the things that you asked questions on when you got the opportunity to speak are things we’ve covered and will be covered in the regulations through working with the RCMP and the RNC.

Thank you to the MHA for Labrador West for the support. I share your concern with intimate partner violence and gender-based violence as well. We’ve got a committee that’s working on that. Both myself and the Minister Responsible for Women and Gender Equality are working on that. Intimate partner violence, we’ve made some substantial investments in a unit at the RNC that’s dealing with that. We just made an investment last week in a leadership position for that. We want to make sure it’s dealt with correctly.

You mentioned about the other recommendations. We’re looking at all those recommendations that came out of the commission’s report. We’re going to be looking at those and, where it makes sense, we’re going to be looking at trying to make those changes.

The hon. Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands, thank you for your support on this crucial piece of legislation. You’re right, the questions that you’ve raised are things that we think of and that we need to have a conversation on to make sure everyone understands. I think education is a big piece. This is a new piece of legislation that can handle, you know, your questions with respect to kids that have a deceased person that was a police officer, getting rid of the uniforms. I know there’s a police officer in

this House of Assembly that has some things, I’m sure.

But I know that those individuals that would be part of those organizations understand the importance of how important it is to keep a good track on the equipment that they do have with respect to uniforms and things. They’re proud of the badge they wear and they’re proud of the uniforms they have, and we want to make sure we can support that.

That asset management that’s going to be had with the RNC and the RCMP is going to be expanded and worked on even more than it is now. It’s very good now, but we want to make sure that we give them the tools that’s required to protect our people that we represent from having to share a similar fate to what those in Nova Scotia had four years ago.

So that’s what we want to do. I look forward to the questions from my hon. colleagues on both sides of the House.

SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The motion is that Bill 94 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 (Hawley George): A bill, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment. (Bill 94)

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

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

L. DEMPSTER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

On motion, a bill, “An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment,” read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill 94)

SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

I move that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 94.

SPEAKER: A seconder for that, please?

L. DEMPSTER: Seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 94.

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

All those in favour, ‘aye.’

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER: All those against, ‘nay.’

Motion carried.

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

Committee of the Whole

CHAIR (Gambin-Walsh): Order, please!

We are now considering Bill 94, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment.

A bill, “An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment.” (Bill 94)

CLERK: Clause 1.

CHAIR: Shall clause 1 carry?

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

Minister, first of all, I’d like to ask – when we look at the definitions, for example, we see that – that was in clause 2 – there’s reference to law enforcement uniforms. My question is: Does this also apply to military uniforms, or is it just law enforcement? Is there any intent to expand that to military uniforms?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you.

I’ll get the timing down, Madam Chair.

There are no thoughts for us to move into the military side. This gives us the flexibility to not just focus on policing agencies, but also law enforcement agencies as well that would be expanded. That’s in addition to what Nova Scotia did in their legislation. We see that as an opportunity, best practices across the country – although we would be number two in the country to have done this, I think, across the country, they’ll start to follow the lead of what we’ve done here, based on what Nova Scotia did as well.

So we built on the learnings of what Nova Scotia did and we’ll continue to make those improvements as they’re required, but that will be handled in regulation about some

other law enforcement agencies that would be included, based on their asking to be included as well.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Minister.

So you referenced in your opening remarks that that is the way that this legislation will be different from the Nova Scotia law. You indicated it's not just going to be police law enforcement. It's going to be outlined in the regulations is what you're saying. So do you have any idea, though, as to what groups that will apply to or is it just if they want to opt in? Could you please expand on that?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chair, a very good question.

We're looking at those that want to opt in that are law enforcement in nature. I can give you a couple of examples; I don't want to pigeonhole that they would definitely be in because it depends on the consultation process, but it could be corrections officers, as an example, or municipal enforcement officers.

We don't want to have people impersonating someone that has the ability to have public trust. You mentioned it earlier in your speaking before, that's what we want to make sure we instill. What happened in Nova Scotia rocked the public trust in policing, we want to make sure we can bring that public trust back. This, among the many other things that we're doing here in this House of Assembly in other ways, I think that's going to help bring that back.

Those organizations and law enforcement agencies will reach out to us based on the criteria that would be how risky is it for the public to be involved. Then we'll work with

those agencies to best show that they're reflected in this piece of legislation.

That's the important piece that we wanted to get dealt with here today.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Minister.

So presumably that could include first responders or firefighters in our communities or any type of organizations like that as well, I presume?

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

B. DAVIS: It's more focused on law enforcement, that angle, but I'm sure some of those organizations could reach out. The risk associated with those would probably be smaller based on this. I don't want to presuppose that, but the intent of the legislation is law enforcement agencies. We look at Department of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture, you look at forestry officers, corrections officers, those individuals that would be in that type of field.

That's what the legislation is trying to capture here, to make sure that no one can impersonate them, to put harm on another individual and rock trust in the system.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

So I guess it really depends on that level of trust or that position of trust that the organization or that person holds. Thank you.

As vehicles are decommissioned and sold, the law enforcement markings are removed. But in some cases and at certain times you

would still see an outline, which may remain visible.

What would you envision happening in those types of cases?

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

B. DAVIS: Yes, thank you, a very good question.

That will be picked up in regulations as well. It's one of those highlighted things we've talked about with the RCMP as well as the RNC. We're going to be looking at ways that we can make sure that vehicle is completely non-recognizable as a police vehicle or cruiser.

If you see a white Crown Victoria driving down the highway, you automatically assume it's the police. We can't stop that process, but what we can do is make sure that people are not being pulled over by someone in a vehicle that's similar, but the markings can't be there.

I think what happened in Nova Scotia that was challenging and one thing we're going to pick up in this piece of legislation is that you shouldn't be a friend of a printing shop that can print a decal that says police on the side that you can stick on your car. That will be illegal based on this piece of legislation, and then that will be dealt with by the RCMP and RNC. We're giving the tools to police what we know they can do. We know they can get at this; we just need to give them the tools to be able to do it.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

On the issue of consultation, my general question is: What agencies were consulted with on the development of this? In your opening remarks you indicated that

municipalities will be consulted, you'll also be consulting with the film industry.

So what I'm asking is who has been consulted already, apart from the people you planned to consult with or the industries, and did you have consultations with the Nova Scotia government, specifically with respect to their *Police Identity Management Act*?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Absolutely, we've discussed with Nova Scotia; we've had conversations with them. We've also discussed with other jurisdictions that are moving down a similar path, and jurisdictional scans. That's why some subtle changes are here like we've talked about already.

We have had extensive conversations with the RNC and the RCMP on this piece of legislation, and internal to government, we've had departments that would be potentially picked up in this, other parts of the Justice Department; other parts of Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture; Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador will be consulted; Municipal and Provincial Affairs was consulted. So the departments within government were.

The part of the regulations that is coming now that will be giving us the detail on which organizations will be included, whether they want to be or not want to be, that will be done through regulation with respect to consultation through those agencies that I have already highlighted, in addition to the ones we've already had conversation with to develop the legislation where it's to today.

CHAIR: The Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

So clearly there's more in terms of consultations; there's a lot more consultation to be done in the future on this.

Thank you.

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

B. DAVIS: Sorry, I'm nodding yes just for the camera, but the camera was not over here at that point.

Yes, you're 100 per cent correct, there is more consultation. We want to move expeditiously on that though. We want to make sure that we get out making that consultation to those organizations that we've highlighted already as quick as we possibly can.

We know that introducing it here today and getting it supported here today is a very important piece, but the next level, getting it to Royal Assent, is equally important. We want to make sure that this is law as fast as we can, but we also want to make sure that those organizations that want to be included, get consulted, and how best to do that from their own asset management, for their own organizations, how that would look. For example, if it's a municipal enforcement agency or if it's a municipal council, how does that look for them. That's the important piece we want to deal with, with them, and work with them very consultatively.

CHAIR: The Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

With respect to retired enforcement officers, there are restrictions that are mentioned with respect to prohibition on display of the word "police" and there are restrictions that apply to retired enforcement officers. I think my question goes to what the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands had raised with respect to uniforms, for example, ceremonial uniforms, which there is an

exemption for, you've indicated in your remarks, retired officers.

But the concern, I guess, is how will this be patrolled, as the Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands had asked. I wanted to ask that as well. So could you please elaborate on what that's going to look like.

CHAIR: The Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

B. DAVIS: Absolutely. It was very early on in the consultation with the RNC and the RCMP, it was very clear to us, that the membership want to be able to go and support their members when they retire. Whether it be in a ceremonial process, like an honour guard, or whether it's on the Remembrance Day parade or July 1 parade, or any other event, that could be a swearing-in of a new officer or a commanding officer. That is a very big piece to the individuals that serve not just in policing, I mean in the military as well. That's a big piece to what people want to have as a part of their personality.

They've done service for some 30 years, in some cases, maybe more. They understand how important that is. We understand and we got to put things in place, as the hon. Member had said. That's where the asset management with the RNC and the RCMP come into play. That's what we're going to be working on with them to ensure that they know what's out there and who has it, so that if something were to go missing, what the process is.

If a retired RNC officer loses a uniform, even though the ceremonial uniforms are marked different than what you would be pulled over with, we want to make sure that we know who had it, what they had and if it's gone missing, how to deal with that part, which is the important piece that the regulations are going to come forward with.

That's the important piece, as we see it. We understand these individuals have a huge

level of trust. They understand the importance of the uniform and what that impact has on a community already, so I would think we're dealing with a very captive audience.

What is a highlighted point that the hon. Member for Mount Pearl - Southlands brought up was what happens if that individual passes away and their family members, who may not have that same affinity. So these are things that the education process is going to be in place. The RNC and the RNCA will be involved right from start to finish about what we're going to do to support those members that want to be part of that and give them an opportunity, if they don't want to wear that uniform, to move these uniforms back to the RNC so they can be disposed of in an appropriate way.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

Yes, it sounds like it will be a lot of work to implement and enact a process so as to control the uniforms and to have an inventory and a record. That, as you're saying, is going to be played out in regulation, so we'll be looking forward to seeing the details of that.

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

B. DAVIS: Absolutely, and it sparked my memory on this. They already have a fairly, I'll say, very good asset management now. We're formalizing what they currently have. We're making sure that there's a process that if they want to dispose of the materials for retired officers, that's fine.

That's one aspect. I would argue that that's a smaller aspect than the general public who have no rules. If they acquire something and they create something at a print shop that they can utilize, this will

cover those individuals that would be more likely to do those bad acts.

The individuals that are retired police officers or peace officers are more likely not to do those things, but we still want to have checks and balances in place to instill that if they have equipment that's kicking around – as the MHA for Mount Pearl - Southlands said, 40 shirts and 35 pairs of pants but not a dress jacket, fair. All those comments are fair and those will be covered in the regulations very, very much so because they're identified as an issue that we already identified with.

The RNC and the RCMP are working on those, as well. They want to understand what's out there, who has it and in what quantities. Those things will be pared back and that's part of what this legislation is allowing them to do on a go-forward basis.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Minister.

Now, when we look at dramatic works and that, basically, there are restrictions now for the use of law enforcement identifiers to authorize persons, such as law enforcement officers, and for designated purposes like dramatic works.

Will every dramatic work be approved? Like, is this a blanket approval, or will there be exemptions there as well?

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

B. DAVIS: I thank the hon. Member for the very good question.

It's not going to be a blanket approval. Each individual – I'll use the term film or show – will go through a same process. They'll have to reach out, if it's in the RNC or the RCMP's jurisdiction, let them know what's

happening. Not unlike what they do now; there's just no formalized process for it.

We're putting a formalized process in place now to ensure we know exactly what's out there – or the RNC and the RCMP do – to ensure that it doesn't go out into the wrong hands. And obviously putting stipulations on those things, so that if you've got a replica police cruiser that you're doing at a film scene or a television scene, that you're not out driving around on the way to the scene. It's got to be brought there in a certain process.

How they do it – I've seen from my previous life, previous ministry that I had, I've seen shows that decal the side of a vehicle, whether it's *Hudson & Rex* or whether it's *Republic of Doyle* at the time, they would decal the vehicles so you couldn't tell that it was a police vehicle that was driving, it was just covered with green tape or something, so there was no mistaking that.

So those are things that we can formalize, and would be put in place anyway, in order to get approval to use those articles that would be emulating police.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

I'm also curious about the online marketplace. When we see with online, for example, unauthorized sales on the online marketplace, how is that going to be monitored, and what is the plan in place to address that market?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you for the question.

That's a complex one as we all know, but, as I said before, this act when it's put in place and voted on in this House and the regulations are finished, there's going to be

a penalty for those that utilize a police emblem or create one, whether you're a business, up to \$25,000 for an impact to that.

Also the police will have the ability, whether it be through tips, whether it be through Crime Stoppers, whether it be through intelligence that they have currently. Once they find out that, it gives them the ability to go in and get those things, search and seizure, to grab those things when they know they're there.

Obviously, like any investigation, if you don't know it's there, it's hard to deal with. So there will be some obvious work with the community through the intelligence gathering that they do anyway that says if someone has 15 replica badges or a replica police car that they're doing in their garage, those things come to the police rather organically and they'll be able to act now that they couldn't act before because it wasn't illegal to have those things before. It was illegal to impersonate an officer but not to hold those things that could allow you to do it. So now, this is formalizing that to make sure that doesn't happen.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

Minister, you talked about Halloween and how often we see people dressing up and display that they're police. They're non-police but during Halloween. I'm just curious how is that going to be monitored and, you know, what's the plan there?

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

B. DAVIS: I thank the hon. Member for the question. I do want to clarify one thing that I said before and I'll get back to the Halloween side in a second.

The permissions for any production that would be involved would also involve the disposal of that said item, whatever that would be: a cruiser, a uniform or a mock badge, whatever that would look like. That would have to be part of the approval given to the film or production. They would have to dispose of it as well at the end of that production. So that's one thing there.

For the Halloween side, I did say that there's no intent here to stop children from being a police officer. I think, probably, everybody in this House of Assembly when they were children, dressed up as a police officer at Halloween. So there's no intent for that.

It's not intending to stop people from dressing up at Halloween either as a police officer, but you're not going to be able to use things that are identical to what a police officer would be wearing. You're not going to be able to have a stylized uniform that would be exactly like the RNC or the RCMP. That would be a very challenging thing. That would be something that would be dealt with in the regulations but also through the impersonation of an officer, we want to make sure that the education piece for the public is clear that we don't want people out there doing that, especially if you're going to be taking advantage of the public, which could happen.

Most of the time, this is not what the intention is. We are making legislation in this House, most times, for the worst of the worst, as the MHA for Mount Pearl - Southlands said in his speech earlier. But that's where we're to as a society. We have to try to protect the public, and sometimes making sure that people understand the ramifications of choosing to dress exactly as an RNC officer or an RCMP officer is not the best thing to do at Halloween.

We understand completely why children and some others would, but there are Halloween costumes that they know you're a police officer but they know it's not a legitimate

police officer, you know, like those funny-style costumes. That's not the intention here.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

As we all know, it is illegal to impersonate a police officer anyway, so that is the existing law.

With respect to your comments about the item has to be rendered unserviceable. There's an exemption there which basically permits you to currently own the item if it's been rendered unserviceable.

Can you just explain in practical terms how that would occur, rendering an item unserviceable?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you very much.

One example could be a police cruiser, making sure there's no lights anywhere near it, it's all taken off; cleaning off the side of the vehicle, making sure there's no decal outline that gives the impression that it's police there.

The simplest example probably would be if you had a badge, an RNC or an RCMP badge, you had one that was given to you by your father, putting it into – for lack of a better term – a shadow box that you can't take out. It's locked in, it's sealed in acrylic or something like that, a clear acrylic, that would be something that would allow you to keep your possession, not have to worry about it.

It's not something you could use that would give the impression that you're a current police officer, similar to your story about the individual that pulled over the couple. We don't want people to be able to have a

serviceable badge that could do that, unless they're a police officer.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

The final question I have is: When can we expect the Lieutenant Governor to proclaim this bill?

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

B. DAVIS: That's a very good question.

After we get approval based on what people have said in the House of Assembly here today, we'll move very quickly to start the consultation period. I don't want to prejudge how quickly that can happen because there are a lot of moving parts with agencies that may want to be included, some that may not. We're going to go through that process.

We will be as expeditious as possible. We want this legislation in effect as soon as possible, but we want to make sure we give, whether it's corrections officers or the RNCA or the forestry officers the ability to meet and chat with us to see what individual concerns they may have, we want to make sure that they're covered.

We know we have a very strong framework built upon the commission's review, built on what Nova Scotia has done, built on what other jurisdictions in this country are doing. We're just going to happen to be the second one to do it, but there will be others that will follow us very closely behind that are going to do similar things that we're doing here today.

I thank you for the great questions here today.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

H. CONWAY OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

That's all my questions.

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Madam Chair, I appreciate that.

Minister, just a couple of questions to follow up from my colleague from Harbour Main with respect to the uniforms worn by retired police officers, you spoke about it already. Just going through Remembrance Day ceremonies, I was present at one in my district where a retired captain from St. John's Regional Fire Department was there in his uniform, which I thought was strange. He said he had approval from his chief to wear it in public.

Is this going to be the same thing going forward with retired police officers for them to use theirs in public, and just to keep, not a reign on it, but for it to be known when they are using them in public and for different events?

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

B. DAVIS: Yes, I thank my hon. colleague from the beautiful District of Cape St. Francis.

That is exactly what would have to be the case and is the current case right now. If you are a retired member who wants to be in a parade, you have to get approval now from the chief of police. That's what happens right now as we speak today.

What we're doing now in this legislation is putting parameters in place to make sure that the equipment, like that uniform, we know who has it, make sure it's in the asset management system. I think it's very, very important that the retired – whether they be military, fire or police – have the ability to do that, through the proper channels. That's all.

That's essentially what we're doing here now. I think that's an important piece that the RNCA would want us to voice here today, that the chief of police would want us to voice – both chiefs of police – and even the director of fire operations, whether they be in St. John's Regional or a retired volunteer fire department.

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank you, Minister, for that response.

Just one more with respect to the public consultation. With respect to municipalities around our province that currently have municipal enforcement, and the first ones come to mind are St. John's, Gander, Corner Brook, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Torbay, Mount Pearl, CBS, Deer Lake, and I'm sure there are others. Have these municipalities and cities and towns been consulted? Is this something that's going to come forward individually with the municipalities who have law enforcement, because no doubt, it's province-wide. I'm just wondering if we can get a bit of clarification on that one, Minister?

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

B. DAVIS: No problem; a very good question.

Prior to the House seeing the bill, we can't consult directly there. So in the beginning of the development of this bill, the RNC and the RCMP haven't seen the bill as it exists here today. You, in the House of Assembly, get to see the bill first, before anybody else. So that's where we're to. They help in the foundation of it.

You asked directly about municipalities. We've reached out to them to let them know this was coming to the House of Assembly. They understand and everyone that I talked to – I can't speak to the others in my staff

that talked to them – were very positive. They do have questions, of course, like you would, but they're very positive about the piece of legislation. They understand exactly what we're trying to do because this is to support them as well. We don't want people going out impersonating the municipal enforcement officer in Grand Falls-Windsor. We don't want that to happen; they don't want that to happen either. This is a measure that we can put in place to support them. They will be involved in consultation on day one.

I've talked to the president of Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador this morning as well to let her know that this was coming. They're all understanding of it. They have questions, just like everyone would, just like you have here today. That will all be dealt with in the balance of time when we work with them in the regulations.

We want to make sure, if they want to be included, they're going to be included. We're going to work with them and municipal enforcement officers are a very good starting point to look at as a basis for what this would be as an enforcement officer, why it's not just police.

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

J. WALL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Minister, for that.

I am pleased to see that the municipalities will be engaged going forward. That is appreciated, I'm sure.

Thank you very much. Nothing further.

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

L. PADDOCK: Thank you, Chair.

Minister, a couple questions. The first one, you indicated that this bill would not be applicable to the military. What about

paramilitary, given the number of paramilitary organizations in the province?

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

B. DAVIS: That is not the intent of the legislation. The intent is to deal with law enforcement.

I actually did think you were going to go military police there for a second; I thought you were going to go there and I was going to say, that's a very good question, I'll have to get my staff just to make sure that's not included.

My understanding is that this legislation deals with law enforcement officers, not paramilitary organizations. But a very good question because we want to make sure we get the information out to the public for sure.

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

L. PADDOCK: Thank you, Chair.

Military police would be subject to the Department of National Defence.

Second question, and I guess this is more all encompassing in looking at where things are from a supply chain. So if you look at graphic designer and all of that, it is all now moving to software. If you look at a lot of the newer vehicles, you have various amounts of software in the vehicle. We even have a Newfoundland company, SkyHawk Telematics, that does asset tracking of vehicles.

Is there any consideration, I guess, in twofold, to look at that software issue, being able to ensure that there's security over that; and, two, given the evolving nature of supply chains, to have a systemic, periodic review of the bill?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Absolutely, we definitely want to always look at legislation, especially when we're bringing in new legislation like this. There's no time frame on this but I know, from my standpoint, we always want, especially when we bring new legislation in, let's look at it year one, year two, just to see how it's going out to the public and how it's being dealt with the key stakeholders.

We're going to continue to do that with this one. This is going to be – I don't want to say a moving document, because once we get it to a place where we think it's good, we want to be there. But the people that are key stakeholders in this, whether they be law enforcement agencies, other than the police, they're going to be a key piece in developing this piece of legislation from a regulation standpoint.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Chair.

The federal government has a total ban on the sale of used police vehicles altogether. My question is: Why wasn't that considered? Why are we going down the route of possibly still selling used vehicles through the asset management?

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

B. DAVIS: Very good question.

We're not pursuing that, per se. People can buy – I go back to a Crown Vic, because that's usually what was a police interceptor but they're different now. But people can have those things that are not police related at all. They look like a police vehicle and if you decal it, it can be an actual police vehicle in people's minds.

So that's what we want to stop here now. We want to make sure that if there is going

to be the resale of something that somebody has had for a number of years, that they're dealt with through this piece of legislation. We don't want anyone to be able to have any preconceived notions that you can transfer, even if it's a police cruiser that's in a museum, it has to be dealt with in the correct way.

It's different if you're driving around in something that's made in 1975 that is not looking like a police vehicle today. We want to make sure that people have no confusion about vehicles that they would be potentially pulled over by. Because that's exactly how it happened in Nova Scotia, among other things, but that's exactly what we want to stop.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: In Nova Scotia, the Commission, in response to the 2023 mass casualty event, they recommended a third party review of decommissioning process for police vehicles and any recommendation arriving from the review would be implemented and alternate avenues for disposal, such as transferred to other government agencies or other levels of government be pursued first.

Is this something, through your regulations, you guys are looking at? Say if the RNC was going to dispose of a former police interceptor, would it be seen if it's needed somewhere else in the public sector first – like, decals taken off and move it into another public sector for approval before it's sold to the general public?

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you.

There are no thoughts that we would do that with this piece of legislation today. One of the things is there are multiple recommendations, many recommendations

in that commissioned report. We're working through those in the department. Anything that makes sense, we're going to be trying to move on. We're working with the police agencies to look at implementing some of the recommendations that make the best sense in a timely manner and we're going to continue to do that.

I'll keep you posted on any of those things, but it's a valid question and something that we'll consider during the regulation part, as well, because it is a good idea.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the minister.

Currently, does the RNC have an asset management and disposal policy prior to this that they're currently operating under, and how much changes between what they're doing now and what's going to be coming into force? Is there much discrepancy there?

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

B. DAVIS: The very quick answer is not much change. There will be some, of course, over time. We'll work with them to make those changes that are required.

They're very supportive of where we're going with this piece of legislation. They are, I would like to say, key architects but they were involved, the RNC, as well as the RCMP. They have processes in place now. We're formalizing some of the things that would deal with retired officers. They have a very strong process on that now.

The biggest piece of this that they're looking forward to is the ability for individuals to be able to get these items, not through the RNC, being able to print them – and they have no ability to be able to go after those people. Now, with this legislation, they'll

have that ability to go, search, seize those items that could be used for that process.

I think the retired officer's piece of the RNC or the RCMP is a very, very small and very low-risk aspect of this, but it is going to be covered in this legislation. We had to. We wanted to make sure that was the case, but that will be in the regulations. They're working with us to make sure their asset management system covers all of those aspects.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Thank you.

Also, we have other light and siren vehicles like ambulance, fire trucks, auxiliary vehicles like that. How will this legislation affect the resale of those assets as well? An ambulance or fire truck, auxiliary vehicles stuff like that, are there also going to be covered in this legislation?

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

B. DAVIS: The answer to the question is very quickly, no, this bill is directly for law enforcement agencies. There will be other things, potentially, coming for those aspects.

Most of these assets would be disposed of – if you're talking a fire truck, most of that would be, if it has passed its useful life from one community, another community, through the fire commission's office, tried to move that to another community that would need it, they're very hard to deal with in that way. Ambulances, usually, run right to the end of their useful life in most cases. In some cases, if you're making a big buy or big change in those, they'll be used in some other service within health and life safety potentially.

CHAIR: The hon. the Member for Labrador West.

J. BROWN: Given the sale of light bars and sirens and stuff like that, will this be also governed under this act? You know, the companies that supply and sell those items to the RNC and the RCMP, will those items be governed under this act as well?

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

B. DAVIS: You're not allowed to put light bars on your vehicle that would give the impression to somebody that would be behind you or anything like that that you would be a police officer. Obviously, this act would be beneficial for that, but you can't do that today.

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

P. LANE: Thank you.

I don't have many questions; they've pretty much been all asked and answered and I appreciate that. I guess, just a couple of quick things.

Minister, in terms of the vehicle – and I think I referenced earlier, I've seen one around here somewhere. I can't recall exactly where, but it was around town here and I think it said police. It didn't say RNC or RCMP; it might have said police. I think it was black and white. I think instead of having a light bar, it was an old-fashioned car with the one round light on the top almost like you see in the movies years ago.

So even though it says police, it does not resemble a modern-day RNC or RCMP vehicle. Like, I wouldn't stop for it if it tried to pull me over. I think it said police on it and it does have a light on it and so on, but it's like I say, it's an antique car for car shows or whatever.

Is that allowed or is it only if it looks like a modern-day RNC or RCMP vehicle that it wouldn't be allowed? How does that work?

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

B. DAVIS: So this act would prohibit the use of the word “police,” unless you were a police agency.

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

P. LANE: Okay, thank you. That’s good to know.

I think you’ve pretty much answered this, but I just want to walk through it very quickly. Would it be the intent, do you think if I was an RNC officer – and maybe this is already the case now; it never used to be but that was a long time ago when I had any involvement there. But right now if I retired from the RNC, upon my retirement, would I be asked by the quartermaster’s store or whoever to say turn in all your old uniforms, all your jackets, all your pants, your shirts, turn it all in as of today. If not, will there be a process now that you would turn it all in when you retire?

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

B. DAVIS: Yeah, so they have an asset management system currently that’s much better than it used to be. But the answer, the long and short of it, is yes. You’re not going to be able to carry all of that, uniforms, the current uniform that they’re wearing. The only exception to that would be your ceremonial uniform, with approval, that currently exists today, from the chief.

That may slightly change in this, but it’s not going to be any different than, you know, you may have to do some different things with a badge, that may have to be affixed to your ceremonial uniform, that would never be able to be taken off, as an example, if it was a cloth badge, for instance.

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

P. LANE: Again, just for my clarification. If I were a retired member, I had gotten my approval for my ceremonial uniform because I’m in the honour guard or I want to use it for Remembrance Day or whatever the case might be, and I should pass away. Somebody at the RNC would know that I had that, it would be on record, and then they would contact my spouse, my children, whatever, to say: Can we have Dad’s or Mom’s uniform back? Is that how it would work?

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

B. DAVIS: Yes.

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

P. LANE: Okay, perfect. Thank you.

I guess just a final thing, again, just trying to clarify. So we’re talking about you can’t print things with police and so on, but I think the Member for Harbour Main – because it was kind of hard hearing her from over here, to be honest, and I don’t have my earpiece because I broke it again, but, anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Asset management.

P. LANE: Yeah, asset management.

I guess I’m just sort of wondering, when you were talking there, I just went on Amazon and I just googled police uniforms and there are tons of hits there. Some of them, yeah, are for kids, Halloween costumes. Some of them, I’ve got to be honest with you, look like the real deal. Now, they might not look just like the RNC uniform, but there are all kinds of different shades and colours and variations and they do look like police. Someone who might not necessarily be 100 per cent – you know, not dealing with the police every day, you could potentially fool somebody, especially in the nighttime.

So how does that work? If you bought something on Amazon or whatever, I guess it's like anything else, if you had it on and the police saw you, they'd, I guess, confiscate it from you or whatever. Of course, if you tried to pretend to be a police officer, you'd still be charged with impersonating an officer, even if it didn't say RNC or RCMP, the intent is you're still trying to pretend to be a police officer, so I guess you'd be charged whether it was an official uniform or not.

Is that how it would work? Is that how it works?

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

B. DAVIS: I don't want to presuppose what charges would come from that, but if the intent was to impersonate an officer, then there is a Criminal Code charge for that. This legislation would allow the RNC, upon knowing this, or the RCMP upon knowing this, that somebody has it in their possession, they could go in and take it, before it becomes a problem. Because if you're waiting for someone to be charged for impersonating the officer, you're almost too late because they've already done something, or planning to do something, that's not in the best interest of the public.

So we want to be able to give them the tools to go get that, because, currently, right now, it's not illegal to possess something like that. We want to make sure it is illegal to possess something like that. So regardless of what your intention was, you shouldn't have it. Because you may be the best-intentioned person that has a uniform that looks exactly like and RNC or RCMP uniform and never the intention of using it for what it was.

If someone breaks into your house and takes it, then they use it for what they want to use it for, and that's not the same thing you had in mind for it. So we want to make sure people understand – collectors in

particular – what risk they have if they don't deal with it in the right way.

There are ways to deal with it, whether that's dispose of it or put it in the right way so that people can't make the impression; make it unserviceable, whether that's a replica badge that your dad would have had or your mom would have had.

We can fix that so you can still have it, but just so someone, if they take it, it will never be serviceable for what they intend to use it for, if it's negative.

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

P. LANE: Thank you, Minister, I do appreciate that.

It all makes good sense to me. I guess the only other thing that came to mind was, I know we're talking law enforcement, I did hear you mention HMP. I'm just kind of wondering, with HMP – I mean, listen, I think all these agencies should have asset management programs, so I'm not against any of that. But given the fact that the intent is to protect the public and when you threw HMP into the mix – I can see municipal enforcement perhaps, RNC, RCMP, even wildlife enforcement because you're out in the public, maybe even Sherriff's officers, because they go around serving people with documents and seizing property, so that's another one that would come to mind. But the HMP, unless you're like a prisoner at the Pen, I don't think the general public would have any – unless there's something I'm missing, I don't think they would have any interaction or be threatened by the HMP.

I'm not sure why they were even brought into it, other than the fact they are part of the law system but they're not really enforcement officers per se. They are only dealing with criminals that have already been convicted and are in jail, right?

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

B. DAVIS: Very good question and I may have inadvertently said corrections officers. They may request to want to be a part of this because they want an asset management process in place, too. That's very possible.

You're right, Sheriff's Officers, municipal enforcement officers, they can all be part of this. I'm not suggesting that corrections officers shouldn't. That would be what the risk would be, to determine whether there is a risk or isn't. They may request and we may say no, there's no risk to the public – not us, the people who would be involved in this, could look and say there is no risk to the public that you would be impersonating a corrections officer and it would be a risk to the public.

Now, there may be reasons why they think it would be a risk to the public that we don't know about today. That's what this whole process of going through consultations with those law enforcement agencies are all about.

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

P. LANE: Again, if they want to be part of it, I think they should still have – I think all of these organizations quite frankly, it's in everyone's best interests to have controls, have asset management so there's no issue there. It was just that from the perspective of – I wouldn't see a warden in the Pen being the same as somebody who could impersonate a police officer in a vehicle and starting hauling over the public or doing harm. That's why, in the same way, I see them as totally sort of different scenarios that's all. That's why I was asking.

That's all the questions I have.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR: Okay.

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

J. DINN: Just a question, more or less, maybe a follow-up or not, depending: Law enforcement agency means a police agency, an agency that provides policing services in another province or territory of Canada and another person prescribed in the regulations. Obviously, this applies to police forces that are within Canada.

I'm just thinking in terms of uniforms or paraphernalia from police uniforms outside of Canada, maybe North America, if you have a New York City police department ball cap or even a vehicle. I don't know what the regulations are down there but it has markings and it's clearly not RNC, clearly not the RCMP. It's clearly identifiable as another police agency that would have no jurisdiction in Canada. I'm assuming then that they wouldn't be covered in this, or would they?

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

B. DAVIS: So not to stop a follow-up, but the short answer would be, if anything says police on it, that would not be permissible here. It has to be only a police officer here.

So if you're driving around a New York City State Trooper vehicle and it has police written on it or gives the impression of that, it prohibits the authorized use of word "police." So if you're wearing a ball hat that's a collector's thing that you visited New York and it says NYPD hat, there's thousands and thousands of them. That would not give the impression that you're a guaranteed police officer.

My brother-in-law is a retired police officer and he has a police hat from everywhere he's ever gone. That's not, I think, the impression that would be problematic. I think if he was wearing a uniform from every area, that would be a problem. Because

regardless of which place you're from, you are still impersonating a police officer which in the *Criminal Code* is a problem and would be dealt with through the *Criminal Code*.

But in this case, if you have this stuff lying around, it can be seized. Where we have to go with it, people would just understand that they have this because they're collectors of this stuff and they would deal with in a way that's appropriate for whatever article of police paraphernalia they have. Whether that's hat badges that people collect all over the world, if they're enclosed and put on to something that they can't be taken off and if they're taken off, they rip apart, they can't be utilized. That's exactly what we're looking for here to make sure they're unserviceable for a negative cause.

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

J. DINN: That's it, Madam Chair.

CHAIR: That's it?

Any further questions?

Seeing no further speakers, shall the motion carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, clause 1 carried.

CLERK: Clauses 2 though 23 inclusive.

CHAIR: Shall clauses 2 to 23 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Motion carried.

On motion, clauses 2 through 23 inclusive carried.

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

CHAIR: Shall the enacting clause carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

CLERK: A bill, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment. (Bill 94)

CHAIR: Shall the title carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, title carried.

CHAIR: Shall I report the bill without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

CHAIR: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Chair.

I move that the Committee rise and report Bill 94 carried without amendment.

CHAIR: The motion is that the Committee rise and report Bill 94 carried without amendment.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

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

SPEAKER (Bennett): Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Placentia - St. Mary's and Chair of the Committee of the Whole.

S. GAMBIN-WALSH: Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill 94, An Act Respecting the Management of Law Enforcement Articles, Uniforms, Vehicle Markings and Vehicle Equipment, carried without amendment.

SPEAKER: The Chair of the Committee of the Whole reports that the Committee have considered the matters to them referred and directed that Bill 94 be carried without amendment.

When shall the report be received?

L. DEMPSTER: Now.

SPEAKER: Now.

When shall the bill be read a third time?

L. DEMPSTER: Tomorrow.

SPEAKER: Tomorrow.

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

SPEAKER: The hon. the Deputy Government House Leader.

L. DEMPSTER: Thank you, Speaker.

I call from the Order Paper, Order 10, second reading of Bill 81, An Act to Amend the Proceedings Against the Crown Act, and that is seconded by the Minister of Justice and Public Safety.

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

B. DAVIS: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing, that we move into the second reading for Bill 86, An Act to Amend the Opioid Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Act.

SPEAKER: Order, please!

I'm going to go back to the Deputy Government House Leader. Are you looking to debate Bill 86?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SPEAKER: No? Not for 86?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SPEAKER: The hon. the Government House Leader.

J. HOGAN: Thank you, Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Deputy Premier,
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 1:30
p.m., Monday.

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